Chapman University

Chapman University Digital Commons

Education (PhD) Dissertations

Dissertations and Theses

Spring 5-18-2019

Exploring Gender Roles and Gender Equality within the Evangelical Church

Christopher Bishop

Chapman University, cj.bisho105@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/education_dissertations

Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#), [Family, Life Course, and Society Commons](#), [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), [Leadership Studies Commons](#), and the [Regional Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bishop, C. (2019). *Exploring gender roles and gender equality within the Evangelical Church* [Doctoral dissertation, Chapman University]. Chapman University Digital Commons. <https://doi.org/10.36837/chapman.000037>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations and Theses at Chapman University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Education (PhD) Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Chapman University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact laughtin@chapman.edu.

Exploring Gender Roles and Gender Equality within the Evangelical Church

A Dissertation by

Christopher J. Bishop

Chapman University

Orange, CA

College of Educational Studies

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Education

March 2019

Committee in charge:

Kris De Pedro, Ph.D., Chair

Don Cardinal, Ph.D.

Gail Stearns, Ph.D.

The dissertation of Christopher J. Bishop is approved.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kris De Pedro', written over a horizontal line.

Kris De Pedro, Ph.D., Chair

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Don Cardinal', written over a horizontal line.

Don Cardinal, Ph.D.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gail Stearns', written over a horizontal line.

Gail Stearns, Ph.D.

March 2019

Exploring Gender Roles and Gender Equality within the Evangelical Church

Copyright © 2019

by Christopher J. Bishop

DEDICATION

To my partner, Leika.

For exemplifying positive change in the world, through your kindness, service, and incredible work ethic. You continue to inspire me.

Thank you for all of the sacrifices you have made and support and encouragement you have provided. I give you all of my heart, and half of my debt.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To God, in all loving forms for giving me the strength and joy of expanding my mind and heart through this program.

I would like to acknowledge my doctoral dissertation committee. The committee was pivotal in the completion of my dissertation. I appreciate their time, thoughtful perspective and guidance throughout the process.

To Dr. Kris De Pedro, I am truly grateful for your mentorship throughout the doctoral program. You exemplify the importance of what it means to thoughtfully engage with this world as a researcher in a caring, authentic and professional manner. Thank you for helping me better understand this world and expanding my understanding of social justice.

To Dr. Don Cardinal, thank you for expanding my understanding of quantitative data, providing me the tools to better understand research through survey methods, and for helping me prepare my understanding of my topic throughout the dissertation process.

To Dr. Gail Stearns, thank you for your insight, suggestions and feedback to respectfully explore and thoughtfully examine the Evangelical community during my dissertation process. Your expertise provided insight that improved my perspective and expanded my curiosities during the dissertation process.

I would have not been able to have successfully completed my doctoral program without the love and support of my family. To my parents, Susan and Greg, thank you for demonstrating the importance of passion, hard work and the value believing in yourself. Thank you for your unconditional love and support throughout the various adventures in my life. To my brother, Corey, thank you for reminding me of the importance of brotherhood, for helping me remain grounded in the love and support of others, and for always being able to make me laugh.

To the Arrietas, for their kindness, ability to fill my stomach, and willingness to bring me along their global adventures. To Uncle Mike and Aunt Linda, for exposing me to the joys and cultures that life has to offer. Especially to Aunt Linda for making my paper sound good. To my grandparents, Mary and Bill, thank you for your continued love, support and faith perspective. To my grandmother, Mamma, thank you for your consistent inquiries of the progress within my program. Your love and support can only be matched by your ability to nag.

I am also incredibly appreciative to all of my friends who encouraged and helped me maintain my sanity throughout the doctoral program. I would especially like to thank Jenny and Tim Haagen, Dr. Justin Koppleman, Dr. Chris Hutchinson, Gaya and Tim Gnaneswaran, Chris Becerra, Diana and Ken Rodgers, Kelsey and Aaron Flewellen, Jon Ceurvorst, and Jeremy Rebis for being an incredible support network.

I would like to recognize and express my gratitude to the Attallah College of Educational Studies at Chapman University for the exceptional doctoral program. The faculty and administrative staff have provided thoughtful support and encouraged growth for all students. I would like to especially thank Dr. Penny Bryan, Dr. Michael Hass, Dr. Keith Howard, Dr. Dawn Hunter, Dr. Whitney McIntyre Miller, Dr. Peter McLaren, Dr. Geraldine McNenny, Dr. Lilia Monzó, and Dr. Suzanne SooHoo for leading me to new discoveries, expanding how I understand knowledge and providing me scholarly growth opportunities.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to and appreciation to my peers in the doctoral program who supported my intellectual and personal growth and who I am honored to call friends. I want to especially thank Dr. Pamela Ezell, Dr. Miznah Alomair, Christopher Jackson, K.P. Williams, Anthony Garrison, Margaret Vento-Wilson, Dr. Michael Fernandez, Dr.

Elizabeth Yomantes, Jackie Aparicio, and Kinda Abujbarah for enhancing an already amazing experience throughout the doctoral program.

I would also like to thank Chapman University who has provided enrichment in my life beyond my wildest expectations. Through Chapman I have experienced educational growth, professional development, given the opportunity to cultivate socially and through amazing leadership opportunities. I have made lifelong friends, fell in love with an amazing partner and continue to be impressed with what Chapman provides.

Lastly, I would like to thank members of the Evangelical community who provided me with the opportunity to share in dialogue during this study. I will be forever grateful for your willingness to openly share your perspective and experiences, and trusting in me to share these beliefs and outlooks.

ABSTRACT

Exploring Gender Roles and Gender Equality within the Evangelical Church

by Christopher J. Bishop

This research aims to facilitate better understanding of perceptions of gender roles and gender equality among members of the Evangelical Church and to determine whether these perceptions differ by gender. The evangelical community's ideologies and values have come to shape social and political dialogues within the United States. A key component of the faith is understanding the role each member plays within his or her family unit and community at large. The evangelical faith's organizational structure and ideologies are informed by a patriarchal model that's placed women at internal and structural odds, based on research exploring evangelically informed organizations. However, there is a gap in literature related to gender roles and equality within the faith, and how these perceptions may differ by gender and the influence a church's organizational structure may have on these perceptions. This process involved the examination of perceptions of gender among evangelical Christians in a nationally representative sample. These findings informed a series of questions designed to explore, at greater depth on a regional level, the views of evangelicals regarding gender roles and gender equality within their organizations. The study provided a multidimensional construct of how the evangelical community defines themselves, understands gender roles and gender equality, and how these definitions affirm and conflict with definitions outside of the church as well as their own church's leadership and organizational structure.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Background	1
Problem Statements.....	2
Defining Purpose Statement.....	3
Research Question Background	3
Defining Research Questions	5
Significance.....	5
Defining Assumptions.....	6
Defining Limitations	6
Theoretical Framework	7
Feminist theory.....	8
Production of gender ideology.	9
Heterosexual ideology, gender roles, sexuality and power.	10
Patriarchy.....	11
Analytical tools.....	11
Feminist Liberation Theology.....	12
Liberation theology.....	14
Feminist theology.	17
Transformational leadership theory.....	19
Defining Delimitations.....	21
Definition of Terms	22
Chapter Two: Literature Review.....	26
Defining Evangelicals	27
Evangelical Gender and Leadership Theories and Ideologies	29
Headship.....	29
Complementarianism.....	32
Egalitarianism.....	33
Practicing the Faith.....	34
Evangelical norms.	35
Dating.	36
Marriage and family.	39

Female roles.....	40
Male roles.	44
Servant Leadership.....	45
Chapter Three: Methodology.....	50
Significance.....	50
Methodological Approach.....	51
Research Design.....	53
Timing and weighting quantitative and qualitative studies.	54
Explanatory sequential design.	55
Implementing Mixed Methods.....	61
Implementation.....	62
Priority.....	62
Integration.....	62
Settings and Participants	63
Preliminary considerations for community engagement.	64
Cultural competence.	64
Worldview.	65
Rhetoric.	66
Paradigms.	67
Defining the Problem	68
Review Studies.....	69
Data Collection and Data Analysis	71
Ethical Considerations.....	74
Summary and Conclusion	75
Chapter Four: Methods and Results.....	77
Stage 1: Quantitative Component	77
Study hypothesis.....	78
Data Source.....	78
Participants and sample population.	79
Independent variables.....	79
Statistical software.....	86
Statistical procedures.....	87
Demographic characteristics: evangelical and non-evangelical.....	88

Comparing perceptions of gender roles and equality among evangelical and non-evangelical participants.....	93
Comparing perceptions of gender roles and equality by gender in the overall sample.....	95
Comparing perceptions of gender roles and equality among men and women in the evangelical subsample.....	97
Comparing perceptions of gender roles and equality among men and women in the non-evangelical subsample.....	99
Summary.....	102
Stage 2: Executive Summary - Secondary Analysis	104
Figure 1. Executive summary – quantitative analysis.....	107
Figure 2. Focus group researcher script.....	111
Stage 3: Qualitative Component	114
Study hypothesis.....	114
Research design.....	115
Participants and sampling schemes.....	116
Data collection procedures and instruments.....	117
Data analysis and procedures.....	121
Credibility and dependability of qualitative results.....	146
Summary	147
Chapter Five: Discussion.....	150
Research Question 1 Findings.....	150
Research Question 2 Findings.....	153
Theoretical Implications.....	155
Feminist theory.....	155
Feminist liberation theology.....	157
Transformative liberation theology.....	158
Methodological Implications.....	160
Practical Implications.....	161
Limitations	163
Quantitative data collection.....	163
Qualitative data collection.....	164
Application of mixed methods.....	166
Conclusion.....	166
APPENDICES.....	169

REFERENCES.....	259
-----------------	-----

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Mixed Methods Design	61
Table 2. Overall Evangelical Belief Characteristics	83
Table 3. Missing Responses from Sample Populations	86
Table 4. Demographic Characteristics: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical	89
Table 5. Demographic Sample Characteristics: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical	92
Table 6. GSS Gender Based Questions Affirmative Responses, Evangelical/Non Evangelical Responses	95
Table 7. GSS Gender Based Questions Affirmative Responses, Gendered Responses ..	97
Table 8. GSS Gender Based Questions Affirmative Response, Evangelical Gendered Responses	99
Table 9. GSS Gender Based Affirmative Responses, Non-Evangelical Gendered Responses	102

Chapter One: Introduction

Background

The evangelical faith has actively defined the moral voice of the American social landscape beginning from initial formation of the faith. The influence and size of this community has grown; evangelicals now represent the largest faith group in the United States. Ideologies and values of evangelicals have become integrated in social and political dialogues alike. Community and individual identities, too, are influenced by evangelical strictures. The faith's teachings are crucial to how believers model justice in social relationships, the workplace and broader society.

Social research examining the evangelical community has enhanced understanding of how the evangelical ideologies have influenced social and political conversations, as well as the faithful's self-understanding. From these findings (Balswick & Balswick, 1999; Bartkowski, 1998; Bartkowski & Read, 2003; Brasher, 1998; Bryant, 2006; Colaner & Giles, 2008; Dahlving, 2011; Ferguson, 2011; Gallagher, 2003; Gallagher, 2004; Hull, 1998; Longman, et. al., 2015; Longman & Anderson, 2016; Oates, Hall & Anderson, 2005; Wilcox, 2004) it is determined that the evangelical community's organizational structure and ideologies influence gender roles and enforce a patriarchal hierarchy model. Women represent less than 10% of the leadership within evangelical churches (Pew Research Center 2016), and their roles are traditionally limited to women's or children's ministry. While each member of the family is crucial within the church, ideology places the man in the authoritative role. Historically this model is supported by both genders; however, during the last 30 years the importance of a dual-income family, and the gender equality empowerment trend, has changed this dynamic.

The faith community maintains its headship ideology, but the practice within the home and lives beyond the church has begun to challenge the faith and its support of gender equality.

To better understand how the Evangelical Church informs gender roles and equality, faith studies have explored ideologies related to gender and family ideals and practices. Research identified an organizational hierarchy within the faith that utilizes gender-defined roles as justification for faith-driven equality. Recently studies have begun to explore perception of equality by gender; however, these studies have primarily been focused on professional women within higher education who work within an evangelically directed institution (Bryant, 2006; Dahlving, 2013; Longman & Anderson, 2016; Lowe, 2011). There is a noticeable gap within the research on contemporary views on gender roles and equality within a church's organizational structure. This study will explore these gaps based on the roles and rights of men and women based on modern society and perceptions within the evangelical community. This paper will explore how the community currently perceives equality, responsibilities, status and emotional well-being between men and women.

Problem Statements

Recent studies highlight challenges faced by women within leadership roles based on the gender role expectations informed by the evangelical faith. These challenges include conflict based on organizational design, opposition by male colleagues, and internal angst over the balance of religious aspiration vs. familial duties. These studies have focused on the influence of faith-influenced values and their effects on personal and professional decisions (Bryant, 2006; Dahlving, 2013; Davidson & Caddell, 1994;

Longman & Anderson, 2016; Lowe, 2011). However, there is scant evidence of exploration the organizational structures, from the perspective of the church, that shape this community's present day sociopolitical attitudes on gender role expectations, equality and feminism. The study seeks to further understand the role the evangelical faith has on developing an individual's gender role, expectations within these roles, and the perspective of others based on gender equality. Exploring the perceptions of gender roles and gender equality among members of the evangelical church may help to determine how the church's ideology influences an individual's understanding of gender-based identity.

Defining Purpose Statement

The purpose of this research was to understand how the evangelical community comes to understand gender roles and equality through faith ideologies and how these perceptions may differ by gender. Additionally, the research took into consideration how a church's organizational structure and leadership may influence the perception of gender roles and equality.

Research Question Background

Great progress has been made (Bryant, 2006; Dahlving, 2013; Dahlving & Longman, 2015; Longman & Anderson, 2016; Gallagher, 2003; Gallagher, 2004; Hull, 1998; Longman, et. al., 2015; Longman & Anderson, 2016; Lowe, 2011; Oates, Hall & Anderson, 2005; Wilcox, 2004) it) understanding individual and organizational challenges faced by working women in an environment informed by the evangelical worldview of a "hierarchically ordered universe" (Gallagher, 2004). However, there remains a central gap in literature that explores central perceptions of gender roles and

equality among members of the Evangelical Church. Historical surveys (General Social Science Survey, Attitudes Towards Women Survey, Sex Role Attitudinal Inventory, Sex Role Egalitarianism Scale Form KK, Five-Dimensional Scale of Religiosity) are fundamentally dated and lack contemporary perceptions regarding the role religion and organizational church structures have on understanding gender roles. More research is needed to explore the "...unique cultural, theological, and structural realities..." (Reynolds, 2014, p.4) of the Evangelical Church and its influence on individual's perceptions of gender roles and equality. Findings contribute to how Evangelical Churches develop and model expectations of gender roles. An understanding of organizational culture shapes an individual's perception of gender and reflection on these findings and can contribute to a richer understanding of gendered voice and gender equality.

On a larger scale historical research on the evangelical church has provided a better perspective of how the community has shaped the understanding of gender roles as well as its impact on American culture at large. Findings from the PEW Research Center (2015) notes that 70.6% of Americans self-identify as Christian, and Protestant Evangelicals are the largest faith denomination (25.4%). The evangelical community within the second half of the 20th Century has actively shaped America from a cultural and sociological perspective (Cochran, 2005; Ingersoll, 2003). Faith leaders have engaged individuals and social organizations on social issues that shape political and social conversations. Theological assumptions of the faith shape the concepts of "traditional family values" and "headship" (Ribuffo, 2006) demonstrated in public policies of today. The evangelical worldview has influenced the gendered realities of the

United States: a thoughtful exploration of how individuals view gender and form expectations of others based on gender is necessary to understand the faith's contributions to its members and society at large.

Defining Research Questions

1. What are the perceptions of members of the Evangelical Church toward gender roles and gender equality?
2. Do perceptions of gender roles and equality differ by gender?

The following are research questions that will inform the quantitative and qualitative mixed methodological approach:

Quantitative: What are the perceptions of gender among Evangelical Christians in a nationally representative sample (General Social Survey)?

Qualitative: How do Evangelical Christians view gender roles and gender equality?

Categorical sub-questions (Figure 2) were asked based on the findings from the quantitative component of the research question. Further information regarding the research questions and their exploration through methodology and methods can be found in Chapter 3.

Significance

Recent research identifies challenges faced by women who work within organizations informed by evangelical ideologies. Despite this progress, there remains a deficiency in literature regarding how the evangelical faith's ideologies and organizational structures influence perceptions and understanding of gender equality at a

foundational level. Understanding of the community's perception is limited due to outdated survey tools. Exploring more recent datasets can affirm recent research on perceptions of gender equality. Utilizing a nationally representative survey, the General Social Survey, to examine gender equality within the evangelical faith, and verifying these findings through in-depth evangelical focus groups and interviews provide further insight and validation into viewpoints on gender role ideology and gender equality. This study has the potential to inform evangelical communities how their leadership, organizational structure and ideologies contribute to men and women's understanding of gender roles and equality.

Defining Assumptions

Inclusion criteria and survey sample size generate an appropriate representation of the selected evangelical community. It is assumed that the responses by participants within the focus group are honest and authentic. Focus group participants respond to verification questions addressed to focus groups to ensure consistency in responses by participants.

Defining Limitations

This researcher is no longer an active member of the evangelical community and this researcher is a male exploring perceptions of gender equality: these factors are primary limitations to this study. This topic of gender-based exploration is controversial within the faith and must be approached in a manner respectful of the faith's headship. The evangelical community is cautious of secular or non-evangelical influence on the community (Cassanova, 1994; Djupe & Grant, 2011; Donald & Larimer, 2008; Rhodes, 2011; Ribuffo, 2006) so this researcher took an informed advocacy-participation

approach to this research that is considerate of the evangelical faith's culture and community work. This authentic and inclusive style informed the use of a Transformative Design within this study's Mixed Methods research. Explored further in Chapter 3, this methodological design focuses on the multiple contexts of a community and a thoughtful approach to develop trust and address concerns of the community. Taking into consideration that others may be experiencing discrimination or oppression, the approach attempts to engage the researcher with participants to address power differentials (Mertens, 2003). This approach will also consider the gap between the researcher and the participants. Prior surveys, including GSS, have not specifically addressed patriarchal, faith-inspired gender bias. For this reason this dissertation will be informed by the theoretical framework of feminism, liberation theology, feminist liberation theology and transformational leadership. This theoretical framework will be explored in the following section.

Theoretical Framework

This study's exploration into how the evangelical faith informs gender identities through church organizations utilizes the theoretical framework of feminist theory, feminist liberation theology and transformational leadership theory. These complementary theories create a theoretical framework that provides necessary guidance and comprehensive framing for the dissertation study. The following will provide an overview of each theory, the theory's application to the research questions and how each theory relates to one another in key ways. Each theory will be consciously incorporated into the dissertation study in a concurrent approach.

Feminist theory.

Feminist theory incorporates evolutionary ideology that not only considers women, but also offers critical intersectional perspectives from a global scale. At its core, the theory seeks to understand and analyze gender inequality and explores the ways in which gender has determined, for men and women, social roles and expectations, as well as dictated experiences, interests and social ideologies (Bailey, 1997; hooks, 1990; Rubin & Nemeroff, 2001; Tong, 2007). Through feminist theory's exploration of gender inequality, findings have brought forth ideological awareness and challenges to discrimination, oppression, patriarchal systems, sexual objectification based on various characteristics including gender, sexuality, race and ethnicity and economic inequalities (Hesse-Biber & Leckenby, 1999; hooks, 1990; Maynard & Purvis; Naples, 2003). The collective and diverse nature (Mohanty, 2003) of feminist theory has grown through interdisciplinary work (Ferguson, 2017) and has brought forth ideology, intellectual change and political action that have improved the lives of women, men, children and diverse populations of students all over the world. In the same ways feminist theory has critiqued society, this research means to explore the Evangelical Church and its perspectives of gender roles through a feminist lens, challenge internalized sexism experienced by women, acknowledge institutionalized subjugation of women, and explore and critique inequality through a critical analysis with those within the culture. Feminist theory is essential in informing this dissertation, due to the impact and social evolution it has generated regarding views on equality, freedom and justice (Anderson & Collins, 1992; Hesse-Biber, S.N., 2012; Keohane, Rosaldo, & Gelpi, 1982;).

Production of gender ideology.

A key finding by feminist theory is that gender roles and the various attributes and characteristics assigned to gender are socially constricted, not biologically assigned (Keohane, Rosaldo, & Gelpi, 1982). Noted as a characteristic of Western society (Keohane, Rosaldo, & Gelpi, 1982), the social and cultural characteristics that define gender roles are constructed externally through various social mediums. The way our culture has been informed by these identities and roles are through a lens of “...androcentrism and gender polarization” (Bem, 1993). As a society that emphasizes masculine interest, individuals are influenced to collaborate in the “social reproduction of patriarchy” (Keohane, Rosaldo, & Gelpi, 1982, p. 84). This collaboration by individuals may be unwitting; regardless, they are contributing to gender polarization through actions that reinforce existing cultural discourse and practices based on society’s manufactured gender identities. Feminist theory considers the repeated actions we all participate in are performances done to maintain compliance and satisfy local expectations that ultimately constitute our gendered identities. This speaks to challenges discovered (Bryant, 2006; Dahlvig, 2013; Davidson & Caddell, 1994; Longman & Anderson, 2016; Lowe, 2011) within evangelical communities among female leaders who face internal struggles, organizational challenges and male counterpart opposition when they act in roles that exist outside of their assigned gender roles. Feminist theory seeks to explore and understand gender identities not through dichotomous differences (feminine or masculine), but considers the “fluid enactment of gender roles in specific social situations” (Bing & Bergvall, 1996, p. 175). Feminist theory’s exploration of fluidity acknowledges that individuals have the ability counter the influence of their surroundings

and move beyond gender constructs. This conscious assessment allows individuals and communities to challenge gender inequalities and determine if they will act as “...negotiations are sites of contestation, resistance, conformance, and permeability” (Cornwall & Lindisfarne, 1995).

Heterosexual ideology, gender roles, sexuality and power.

The challenge of developing awareness and providing choice related to gender ideologies within societal constructs is crucial within feminist theory and essential in the exploration of the research question. Feminist theory acknowledges that while women and men may choose to identify with gender roles socially assigned, but if they have no free option to choose outside of these roles, they are in an unacceptable position. This intolerable positioning is demonstrated in circumstances where a woman’s biology and gendered expectation dictate her options to “...reproduction of mothering, social organizations of biology, as caused by marriage law or, as extensions, by the patriarchal family, becoming society as a ‘patriarchy’; or as caused by artificial gender roles and their attendant attitudes...” (Keohane, Rosaldo, & Gelpi, 1982, p. 84). In this context sexuality is presented as the primary form of power favoring men over women. Similar to the complementarian (Bryant, 2006; Bryant, 2009; Colaner & Giles, 2008; Gundry, 1987; Hull, 1998; Smith, 2000) ideologies within the evangelical faith, social requirements are informed by heterosexuality and institutionalized male dominance paired with female sexual submission. The challenge identified within society, as well as the Evangelical Church, is that when power is informed by sexuality, gender roles are made legitimate or verified by an ideology that presents these roles as “truth”. Through the utilization of feminist theory there is a call to raise consciousness of “...the collective critical

reconstitution of meaning of women's social experience, as women live through it" (Keohane, Rosaldo, & Gelpi, 1982, p. 84), by means of exploration and analysis of inequality through a critical embrace with those within the culture.

Patriarchy.

Feminist theory has identified which member within a societal or organizational structure benefits from gendered ideologies and roles, and represents a crucial level of analysis. This is understood through the identification of how a society or organization arranges a hierarchy and defines the activities and functions based on defined groups in terms of roles and relations. The way in which sexuality or gender defines social relations, creates social process, organizes power, and directs desires informs a society and the roles men and women are allowed to fill within it (Keohane, Rosaldo, & Gelpi, 1982). Feminist theory holds a critical mirror and offers analytical perspective for not only the benefit of women, but also how the world critically intersects and reflects on political engagement of practices (Mohanty, 2003). This process is made possible through critical conversations and the use of three analytical tools informed by feminist theory. These tools will be applied throughout this dissertation to ensure that the theories referenced within this chapter will be applied thoughtfully and critically.

Analytical tools.

Feminist theory cultivation and practices is applied through methods of "analytic sensibilities" (Cho et al. 2013, p. 795), in the forms of intersectionality, the interdisciplinary, and the intertwining of scholarship and activism. Intersectionality is utilized to avoid "single axis" (May, 2015) category of analysis through the facilitation of "...a matrix orientation (wherein lived identities are treated as interlaced and systems of

oppression as enmeshed and mutually reinforcing)” (May 2015, p. ix). This is done through the analysis of multiple subject positions based on lived experiences and personal reflection of “structural, political, philosophical and representational inequities” (May, 2015, p. 10). Intersectionality invites the researcher and participants to have critical engagements. The practice of interdisciplinary inquiry recognizes that studying gender based-ideologies from a single discipline is inadequate for empirical reasons (Hakwesworth, 2012), and multiple intellectual fields” are necessary to “develop an inclusive account of politics.” Puar (2007, p. xvi). Coupled with the concept of intertwining “...multiple and diverse types of sources, modes of inquiry, and practices of writing are required by feminist curiosities” (Grewal, 2005, p. 34). These analytical tools highlight the importance of integrating the following two theories to ensure an appropriate collective mode for change can take place through the thorough exploration of structural inequalities.

Feminist Liberation Theology

The application of the feminist theory’s analytical tools of intersectionality, interdisciplinary, and the intertwining of scholarship and activism, lead to the utilization of the theoretical framework of feminist liberation theology. This theology explores the experiences of women struggling for liberation principally in the area of biblical religion, while concurrently exploring alternative visions of liberation (Ruether, 1983). The theoretical framing promotes the “full humanity of women” (Ruether, 1983) through the empowerment of women to claim the principle for themselves. Through a liberation and feminist theological lens, the approach for critically analyzing the Christian faith focuses on patriarchy presented in the form of a “...pyramid system and hierarchical structure of

Society and church in which women's oppression is specified not only in terms of race and class but also in terms of marital status" (Fiorenza, 1984, p. 37). Affirmed through the challenges within the church identified within the research question background section, feminist liberation theology examines the root challenge of the ideological framework of the past that "...despite the prominent place of women in Christian communities, theology does not take women sufficiently into account. If the 'people's church' is to make progress and if liberation theology is to mature, the issue of the situation of women must be part of all theological endeavor." (Berryman, 1987, p. 173 - 174). Consideration of this theological perspective is necessary for the evangelical community to fully understand its role in defining gender as well as the benefit of this critical assessment to enrich the church and all associated individuals.

To utilize this theoretical framework appropriately it is important that liberation theology is also defined. Recognized as a movement in Christian theology, which was primarily developed by Latin American Roman Catholics, the theories emphasize liberation from social, political, and economic oppression as an anticipation of ultimate salvation. The life and work of El Salvador's Archbishop Oscar Romero best exemplified the belief of providing a "voice for the voiceless" (Chomsky, 2016, p. 11). It evolved not only out of the Christian faith but also is influenced by Buddhism, Judaism and New Thought.

Feminist theology is also integral to the development of Feminist Liberation Theology. Feminist Theology examines the anthropological development of faith structure through traditions, practices, scriptures, and theologies that are informed by a feminist perspective (Bayer, 1986; Berryman, 1987; Floyd-Smith & Pinn, 2010). The

core belief of change that emerged from feminist theology challenged the patriarchal model of theology that had been developed and maintained but could no longer be tolerated. This theology emerges with two primary approaches to address this challenge: exclusive and inclusive approaches (Ackerman, 1988). The exclusive approach is one that incorporates the belief that the Judeo-Christian faith was established by men for men. The principles and structure it exists by denies the ability to integrate the concept of self for women and should be abandoned. The inclusive approach acknowledges the inappropriately applied patriarchal mode of Christianity but believes at its core Christianity is based on human liberation and the system needs a paradigm shift. For the purpose of this dissertation to be inclusive and reach out to “the other” an inclusive perspective has been applied. The incorporation of social, political and economic spheres of influence and oppression that exist within and beyond the church are at the core belief of feminist liberation theology. The response is the promotion of “full humanity of woman” that is claimed by woman. The theoretical elements of liberation theology and feminist theology are crucial components of feminist liberation theology, for this reason the theoretical framing of each was an important consideration for this dissertation.

Liberation theology.

Liberation theology acts as a systematic reflection of the Christian faith from the experience and perspective of the poor. This is done through reading the Bible and key Christian doctrines in an inclusive manner that is considered the “...essential message inherent in Christian teaching, although not always rendered explicit by traditional theological methodologies” (Bayer, 1986, p. 10). The alignment of this research question with the objective of liberation theology warrants thoughtful consideration on how to

elicit responses to questions and dilemmas that are raised based on the experiences of the church, and may be in conflict with the culture created. The research question benefitted from liberation theology's approaches, reflecting upon ideologies and practices within the Christian faith and how they serve their community in the following way, "As an initial description, we may say that liberation theology is:

1. An interpretation of Christian faith out of the suffering, struggle, and hope of the poor.
2. A critique of society and the ideologies of sustaining it.
3. A critique of the church and of Christians from the angel of the poor."

(Berryman, 1987, p. 5-6).

These three tasks demonstrate the importance of considering social science and social theory as the researcher explored how gender is realized and experienced within the evangelical faith. A crucial deliberation raised by liberation theology is how to bring about an understanding of equality and practice of empowerment for poor (gender, for this dissertation) within a church that is historically conservative (Bayer, 1986; Berryman, 1987; Floyd-Smith & Pinn, 2010)? The timing of the liberation theology movement within various Latin American communities during the 1960s occurred in concurrence with the Vatican Council II out of a crisis for the poor and a needed response (Ackerman, 1988). The evangelical community faces a crisis for gender equality during a time when conservative ideology within the church affirms a modern day patriarchal system. Informed by the Family Policies and Moral Majority movements within the 1970s and 1980s, social and political challenges of today challenge the role women play in defining their lives, opportunities and rights (Pohli, 1983; Regnerus, Sikkink, & Smith,

1999, Smith et. al., 1998; Smith; 2000). It is time for the evangelical community to reflect on its role and how its ideologies and organizational practices contribute to the liberation and empowerment of women, their suppression, or a combination of the two. Application of this reflection calls for a reflection of ideologies, biblical interpretation and organizational structures.

Liberation theology ideological perspective considers the church organization Biblically informed under the belief that God stands alongside the oppressed, acts to free the marginalized, and challenges those with the means and power to lessen the experience of others. These principles are articulated in the theological belief that the Christian faith's theological understanding is as follows:

1. God's acts
2. The record of God's acts, the Bible.
3. A hermeneutic which sees God as liberator within specific economic and social systems.
4. The performance by the church of the project assigned to it." (Bayer, 1986, p. 11)

The process of applying this theological belief utilizes the Bible in terms of experiences and to reinterpret those experiences in terms of biblical symbols, a process referred to as the hermeneutical cycle. Liberation theology had identified the challenge of the church at the time, which remains relevant today, in which church leadership applied the hermeneutical cycle to maintain a system of power that puts others at a disadvantage. In the 1960s, Liberation theology questioned how priests messaged about the distribution of wealth, which placed many in poverty, as a system reinforced by "God's will" (Bayer, 1986; Berryman, 1987; Floyd-Smith & Pinn, 2010). The effect of the church

communicating this perspective enforced a universal view through the use of religious symbols and rationalization that resulted in the poor internalizing their positionality as “Blessed are the poor in spirit”. Theological scholars and activist, notably Leonardo Boff, challenged the church’s use of ideology and biblical interpretation based on two principles: “(1) the main root of the oppression they suffer is the elitist, exclusive, capitalist system; and (2) people resist and are liberated to the extent that they become united and create a network of popular movements” (Berryman, 1987, p. 76). The response was to empower localized organization structures and communities by means of the Christian faith. This resulted in a system of empowerment that engaged the poor within leadership roles in the church to collectively improve communities and institute a more just society. While controversial, this adaptation of community reflection and systematic inclusion are key principles that were applied within the focus groups during the dissertation. From the critical reflection and movement inspired by liberation theology, the researcher moved to the theoretical teachings of feminist theology to apply a gender informed reflection of the Evangelical Church.

Feminist theology.

Feminist theology incorporates activism and academic discourse with the intention to resist patriarchal hierarchies. While the theological approach was founded to challenge gender-based forms of oppression, efforts to support the proliferation of other communities have evolved to include race, class, ethnicity, and sexual orientation. Identified forces that have continued to challenge the efforts made by the feminist theological conversation include globalization, in forms of imperialism and Western colonialism. At its core, the theoretical framing seeks to challenge the primarily male-

dominated categories that have come to define theology, history, biblical interpretation, and other areas needed to be critically analyzed (Berryman, 1987).

Drawing from the experiences of women, feminist theology raises consciousness by critiquing historical realities and theological reflection that result in the historical reality of sexism in human society. Coupled with feminist literary criticism, feminist theology will be utilized in this research to identify with females and re-evaluate literature and ideology through the lens of a female author. Feminist theology was born out of the reflection and critique of sexism, defined by Rosemary Ruether as the “gender privilege of males over females” (Ruether, 1983, p. 165), in the perspective of Christian faith. Feminist theology seeks to consciously consider the effects of the societal patriarchal model and examines the way in which Christianity has used imagery to control and oppress women. Ruether’s theological exploration identified the use of male images within faith to influence patriarchy in society within ancient Near East and Christianity (Ruether, 1985). Specifically, this was explored in the use of a father figure creating a “...Father-ruled society: aristocracy over serfs, masters over slaves, kin over subjects, racial overlords over colonized people” (Berryman, 1987, p. 175). Through activism and wisdom of women of faith, religious scholarship has been used to challenge patriarchal systems and use religion and various culture traditions to enhance women’s status. The rich knowledge of contemporary feminist theology offers to this dissertation a “...wealth of critical, constructive, and located imagination of rethinking dominant Christian theological and other religious discourse” (Floyd-Thomas & Pinn, 2010, p. 212). The use of feminist theology and liberation theology under the umbrella of feminist liberation theology provided a faith-based perspective of how to consider patriarchal

influence on the evangelical faith and seek to discover a gender equitable perspective and representation within the church.

Transformational leadership theory.

The theological leadership and organizational structure of a faith group heavily contributes to its understanding of faith ideologies and its interpretation of gender. For this reasoning consideration of a commonly associated leadership style with the Evangelical Church, transformational leadership theory, is necessary to include within the theoretical framework of this research. Transformational leaders utilize a style that engages others to achieve an agreed-upon vision. This style of leadership involves fundamental social change, including moral-ethical dimensions to lift both the leader and the followers (Avolio & Luthans, 2007; Bass, 1999; Bass & Steindlmeier, 1999; Burns, 1978, 2003). The effects of transformational leadership on followers include the ability to have followers “...transcend their own immediate self-interest for the greater good of the group, organization and society” (Gill, 2011, p. 83). Transformational leaders use one or more of four key components: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). Correlation between key components of transformational leadership are linked to higher follower loyalty, trust, commitment, performance and satisfaction. This style of leadership is not only incredibly beneficial to obtain, maintain and expand upon membership within a church; it embodies contemporary evangelical message of authentic personal growth in a modern world (Shibley, 1998). To best understand how this leadership style contributes to a church’s understanding of ideology and comprehension of gender roles and equality,

there are five dimensions how church leaders apply transformational leadership that will need to be reflected upon.

Leveraging charismatic and authentic leaders within a decentralized authority structure, transformational evangelical leaders identify themselves as visionaries and/or change agents; have the ability to display courage in the face of resistance and risk; emphasize the importance of motivation, empowerment and trust; drive strong values; see mistakes as learning opportunities, and have the ability to manage complex, uncertain and ambiguous challenges (Tichy & Devanna, 1986). The manner in which faith leaders apply this style with ideology and gender roles will be examined in the following five dimensions: vision, inspirational communication, intellectual stimulation, supportive leadership and personal recognition. Vision is defined as the ability to express “...an idealized picture of the future based around organizational/church/faith values” (Gill, 2011, p. 90). Inspirational communication will be assessed by how a leader expresses “...positive and encouraging messages about the organization/church/faith, and making statements that build motivation and confidence” (Gill, 2011, p. 90). Intellectual stimulation will be determined by how the leader enhances a church member’s “...interest in and awareness of problems, and increasing their (sic) ability to think problems in new ways” (Gill, 2011, p. 91). Supportive leadership will be evaluated based on how members feel the leader expresses “...concern for followers and taking account of their personal needs” (Gill, 2011, p. 91). Lastly, personal recognition will be determined by how a leader is determined to “...provide rewards such as praise and acknowledging effort in the achievement of specific goals” (Gill, 2011, p. 91). Collectively considering how the theoretical approach of a transformational leader

informs the understanding of gender ideology through the use of ideologies and organizational structure while incorporating feminist liberation theological are necessary theoretical framings that were considered when examining the research questions and maintaining a thoughtful and inclusive approach to the dissertation research.

Defining Delimitations

To aid in the management of constraints outside of the researcher's control, several delimitations were put in place to consolidate factors that may affect the results of the dissertation. The data collection via focus groups consists of participants that are not compensated and therefore may be reluctant to fully participate in the research process. Additionally, the focus group themes involving gender role ideology, liberation theology, feminism, and religion are controversial within American society. The nature of the questions may also provoke some respondents to provide socially desirable answers instead of candid answers to please the researcher. Considering these factors, the researcher's initial objective was to identify an Evangelical Church to work alongside to provide valuable feedback to the leadership and community as it relates to leadership, organizational structure and ideological impact on the understanding of gender roles\equality among its faithful. By explaining to the church the value of an often unexplored perspective for the church, and its potential benefit -- how to engage and retain members -- the researcher's intention was to engage a population of willing congregants who could authentically participate in a focus group to benefit their community.

The identification of eligible participants through the church or online community was refined by characteristics that align with the boundaries of the study: group members

who identify as congregants of an Evangelical Church within the Southern California region and are older than 18 years of age. The theoretical perspective and intentionality of the focus groups was explained prior to completion of the eligibility statement to ensure the intentionality of the research is explicitly described to participants so they understand how equality is practiced and realized within Evangelical Church. This helped to ensure commitment by the focus groups. A timeline of expected completion of the focus groups was stated to ensure the meetings were scheduled in a timely fashion based on the timeline of the study. An option for participants to be contacted was listed on consent forms, to be utilized at a later date, as a validity measurement to ensure participants appropriately understood questions. This helped to ensure accuracy during the assessment and discovery process of the research.

Definition of Terms

Complementarian: Complementarianism is an ideology that believes the differences between men and women regarding "...their capacities, positions and inclinations..." are divinely instituted (Perry, 2013, p. 396). It is believed God instituted complementary gender specific roles for men and women, a perspective that affirms the headship ideology. This viewpoint calls for men to take leadership roles in church and family while women supplement their service through submissive "helper" roles, and are prevented from church leadership and teaching men (Bryant, 2006; Bryant, 2009; Colaner & Giles, 2008; Gundry, 1987; Hull, 1998; Smith, 2000).

Egalitarianism: Egalitarianism dictates an individual's response to another individual to be unbiased on the basis of sex. The belief does not discriminate against women in traditional men's roles, or men in women's roles (Beere & King, 1984; McHugh &

Frieze, 1997). It is believed that biblical truths support gender equality and marriage is a commitment of mutual submission to God's will (Smith, 2000).

Evangelical Protestant: A global and trans-denominational movement associated with Protestant Christianity which maintains the belief that the essence of the Gospel consists of the doctrine of salvation by grace through faith in Jesus Christ's atonement. Evangelicals have three primary pillars of their faith: the significance of converting to the faith by being "saved" or having a "born again" experience in receiving salvation, in the authority of the Bible as God's revelation to humanity, and in spreading the Christian message (Pohli, 1983; Shilbey, 1988).

Feminism: A theoretical study based on a continuously evolving construct based on changing societal attitudes, roles and perceptions of women and men (Frieze & McHugh, 1998). The theory seeks to understand and analyze awareness of gender inequality and explores how gender has determined for men and women social roles and expectations, as well as dictated experiences, interests, and social ideologies.

Gender: For purposes of this study and the perspective of the evangelical community, gender was defined within the context of biological and social dimensions and behavior (Undry, 1994). Gender is recognized status that is achieved through social, cultural and psychological means. Based on the social aspects associated with gender, gender is also discussed in relation to the act of managing behavior in a current situation in light of socially shared meanings which concern the attitudes, behaviors, and feelings that are socially considered appropriate for a biological sex category (McCreary, 1994; Smith, Noll & Bryant, 1999; West & Zimmerman, 1987).

Gender Behavior: Social norms dictating the types of behaviors that are considered

acceptable, appropriate or desirable based on the actual or perceived sex of an individual.
(Undry, 1994)

Gender Equality: Equal opportunities and responsibilities for men and women within the public sphere, workforce, home and interpersonal relationships (Bolzendahl, & Myers, 2004; West & Zimmerman, 1987). From the perspective of a relationship, gender equality in practice results in each partner having equal status, a mutual sense of well-being, and imparting attention to the other partner (Knudson-Martin & Mahoney, 2005).

Gender Role Ideology: A sociopolitical attitude regarding the appropriate roles, rights, and responsibilities of men and women within a society (Fassinger, 1994). Within this study the exploration of roles and rights of men and women were based on modern society and perceptions by the Evangelical Church.

Headship: Defined as a person who operates in a position of chief authority, leadership or supremacy. A key ideology that evangelicals have adopted to exemplify their principles of “tradition” and “morality” is displayed in a “traditional family model” (Frederick, 2010, p. 183). The practice of this model is one where familial gender roles of the male breadwinner and female domestic are applied.

Ideology: An organization’s attitudes, opinions, and beliefs shared with others and derived from an external authority. Ideology is applied to diverse areas of social life that consist of politics, religion, economics, minority groups, or philosophical aspects (Eagly et al., 2004; Jost, 2006).

Organization: A body of people with a particular purpose, or collective goal that is linked to an external environment.

Religious Ideology: From the perspective of Christianity within an evangelical framing, religious ideology advocates a singular God Deity, subscription to repentance, belief of the end of days or end of the world, faith that God will continue acting in the history of humankind, and adherence to the authoritative teachings of the Bible (Faulkner & DeJong, 1966).

Traditional Roles: Roles that represent an unfair and uneven distribution of power between women and men. From this perspective, men are considered to act in the capacity of the dominant sex and the primary breadwinner with patriarchal authority and women are in a subservient role within home and society (Liss, Hoffner, & Crawford, 2000; Hosterman, Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2005).

Transformational Leadership: A construct where a leader works with followers to identify a vision that advances both to a higher level of morality and motivation. This construct allows a leader to inspire followers to change their expectations, perceptions and motivations to work towards a common goal (Burns, 2013).

Chapter Two: Literature Review

The following will provide thoughtful insight into the American Evangelical Church community's perceptions of gender equality and leadership. Informed through critical literature and research findings, this community will be explored through its history, theories, beliefs, and application of its belief systems. A clear theme that is represented throughout the literature is the evangelical community's continued clarification or redefinition of gender ideologies in defense of its family values (Frederick, 2011).

This study seeks to better understand how the Evangelical Church utilizes a patriarchal headship model with gendered roles. This concept will be explored through the sections "Defining Evangelicals," "Evangelical Gender and Leadership Theories and Ideologies," "Headship" and the associated ideological practices of "Complementarianism" and "Egalitarianism." The implications of this ideology are realized through the internal and external barriers faced by women seeking equality within the evangelical community. This is affirmed through the sections "Practicing the Faith (Evangelical Norms, Dating, Women Roles, and Male Roles)" and 'Servant Leadership.' The findings from this document will provide context to guide the primary research objective of examining perceptions of gender roles and equality among members of the Evangelical Church and to determine whether these perceptions differ by gender.

Defining Evangelicals

The central beliefs that define the Evangelical community are based on conversion to the faith, reliance on Biblical authority, active engagement in spreading the faith, and focusing on the redeeming characteristics of Christ. Individual and community identities and roles flow from these foundational beliefs and roles are developed to maintain their belief system as an embattled minority.

A popularized term self-defining the Protestant Evangelical faith is that of being *saved* or *born again*. This terminology defines the perception of church members as being *separate* or *other* compared to the *secular world* (Shelby, 1998). The perception of all practices and beliefs outside of the evangelical faith as *secular* demonstrates members' assertion that their faith is the only belief with spiritual or religious merit (Shelby, 1998). A common evangelical belief is that their acquired salvation "...gives believers access to the prophetic secrets of the Bible, they view themselves as the only people who know where history is headed and the only ones who know how to escape its consequences" (Pohli, 1983). Their belief in God's judgment as the definitive perspective on human affairs guarantees their salvation through maintenance of a relationship and dedicated belief to following God's word (Shelby, 1998). From these perspective evangelicals believe it is their responsibility to model justice in social relationships including marriage, wife-husband relationships and in the care of children (Shelby, 1998).

Traditionally the movement had separated itself from "the world" to ensure preservation of the *purity* of the community (Shelby, 1998). Fundamentally this lead those in the Evangelical Church to defend their religious traditions from worldly and

modern education, which is considered to lead followers away from *the truth* (Shelby, 1998). The church focuses on building a supportive community, a tribe, and it also creates tribal thinking which perpetuates a fear of foreign thoughts; thinking less of those who do not share the same opinion; and an *us vs. them* mentality, which places the church in defensive conflict with modern education (Shelby, 1998). From a fundamentalist perspective the concept of defending the church against worldly education was put into action by the community through opposition to intellectual thought, disapproval to early liberalization within the evangelical movement and increased departure from social and political engagement outside of fundamentally directed initiatives (Bunn, 2005). While the Evangelical Church has primarily distanced itself from these fundamental ideologies, at the core of the faith there remains a belief that the Bible is considered “God Breathed” and “infallible” (Bunn, 2005, p. 7), which brings into question how separated the church is from its historical fundamentalist beliefs. With a population of evangelicals estimated at between 90 and 100 million, according to the National Association of Evangelicals, those within the faith often believe themselves embattled for representing a *majority* view while also being persecuted by the world as an “embattled minority” (Pohli, 1983).

These divinely informed social ideologies present guiding principles on how its members are called to live their lives. It is from these principal beliefs that individual responsibilities and authority based on gender-defined roles are derived. Core theologically informed ideologies of gender and leadership are explored through the ideology of headship in the following section.

Evangelical Gender and Leadership Theories and Ideologies

The Evangelical Church's ideological belief of headship informs not only its perspective on gender but leadership within the church and personal life, specifically the home. Theories explored will include headship, familialism (a supportive ideology of headship), complementarianism, and egalitarianism.

Headship.

A key ideology that evangelicals have adopted to exemplify their principles of “tradition” and “morality” is displayed in a “traditional family model” (Frederick, 2011, p. 183). The practice of this model is one where familial gender roles of the male breadwinner and female domestic are applied. Crucial to this model is the belief that males are granted final authority related to any decisions made, gender defined divisions of household and parenting tasks, and the responsibility of sole breadwinner to a family (Frederick, 2011, p. 184). While the evangelical community does not perceive the term “headship” as gender specific, the authority over family relationships from the perspectives of evangelicals is gender specific to the male (Bartkowski 2001; Clapp 1993; Hunter 1983, 1987; Smith 2000; Wilcox 2004). Ideology calls for wives and children to acknowledge authority related to all family matters. Studies have identified that this model is widely accepted within the evangelical community. A Pew-funded Religious Identity and Influence Survey in 1996 identified that 85% of evangelicals believe that “the husband should be the head of the household” compared to 48% of the general public (Lundquist and Smith, 1998). A more recent study conducted by Ringel and Belcher (2007) and affirmed by Ali et al. (2008) confirmed that men and women in the evangelical community believed that men should be the head of the household, a role

mandated by God. Affirming this perspective, women reported their role is to “support their husbands, care for their children, and organize the household.” The survey results also affirmed the importance of female submission (Elisan, 2016, p. 4). From these findings it appears both evangelical men and women perceive these ideologies as non-oppressive. Rather the gender-informed roles they fill are key to their faith, essential to contributing to their family’s wellbeing, and a cornerstone for the evangelical community.

The values associated with traditional gender roles within families for evangelicals (Gallagher 2003; Gallagher & Smith 1999; Smith 2000) are referred to as familialism (Wilcox, 2004). Familialism encompasses the expectations and preference for a traditionally defined family model; one where the male role is associated with the breadwinner and the female is associated with domestic home life (Frederick, 2010). The desire to maintain this family order has become an “identity boundary maintenance device” for evangelicals (Lee, 1998). The importance of committing to the permanence of marriage, child-rearing, heterosexual relationships, and traditional family values have become a faith and politically centered identifier for the evangelical community (Frederick, 2010).

Evangelicals believe that headship is Biblically aligned and God-directed. This belief places men “rightfully in charge” while women are protected within the contract of marriage by a divine order (Conolly, 2008). Evangelicals state that this male-specific headship does not contradict gender equality, emphasizing the weight of responsibility placed on the husband and not the submission of women (Smith 2000; Smith et al. 1998). Males are not perceived to be compensated for their services (Smith, 2000), and in turn

wives are held to the responsibility of being “Godly” and overseeing all domestic necessities, including cooking, cleaning, care for all family members, and submission to a husband’s authority (Frederick & Balswick, 2006). This patriarchal model and defined gender roles have been referenced or redefined as “mutual submission” or “servant leadership” by the evangelical community (Smith 2000; Bartkowski, 2001). It is from this philosophy that evangelicals not only gain strength but also are presented a God-given duty to adhere to headship. Opposition to this theology is believed to cause “callousness toward the suffering of others”: such social movements as feminist, progressive and anti-family ideologies fall into this category (Lee-Branwell, 2016, p. 31, p. 137).

Headship ideology has been identified as central to evangelical beliefs and understanding of gender roles; however, research has also defined variations on how members of the evangelical community apply headship ideologies in their personal lives. In-depth interviews conducted by Gallagher and Smith (1999) with evangelical men and women regarding male headship lead to the discovery that these gendered roles are not necessarily practiced. Major findings within the research identified symbolic traditionalism and pragmatic egalitarianism beliefs within the evangelical community (Eliason, 2016). Symbolic traditionalism affirms the participants’ beliefs in male headship and the associated role of women’s submissive behavior. Pragmatic egalitarianism described a lived experienced counter to male headship, in which participants lived out an egalitarian lifestyle of gender inclusive shared responsibility, respect and openness to gender equality in the workplace. These finding demonstrated that headship and gender identity remain a key ideology of the evangelical faith;

however, findings show a variance of practice from those who live based on ideals of headship while others perceive these ideologies as symbolic. These ideologies and lifestyles will be explored more thoroughly in the Complementation and Egalitarian sections.

Complementarianism.

This ideology describes the differences between men and women regarding “...their capacities, positions and inclinations...” as divinely instituted (Perry, 2013, p. 396). This perspective states God instituted complementary gender specific roles for men and women, a perspective that affirms the headship ideology. This viewpoint calls for men to take leadership roles in church and family while women supplement their service through submissive “helper” roles, and are prevented from church leadership and teaching men (Bryant, 2006; Bryan, 2009; Colaner & Giles, 2008; Gundry, 1987; Hull, 1998; Smith, 2000). Evangelical churches preach gender role ideologies that are housed within a larger belief system that is Biblically informed (Piper & Grudem, 1991). Literal interpretation of biblical passages supports gendered marital roles (Colaner, 2009). An example of this can be found in Ephesians 5:22-23 (New International Version), “Wives, submit to your husbands as to the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church.” Articulated in *The Danvers Statement* (1988), the Council of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood publically stated to the evangelical community “...there is a clear distinction between man and women where the man has ultimate headship, authority and responsibility in marriage” (Colaner, 2009, p. 100). Complementarian application of headship is still considered a primary belief among evangelical congregations (Gundry 1987; Hull 1998; Smith 2000).

Beyond the household, complementarianism demonstrated its support for women to contribute to the church in multiple leadership facets. Churches within this ideology have supported women's rights to exercise pastoral leadership within foreign missionary work, even though similar rights may not be permitted at their home church (Stackhouse, 2000). Additionally, female staff workers are given the opportunity to lead in para-church groups (such as fundraising), Bible schoolteachers, leaders of small-group studies, and inspirational leaders (Stackhouse, 2000). The successful capacity in which women have managed to contribute to the evangelical faith in pastoral and missionary leadership roles abroad and at home has brought into question the full comprehension on how the Bible directs gendered roles (Stackhouse, 1988). The ideological opposition to the evangelical community's application of headship is articulated through egalitarianism.

Egalitarianism.

While maintaining a shared evangelical faith, egalitarianism stands in opposition to complementarianism, which states Biblical truths support gender equality and marriage is a commitment of mutual submission to God's will (Smith, 2000). With an ideology articulated by the Council of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, this community reinforced its belief through Biblical verses including Galatians' 3:28 (King James Version), "There is neither male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus". From this perspective, neither gender was obligated to fulfill certain roles, but any person was given the opportunity to "fulfill" all that God had granted in Genesis (Colaner & Warner, 2005). Egalitarianism also challenges headship marriage positions, believing instead that partners were equal in marriage, including capacities in home, church and career (Colaner & Warner, 2005).

Egalitarian ideologies have helped evangelical women support their personal aspirations while practicing their faith (Colaner & Giles, 2008). Inspired and supported by the second wave feminist movement, women within the faith have more actively realized both home and career goals since the 1970s (Ridgeway, 1978). Research has shown (Colaner and Warner, 2005), that women who are evangelical and subscribe to egalitarian ideology saw themselves equal to men and were more likely to pursue equitable careers of male counterparts that require training, higher education, and assume leadership roles. Beyond personal development, egalitarian principles have led men and women to both formally and informally challenge (Gallagher and Smith 1999; Ingersoll 2003; Manning 1999) the predominant complementarian teaching style of evangelical congregations (Gundry, 1987; Hull, 1998; Smith, 2000). Within the evangelical church the egalitarian principles are perceived as a marginalized community considered to be associated with secular feminism, liberal Biblical interpretation and counter to the family focused message of the church (Gallagher, 2004).

The ideological framing of gender and leadership provide insight into the belief system of the evangelical community, however understanding how these formal structures impact individuals is represented authentically through application and practice of these beliefs. Further exploration of how a patriarchal model informed within socialized evangelical norms, dating, marriage, and roles of women and men provides insight into how equality varies among genders.

Practicing the Faith

The application of headship ideologies expands beyond the church walls and contributes to the way in which gendered roles occur within social situations. The

following explores how gendered expectations contribute to social norms for evangelical members, as well as contributes to dating, marriage, and the personal and social capacities of males and females. Each section will highlight the expectations of both women and men, and their contributions to maintaining headship ideologies within their respective roles as dictated by their faith.

Evangelical norms.

Religion is a gendered institution and the evangelical church is no different (Epstein, 2007; Neitz, 2014). The previously discussed ideologies demonstrated a predominant perspective that “religious ideologies are seldom gender neutral” (Janseens, 2007, p. 14); and the value placed on gender dictates religious responsibilities (Hoffman & Bartowski, 2008). This system is applied by leaders within the evangelical community regarding how individuals not only serve in leadership roles (Adams, 2007) but also participate in relationships (dating and marriage), family life (Gallagher, 2003; Wilcox, 1998) and activity in the labor force (Rindfuss & Brewster 1996). The family model focuses the community norms on the importance of committing to marriage, establishing roles for family and child rearing, and supporting community practices; and maintains political perspectives that sustain the community (Frederick, 2010). By focusing on these ideals, individuals commit to “biblically centered lifestyles” and “theological essential lifestyles,” not gendered roles (Frederick, 2010, p. 185). It is from this perspective that evangelicals have managed to establish rhetoric of the moral voice against American culture, while possessing power within the culture (Smith, 1998).

Despite teachings within the church that honor headship, studies have shown many social practices within the home that have deviated from this rhetoric (Bartowski,

Ellison, & Wilcox, 2000). These discrepancies of religious rhetoric and individual ideology bring into question what is a normalized practice of a person from the evangelical faith (Denton, 2004). Research focused on the evangelical community has demonstrated over the decades that perceptions of gender norms and ideologies by members within the community have evolved to align with societal changes (Gallagher 2004a, 2004b; Griffin 1997; Manning 1999; Smith 2000). Additionally, findings have shown American evangelicals' beliefs have resulted in shifting roles of women within the congregation (Adams 2007; Chaves 1999, Chaves & Cavendish 1997; Ingersoll 2003). Postmodern feminist has labeled these paradoxes within Evangelical gender ideology as “non-unitary subjectivity”, describing individuals experiencing various and constant changing constructions of reality and of the self (Bloom, 2002a, p. 291).

What is clear is that gender interactions and ideologies within the faith do shape the involvement and experiences of men and women in unique ways. Professionally there are norms and institutional practices within the church that have made the experience of women more challenging than those of men (Perry, 2013). Evangelicals also practice norms based on gender-specific identities as individuals, while dating and within their family structure. The following sections will explore the gendered experiences of women, men, their roles while dating, as well as within a family unit.

Dating.

Relationships represent an example of how individuals make sense of their religious faith. Within the evangelical community relationships shape individuals' understanding of their position within the relationship as well as the religious community (Irby, 2014). Most literature focuses on the evangelical gender norms based within

marriage and family (Coltrane & Adams, 2008), however religious traditions and roles were established prior to individuals taking their vows of marriage. What makes the experience of evangelical gender identity unique in dating is that men do not have full authority of headship that is culturally vested to them in marriage (Irby, 2014). While dating, individuals establish how they value themselves and their role within the religious community. The evangelical community does however influence this process because couples reflect on how their actions may be judged, resulting in “moral dilemmas” (Gerson, 2002).

Research focused on young evangelicals found that perceptions of an idealized dating experience is more informed by their understanding of gender relations established by the evangelical church (Irby, 2014). A clear rule the evangelical community established: sexual intercourse is not permitted prior to marriage, a norm that placed responsibility predominantly on women (Bogle, 2008). Young evangelicals often set themselves apart from the “hookup culture” (Bryant 2006; Freitas 2008; Perry and Armstrong 2007; Wilkins 2008) to focus on faith-centered groups with distinct Christian norms (Irby, 2014). On and off college campuses, young evangelicals feel socially marginalized and seek out communities of like-minded social networks that affirm evangelical-based social norms in dating situations (Perry & Armstrong, 2007; Wilkins, 2008). Many of the dating expectations found within evangelical communities are informed by gendered roles that support the expectations of marriage and abstinence from sin (Bryant, 2006; Perry & Armstrong, 2007).

Fear of committing a sin, specifically sex, within a relationship has led some evangelicals to abstain from relationships as well (Bryant 2007; Wilkins 2008). To

counter this fear evangelical communities and colleges have presented gendered ideologies which help provide understanding of biological sexual “struggles” distinct to each gender, placing a predominant amount of responsibility on women (Bryant 2007; Freitas 2008). Irby’s (2014) study defined the concept of “romantic abstinence,” which provides guidance to each gender by establishing a power structure and gendered responsibility to ensure purity and dominance. Women are called to aid in the struggles of the men who are biologically weak based on sexual desires. Men are called to set boundaries to ensure women don’t progress the relationship too quickly, since women are identified as emotionally weak and have an “excessive desire for attachment” (p. 263). The framing of gendered responsibility and seriousness of relationships is meant to allow for individuals to focus on self-development as they prepare “...for when God introduces their spouse to them” (Irby, 2014, p. 263).

For evangelicals, dating norms emphasize the relationship journey as a period to focus on individual growth, establishment of a community of like-minded individuals, and date someone who will help growth in the faith. To alleviate the stress and general difficulty shared by young people in dating, the evangelical community advises building a “community” to ensure success and support (Irby, 2014). Evangelicals establish a normed strength during their dating life, emphasizing a group of likeminded evangelicals that provide advice and accountability; and ensure success based on Biblically aligned principles and ideologies (Irby, 2014). These support groups focus on individual growth and establishing a strong relationship; however, objectives in both areas are informed through gendered evangelical worldviews.

Marriage and family.

Qualitative and quantitative social research focused on gender-based relational norms of the evangelical community has found very similar practices among other non-evangelical families (Bartkowski, Ellison, Wilcox, 2000). Examination of marital decisions associated with finances, childrearing and work decisions all lack significant variations between evangelical and non-evangelical families (Lundquist & Smith, 1998; Smith, 2000). Various research on surveys has demonstrated compromise, negotiation and collaboration by evangelical spouses on decision-making, labor and child care (Bartkowski, 1999b, Brasher 1998; Gallagher and Smith, 1999; Griffith, 1997; Manning, 1999; Stacey, 1990). Unique to evangelical marital and family satisfaction by those surveyed has been a shared understanding and commitment to headship by both genders (Bartkowski, Ellison, Wilcox, 2000). The satisfaction for evangelicals within marriage and family show a stronger association with gender roles than gender ideology (Amato and Booth, 1995; Wilcox and Nock, 2006). Gender roles have shown to influence both maintenance (Stafford, Dainton & Hass, 2000) and openness (Aylor & Dainton, 2004) within relationships. Gender roles align with the ideologies and relationship norms of evangelical headship, in which reoccurring patterns of behavior dictate family functions based on masculine and feminine traits (Galvin, Bylund, & Brommel, 2004). Research regarding the evangelical family dynamic has primarily abstained from gender ideologies, affirming that norms within the family dynamic focus on the headship-informed gender roles.

Parenting within the evangelical community presents itself in normed roles of paternal authority (Bartkowski and Ellison 1995; Bartkowski & Xu, 2000; Lienesch

1991) and emotional engagement on part of the mother and father (Bartkowski, 1995; Bartkowski & Wilcox, 2000; Wilcox 1998). The gender roles of the father are demonstrated through “leadership,” described as more involved than non-evangelical fathers (Bartkowski & Wilcox 2000; Wilcox 1998), including childcare tasks and monitoring of chores and homework. The gender-influencing evangelical movement of the Promise Keeper’s in the 1990s, addressed in greater detail within the “Male Roles” section, influenced a new evangelical fatherhood model that was expressive and involved with the family (Wilcox, 1999). Headship also informs the expectations of children, with evangelical parents valuing obedience in their children (Ellison and Sherkat, 1993a) and utilizing corporal punishment for disciplinary measures (Ellison and Sherkat, 1993a; Grasmick, Bursik & Kimpel, 1991).

The evangelical community’s focus on the wellbeing of its members has contributed to its more affectionate and engaged family norms (Bartowski, Ellison, Wilcox, 2000), but there still is an underlining order of authority within roles that is “divinely ordained” (Bartowski, Ellison, Wilcox, 2000, p. 16). The ultimate objective of salvation is linked to the family unit’s ability to express authority that models God’s love, and the faith calls for the father to take a lead in this model (Hunter, 1987). The model of family authority is affirmed through support mechanisms within evangelical churches and contributes to female and male’s commitments to headship and gender norms.

Female roles.

In exploring the normed experiences of females within the evangelical community studies have demonstrated that women have adapted (Brasher 1998; Chong 2006; Davidman, 1991) to strategically perform passive roles with the objective to improve

their lives within and outside of their families (Gallagher 2003; Griffiths 2000). Women have also actively sought out opportunities within the church that support the headship model and the church community as demonstrated by a rise in women studying to be religious leaders within their communities (Charlton, 1987; Kleinman, 1984). Adhering and contributing to the headship ideologies has shown to benefit women in the form of privileged femininity (Frederick, 2011). The support of complementarian ideologies by women within the community, referred to as a “women’s sphere,” has shown praise and affirmation by the community. This questions whether there is any cost or loss to women in adhering to gendered expectations by the church.

Research has identified that women within the evangelical faith have increased work/family conflict as aspirations and participation in the workforce have risen (Jacobs and Garson, 2008). The gendered expectations established within the faith results in challenges to women from a moral and cultural perspective (Ammons and Edgell, 2007; Blair-Loy, 2005; Gerson, 2002). Objectives and tasks defined by gender have resulted in competing pressures internally, within the family and within the faith community (Ammons and Edgell, 2007; Blair-Loy, 2005; Kahn, 1964). Research has shown that women within the evangelical community place the faith’s ideologies at a high level of importance when making decisions related to family and professional lives (Bartkowski, and Read, 2003; Colaner and Warner, 2005; Glass & Jacobs, 2005; Lehrer, 2004; Rhodes, 1983; Sherkat, 2000). The importance of gendered roles shows that women within the evangelical faith are more likely to align their life aspirations and roles with those gendered expectations (Oates et al, 2005; Scanzoni & Hardesty, 1992; Sellers et al., 2005). Evangelical women affirmed a complementarian belief that supported headship

within the church and home, but challenged this ideology when applied to work and politics (Manning, 1999; Gallagher & Smith, 1999). This brings into question if equitable gender practice is achievable by women within this community but outside of the church and home.

Evangelical women affirm they are striving for professional careers while also fulfilling gender specific responsibilities of family and motherhood (Bronzaft, 1991; Colaner & Waner, 2005; Glass and Nath, 2006; Hirschfeld, 1989; Pollitt, 2005). The challenge that evangelical women face is reconciliation of personal aspirations with perceived feminine roles dictated by the church (Oates et al., 2005; Sellers, et al., 2005). Within the gendered realities of the church, women are not entitled to the opportunities or positions that are provided to men (Keyes, 1995). Women within this environment are found to pursue career aspirations that are stereotypically feminine such as education for youth, or roles within the church characterized by gendered limitations (Hoffnung, 2004). The experiences of women finding professional roles within the evangelical community have been influenced by gender dynamics that have been found to place bias towards men and married women over single women. This power dynamic in favor of men enforces a soft patriarchy, and places a unique burden on women's "intentions" as they seek the role of contributing or primary provider within their family (Perry, 2013). Women within the evangelical community found that to be successful in a patriarchal community they had to seek empowerment through small groups of females and create their own leadership opportunities (Brasher, 1998).

The strongest support within the faith for women has been through organizational efforts with likeminded women. A large scale example of this is Women's Aglow

Fellowship International (<https://www.aglow.org/about-us>), which maintains an intentional mission aligned with the church as a “network of praying women working to evangelize the world” (Griffith, 1997, p. 33), while downplaying theology and focusing on “equality (in the eyes of God), personal growth, self-esteem and emotional closeness with Jesus” (Griffith, 1997, p. 64). Combined with a message meant to inspire women, this organization represents Biblically informed core values with opportunities for women to serve and grow outside of traditional gendered norms. Evangelical women have also managed to balance gender roles and ideologies by starting their own businesses which allow flexibility in their schedules as well as ideologies (Kepler, Shane, & Heights, 2007). This hasn’t been without criticism. Divergences from beliefs or actions that are gender-ideologically defined are labeled “inappropriate” and “deviant behavior” (Bilezikian, 1985). This label has been primarily applied by more conservative evangelical subcultures opine such actions diminish the domestic purpose of wife and mother (Oates et al., 2005). These same fundamentalist churches found that female parishioners are more likely to endorse traditional gender role and avoid associating themselves with feminism, despite expressing support for equal pay (Barsher, 1998). While much of the research on gendered roles of women has focused on the shifting roles women have played (Adams, 2007; Chaves, 1999; Chaves and Cavendish, 1997; Ingersoll, 2003), and transitions within gender dynamics of the evangelical family (Bartkowski, 1999, 2000; Ellison and Bartokwoski, 2002; Gallagher, 2003; Gallagher & Smith, 1999; Griffin, 1997; Wilcox, 2004), the control and precedent set for women within the church remains direct by the authority and leadership of male evangelicals.

Male roles.

Gender-focused studies on evangelicals during the past 30 years have primarily focused on faith participation and key experiences that have shaped the community's masculine ideology (Bartkowski, 2000; Lockhart, 2000; Gallagher and Wood, 2005). These studies state the masculine role within the faith not only dictates the role of the male but also the style of leadership within the Evangelical Church. Pew research states that evangelicals are more likely to expect the man to "lead in spiritual matters" as well (Smith, 2000). This headship includes leading family devotionals and facilitating discussions that may lead to domestic conflict (Bartkowski, Ellison, & Wilcox, 2000). The role of the modern evangelical man was notably redefined in the late 1990s through the "soft-patriarchy" (Eldridge, 2001; Weber, 2006) movement characterized by "...compassion, faithfulness, and involvement in all aspects of civil, community, and family life" (Perry, 2013, p. 396). In this capacity evangelical men have evolved beyond provider and home authoritarian. The new male leader is expected to be socially engaged with his family in child rearing and emotional support in addition to embracing ideologies supportive of multiculturalism and vigilant protection. (Bartkowski, 2004; Heath, 2003; Wilcox, 2004).

This change in masculinity was led by the evangelical non-profit organization the Promise Keepers in the 1990s. This movement Biblically redefines masculinity through literature, large events, and messages presented in many evangelical churches (Frederick, 2011). The new masculine gender expectations resonate in diverse gender metaphors, implying that men within the evangelical faith have the capacity to choose their gender identity (Bartkowski, 2001, 2004; Gallagher, 2003; Smith 2000). Bartkowski (2004)

identified four primary roles of the evangelical male, “(a) the rational patriarch, (b) the expressive egalitarian, (c) the tender warrior, and (d) the multicultural man” (Frederick, 2011, p. 188). These identity preferences demonstrate that headship and leadership is changing more in ideological responsibility and less on economic provision and Biblical authority. It appears “servant leadership,” informed by Biblical authority, has become the central leadership practice for the evangelical community (Gallagher, 2003). However, women in leaderships bring into question if headship still informs servant leadership.

The framing of gendered roles and expectations demonstrates the evangelical community’s belief that equality is experienced through personal responsibilities. This adoption of soft patriarchy highlights the community’s ability to add value to those who proscribe to a headship structure, and label those countering these ideals as destructive to the individual, family and community’s wellbeing. The implementation of these foundational beliefs is further explored in the perception of leadership within the evangelical community.

Servant Leadership

Personal growth and transformation are key concepts within the evangelical community. Leaders within the evangelical community are essential in preaching these ideologies and creating a framework for how members grow personally and help the evangelical community grow as well. The following will explore how leadership informs gender-based roles in and outside of the church.

The Evangelical Church’s re-definition of masculinity as socially engaged and emotionally supportive aligns with ideals of servant leadership (Gallagher and Wood, 2005). Informed by Robert Greenleaf, servant leadership is a response to hero-based

leadership styles with an objective to focus "...leadership as a service to followers, therefore raising their status, and the relationship between the two" (Western, 2013, p. 44). This post-heroic leadership ideology parallels with the new masculine perspective of the evangelical church. In the same way the church was responding to an evangelical, or transformative style of leadership, this new leader is seen as "...authentic, emotionally intelligent, sensitive and less rational, privileging the emotional and internal self" (Western, 2013, p. 46). Much of the language within the more modern and egalitarian-style church has helped shape the community from male headship into servant leadership (Smith, 2000). Within this model, males maintained recognition as leaders through their actions of "servanthood" (Frederick, 2011, p. 184). In practice, this servant leadership model is still perceived as a "softer headship" (Stasson, 2014, p. 114). Servant leadership is applied to help the church progress into changing gender roles, while maintaining traditional Biblical authority. Reframing the idea of headship transitioned roles from "ruler" to "responsibility". This updated ideology is affirmed by a strongly complementation belief by the evangelical community that husband and wives are given "God-given identities" (Stasson, 2014 p. 114-115). Outside the church the roles and expectations of headship remained. More recent research has brought to light the challenges still faced by women leaders in the Christian college environment (Anderson and Longman, 2011; Bryant, 2006; Dahlving, 2013, Lowe, 2011).

Studies during the past 10 years focused on the experience of women leaders in the Council of Christian Colleges & Universities (CCCU), displayed working and leadership challenges for women outside of the church but still aligned with headship ideals of the Evangelical Church. The 111 member institutions of CCCU identified a lack

of female leaders, identifying only six female presidents, 17 female chief academic officers (Longman & Anderson, 2011). Women represent on 35% of the full-time faculty at the time of this study (Lafreniere & Longman, 2008). The experience of these female leaders provides insight to a complementation headship model that resulted in a lack of self-realization by these women within a patriarchal hierarchy, complicated by the historical structure of higher education and the evangelical community (Dahlving, 2013). The findings identified a lack of “planned leadership” for women (Dahlving, 2013, p. 94), demonstrated by male-dominated role placement methods that put women at a disadvantage. The environment itself shows an evangelical-informed hierarchy that discourages female leadership, “The culturally ingrained, traditional Christian beliefs of many CCCU member institutions may foster a campus environment that discourages female leadership” (Dahlving, 2013, p. 94). There is an expectation among female leaders and female staff to maintain gendered home/life responsibilities, “three commonalities among the women who integrated their lives: (a) multiple life roles that positively enhanced one another; (b) renegotiation of work and family roles to be compatible; and (c) spouses, extended families, and/or hired domestic help that provided tremendous practical support.” (Dahlving, 2013, p. 97). Lastly, if a female was not married and not a mother her priorities were questioned: “Christian culture’s value of motherhood contributed to prejudice against women who are not mothers. Similarly, Smarella’s findings suggested that marital status can be a double bind for women leaders” (Dahlving, 2013, p. 97). These experiences by women within evangelically informed environments commonly result in women disengaging or avoiding leadership roles (Eagly, 2005). This exemplar of the application of evangelical ideologies outside the

church displays the realities of a faith community that remains historically rooted and informed by gender roles.

The research explored through this question affirmed the patriarchal framework of the Evangelical church informs gender identities and roles for its members. Perceptions and practices of headship vary based on interpretation and practice by evangelical members, as discussed within complementarian and egalitarian ideologies. To better understand the gap in ideology and practice of evangelical gender roles the research sought to examine perceptions of gender roles and equality among members of the Evangelical Church and to determine whether these perceptions differ by gender. This was accomplished through the examination of perceptions of gender among evangelical Christians in a nationally representative sample (General Social Survey). These findings were paired with narrative response forms to determine how evangelical Christians view gender roles and gender equality.

The following research questions are informed through the methodological approach:

1. What are the perceptions of members of the Evangelical Church toward gender roles and gender equality?
2. Do perceptions of gender roles and equality differ by gender?

The following are research questions that will inform the respective quantitative and qualitative mixed-methodological approach:

Quantitative: What are the perceptions of gender among evangelical Christians in a nationally representative sample (General Social Survey)?

Qualitative: How do evangelical Christians view gender roles and gender equality?

Categorical sub questions (Figure 2) were asked based on the findings from the quantitative component of the research question. Further information regarding these research questions and their exploration through methodology and methods can be found in Chapter 3.

Chapter Three: Methodology

The primary objective for this dissertation study was to examine: 1) the perceptions of gender roles and gender equality among members of the Evangelical Church and 2) determine if perceptions of roles and equality differ by gender. An explanatory sequential mixed methods design was utilized to meet the objectives of this research. The method was informed by a two-phase design in which the quantitative data is first collected followed by qualitative data collection. The purpose of this sequence was to use the qualitative data to further explain and interpret findings from the quantitative phase. The following sections will first discuss the significance of the methodology for this study and the rationale for the use of mixed methods. Secondly a description of the methodological approach and the associated research design and theoretical framework will be explained. Third an illustration of how the study implemented mixed methods through the settings and identification of participants, definition of the problem, review of previous studies, data collection, research procedures, data processing and analysis, and ethical considerations will be described.

Significance

Foundational understanding of gender within the evangelical faith has largely been understood and informed by divinely instituted gender roles (Bryant, 2006; Bryant, 2009; Colaner & Giles, 2008; Gundry, 1987; Hull, 1998; Smith, 2000). Evolving societal changes related to gender roles/equality have begun to impact how evangelicals understand gender and associated roles within the faith. Studies have previously explored evangelical ideologies related to gender and family ideals and practices. Research (Berryman, 1983; Hosterman, Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2005; Keohane, Rosaldo, & Gelpi,

1982; Liss, Hoffner & Crawford, 2000; Wilcox, W.B., 2004) has identified an organizational hierarchy within the faith that utilizes gender-defined roles, which are perceived to complement one another. Recent studies have explored evangelical perceptions of gender equality; however, these studies have a focus limited to professional women who work within evangelical higher education institutions (Dahlving, 2013; Dahlving & Longman, 2010; Longman & Anderson, 2016; Taylor, 2013). There is a noticeable gap within the research (Bartkowski, 2000; Lockhart, 2000; Gallagher and Wood, 2005) related to gender roles/equality within the faith community at large and how these perceptions may differ by gender. A mixed methods study can address this gap in literature through means of a quantitative examination of perceptions of gender among evangelical Christians in a nationally representative sample. Qualitatively the research can be enhanced through the exploration of evangelical Christians views of gender roles and gender equality within their organization through focus groups. Results from the focus group discussions demonstrate how dialogue affirms or challenges the survey findings based on community members' perceptions and experiences. The study utilized the theoretical framing of feminist theory as well as considered traditional evangelical theoretical perspectives of gender, such as headship. The following section will affirm the use of mixed methodologies as the most appropriate approach to better understand gaps in research related to gender roles and gender equality within the Evangelical Church.

Methodological Approach

Having worked with the evangelical community to better understand its perceptions of gender roles/equality, a mixed methods research design and its

methodological approach provided needed structure in exploring this research question. Mixed methods research is a design that incorporates a methodology and a method of inquiry. Creswell and Plano Clark (2007), describe the methodology involving “...philosophical assumptions that guide the direction of the collection and analysis of data and the mixture of qualitative and quantitative approaches in many phases of the research process” (p.5). The methods component is centralized on collecting, analyzing and mixing quantitative and qualitative data in either a single or series of studies (Clark & Plano Creswell, 2007). The primary grounds for this methodology and methods approach are that the combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches provides a more comprehensive understanding of the research problem than either approach independently (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007; Morse & Niehaus, 2009). The utilization of “quantitative (close-ended)” and “qualitative (open-ended)” approaches provides a building on or extension of the respective strengths that each method provides (Sweetman, Badiee, & Creswell, 2010, p.441). The following section will demonstrate the importance of thoughtful consideration of how this study incorporated quantitative and qualitative approaches to contribute to the research inquiry (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

Mixed methods research provides a dual integrative research approach to more accurately and comprehensively understand gender roles/equality within the evangelical community. The application of qualitative methodology in past studies contributed needed voices and transparency not exhibited by dated quantitative studies (Bolzendahl & Myers, 2004; Brewster & Padvic, 2000; Ciabattari, 2001; Diekman, Eagly & Kulesa, 2002; Harris & Firestone, 1998; Schnittker, et al., 2003). Greater insight into

understanding of evangelical members' personal beliefs and experiences of gender role identities and headship (Gallagher & Smith, 1999), has been displayed in recent findings which have identified the challenges women in leadership roles face within the evangelical community (Dahlving, J.E. & Longman, K. A., 2010; Lowe, M.E., 2011; Longma, K.A., & Anderson, P.S., 2016). Furthering these findings, mixed methods in this study provided an understanding of the evangelical community's beliefs of gender roles and gender equality by means of a large, nationally normed survey and affirmed through focus groups to ensure the findings are not affected by generalizability or biases of small research populations (Smith, 2000; Wilcox, W.B. & Bartkowski, J.P., 1999). In addition, mixed methods not only uses quantitative and qualitative data but also considers inclusive design with participants (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). The application of mixed methodology is further explained in the research design section.

Research Design

Design is a crucial component of the research process, which informs the beginning phases of the philosophical assumptions through the data analysis (DeLisle, 2011). Mixed-methods designs are distinct from mono-methods with their incorporation of qualitative and quantitative data. Key to this methodology is the manner in which the data is integrated within the primary conditions for the particular variety of mixed method designs (Teddle & Tashakkori, 2009). Mixed-methods designs are informed by typologies, which establish "...implicit rules, procedures and criterion for mixing" (DeLisle, 2011, p. 93). Teddle and Tashakkori (2009) and establish seven criteria used within the typological design of mixed methods: (1) number of approaches, (2) number of strands, (3) implementation, (4) stages of integration, (5) priority, (6) function, and (7)

ideological perspective. Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) expanded definition and purpose of typology further by clarifying decisions related to timing, weight, and mixing.

Timing and weighting quantitative and qualitative studies.

Timing takes into consideration the temporal relationship between the quantitative and qualitative data (Greene, et al., 1989) as well as the order in which the research will be analyzed and interpreted (Morgan, 1998). The decision related to timing is applied either concurrently or sequentially (Morse, 1991). The weighting (or emphases) decision for mixed-methods design relates to the prioritization of the quantitative or qualitative datasets as it relates to answering the research question. Referred to as the “priority decision” (Morgan, 1998), researchers must consider both methods of equal weight; or if one will take a higher precedent over the other. The strongest indicator of how a researcher will apply the weighted decision is based on his or her theoretical or worldview (Morse, 1991). Additionally, practical considerations of data collection and data availability also play a role in this decision (e.g., Creswell, 2003). Lastly, target audiences for the research (e.g. committee members, advisors, or journal editors) influence this weight as well (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). The third weighted decision, the mixing decision, relates to the procedures chosen by the researcher how quantitative and qualitative data will be mixed. There are three approaches (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011), two of which merge the data sets and a third embeds a data set within the other. “Merging data sets” is the process in which two data sets are integrated during the interpretation or analysis of the data; “embedding data analysis at the design level” is when a quantitative data sets is embedded in a larger qualitative set or vice versa; and lastly “connecting from data analysis to data collection” is when analysis of

one type of data leads to the needs of the other type of data (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). These collective components have resulted in four major mixed-methods research designs and two newer approaches to mixed-methods design as defined by the work of Creswell and Plano Clark (2011).

Two mixed-methods designs (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011) were determined to support the question of gender roles/equality within the Evangelical Church: explanatory sequential design and transformative-emancipatory design. Explanatory sequential design is a two-phase design where the qualitative study is dependent upon the quantitative study results. The qualitative phase is used to affirm or explain the quantitative findings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 71-75). Transformative-emancipatory or transformative design addresses issues of social justice and inclusion of marginalized or underrepresented populations (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 27). As previously outlined, decisions related to interaction, priority, timing and mixing are made within the context of the explanatory sequential design. The study approached the research questions from a perspective that attempts better understand the evangelical community through the transformative mixed methods design. This approach is explored further in detail within the theoretical framework section.

Explanatory sequential design.

The mixed-methods design used to inform this study was explanatory sequential design. The level of interaction between the quantitative and qualitative data, the priority of the data, timing of how the data would be utilized and the analysis of the data were crucial in choosing the explanatory research design. Integral to the research question, the design places priority in understanding perceptions of gender roles/equality in which the

quantitative results (General Social Survey) were used to guide questions for the qualitative analysis (focus groups). The findings from the qualitative analysis (focus groups) were then used to explain the quantitative results (General Social Survey). From a design perspective, this two-phase process was conducted where a priority was given to the collection and analysis of quantitative data by examining the General Social Survey. The quantitative phase findings identified specific results that were determined to need additional explanation. Results that needed additional explanation included findings that were unclear, unexpected, significant or non-significant results, and outliers or extreme cases. Phase two followed with the collection and analysis of qualitative data, through the use of focus groups of evangelicals. The quantitative and qualitative results were then combined, analyzed, and interpreted. This explanatory sequential design process proved to identify results and explore findings that were significant and able to be analyzed at in-depth levels beyond either quantitative or qualitative study alone. In addition to exploratory sequential design, components of transformative design were also used to understand how the research question can be considerate of the evangelical community.

Transformative design.

This design is identified by Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003) as the “best” philosophical basis for utilizing mixed methods. It is also known as transformative-emancipatory paradigm or advocacy-participatory approach (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 27). It demonstrated itself to be the most aligned design option for examining gender equality within the evangelical community. Focusing on the experiences of others who may be experiencing discrimination or oppression, the approach engages the researcher with participants to address power differentials (Mertens, 2003). Key to this

experience is the researcher's ability to understand multiple contexts of a community, building trust with participants, and cultivating thoughtful approaches to address concerns of a diverse community (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 27). These principal design characteristics align with the intentions of this research to work with a community to better understand and enact positive social change by understanding, clarification, and by providing a voice to those oppressed by power and privilege. Key to all stages of this design were considerations for voice and power (Shannon-Baker, 2016). This can only be accomplished through a strong relationship and involvement with the participating community (Shannon-Baker, 2016). As a researcher this required an understanding and transparency of the researcher's positionality, values, ethics and paradigm(s) (Creswell & Plano, Clark, 2003; Mertens, 2010).

The utilization of transformative design is timely as researcher and national awareness of issues related to marginalized populations of class, race, disabilities and gender are growing (Shannon-Baker, 2016). As a researcher it is imperative to engage thoughtfully with a community to reflect with those who may be affected by or excluded from a community. Examples of how this design has effectively engaged with communities include research by Chilisia (2005), who brought attention to the research community's efforts in Botswana's HIV/AIDS prevention efforts and how they contributed to marginalizing African value systems (Shannon-Baker, 2016). Exploration of power inequities through the triangulation rationale of quantitative and qualitative data sets allows transformative mixed-methods design to give voice and understanding to perspectives that take place at the top and bottom of social structures (Shannon-Baker, 2016). Transformative design frames the research in a way that directs the entire

research process with the underlining objective of serving to create a “...more just and democratic society...” (Mertens, 2003, p.159).

The strength of transformative design is that it exists within its theoretical framing of questioning social change. This frames an intention to better understand the changing phenomenon and in turn advocate for those participating in the study by providing voice to diverse perspectives. The primary weakness that exists within the design are the scarce literature used to guide this evolving research process. Mertens (2003 and 2009) identified that it is crucial for researchers to be familiar with the literature, to be aware of key historical conflicts, and to thoughtfully engage in the research process by defining a problem according to the needs of the marginalized community. To ensure consistent application of mixed-methods approach that is informed by a transformative worldview when collecting data, Mertens (2003) identified the need for researchers to consider the “... (a) benefits, (b) credibility of data collection, (c) effective communication, (d) cultural relevance, and (e) social transformation...” (Canales, 2013, p. 16) to appropriately engage with the data, participants and the research design. Working with the evangelical community within this design requires articulating a clear benefit that is realized by the community and promotes collaboration with data collection and feedback in an effective and respectable way. This will require identifying appropriate communication strategies that are respectful of the community model, considerate of gender norms and culturally sensitive to the headship and family model. Objectives for the research will need to allow for co-developed data analysis, interpretation, and reporting results that are conscious of community voice and power structure.

Experts in the application of transformative design provide perspective that some communities may have had negative experiences in working with researchers and may show resistance to participation in the research (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Practical advice and design methods (Shannon-Baker, 2016) that have been successful for researchers using this mixed-method design will be applied in this work with the evangelical community to ensure inclusion, respect and successful design implementation. Canales (2013) provides a transformative design check-list (Appendix, Table 1) that was developed for researchers to utilize as a tool to ensure the mixed-research methods is applied successfully through a transformative design. Mertens (2003) also provides a tool framing transformative emancipation design through her identification of context, design origin, purpose of use of design, design characterization, design approach of connecting theory to data, researcher's relationship to the research, methods, interferences from data and implications of mixed-methods research (Appendix, Table 2).

In addition to applying the appropriate processes, methods experts in mixed-methods (Mertens, 2004; Canales, 2003; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011) reiterate the importance of involving the communities with the research in terms of "...question development, determining culturally appropriate methods, effective recruitment, sensitive data collection..." (Shannon-Baker, 2016, p. 327) in addition to analysis and reflection of the data. Empowering the evangelical community with data collection could assist in design components of the primary qualitative data and affirmation of findings in use of secondary quantitative data. Canales (2013) notes that this involvement, "... benefits the

community by providing...research training to its members and promotes credibility through collaboration with the community” (p. 16).

A noted challenge of the transformative design by Mertens (2007) and Cannales (2013), is articulating how the research will provide value added to the community such that it is viewed credibly, appropriate to the community’s needs, maintains cultural sensitivity, and ensures the end result is a positive change. Cannales’ (2013) guide (Appendix, Table 1) and Mertens (2007) inquiry table (Appendix, Table 2) provide areas of contemplation for the researcher as to how to maintain cultural sensitivity by reflecting how the questions are posed, the “cultural equivalent” value of the measures, and if the research will validate the community it is serving. The data analysis phase also requires that focus is placed on power dynamics, effects on diverse groups, and reported in a manner that promotes social change (Mertens, 2013).

This method provides the structural capacity to incorporate the quantitative and qualitative components of this research question while maintaining a culturally sensitive approach in working with the evangelical community. Cultural sensitivity is incorporated through the use of cultural competences (Mertens, 2005; Moghaddam, et al., 2003) requiring an understanding of a community’s knowledge. This is essential in working with a community that is sensitive to the topic of gender equality. The engaging nature of the research question on gender perceptions via quantitative and qualitative measures allows for rich empirical data to be collected and analyzed in a way that benefits from the strength of depth and population scope of each style of research. Paired with the transformative design, this methodology addresses social inequities through inclusion, respectful culturally sensitive data collection, and with the intention of enacting positive

social change. For these reason this method is the most appropriate for working with the evangelical community to explore gender roles/equality. The following section will explore how mixed methodology was implemented into the research question.

Implementing Mixed Methods

The implementation strategy of a mixed-method design is determined by four criteria established by Creswell and Plano Clark (2007), as illustrated in the matrix below. Based on the previously discussed research design, the shaded cells represent the implementation used within this research study. Explanations of each stage will be discussed further in the sections below.

Table 1. Mixed Methods Design

Implementation	Priority	Integration	Theoretical Perspective
No Sequence	Equal	At Data Collection	Explicit
Sequential-Qualitative FIRST	Qualitative	At Data Analysis	
Sequential-Quantitative FIRST	Quantitative	At Data Interpretation	Implicit
		With Some Combination	

Implementation.

As seen in Table 1 the implementation stage utilizing a mixed-methods research modality applies quantitative and qualitative components. The data collection process dictates priority, integration, and theoretical perspective. For this study, perceptions of gender roles/equality within the Evangelical Church were first informed by quantitative data from the 2016 General Social Survey. The analysis of the quantitative data provided results, which generated questions for the qualitative study. Then, the qualitative study was conducted through focus groups where participants discussed their perception of gender roles/equality within the larger community.

Priority.

As seen in Table 1 priority describes how data is collected and analyzed within a mixed-methods research based on quantitative or qualitative components. By design, priority is placed on the quantitative portion of the research in this study. The quantitative data was first analyzed, and specific quantitative results were identified to inform the qualitative study design. The quantitative study was used to inform questions and content evaluated within the qualitative portion, focus group feedback, of the study. Responses from the focus group were evaluated and additional perspective was explored that was not fully captured within the General Social Survey.

Integration.

As seen in Figure 1, integration and theoretical perspective were defined based on what stage (quantitative or qualitative) components of the research process will be incorporated: at data collection, during the analysis of the data, upon interpretation of the data or with some combination of these stages. To ensure reflection and integration of

findings, integration took place during all stages within the research process, with weighted value placed at data interpretation with participants having a voice in the findings. From a methods perspective the mixing of the data is conducted during the final analysis. During the final analysis findings from the initial quantitative study, which informed questions that guided dialogue for the focus groups, will be compared with clarifying statements and thematic discussions from the focus groups. This merging was used to affirm or challenge the findings from quantitative data and incorporated qualitative findings from the focus groups to create a more complete picture of the perspective of gender roles/equality within the evangelical community (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007).

Settings and Participants

The research topic explores the perceptions of evangelicals on the topic of gender roles and gender equality. The 2016 General Social Survey results generated the quantitative data, which includes questions that identify evangelicals based on key ideology responses. Members of this population are based on a nationally normed population of participants 18 years and older. The qualitative data is generated based on perceptions of evangelicals from Southern California who are 18 years and older. The methods sections in Chapter 4 goes into greater detail regarding outreach and ethical consideration for participants; however, from a methodological perspective the following sections will examine preliminary considerations for community engagement, cultural competence, worldview, rhetoric, and paradigms taken into consideration for this research as demonstrated in the Transformative, Mixed Methods Checklist (Canales, 2013).

Preliminary considerations for community engagement.

In addition to technical implementation processes, philosophical assumptions must also be considered to provide a foundation for mixed-methods research (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). Preliminary considerations provided guidelines to develop culturally relevant criteria that are imperative to promote an active worldview, or paradigm, that promotes social equality for evangelical community research participants. These considerations are informed through Canales' (2013) "Mixed Methods Checklist" which was developed as a research tool to jointly apply community inclusiveness and mixed-methods approaches during her study of the psychological research with Mexican Americans. The four preliminary considerations identified by Canales (2013) and explored below are cultural competence, worldview, rationale, and rhetoric.

Cultural competence.

Cultural competence acknowledges a community's culture as a crucial component of successful implementation of mixed methods. Citing the American Psychological Association (2003) and affirmed by mixed-methods researchers (Mertens, 2005; Moghaddam, et al., 2003), this component requires researchers be familiar with the community's culture and respectful of its knowledge distance from community norms and beliefs. Canales (2013) states researchers are not only aware of the community but the language and terminology used within the community to better understand the "lived experience" (p.11), informed through scholarly research. In circumstances where there is an identified absence in these areas, it is advised researchers to have a consultant familiar within these areas. The researcher solicited ongoing feedback on data collections processes (e.g. interview protocol development) and data analysis strategies (e.g. member

checking) with members within the evangelical community to provide perspective and understanding of the research with participants to ensure that the dialogue conducted with members of the evangelical community is authentic and inclusive. While the literature review provides a comprehensive academic understanding of the evangelical community, application of the researcher's 30 years of lived experience within the community as well as personal contacts with practitioners and leaders was consciously considered to ensure authentication of cultural competence throughout the research.

As a former member of the evangelical faith community the researcher maintained an insider perspective and shared a level of understanding with much of the faith in practice. However, based on the researcher's personal beliefs and challenges faced within the Evangelical Church resulting in the recognition of perceptions of gender inequality within the researcher's local evangelical community as well as the professional role maintained during this research study, the researcher also identified as an outsider. Understanding both roles was crucial defining how I engaged with participants and remained subjective throughout the process. Acknowledging the advantages and challenges of the researcher's positionality created awareness of strengths to connect as a co-struggler who relates to and benefitted from the church. This connection with participants provided context that the research would be mutually beneficial to the evangelical community.

Worldview.

The worldview (or paradigm) defines how a researcher views the world and in turn conducts research from this perspective (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). The researcher shared with the participants his involvement with the church that resulted in

deep relationships and opportunities for personal enrichment. By authentically engaging with the community the intention was to display a personal cultural consciousness and critical awareness of the patriarchal system that at times limited others within the community, specifically those of a different gender, from engaging equitably with opportunities that were provided to the researcher. This topic will be explored in greater detail in the “Paradigms” section, however Cannales (2013) brings attention to one of the four (post-positivist, constructivist, transformative, and pragmatic) worldviews (Mertens, 2005) and its particular importance to social considerations of mixed methods. Compared to the other worldviews transformative is noted as having a “more rigorous standard of objectivity” (Cannales, 2013, p. 12) when including groups and perspectives that have been traditionally excluded. With a focus on community inclusion, aspects of the transformative perspective were used to engage with participants and this paradigm more appropriately aligns with the mixed-method study of the evangelical community and the exploration of gender equality.

Rhetoric.

Cannales identified (2013) that rhetoric is thoughtfully considered to both affirm and challenge existing principles and rules that have been established by social science research (Creswell & Clark, 2007). Applying language that leads to the design, process and analysis of research has the potential to transform a community by affirming voices and social characteristics within a community that may not be traditionally recognized. The consideration of rhetoric for this study of gender roles/equality within the evangelical community not only incorporated voice and perspective but also gender-informed language, feminism and feminist liberation theology to highlight gender issues. The

quantitative component of the data analysis provided insight into how the community perceives gender on a national scale through a feminist lens, and the qualitative component incorporated reflection from the quantitative data and personal experiences across genders to better understand community perception.

Paradigms.

The theoretical position, or paradigm, provides clarity to the systems of belief that informs the inquiries into the evangelical community and influences how mixed methods is applied within the research (Morgan, 2007). Paradigms do not exist in fixed perspectives and rigid research processes, but allow for clearer framing of problems and guidance throughout the research process (Shannon-Baker, 2016). The “paradigmatic foundation” of mixed-methods research has been an evolving “war” during the past several decades which has been both challenging and formative for mixed methods (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003). Ranging from how a paradigm would be defined (Freshwater & Cahill, 2013) either as a method to summarize or a process to create knowledge (Morgan, 2007); a tool or a construct (Biesta, 2010); or if one paradigm might be most appropriate for this methodology (Mertens 2012), these discussions have helped shape the intention and application of mixed methods (Shannon-Baker, 2016). For mixed methods to be applied thoughtfully and effectively, a researcher must determine how a paradigm will be applied in an actionable manner (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Shannon-Baker, 2016). Applying paradigm transparency is beneficial when working with the evangelical community to ensure an understanding of the researcher’s beliefs and intentions, and help maintain accountability within these beliefs. The transformative paradigm, which focuses on the experiences of others who may be experiencing

discrimination or oppression (Mertens, 2003), is applied to highlight issues of need (quantitative data) and give voice to those issues (qualitative data) (Sweetman, Badiee & Creswell, 2010).

Defining the Problem

Mixed-methods research calls to not only investigate existing scholarly research that has shaped the understanding of a community but to also engage with members of the community when defining the research problem. Consulting community members creates “relevance validity” (Martens, 2003, p. 144) in establishing a problem in a marginalized community. In addition, affirming literature findings and discussing key issues with community members provides insight into oppression and concerns over diversity that can direct research problem development (Sweetman, Badiee, & Creswell, 2010). Mertens (2013) and Sweetman, Badiee, & Creswell (2010, p. 442), identified key questions that help articulate if a problem has been appropriately framed when evaluating literature, research design and community interaction:

- a) Do the authors openly reference a problem in a community of concern?
- b) Do the authors openly declare a theoretical lens?
- c) Were the research questions (or purposes) written with an advocacy stance?
- d) Did the literature review include discussion of diversity and oppression?
- e) Did the authors discuss appropriate labeling of the participants?
- f) Did data collection and outcomes benefit the community?
- g) Did the participants initiate the research, and/or were they actively engaged in the project?
- h) Did the results help facilitate change?

These questions were utilized to guide the researcher's explorative approach with the evangelical community throughout the research process and provided guidance in incorporating previous literature to inform the researcher's application of a mixed methodological approach.

Review Studies

Existing literature was reviewed on the topic of evangelical community members and perceptions of gender. Previous literature provides insight into how the research community has come to understand evangelicals' perception of gender roles/equality. Determining how previous research was conducted provides consideration of methods used, and if cultural competencies were integrated to obtain an authentic definition and perception from the evangelical community. Close attention was paid to studies that utilized mixed methods (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Past research has identified a patriarchal ideology at the core of the evangelical faith, but gaps in the literature did not define the perception of this headship model and its implementation by community members. Guided by appropriate search terms (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011) and references focused on evangelical gender equality the researcher found that literature addressing the definition of the evangelical community (Pohli, 1983; Shelby, 1998), the community's historical relation with gender (Bedroth, 1954; Gallagher, 2004; Stasson, 2004; Wuthnow, 1998), evangelicals' socially defined gender and leadership ideologies (Bartkowski 2001; Clapp 1993; Frederick, 2011; Hunter 1983, 1987; Smith 2000; Wilcox 2004), variances in practice of these social ideologies (Bryant, 2006; Bryan, 2009; Colaner and Giles, 2008; Colaner and Warner, 2005; Gundry, 1987; Hull, 1998; Smith, 2000) and community norms (Adams 2007; Chaves 1999, Chaves and Cavendish 1997;

Gallagher 2004a, 2004b; Griffin 1997; Ingersoll 2003; Manning 1999; Smith 2000) provide a past and present context for the community in relation to the research questions.

To better inform the researcher's methodological approach, studies exploring the evangelical community through use of mixed methods were identified. The studies' techniques were explored to consider the effectiveness and challenges in using mixed methods and to determine the manner in which the methods effectively engaged with the communities they researched. Deborah Taylor's "Culturally Relevant Pedagogy and Behaviors: A Study of Faculty Beliefs at Six Christian Postsecondary Institutions" (2013) explored the higher education evangelical community's relation with cultural diversity and theological beliefs. The researcher's application of a mixed-methods design through use of a survey (quantitative) and interviews (qualitative), demonstrated the power of both capturing the perceptions across a campus environment and the honest challenges faculty expressed in interviews when discussing and experiencing theological, gender and socioeconomic diversity.

In a similar higher education vein Mark Bow (2012), used mixed methods for the purposes of "Investigating Intellectual Diversity at Elite Public Universities in Southern California through the Perceptual Lens of the Evangelical Undergraduate Student". The study sought to find evidence of public universities providing expression of "social, religious, and/or politically conservative thought" (p. v). A survey and interviews were also conducted to affirm the researcher's assumption that the public environment offered limited opportunity for "conservative thought" and students shared that they felt uneasy when sharing conservative beliefs within the classroom environment. This study affirmed

the victimization and “othering” often shared by the evangelical community (Shelby, 1998) and provided an opportunity to gain a larger perspective with individualized affirmation of this finding based on the research design.

The final research example closely examined a mixture of qualitative and quantitative data gathering techniques when exploring 13 cases of individuals who sought to be ordained (unsuccessfully) within the Evangelical Church. Nortomaa’s “Who is Not Ordained, and Why?” (2016), used mixed methods to explore a pilot study of ordained and non-ordained within the Evangelical Church through the means of triangulation of quantitative data (several types of categorical and continuous datasets) and qualitative data (interview with open-ended questions). The study provided examples of the necessary technical details as well as highlighted limitations that arise with the used techniques, including unfinished surveys, technical constraints of questionnaires, and difficulties in mapping the quantitative and qualitative datasets (Nortomaa, 2016).

Consideration of previous literature, mixed-methods research exemplars, and the research questions on gender roles/equality within the evangelical community affirms the use of mixed methodology to explore this research topic. Mixed-methods research design provides the opportunity to obtain input from a larger community sample and the ability to integrate a perspective. This design contributes an authentic community perception most appropriate for the study’s research questions.

Data Collection and Data Analysis

The data collection method was derived from the mixed-methods design chosen for this research project. The explanatory sequential design for this research project proscribes a three-stage path to data collection (Creswell, 2006). Specific methods that

were used to collect and analyze the data will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4. The first stage involved the data collection and analysis of quantitative data. The first stage utilized data from the 2016 General Social Survey. During the second stage decisions were made on how to best apply the results from the first stage to influence the third stage's qualitative data collection and analysis. The second stage reflects on how the findings from the first stage further explain the perceptions of evangelicals regarding gender roles/equality. These findings provide guidance on selection of participants and content for discussion with participants during the third stage. This study has previously defined both quantitative and qualitative methods to gauge perceptions of practicing evangelicals older than 18. First-stage findings were analyzed in stage two to determine what topics need further explanation in the qualitative stage of data collection.

Considerations of key results from Stage One to discussed in Stage Two included statistically significant or non-significant results, variables that distinguish group identities, distinguishing demographic characteristics, and outlier or extreme cases.

Utilizing the findings from the second stage, the third stage involved the collection, analysis, and defining results of the qualitative data. The qualitative portion involved conducting three unique focus groups with evangelical participants. The final stage involved mixing the quantitative and qualitative data, with the quantitative data informing the qualitative as defined by the explanatory design. Further discussion of mixing of the datasets is discussed in the following section.

Mixing qualitative and quantitative data sets.

Mixing quantitative and qualitative data took place through five primary activities of data analysis informed by mixed methods: data cleaning, data reduction, data transformation, data collection and comparison, and inquiry conclusions and inferences.

Analyzing valid populations and crucial questions linked with gender equality through means of existing secondary data occurred during the data cleaning process. At this juncture the data sets were reviewed for valid responses, methodological soundness and indicators of variability and range. Data identified as suspect or not defensible was flagged (not utilized) or set aside for further, later review prior to moving to the secondary stage.

Following the data cleaning process, data is analyzed and reduced to descriptive forms within the data reduction activity. This process involves the examination of frequencies, descriptive statistics, factors, case summaries, descriptive themes, or reduced displays of descriptive information.

A critical point of analysis, the data transformation activity bridged the findings from the initial quantitative study to develop the questionnaire. The quantitative analysis of the secondary data standardized and consolidated the data into a comprehensive data set that identified multiple variables and informed thematic groups of questions related to gender equality.

Utilizing the findings formed in the quantitative analysis and data provided through the focus groups, the data correlation and comparison activity investigated patterns of relationships in the data set, marking clusters of variables, themes on faith and gender equality, or stories that appear to go together, as well as what importantly

differentiates one data cluster from the others. A crucial component of this activity was the assessment of patterns and relationships across different forms of data (qualitative and quantitative) and to compare relational findings from one form of data (secondary data) to relational findings from a different form of data (original questionnaire).

The final stage of analysis was processed to develop final conclusions and inferences. This was accomplished through the comparison of cohesive themes recorded through data analysis of focus group responses with similarities discovered within the initial analysis of nationally normed secondary data.

Ethical Considerations

Potential risks to communities and participants when engaging with transformative design are evaluated by Canales (2013). Considerations for community inclusion are refined through a transformative design checklist, developed for researchers to utilize as a tool to ensure a mixed-methods research approach is applied successfully through a transformative design. Mertens (2003) also provides a tool-framing transformative emancipation design through her identification of context, design origin, purpose of use of design, design characterization, design approach of connecting theory to data, a researcher's relationship to the research, methods, interferences from data and implications of mixed-methods research.

This practice was applied by engaging members of the evangelical community throughout the process. Before a participant chose to engage in a focus group a thoughtful process ensured the topic at hand was addressed by a mature participant. Only adults (18 years and older) were involved, participants' identity and responses remained confidential, and no questions were used to challenge or place undue stress on

participants. As an investigator, the researcher took responsibility to debrief participants individually after the focus groups to address any misconceptions about the study as well as obtain experiential feedback. Prior to, and after the focus groups, participants were informed of the intentions of the study, the desired sample size, and the validity and reliability of measuring instruments. Participants were informed they can obtain a summary of the study's results by contacting the investigator via email. The participants invited to express opinions or perspectives not addressed within the series of questions.

Confidentiality is a key aspect of ethical considerations and a key component of trust between participant and investigator that was explained to all participants. Participants were made aware of their rights within this investigation and provided an informed consent document to sign, prior to the focus group. The investigator ensured participants read and understood their rights as confidential study participants. The logistical maintenance of the forms was explained: I maintained forms in a secure location.

Summary and Conclusion

This research topic's thoughtful application of mixed methodology through the exploration of perceptions of gender roles/equality among evangelicals ensures the community was treated respectfully while also seeking to understand the gap not yet explored within this research topic. The utilization of exploratory sequential design provided an understanding of how nationally normed surveys understand perceptions of gender roles/equality among evangelicals through the initial quantitative stage. Findings from the quantitative stage informed the qualitative stage topical discussion of gender roles/equality with members of the evangelical community. Dialogue with evangelicals

was engaging and culturally responsive through the use of components of transformative design. The following chapter describes the application of these methods and the results discovered within perceptions of gender roles and gender equality by gender within the community.

Chapter Four: Methods and Results

This chapter discusses the mixed methods applied throughout the three stages of the research study; and results. Specifically, the researcher: 1) explores perceptions of gender roles/equality among evangelicals through a statistical analysis of the General Social Survey 2) produce a descriptive summary of quantitative findings and questions to affirm perceptions with community members and 3) describe significant themes that affirm or challenges perceptions of gender roles/equality among a small sample of community members in the qualitative stage. The results from Stage 1 (quantitative), Stage 2 (quantitative informing qualitative) and Stage 3 (qualitative) are discussed in addition to the study's results. The study's aim is to provide a comprehensive review of the methods and results to allow for transparency within the researcher's analytical decisions.

Stage 1: Quantitative Component

In initial research, this study analyzed evangelical beliefs and gender roles/equality perceptions, drawing publicly available data from the 2016 General Social Survey which was analyzed through the use of IBM SPSS Statistics software version 25. Existing questions gathered by the General Social Survey examined perspectives of gender roles/equality. Existing demographic information identified perceptions by gender and evangelical and non-evangelical association. Using the software, the researcher generated cross-classification tables and conducted chi-square of association, comparing rates of gender equality by gender and faith identity. A process similar to that applied by the PEW Research Center was utilized to determine how a person's gender plays into their faith (Pew Research Center, 2018). The results of this stage aided development of

thematic questions to clarify or address informational gaps in focus groups data. This iteration technique represents a long-standing inquiry practice in multiple methodological traditions.

Study hypothesis.

Based on literature review, the researcher predicted that evangelicals would place a lower value on gender equality compared with non-evangelicals, based on gender-informed variables within the General Social Survey. Additionally, men would value gender equality lower than women.

Data Source.

The General Social Survey (GSS) has monitored societal change and the evolving fabric of American society since 1972. With the exception of the U.S. Census, data gathered from the GSS is the most frequently analyzed source of information within the field of social science. The data is used by scholars, policy makers, and students. More than 27,000 journal articles, books, and Ph.D. dissertations have been based on GSS data (gss.norc.org). Since 1994 the GSS has administered two samples in even-numbered years, each with a target sample size of 1,500, rather than to a single 1,500-person sample each year. Total sample sizes for these biennial GSSs ranged between 2,765 (2002) and 2,992 (1994). In 2006 a third sample was added and the sample size was 4,510 (gss.norc.org). There are no oversamples during this period. The survey includes questions that capture demographic, behavioral and attitudinal, and special interest questions. Findings from the GSS have provided insight into the experiences and perceptions of American society including such topics as sexual behavior, quality of working life, social capitalism, social identity, optimism, health, and racial/ethnic

identify. This study utilizes the data and focuses on populations that have identified beliefs that are shared with evangelicals and analyzes questions themed around social experiences associated with gender.

Participants and sample population.

The 2016 General Social Survey contains a standard core of demographic, behavioral, and attitudinal questions, plus topics of special interest. Among special interest topics covered are civil liberties, crime and violence, intergroup tolerance, morality, national spending priorities, psychological well-being, social mobility, and stress and traumatic events. Notable research utilizing the 2016 GSS examined topics including social media use and mental well-being (Hardy, B. W., & Castonguay, J., 2018), political trust and partisan strength in the United States (Hooghe, M.M. & Castonguay, J., 2018), parental divorce and religiosity (Hsien-Hsien, L., & Nicholas H., W., 2011), and religious affiliation and work-family conflict among men and women (May, M. m., & Reynolds, J., 2018).

The sample for this current study includes the 2016 GSS sample (2,867), and the evangelical community subsample (348), that will be explained further in the “Measures” section. The metrics used to define the populations examined are further explained in the following section.

Independent variables.

Participants were defined as evangelical if they responded to three questions that represent ideals shared within the faith group. The first is “Describe your feelings about the Bible.” The answer options for that question are “The Bible is the actual word of God and is to be taken literally, word for word”; “The Bible is the inspired word of God but

not everything in it should be taken literally, word for word”; “The Bible is an ancient book of fables, legends, history, and moral precepts recorded by men”; “Don’t Know”; or “Not Applicable”.

The second question is “Would you say you have been ‘born again’ or have had a ‘born again’ experience, defined as a turning point in your life when you committed yourself to Christ?”. The answer options are “Yes,” “No,” “Don’t Know,” or “Not Applicable.”

The third question is “How fundamentalist are you currently?” The answer options are “Fundamentalist,” “Moderate,” or “Liberal.” The questions are aligned with central beliefs of evangelicals, which include reliance on biblical authority, being “saved” or “born again,” and the strict belief and practice of literal biblical ideology through the support of the church community (Bunn, 2005; Pohli, 1983; Shelby, 1998).

In addition to questions defining the target population, independent variables based on gender were also utilized. The participants’ gender was defined via a binary response option, “male” or “female.” The binary definition of gender was necessary based on the research questions and respective of the community’s embrace of traditionally defined gender roles and perceptions (Liss, Hoffner, & Crawford, 2000; Hosterman, Lefkowitz & Gillen, 2005). This binary gender definition is based on patriarchal social constructs addressed in the analysis informed by feminist ideologies that challenge dictated experiences, interests, and social ideologies (Bailey, 1997; hooks, 1990; Rubin & Nemeroff, 2001; Tong, 2007).

Dependent variables.

Participants responded to a variety of attitudinal questions regarding gender roles/equality. This survey proscribed 12 variables on this topic that inquired regarding perspectives by individuals who received a position or promotion based on gender; experienced discrimination in the work place based on gender; the impact of work on both genders by work, divorce laws and women in leadership. Responses for the analysis were dichotomized as either an affirmative or negative in response to the altitudinal questions. Responses of “very likely,” “somewhat likely,” “strongly agree,” “agree,” “I’m for it,” “yes,” “definitely should be,” “easier,” and “probably should be” are categorized as affirmative responses. Responses of “somewhat unlikely,” “very unlikely,” “disagree,” “strongly disagree,” “no,” “more difficult,” “against,” and “strongly against” are negative responses.

Study sample.

Table 2 displays responses to the three questions that define what participants would be included. When determining the size of the sample, three 2016 GSS-identified characteristics were examined. These include Bible Literalists, which comprised of 31.8% (911) of the 2,867-person GSS survey; Fundamentalists, representing 24% (687) of respondents; and those having experienced a “born again” experience, 42% (1,203). Using all three characteristics, Evangelicals represent 12.1% (348) of the survey population.

Table 4 displays the responses to demographic-themed questions, identifying characteristics of the overall population, and evangelical and non-evangelical sub-groups. The non-evangelicals represent 87.9% (2,519) of the 2,867 2016 GSS respondents.

Females (62.2%) over indexed within the faith population compared to the non-evangelical population (55.5%) and the overall population (55.5%). When comparing race and ethnicity in a bivariate grouping of Caucasian and people of color, the non-evangelical population represents the highest population of Caucasian participants (74.1%), when compared to the overall population (72.4%) and evangelical population (60.6%). When comparing age groups, non-evangelicals have the largest representation for the age group 18 – 49 (51.8%) when compared to the overall population (49.9%) and the evangelical population (36.5%). The evangelical population has the largest representation for the age group 50 and older (63.5%) when compared with the overall population (50.1%) and non-evangelicals (48.2%). Further discussion identifying significant bivariate analysis is discussed within the “Demographic Characteristics: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical” section.

Table 2. Overall Evangelical Belief Characteristics. (n=2,867)

Variable	Overall (%) (n=2867)	Evangelical (%) (n=348) (12.1%)	Non-Evangelical (%) (n=2519) (87.9%)
Feelings About the Bible*			
Word of God	911 (31.8%)	100.0%	23.4%
Inspired Word	1,252 (43.7%)	NA	49.7%
Book of Fables	624 (21.7%)	NA	24.8%
Other	42 (1.5%)	NA	1.7%
Missing	37 (1.29%)	NA	1.5%
How Fundamentalist Are You*			
Fundamentalist	786 (24.0%)	100.0%	13.5%
Moderate	1,130 (39.4%)	NA	44.9%
Liberal	903 (31.5%)	NA	35.9%
Missing	147 (5.1%)	NA	5.8%
Had “Born Again” Experience*			
Yes	1,203 (52.7%)	100.00%	33.9%
No	1,595 (55.6%)	NA	63.3%
Missing	69 (2.4%)	NA	2.7%

*p < .05

*NA: The evangelical population is defined by a select response in each variable above. For this reason, the entire population is defined by a single response in each variable field.

Missing data.

The current study’s analyses had consisted of missing data. It is critical to acknowledge that non-responses within survey analyses pose two primary problems (Penn, 2007; Smith, 1991); missing data can reduce sample size and create non-response bias. The result of these problems can limit the ability to conduct subgroup comparisons

and known data may result in an unrepresented response. Analysts utilizing the GSS have historically considered non-response as a “trivial problem,” as most demographics exhibiting a non-response rate below 1% (Smith, 1991). Despite this challenge, the GSS remains a reliable, nationally normed survey with higher response rates than other similar United States-based surveys (Smith, 1991). Exceptions to the GSS reliability do exist; for instance, has been challenging because non-response within GSS has increased over time (Burt, 1985; Smith, 1991). It is important to account for non-responses to ensure bias is not represented within the analysis (Penn, 2007).

For the purposes of this analysis, missing responses and non-responses have been grouped together as a missing response. These missing responses were excluded from the analysis and the findings. The percentages of missing by the overall sample, evangelical and non-evangelical datasets are displayed within the table below (Table 3). The variables have been grouped by characteristics of evangelicals, demographics, and questions assessing gender equality. Variables defining evangelicals and a majority of demographic responses have a low percentage (5% or less) of missing responses. A higher percentage of missing responses have also been identified among variables related to gender equality questions (48.6% average for overall population). Previous research in studies such as this (Burt, 1985) Penn, 2007; Smith, 1991) have identified that a common reason for missing data is reluctance by participants to share information with others, especially that information which is considered “private and personal” (Bradburn & Sudman, 1979). Income-related questions are historically defined as sensitive (Smith, 1991) and the variables associated with gender equality are similarly sensitive questions. Despite these known challenges, research that has affirmed necessary best practices in

survey data (Madans, Miller, Maitland & Willis, 2011) has determined that the General Social Survey is the most reliable in quality of design and self-perception questions; and results are the most reliable when compared to like surveys (Alwin, Beattie, & Baumgartner, 2015).

Table 3. Missing Responses from Sample Populations (n=2,867)

Variable	Overall (%) (n=2,867)	Evangelical (%) (n=348) (12.1%)	Non- Evangelical (%) (n=2519) (87.9%)
Feeling about the bible	37 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	37 (1.5%)
How fundamentalist are you	147 (5.1%)	0 (0.0%)	147 (5.8%)
Had a “born again” experience	69 (2.4%)	0 (0.0%)	69 (2.7%)
Gender	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
A man won’t get a job or promotion	1,954 (68.2%)	231 (66.4%)	1,723 (68.4%)
A woman won’t get a job or promotion	1,932 (67.4%)	237(68.1%)	1,695 (67.3%)
Experienced discrimination at work in past 5 years	1,411 (49.2%)	186 (53.%)	1,225 (48.6%)
Divorce law should be easier	1,077 (37.6%)	122 (35.1%)	955 (37.9%)
For preferential hiring of women	1,971 (68.8%)	228 (65.5%)	1,743 (69.2%)
Mother working doesn’t hurt children	989 (34.5%)	112 (31.9%)	877 (34.8%)
Better for a man to work, woman tend home	995 (34.7%)	111 (31.9%)	884 (35.1%)
Should hire and promote women	1,916 (66.8%)	234 (67.2%)	1,682 (66.8%)
Women not suited for politics	1,060 (37.0%)	125 (35.9%)	935(37.1%)
Preschool kids suffer if mother works	992 (34.6%)	115 (33.1%)	877 (34.8%)
Government is responsible to promote equality	1,520 (53.0%)	168 (48.3%)	1,352 (53.7%)
Men hurt family when focus on work too much	988 (34.5%)	111 (31.9%)	877 (34.8%)

Statistical software.

The instrumentation used during first study stage analyzing the 2016 General Social Survey data is IBM SPSS Statistics version 25. SPSS is utilized to interact with, edit, batch and statistically analyze data. A software system widely utilized within social science research for statistical analysis (Pallant, 2013), the software allows for statistical

analysis, data management, and data documentation. For purposes of this study, the software includes bivariate statistics to perform groupings of perceptions on gender roles and gender equality. SPSS also provides users with the ability to perform a chi-square tests for independence to discover if there is a relationship between categorical variables. The procedures used to conduct this analysis are described further below.

Statistical procedures.

The secondary analysis data collection process was conducted by identifying independent and dependent variables within the 2016 General Social Survey that classified the evangelical population and measured its perception of gender roles/equality. A chi-square bivariate analyzed these figures using IBM SPSS. The “Data Analysis Procedures” section explains why this procedure is appropriate to understand the figures and discover findings during Stage One. The collection of this data is explained below.

The analysis defined and compared evangelical beliefs and explored the demographic characteristics of evangelical and non-evangelical participants. Chi-square tests of association were conducted to compare attitudinal perspectives of gender equality on gender-based questions between evangelical and non-evangelical participants. The analyses were conducted to address questions guiding the dissertation study:

1. What are the perceptions of members of the Evangelical Church toward gender roles and gender equality?
2. Do perceptions of gender roles and gender equality differ by gender?

The quantitative portion of this study specifically examined perceptions of gender among evangelical Christians in a nationally representative sample (GSS).

Demographic characteristics: evangelical and non-evangelical.

Demographic information defined in the 2016 GSS was analyzed through a chi-square test to better understand the characteristics of the evangelical and non-evangelical communities. A chi-square test examined the relationship between gender and evangelical identity. The relationship between these two variables was significant, $X^2 (2, N = 2,835) = 8.23, p = 0.00$. Evangelicals claim a higher percentage of women (62.7%) when compared to the overall population (55.5%) and non-evangelical population (54.5%). A chi-square test examined the relationship between race/ethnicity and the evangelical identity. The relationship between these two variables was significant, $X^2 (2, N = 2,835) = 83.57, p = 0.00$. Representation among black/African-Americans was shown to be higher among evangelicals (33.3%), when compared to overall (16.6%) and non-evangelicals (14.2%). A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between age groups and evangelical identity. The relationship between the two variables was significant, $X^2 (2, N = 2,835) = 32.24, p = 0.00$. Evangelicals have a higher percentage of believers older than 50 years old (63.5%), compared to the overall population (50.0%) and non-evangelicals (48.1%). These characteristics are displayed below in Table 4.

Table 4. Demographic Characteristics: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical (n=2,867)

	Overall (%)	Evangelical (%)	Non-Evangelical (%)
	(n=2867)	(n=348)	(n=2519)
		(12.1%)	(87.9%)
Variable			
Gender *			
Male	1276 (44.5%)	37.4%	45.5%
Female	1591 (55.5%)	62.6%	54.5%
Race/Ethnicity			
White	2077 (74.3%)	60.6%	75.0%
Black/African American	470 (16.6%)	33.3%	14.2%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	58 (2.0%)	1.7%	2.1%
Asian	89 (3.1%)	1.4%	3.4%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	4 (0.1%)	0.0%	0.2%
Hispanic	102 (3.6%)	2.3%	3.8%
Other	13 (0.5%)	0.3%	0.5%
Race/Ethnicity*			
White	2077 (72.4%)	211 (60.6%)	1866 (74.1%)
People of Color	736 (25.7%)	136 (39.1%)	600 (23.8%)
Age*			
18 - 29	472 (16.6%)	9.2%	17.7%
30 - 49	944 (33.3%)	27.3%	34.1%
50 - 64	798 (28.1%)	36.8%	26.9%
65 And Over	621 (21.9%)	26.7%	21.2%

*p < .05

Additional analysis explored significant relationships between the evangelical and non-evangelical communities related to marital status, total family income, if an individual was currently working for pay, the highest degree an individual had earned and

if a person considered himself or herself religious. A chi-square test examined the relationship between marital status and evangelical identity. The relationship between these two variables was significant, $X^2 (2, N = 2,833) = 40.72, p = 0.00$. The results showed that evangelicals are most likely to be married (48.0%), widowed (15.2%), or separated (4.6%) when compared to the overall population and non-evangelicals. Another chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between total family income and the evangelical and Non-Evangelical populations. The relationship between these two variables was significant, $X^2 (2, N = 2,835) = 20.16, p = 0.00$. Among the overall sample, 53.1% of evangelicals' report family income less than \$50,000. This percentage of low family income is higher than the overall population (44.8%) and non-evangelicals (43.8%).

A chi-square test was also examined the relationship between individuals working for pay and evangelical identity. The relationship between these two variables was significant, $X^2 (2, N = 2,835) = 9.72, p = 0.01$. Evangelicals have a higher percentage of respondents working without pay (21.6%) compared to the overall population (18.8%) and non-evangelicals (18.4%). Another chi-square test examined the relationship between college education levels and evangelical identity. The relationship between these two variables was significant, $X^2 (2, N = 2,835) = 20.22, p = 0.00$. Evangelicals have a significantly higher percentage of individuals with a high school degree or less (76.1%) when compared to the overall population (62.4%) and non-evangelicals (60.5%).

A chi-square test examined the relationship between evangelical identity and personal religious conviction. The relationship was significant, $X^2 (2, N = 2,810) =$

277.93, $p = 0.00$. Evangelicals have a higher percentage of its faithful self-identifying as very or moderately religious (88.8%) when compared to the total population (54.6%) and percentage of non-Evangelicals (49.9%). These characteristics are displayed below in Table 5.

Table 5. Demographic Sample Characteristics: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical (n=2,867)

Variable	Overall (%) (n=2867)	Evangelical (%) (n=348)	Non-Evangelical (%) (n=2,519)
Marital Status*			
Married	1207 (42.6%)	48.0%	41.8%
Widowed	245 (8.6%)	15.2%	7.7%
Divorced	490 (17.3%)	14.7%	17.7%
Separated	101 (3.6%)	4.6%	3.4%
Never Married	730 (27.9%)	17.5%	29.4%
Total Family Income*			
Less Than \$15,000	364 (12.8%)	16.4%	12.3%
\$15,000 - \$25,000	320 (11.3%)	12.1%	11.2%
\$25,000 - \$50,000	586 (20.7%)	23.6%	20.3%
\$50,000 - \$75,000	462 (16.3%)	15.8%	16.4%
\$75,000 or More	842 (29.7%)	20.4%	31.0%
Missing	261 (9.2%)	11.8%	8.8%
Currently Working For Pay*			
Yes	923 (32.6%)	25.3%	33.6%
No	532 (18.8%)	21.6%	18.4%
Missing	1380 (48.7%)	53.2%	48.0%
Highest Degree Earned*			
Less than High School	325 (11.5%)	17.3%	10.7%
High School	1442 (50.9%)	58.8%	49.8%
Junior College	214 (7.6%)	6.9%	7.6%
Bachelor	534 (18.9%)	12.1%	19.8%
Graduate	316 (11.2%)	4.9%	12.0%
Considered A Religious Person*			
Very Religious	456 (16.2%)	42.7%	12.5%
Moderate Religious	1080 (38.4%)	46.1%	37.4%
Slight Religious	643 (22.9%)	5.8%	25.3%
Not Religious	631 (22.5%)	5.5%	24.8%

*p < .05

Comparing perceptions of gender roles and equality among evangelical and non-evangelical participants.

A chi-square analysis assessed perceptions of gender equality among evangelical and non-evangelicals. Significant bivariate associations were found within select variables, noted with an asterisk.

Tables 6 through 9 show results from chi-square tests, examining the association of gender related questions and responses by both genders representing both evangelicals and non-evangelicals.

Table 6 details perceptions of gender-based questions were analyzed comparing evangelicals and non-evangelicals. A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between the perception of it being better for a man to work and for women to tend the home and Evangelical identity. The relationship between these two variables was significant, $X^2 (2, N = 1,857) = 71.41, p = 0.00$. This relationship found that Evangelicals believed at higher percentage rates, when compared with non-evangelicals, that it is better for a man to work and a woman to tend the home (34.2% compared to 15.6%). A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between the perception of women not being suited for politics and Evangelical identity. The relationship between these two variables was significant, $X^2 (2, N = 1,793) = 18.42, p = 0.00$. This relationship found that evangelicals believed at higher percentage rates, when compared with non-evangelicals, that women are not suited for politics (30.0% compared to 17.9%). Evangelicals were asked if preschool children suffer if their mothers work outside the home. A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between the perception of preschool children suffering if women work and Evangelical identity. The

relationship between these two variables was significant, $X^2 (2, N = 1,859) = 21.67, p = 0.00$. This relationship found that evangelicals believed at higher percentage rate, when compared with Non-Evangelicals, that preschool kids suffer when women work (27.7% compared to 16.9%).

Evangelicals were also queried on attitudes on divorce law. A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between the perception of current divorce law and Evangelical identity. The relationship between these two variables was significant, $X^2 (2, N = 1,396) = 19.61, p = 0.00$. This relationship found that non-evangelicals believed at a higher percentage rate, when compared with evangelicals, that divorce laws should be easier (40.5% compared to 31.0%).

A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between the perception of the remaining gender-based questions by evangelical and non-evangelical populations. No significant relationship was found to exist between these variables and the Evangelical and Non-Evangelical populations. The chi-square tests for all relationships within Table 6 can be found within the appendix.

Table 6. GSS Gender Based Question Affirmative Responses, Evangelical/Non-Evangelical Responses (n=2,867)

Variable	Overall (%) (n=2,867)	Evangelical (%) (n=348)	Non-Evangelical (%) (n=2,519)
A man won't get a job or promotion	905 (31.6%)	33.6%	31.7%
A woman won't get a job or promotion	687 (24.2%)	23.0%	24.4%
Experienced discrimination at work in past 5 years	266 (9.5%)	8.0%	9.6%
Divorce law should be easier*	697 (39.3%)	31.0%	40.5%
For preferential hiring of women	312 (11.0%)	15.9%	10.3%
Mother working doesn't hurt children	1404(49.5%)	46.6%	49.9%
Better for a man to work, woman tend home*	508 (17.9%)	34.2%	15.6%
Should hire and promote women	687 (24.2%)	26.1%	24.0%
Women not suited for politics*	348 (19.4%)	30.0%	17.9%
Preschool kids suffer if mother works*	513 (18.1%)	27.7%	16.8%
Government is responsible to promote equality	1134(40.0%)	43.7%	39.5%
Men hurt family when focus on work too much	983 (34.7%)	39.3%	33.9%

*p < .05

Comparing perceptions of gender roles and equality by gender in the overall sample.

As seen in Table 7, perceptions of gender-based questions were analyzed between male and female populations. A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between the perception of a mother working does not hurt children and male and female populations. The relationship between these two variables was significant, $X^2(2, N = 1,878) = 17.11, p = 0.00$. This relationship found that females believed at a higher percentage (79.0%) than males (70.7%) that a mother working does not hurt children. A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between the perception that people should hire and promote women and male and female populations. The relationship between these two variables was significant, $X^2(2, N = 864) = 16.44, p =$

0.00. This relationship found that females believed at a higher percentage rates (76.4%) than males (49.8%) that there should be a priority to hire and promote women. A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between the perception of preschool children suffering if women work and male and female populations. The relationship between these two variables was significant, $X^2 (2, N = 1,875) = 18.10, p = 0.00$. This relation found that when compared to women, males were found to have believed at a higher percentage rates that preschool kids suffer if a mother works (32.7% compared to 23.8%). A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between the perception of men hurting their family when they focus too much on work and male and female populations. The relationship between these two variables was significant, $X^2 (2, N = 1,878) = 17.11, p = 0.00$. This relationship found that males believed at a higher percentage (69.2%) that men hurt family when they focused on work too much compared to females (54.3%).

A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between the perception of the remaining gender based questions and the male and female populations. No significant relationship was found to exist between these variables and the male and female populations. The chi-square tests for all relationships within table 7 can be found within the appendix.

Table 7. GSS Gender Based Question Affirmative Responses, Gendered Responses (n=2,867)

Variable	Overall (%) (n=2,867)	Male (%) (n=1,510)	Female (%) (n=1,357)
A man won't get a job or promotion	430 (47.1%)	46.9%	47.2%
A woman won't get a job or promotion	691 (73.9%)	49.8%	76.4%
Experienced discrimination at work in past 5 years	269 (19.7%)	19.9%	19.6%
Divorce law should be easier	702 (49.9%)	48.8%	50.8%
For preferential hiring of women	315 (35.2%)	35.2%	35.1%
Mother working doesn't hurt children*	1415 (75.3%)	70.7%	79.0%
Better for a man to work, woman tend home	515 (27.5%)	27.8%	27.2%
Should hire and promote women*	693 (80.2%)	74.9%	85.9%
Women not suited for politics	353 (19.5%)	18.4%	20.4%
Preschool kids suffer if mother works*	520 (27.7%)	32.7%	23.8%
Government is responsible to promote equality	1142 (84.8%)	85.0%	84.6%
Men hurt family when focus on work too much*	990 (61.0%)	69.2%	54.3%

*p < .05

Comparing perceptions of gender roles and equality among men and women in the evangelical subsample.

As seen in Table 8, perceptions of gender-based questions were analyzed between evangelical males and evangelical females. A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between the perception of the gender based questions and the male evangelicals and female evangelical populations. No significant relationship was found to exist between these variables and the evangelical and non-evangelical populations. However, when comparing responses among evangelical males and evangelical females with variables that were identified having a significant association among the gender specific overall population (table 7) and non-evangelical population (table 9) we see

similarities. The variable that a mother working doesn't hurt children is found to be significant among the overall population of females and non-evangelical females; this sentiment is shared with evangelical females (71.9% compared to 63.3% of male evangelicals). Similarly, females overall, Non-Evangelical females and Evangelical females believe at higher percentage rates than their male counterparts that we should hire and promote women (74.2% of evangelical females compared to 69.3% of evangelical males). The total population of males, non-evangelical males and evangelical males also believed at higher percentage rates that preschool kids suffer if mother works and men hurt the family when they focus on work too much (47.8% of evangelical males compared to 35.7% of evangelical females). The chi-square tests for all relationships within table 8 can be found within the appendix.

Table 8. GSS Gender Based Question Affirmative Responses, Evangelical Gendered Responses (n=348)

Variable	Overall (%) (n=348)	Evangelical Male (%) (n=130)	Evangelical Female (%) (n=218)
A man won't get a job or promotion	69 (59.0%)	74.4%	51.3%
A woman won't get a job or promotion	80 (72.1%)	69.4%	74.2%
Experienced discrimination at work in past 5 years	28 (20.3%)	24.6%	17.3%
Divorce law should be easier	70 (35.4%)	27.6%	40.2%
For preferential hiring of women	55 (45.8%)	47.5%	45.0%
Mother working doesn't hurt children	162 (68.6%)	63.3%	71.9%
Better for a man to work, woman tend home	119 (50.2%)	47.8%	51.7%
Should hire and promote women	91 (85.0%)	79.2%	89.8%
Women not suited for politics	67 (30.0%)	30.6%	29.7%
Preschool kids suffer if mother works	94 (40.3%)	47.8%	35.7%
Government is responsible to promote equality	152 (84.4%)	78.8%	87.7%
Men hurt family when focus on work too much	139 (65.9%)	72.1%	61.6%

*p < .05

Comparing perceptions of gender roles and equality among men and women in the non-evangelical subsample.

As seen in Table 9, perceptions of gender-based questions were analyzed between non-evangelicals Males and non-evangelicals Females Chi-square bivariate analysis within table 9 compared the beliefs of non-evangelical males and non-evangelical females within the overall population and their beliefs on gender equality based variable

questions. A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between the perception of a mother working does not hurt children and the non-evangelical male and non-evangelical female populations. The relationship between these two variables was significant, $X^2 (2, N = 1,626) = 17.50, p = 0.00$. This relationship found that non-evangelical females were found to have believed that a mother working does not hurt children at a higher percentage rate (80.4%) when compared to non-evangelical males (71.5%). A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between the perception that people should hire and promote women and the non-evangelical male and non-evangelical female populations. The relationship between these two variables was significant, $X^2 (2, N = 751) = 13.67, p = 0.00$. This relationship found that non-evangelical females believed at a higher percentage rate (85.1%) when compared to non-evangelical males (74.2%) that there should be efforts made to hire and promote women. A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between the perception of preschool children suffering if women work and the non-evangelical male and non-evangelical female populations. The relationship between these two variables was significant, $X^2 (2, N = 1,626) = 17.84, p = 0.00$. This relationship found that non-evangelical males were found to believe at higher percentage rates (30.8%) when compared to Non-Evangelical females (21/6%) that preschool kids suffer if a woman works.

A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between the perception of men hurting their family when they focus too much on work and the non-evangelical male and non-evangelical female populations. The relationship between these two variables was significant, $X^2 (2, N = 1,396) = 35.00, p = 0.00$. This relationship

found that non-evangelical males were found to believe at higher percentage rates (68.8%) when compared to non-evangelical females (53.3%) that men hurt the family when they work too much.

A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between the perception of the remaining gender based questions and the male non-evangelical and female non-evangelical populations. No significant relationship was found to exist between these variables and the evangelical and non-evangelical populations. The chi-square tests for all relationships within table 9 can be found within the appendix.

Table 9. GSS Gender Based Affirmative Responses, Non-Evangelical Gendered Responses (n=2,519)

Variable	Overall (%) (n=2,519)	Non-Evangelical Male (%) (n=1,146)	Non-Evangelical Female (%) (n=1,373)
A man won't get a job or promotion	357 (45.3%)	43.3%	46.5%
A woman won't get a job or promotion	607 (74.2%)	71.6%	77.1%
Experienced discrimination at work in past 5 years	238 (19.7%)	19.6%	19.8%
Divorce law should be easier	627 (52.3%)	51.9%	52.3%
For preferential hiring of women	257 (33.5%)	33.8%	33.3%
Mother working doesn't hurt children*	1242 (76.4%)	71.5%	80.4%
Better for a man to work, woman tend home	389 (24.0%)	25.3%	22.9%
Should hire and promote women*	596 (79.4%)	74.2%	85.1%
Women not suited for politics	281 (17.9%)	16.9%	18.7%
Preschool kids suffer if mother works*	419 (25.8%)	30.8%	21.6%
Government is responsible to promote equality	982 (84.8%)	86.0%	84.0%
Men hurt family when focus on work too much*	844 (60.5%)	68.8%	53.3%

*p < .05

Summary.

The first-stage quantitative results demonstrate that perceptions of gender roles/equality varied among evangelicals and non-evangelicals. The gender equality differences are more pronounced when examining gender-specific responses within the evangelical and non-evangelical populations are explored.

By categorizing the gender equality dependent variables into dichotomized responses (those which support and those that challenge gender equality) we arrive at a

clearer understanding how evangelicals and non-evangelicals, and the genders within these populations, respond to challenging statements on gender equality. Gender equality variables expressing “a man will not get a job or promotion over a woman,” “it is better for a man to work and a woman to tend the home,” “preschool kids suffer if a woman works,” and “women are not suited for politics” represent opinions that challenge gender equality for women.

This study affirmed the hypothesis that evangelicals would have a lower perception of gender equality when compared with non-evangelicals. The second hypothesis predicted that men would have lower perceptions of gender equality when compared with women; this hypothesis was also confirmed. The challenge existing within the hypothesis, specifically the first, is that evangelicals supported equality at higher percentages than non-evangelicals. This complicated relationship is explained further below.

The first hypothesis is that evangelicals would have a lower perception of gender equality when compared with non-evangelicals. This is confirmed: evangelicals have a lower perception of equality demonstrated by a higher percentage of responses that challenged equality (31.4%) when compared to the same responses by non-evangelicals (20.5%). Findings also demonstrated that evangelicals responded positively at higher rates (32.4%) to questions supporting gender equality when compared to non-evangelicals (30.3%). This complicated narrative of populations both challenging and supporting gender equality affirmed the utilization of mixed methodologies to gather a greater understanding through a qualitative study with faith community members. This

complicated relationship of challenging and supporting gender equality is found when examining other populations' perceptions of gender equality as well.

The second hypothesis predicted men would have lower perceptions of gender equality when compared with women. This is confirmed: men responded negatively by a higher percentage to questions that challenged gender equality (31.5%) compared to the same answers by women (29.7%). Findings also demonstrated that men responded at lower rates (64.1%) in questions supporting gender equality when compared to women (69.2%). These findings affirmed the statement made within the hypothesis.

This analysis demonstrates the variation of perceptions of gender equality within the evangelical community. The findings from this analysis informed what perspectives need to be clarified within the qualitative focus groups section of the research. These findings informed the Stage 2 objective: prosecution of a descriptive summary of findings from the secondary analysis and develop questions to affirm perceptions with evangelical community. The executive summary and focus group researcher script were developed by findings from Stage 1 to guide focus group discussions.

Stage 2: Executive Summary - Secondary Analysis

The findings from Stage 1 of the research led to the development of a comprehensive document utilized to inform and lead discussions for the qualitative portion of the research. As seen in Figure 1 and Figure 2, the following two documents represent the analysis shared with the participants of the qualitative component of the study (Executive Summary – Quantitative Analysis) and the script (Focus Group Researcher Script) utilized by the researcher to lead discussion during the focus group sessions.

In addition to these documents from Stage 1, Figure 1 and Figure 2 are based on feedback from faith community members. Discussions held with an evangelical leader and congregants to confirm the language used and format of discussion were engaging and conducive for dialogue. Knowing that this topic would be met with hesitation, precise language was important to ensure participants did not feel defensive.

Initial dialogue with community members affirmed the importance of language. Feedback indicated the topic of gender would be met with hesitation and would be seen as a critique upon the community. For instance, based on feedback the graphical representations in Figure 1 were changed from “Pro Equality” and “Anti Equality” to “High Perception” and “Low Perception.” Survey groups were classified as “low perception” if they had an overall higher percentage of response in the General Social Study to questions that challenged gender equality. Beliefs that “a man will not get a job or promotion over a woman,” “it is better for a man to work and a woman to tend the home,” “preschool kids suffer if a woman works,” and “women are not suited for politics” represent opinions that challenge gender equality from the perspective of a woman. Groups were classified as “high perception” if they recorded a higher percentage of positive responses in the GSS to questions that support gender equality. Beliefs that “a woman will not get a job or promotion over a man” “support for preferential hiring of women,” “a woman working doesn’t hurt a child,” and “affirming government support for gender equality” are variables that support gender equality. As discussed in the findings section in Chapter 4, not all responses by population were found to be significant when conducting a bivariate analysis.

The categorization of “High Perception” and “Low Perception” variables were discussed with focus group participants. This dialogue helped to ensure the intentionality of the study and that the researcher’s position on the research was communicated clearly. Language used within Figure 2 reiterated the importance of perspective shared by participants. These conversations helped to ensure the presentation of Stage 2 quantitative analysis summaries and the dialogue within the focus groups is inclusive but also pushed participants to talk candidly about their understanding and perceptions of gender roles and gender equality.

Figure 1. Executive summary – quantitative analysis.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What are the perceptions of gender roles and gender equality among members of the Evangelical Church?
2. Do perceptions of gender roles and equality differ by gender?

PARTICIPANTS & PROCEDURES

The secondary data analysis utilized findings from the 2016 General Social Survey (GSS). The GSS gathers data on contemporary American society for the purpose of monitoring and explaining trends and constants in attitudes, behaviors and attributes. The sample for this study includes the GSS 2016 sample (2,867), and the subsample of an evangelical community (348).

MEASURES

Evangelical: Participants were defined as evangelical if they responded to three questions selected from the GSS that have been identified to represent ideals shared among evangelicals. The ideals identified include belief that the Bible is the actual word of God and should be taken literally; an individual who identifies as having a fundamentalist faith; and identify as having had a “born again” experience.

Gender Roles/Equality: This survey selected 12 variables from the GSS on this topic that inquired on attitudinal perspectives of an individual who received a position or promotion based on their gender, experienced discrimination in the work place based on gender; the family impacts of men or women, or both, working outside the home; divorce laws, and women in leadership.

HYPOTHESIS

Based on existing literature, it is predicted that evangelicals would have a lower perception of gender equality (attitudinal responses that are opposed to traditional gender roles and in favor of gender equality) when compared with non-evangelicals. Additionally, it is predicted that men would have lower perceptions of gender equality than women in similar demographics.

DATA ANALYSIS

An analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS Version 25. Bivariate analysis was conducted to address the study's objectives. Chi-square tests of association were conducted to

compare attitudinal perspectives on gender-based questions between evangelical and non-evangelical participants.

FINDINGS

The first hypothesis predicted that evangelicals would have a lower perception of gender equality when compared with non-evangelicals¹. The findings demonstrated that evangelicals DO have a lower perception of equality demonstrated by a greater percentage of positive responses to questions that challenged equality (31.4%) when compared to the same answers by non-evangelicals (20.5%). Findings also demonstrate that more evangelicals responded (32.4%) to questions supporting gender equality when compared to non-evangelicals (30.3%). This complicated relationship of challenging and supporting gender equality is found when examining other populations' perceptions of gender equality as well.

The second hypothesis predicted that men would have lower perceptions of gender equality when compared with women. The findings demonstrated that men DO have a lower perception of gender equality demonstrated by a greater percentage of responses to questions that challenge equality (31.5%) when compared to the same questions answered women (29.7%). Findings also demonstrated that men responded at lower rates (64.1%) in questions supporting gender equality when compared to women (69.2%). These findings affirmed the statement made within the hypothesis.

¹ Lower perception of equality was defined by a population having an overall greater percentage responding to the selected General Social Study's gender equality questions in a way that challenged equality. High perception of equality were defined by a population having an overall higher percentage responding to the selected General Social Study's gender equality questions that supported gender equality. As discussed in the findings section in Chapter 4, not all responses by population were found to be significant when conducting a bivariate analysis. This was discussed with focus group participants.

Table 1 provides the headcount and percentage representation of each mentioned sample population with its respective responses to perceptions on gender equality. Table 2 provide a visual bar chart of the information presented in Table 1

Table 1. GSS Gender Equality Questions Responses (n=2,867)

Variable	Overall (%) (n=2,867)	Low Perception Gender Equality (%)	High Perception Gender Equality (%)
Evangelical	348 (12.1%)	31.4%	32.4%
Non-Evangelical	2,519 (87.9%)	20.5%	30.3%
Male	1,276 (44.4%)	31.5%	64.1%
Female	1,591 (54.6%)	29.7%	69.2%
Male (Evangelical)	130 (4.5%)	50.2%	68.4%
Male (Non-Evangelical)	1,146 (40.0%)	29.1%	67.7%
Female (Evangelical)	218 (7.6%)	42.1%	71.7%
Female (Non-Evangelical)	1,373 (47.9%)	27.4%	68.9%

Table 2. Graphical Representation of GSS Gender Equality Questions Responses (n=2,867)

Figure 2. Focus group researcher script.

INTRODUCTION

Hello everyone, and welcome to the focus group. My name is C.J. Bishop and I am a doctoral student with Chapman University.

OVERVIEW OF THE TOPIC

Thank you for taking the time to join in a dialogue where you are able to provide your perception and voice as members of the Evangelical Church on the topic of gender roles and gender equality. There have been several research studies exploring this topic: in national surveys, commentary of key leaders, or responses from students, faculty, or staff at Christian colleges. However, there is a missing perspective from members whose practices and beliefs represent the evangelical community. This is why we are here, to hear your voice. I will also be meeting with another focus group with members of the Evangelical Church, but I am unable to disclose its information because of the Institutional Review Board standards on confidentiality.

The results will be used to inform my dissertation topic which seeks to examine perceptions of gender roles and gender equality among members of the Evangelical Church. As someone who grew up in the Evangelical Church and who is a practicing Christian, this research topic is important to me. The topic hopes to provide a needed voice and perspective directly from the evangelical community. This will be accomplished through a mixed-methods approach. The first portion of the research analyzed perceptions of gender among Evangelical Christians in a nationally representative sample through use of the General Social Survey. We will look at these findings during our time to inform our discussion. The second portion of the research explores how Evangelical Christians view gender role and gender equality through discussion such as this one.

You were invited because you all identify as being members of an Evangelical Church who are actively practicing your faith. For this reason, your perspectives on how your faith and your church have informed your opinions on gender roles and gender equality are highly valued.

There are no wrong answers but rather differing points of view. Please feel free to share your point of view even if it differs from what others have said.

You've probably noticed the microphone. I will be tape recording our conversation because I don't want to miss any of your comments. People often say very helpful things in these discussions and I can't write fast enough to get them all down. We will be on a first name basis tonight, and I won't use any names in the final report. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. As stated in the consent form all identifiable collected information about you will be removed and replaced with a code. The audio recordings will also be stored in a secure location and transcribed. I intend to keep the research data until the research is published and/or presented. The report will be used to aide in the completion of my dissertation with the objective of helping provide voice and perspective to community

members through a mixed methods approach. Let's review the consent forms provided to you all.

****Review Consent Form, ask if there are any questions, collect signed consent forms****

GUIDELINES

- No right or wrong answers, only differing points of view
- I will be tape recording, so I ask that only one person speaks at a time
- We're on a first name basis
- You don't need to agree with others, but you must listen respectfully as others share their views
- I ask that you turn off or silence your phone. If you cannot and if you must respond to a call, please do so as quietly as possible and rejoin us as quickly as you can.
- My role as moderator will be to guide the discussion
- Talk to each other

QUESTIONS

Well, let's begin. I've placed name cards on the table in front of you to help us remember each other's names. Let's find out some more about each other by going around the table and sharing our favorite food.

I'm passing out the "Executive Summary" from the first portion of the research to explain how the information was gathered and gain perspective from you all on the process and the findings.

****Read: Research Questions, Participants & Procedures, and Measures****

1. What are your thoughts on how evangelicals are defined? In what ways do you feel this definition represents your experiences or the experiences of others on how evangelicals are defined? What additions or changes need to be made to the current definition?
2. What are your thoughts on the questions chosen to assess perceptions on gender roles? In what ways does this definition represent your experiences or the experiences of others that help define gender roles? In what ways have you experienced or witnessed gender roles? These roles may be experienced within the family, at church, in a work place or in social gatherings.
3. What are your thoughts on the questions chosen to assess perceptions on gender equality? In what ways does this definition represent your experiences or the experiences of others that help define gender equality? In what ways have you experienced or witnessed gender roles? These experiences may be within a family dynamic, at church, in a work place or in social gatherings.
4. How has the church practiced or discussed gender roles and gender equality? In what ways do your personal practice of gender roles and gender equality aligned with concepts are described in the church? In what ways have your personal practices differed from that of the church? Can you give me examples of how you've experienced this or seen others experience this?

****Read: Hypothesis****

5. What are your thoughts about the hypothesis? What is your hypothesis on how evangelicals perceive gender roles and gender equality compared to non-evangelicals? What do you think informs your perspective of your hypothesis?

****Read: Data Analysis and Findings****

6. What are your thoughts on the findings? Were they what you expected? Why or why not? How have your experiences or the experiences you've seen of others affirm or challenge these findings?
7. What would you do you feel is missing from the data? What would you like to be explored?

Stage 3: Qualitative Component

The qualitative third stage of the research utilized summarized findings from the second stage of quantitative findings to discuss with evangelical participants their thoughts on the findings as well as their personal experiences and perceptions of gender roles and gender equality.

Participants engaged in focus groups that discussed key findings and addressed gaps on perception of gender roles and gender equality through the use of a more in-depth understanding of the participants' faith and personal experiences. The focus groups provided essential perspectives that clarified gender roles and gender equality from a faith perspective. Additionally, questions reflecting the participant's perspectives of gender roles and gender equality within their church's organizational design were discussed within the focus group. This section will cover the study hypothesis, research design, participants and sampling schemes, data collection procedures and instruments, data analysis and procedures, and primary findings. Findings from this third stage of the study will be mixed with the finding from the other two stages in the final mixed data analysis.

Study hypothesis.

The findings from the quantitative portion of the study identified that evangelicals have a complicated relationship with gender roles\equality as represented by the 2016 General Social Survey data. Evangelicals were found to have higher criticism for (31.4%) and support of (32.4%) of gender equality compared to their non-evangelical counterparts (30.3% in favor, 20.5% opposed). However, when comparing genders among evangelicals and non-evangelicals, both evangelical men (50.2%) and women (42.1%)

were shown to have higher support for statements criticizing gender equality, but evangelical women showed the highest responses for statements affirming gender equality (71.7%).

For the qualitative portion, the researcher predicted that a more focused conversation would identify why this complicated relationship exists. The 2016 General Social Survey did not provide perspective of respondents' perceptions of gender equality within the church, the household, the workplace or society at large. It is hypothesized that traditionally defined gender roles would be expected within the home and church, and perspectives focused on gender equality would be more present when discussing the workplace or society at large. The researcher also hypothesized the focus groups would identify the largest variance to exist between the women within the conservative Evangelical Church and women within the liberal Evangelical Church. Literature (Bryan, 2009, Colaner & Warner, 2005) has identified the most prominent population supporting traditional gender role ideologies within the Evangelical Church are women within the church. It is expected that women associated with the liberal Evangelical Church to have a noticeable opposing view in comparison.

Research design.

Data design for the third stage was informed by exchanges between the researcher and focus group participants. The mixed-methods sequential explanatory design directed the collection and analysis of quantitative data during first stage, summary of findings of the second stage, and finally led to the collection and analysis of qualitative data of the third stage. The use of qualitative data is used to assist in explaining the findings from the quantitative portion of the study. Focus groups were utilized to provide a more

personalized and in depth understanding of gender roles/equality through personal experiences. Three focus groups were conducted to explore perceptions of gender roles/equality among members of the Evangelical Church and whether these perceptions differ by gender. The perceptions found within the focus groups were analyzed using thematic analysis. The findings from the quantitative portion of this study and qualitative study were then reflected upon through a mixed data analysis procedure. This comparison affirmed shared findings and identified differences between the quantitative study and the qualitatively informed focus groups.

Participants and sampling schemes.

The identification of eligible participants took place through outreach efforts by the investigator during a four-week time frame. The target sample for a single focus group ranged from seven to 12 participants. With the help of evangelical community 29 participants took part in the study, resulting in three focus groups. Participants were required to be at least 18 years of age and a practicing member of an Evangelical Church. To ensure participants could meet in person the population was selected from eligible participants within the Southern California region. It was important that both male and female evangelicals were represented to ensure both perspectives were present. In addition to gender, the samples of participants were considered based on representation from a conservative and liberal Evangelical Church. Participant recruitment will be discussed further in the recruitment section. The 29 participants were 18 (62%) females and 11 (38%) males. Participants also identified their respective churches as having a more liberal ideology (11, 38%) or a more conservative ideology (18, 62%), members of both genders were represented within each of these types of churches. The demographics

of the respective focus groups were represented by a small faith group of individuals in their early to mid-thirties (focus group 1), a group of primarily members who are fifty and older (focus group 2), and a women's faith group made up of college age women in their early twenties and two women older than fifty (focus group 3). Outside of the women's group, both male and female participants represented the two other groups.

Through an established relationship of a faith community insider, the researcher coordinated a scheduled date and time for each focus group to take place with identified participants. The investigator administered the focus groups during a five-week timeframe. To be eligible to participate, respondents were required sign an informed consent form. This form was read aloud with each focus group, questions were answered, and each participant acknowledged comprehension of the consent form and signed the form prior to engaging in the focus group. Written and verbal explanation was provided within the consent form that there would be no compensation for participating in the focus group. The focus groups set timeframe of forty-five minutes to an hour and a half to complete. After completing the focus group, a debriefing took place to ensure participants understood all aspects of the study and associated questions.

Data collection procedures and instruments.

Data collection within the third stage took place over a five-week timeframe. Three focus groups were conducted ranging from seven to 12 participants within each group. Each focus group took 90 minutes. Utilizing the executive summary and researcher script from the second stage, a dialogue took place within the focus group related to the findings of evangelical gender roles/equality perceptions based on the 2016 General Social Survey findings. Additionally, questions were asked to participants related

to their perceptions of gender roles, gender equality and any personal experiences they may have had as well as any experiences they have witnessed. The dialogue of each focus group was recorded with a Zoom H1n Handy Recorder and three Olympus E33 Table Top Conference Meeting Omni-directional microphones. The researcher transcribed the transcripts of each focus group, utilizing a combination of NVivo version 12 and Microsoft Word. Additionally, the service of a third party transcribing service, REV, was utilized to confirm the accuracy of the transcribed data. During the data grouping and analysis phase NVivo version 12 was used to analyze the transcriptions, Microsoft Word and Microsoft Excel was utilized to transcribe and conduct a five-stage process of thematic analysis. The grouping and data analysis of the third phase is discussed in greater detail in the Data Analysis and Procedures section.

Recruitment.

Passive (email outreach) and informed recruitment took place with outreach efforts made by the researcher to individuals who had existing relationships with the researcher and were actively involved in evangelical churches. Outreach was made to multiple individuals involved with a variety of Evangelical churches within the Southern California region. The researcher explained to community insiders the focus groups would be conducted in confidentially and participants would be able expand upon interpretations of the data already collected. Once an understanding of the research objective and all questions and concerns were addressed with the community insider, an email was sent to potential focus group participants with the intention of soliciting a target sample size of seven to 12 participants. The target sample size was satisfied when 29 qualified participants responded: they were divided into three focus groups

composed of 7 to 12 participants each. Each focus group was coordinated in partnership with the researcher and a member of the participants' church. This process was used to ensure trust was established with the faith community, to provide full transparency regarding the objective of the study, and allow for questions to be asked to ensure comfort with the topics of the focus group conversation. Once there was a commitment, meeting times and locations were established. Rationale and explanation of study setting are explained in the following section.

Study setting.

Focus groups took place at the homes of two faith-based small groups that regularly occurred, and at a meeting room of one of the churches. Originally the study setting was to be scheduled in a rented space within a library or business park. After discussing this option with community insiders it was determined that conducting the focus groups at community coordinators' homes and on a church meeting site was most appropriate and convenient based on the location of the participants. Food and beverages were provided to participants at each study setting, taking into consideration any dietary restrictions ahead of meeting. Discussions took place in a seated circle with the recording device in the middle and microphones spread across the table to ensure all conversations could be recorded. Consent forms were read, understood and signed prior to engaging in the focus group. Guidelines were discussed (seen in Researcher Script in Stage 2) to ensure that participants were respectful to one another, no cross talk took place and that the focus group was meant to engage as a dialogue with participants. The three focus groups lasted between an hour and an hour and a half each. The participants varied by the evangelical churches they attend and their roles within their respective churches.

Participants were queried on demographic characteristics, religious and faith community support, perceptions of gender roles/equality and other variables discussed in the quantitative summary. After completing the focus group, a debriefing took place to ensure participants understood all aspects of the study and associated questions.

Moderator and note-taker.

The primary researcher acted as the moderator and note-taker. A recording device was utilized for each focus group session, allowing the researcher to take notes based on tone, primary themes and noted interactions between participants. These notes were blended into the discussion during the transcription process.

Sessions.

One session was conducted for each focus group lasting an hour to 90 minutes. Each session was coordinated with a primary insider within the Evangelical Church to ensure trust would be established with the participants.

Ethical consideration.

The process of informed consent was described in both passive (e-mail outreach) and active recruitment efforts. Explanation of the informed consent was made available to participants prior to arranging focus group meetings. If correspondence was made via email the consent form was sent and described in writing. If correspondence is made via phone, a verbal explanation of the consent form was discussed and a follow-up email with the consent form attached was sent. Participants were provided the option to ask questions regarding the consent form prior to confirmation of the meeting. An expectation that the consent form is understood and would be available for signature upon meeting with participants was also established. The explanation of the informed

consent form was reiterated and a physical copy was provided to members prior to the focus group initiation. Participants were not able to participate in the focus groups unless they understood their rights. Participants had to be adults, 18 years of age and older, who verified that they understood the purpose focus group and their rights as participants.

All identifiable information collected about that participants during the research process was removed and replaced with a code. A list linking the code and identifiable information was kept separate from the research data. Personal identifiers were retained for purposes of potential outreach by the researcher in case answers needed clarification. Members were required to consent to future contact by the researcher if needed. This was covered in the consent form. The data was stored on a laptop device with an encrypted password. A back-up of this information was stored securely within the iCloud service. The coded key linked with personally identifiable information was kept separately from its associated data. This security format allows for accessibility by the researcher while ensuring confidentiality for group members.

Data analysis and procedures.

A feminist theoretical framework was used to inform the data analysis and coding of the qualitative data. Discussed within the methods section, the feminist perspective was chosen for its ability to capture the subtleties and nuances of women's lived experiences. Additionally, feminist's perspective seeks to encompass a better understanding of oppressed populations through probing questions that focus on power, difference and silence. Through listening to the voices of the participants, a feminist theoretical framework was used to empower the experiences of the participants and

examine connections between their experiences and the faith that informed their lives and shaped their perspectives on gender roles and gender equality.

To identify, analyze, and report patterns within the data (Braun and Clarke, 2006) which surfaced during the focus group, thematic analysis was applied. This analyzed classifications and themes or patterns related to data. The themes were informed by the research question and findings from the quantitative analysis. This analytical technique was chosen for its ability to facilitate data gathered from interviews from a data-driven perspective and to code in an inductive way. This comprehensive process enables a researcher to identify cross-references between the data to identify evolving themes (Hayes, 1997). This process empowers the researcher to determine relationships within findings based on concepts and then compares these concepts with replicated data. This complements the mixed-method approach as well since these concepts can also be compared with data that has been gathered at a different point in time during the research. A five-stage process generated the thematic analysis of the focus groups (Boyatzis, 1998).

The five-stage process of thematic analysis has been applied throughout the qualitative portion of the research to ensure insight was gained and deeper appreciation for the group and individual dialogue informed the research and analysis. These stages included: data collection, coding data, code validation, themes and framework identification, and information consolidation and finalization of theme names. The data collection stage included gathering information directly from the participants by means of statements from the focus group dialogue, audio recording and transcription, as well as keeping a field diary for personal reflection and observational data.

During the data coding stage, the collected information was coded by examining every two to three lines of text to identify key words, concepts, images and reflections. Codes defined by the data included: defining evangelicals, egalitarianism, complementarianism, evangelical norms, female roles, male roles and gender equality. These codes were based on evangelical community terminology and understanding defined within the literature (Fassinger, 1994, Frederick, 2010) and by members of the focus groups. Both topical and analytical coding were addressed. Data-defined codes informed the topic coding which then indicated themes needed to answer the research questions (Richards, 2015). From a feminist theoretical framework, the coding analysis was influenced by how women understand themselves, and by the relationship between men and other women.

Additionally, feminist theoretical framework considered the perspective of the evangelicals who see themselves as an oppressed minority. As described by Boyatzis (1998), a quality code captures the qualitative richness of a phenomenon, as well as being clear and concise. The formation of these codes informed the themes that were utilized and compared with quantitative data. To ensure the codes hold reliability and were not misinformed by misinterpretation or researcher bias the third stage, code validation, was incorporated throughout the research.

Validation occurred throughout the analysis stage by means of double-checking the codes for consistency as well as verifying findings with participants. From this process a codebook was developed to identify themes and sub-themes during Stage Four, Themes and Framework Identification. These themes were based on patterns that appear within the coded data, traditionally informed around specific vocabulary or conversation

topics. Lastly, information consolidation and finalization of theme names, took place to identify a name with each theme.

Descriptive statistics for demographic variables.

For the qualitative portion of the study, thematic synthesis (Bazeley, 2013; Harden, 2008; Richards, 2015; Stewart & Steward, 1990) was used to analyze the data collected within the focus groups. Utilizing NVivo 12 software and transcription services from Rev.com, an open-ended coding process was utilized to capture dialogue among participants within the focus groups. The initial review of the data involved coding participants' quotes and reflections by the researcher that captures the interpretations of the dialogue that took place. The initial round of topic coding (Richards, 2015) allocated passages to topics that spoke to the research questions. This process led to the development of 10 broad themes including "Evangelical Norms", "Complementarianism," and "Familism/Headship". Following this initial phase of coding, an "analytical coding" (Richards, 2015) phase was used to refine the lists of themes. The objective is to provide context and create categories that express new ideas about the data. The results were a refined list of seven primary themes (Defining Evangelicals, Egalitarianism, Complementarianism, Evangelical Norms, Marriage/Family, Female Roles, and Male Roles) and expansion of each respective passage to ensure proper categorization. An example: "Familialism/Headship" is now grouped under the broader associated categorization of "Complementarianism"; and "Community Norms" is grouped under "Evangelical Norms".

Primary themes.

Participants discussing gender equality perceptions demonstrated within the 2016 General Social Survey focused on five most topical primary themes based on content analysis from the transcription: Complementarianism (28.21%), Defining Evangelicals (27.02%), Gender Equality (11.55%), Egalitarianism (10.44%) and Female Roles (9.32%). The following definitions provide context to the primary themes:

Complementarianism.

This ideology asserts the differences between men and women's "...capacities, positions and inclinations..." are divinely instituted (Perry, 2013, p. 396). This perspective further asserts God instituted complementary gender-specific roles for men and women that reaffirms a headship ideology. This viewpoint calls for men to take leadership roles in church and family while women supplement service through submissive "helper" roles, and are prevented from church leadership and teaching men (Bryant, 2006; Bryant, 2009; Colaner & Giles, 2008; Gundry, 1987; Hull, 1998; Smith, 2000).

Comments that "males and females are created to 'not be equal' but to 'complement' one affirm complementarianism. Based on these ideologies evangelicals commonly consider it "inappropriate" to compare the two sexes. Supporters of this theological ideology clarified that the decision for females to stay at home and raise the children is "biblically informed" and a "personal commitment" to raise children in a "proper environment." This belief is demonstrated in the following statements:

I can only answer from a faith-based response. Because, that's my biblical worldview: (it) dictates on how I respond, how I work, how I look at this world. I

can't separate my faith from who I am, and say I'm just this, is going to how I answer this question. It has to be through that lens of a biblical worldview.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

When that's been a personal commitment between the two that maybe it's very, very important to have someone home and possible to have a woman stay at home or the wife stay home to raise the children

Male, focus group 2 (conservative church)

I'm sure some people would say yeah, of course it is, you're putting your thumb on your wife and the man's keeping the woman home when in fact the two have made a conscious decision, biblically speaking. We wanna raise our children and what's more important than anything is raising our kids in a proper environment.

Male, focus group 2 (conservative church)

There's just so many, people bring so many meanings to those words and I think we all know what they're trying to get at, you know, it's very clear, but they could be more clear. It's almost like they copped out with the phrases as opposed to really drilling down a little deeper and being more specific.

Male, focus group 2 (conservative church)

In dialog, evangelicals expressed the complementarian view that traditional gender roles are not forced upon females. Additionally, some participants alluded that God created males and females differently, with females created in a “nurturing role” and men as “heads of household”:

Yeah, especially when it says “compared to non-evangelicals.” There is a difference of perception of raising families from a Bible basis taught. You know, what it teaches versus a second review of what the family should be.

Male, focus group 2 (conservative church)

Because, we have been taught that the men are the head of the household, and that you have to have a head. You've got to have somebody that's going to shoulder some of those major responsibilities, and when that becomes the woman, then we've begun to feminize manhood. We just, I think that there's just a lot of men that have, that it might have hurt.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

The results indicate the belief that households that do not adhere to complementarian norms, i.e. when females exist as the primary breadwinner, it's believed to cause "confusion to children," "hurts men" and "feminizes men.:

If it is at all possible for the mother to stay home with her children, that would be ideal. I think that we believe that, because I believe that God created us in that nurturing image. But, that doesn't mean that men can't be more nurturing as well. I think maybe this might show an openness to saying, if the job ... There are many women today that are the bread winners, and that has turned a lot of things upside down, I think. I think that it causes, it can cause some confusion (to children), I think it can. I'm sorry, I just do.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

Female participants in each of the focus groups questioned the value of women in leadership roles outside house, including in the church. Notably female participants within the conservative focus group stated that women should "not be given pastoral responsibilities" and felt "uncomfortable" with women giving a sermon:

... (I'm) pretty traditional. I'm the director of children's ministry. Men can have that job, and women can have that job. You don't see very many youth directors as women. It's usually men. You don't see very many worship leaders as women, it's usually men. There are some traditional positions that ... Now, I'm not saying that there aren't exceptions, but I'm saying mostly those positions are going to be filled by men. Right or wrong, weak or strong, I don't know. I just wonder how many women would want those positions that go after that, being a youth leader. Yes, youth in that, but being over the high school department, or doing that kind of thing. Maybe there's some room to grow in that area. Because, women are very qualified and they have a lot to teach. But, I think in that area it is a little bit, we are more traditional. There's gonna be certain gender roles in the church.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

Now, as far as a church environment goes, there are traditional roles that are being filled. I think that women have challenged some of those in some of the different denominations, on becoming pastors and different things like this. I think that women have been given gifts. But, should they be over men in the leadership role? That's a question that's been asked for hundreds of years. For me, I don't feel comfortable. I wouldn't feel comfortable in that position to be a pastor that would

be up there every week giving a sermon. I just, that just doesn't, I wouldn't feel comfortable with that. I think as far as evangelicals, traditional in the workplace, as far ministry goes it'

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

Participants who found complementarian concepts challenging believed that these ideologies were limited to perspectives on roles within the church. Notably this was raised within the liberal focus group: they opined that gender roles presented by leadership do not align with the reality of their lives in the workplace and home:

...unfortunately there is a difference on how gender is taken in those different roles. Like we do have a different role as women in our home, than we do at church, than we do in the workplace. And especially leadership, it's very different. For church simply we are not allowed to be leaders in the church. That's just what it is. So there is a huge difference for women

Female, focus group 1 (conservative church)

I think in the workplace is informed by cultural norms, workplace norms, leadership. Church is informed by leadership but also biblical narrative. What do people believe about the Bible. And that's how gender roles are, I think, informed and how people of different genders are treated within the church. So it's like the foundation is completely different.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

Critiques of complementarianism stated that these “conservative” ideologies are primarily dictated by church leadership as a result of “cherry picking” verses to put men in power and support “institutionalized sexism in the present church:

And I feel like, it's just like we all do the unfortunate reality it's that the men in leadership are cherry picking Bible verses that are informed by cultural norms. And choosing which one not to apply based on gender roles and then that is how leadership is developed.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

Which we all do. We all cherry pick verses. None of us follow it to a T but we are picking the ones that are the most convenient to keep male leadership in place.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

Defining evangelical.

The questions that were used to define evangelicals within the 2016 General Social Survey became a large discussion topic by all participants. The dialogues that took place provided clarity regarding participants' theological beliefs that later affirmed participants' perspectives on gender roles/equality. A segment of participants affirmed the Bible as the word of God while another segment believes the text is based on fables. The most notable variance on theological belief is the perspective on Jesus' teachings. Conservatives perceive Jesus living a life which complied with the patriarchal and complementarian teachings of the church. Liberals believe Jesus exemplifies feminist principles of gender equality.

The three characteristics used to define evangelicals within the quantitative portion of the study are 1) belief in the Bible as the literal word of God, 2) church-goers who have a fundamentalist-informed faith and 3) have been "born again.". Statements by focus group participants expressed that these characteristics generalized evangelical ideologies:

Yeah, those definitions. It's almost like these are stereotypes.

Male, focus group 2 (conservative church)

Someone from outside the evangelical community looking in and saying, "Oh well, okay, they're born again and they're fundamentalists" and so when you do drill down and you get specific it's much more clear and easy to identify with.

Male, focus group 2 (conservative church)

Yeah, I think that if you were to tell someone who is a member of the evangelical church or considers themselves (sic) part of that group they would be like "I don't believe" I would define myself that way. I don't read that I think that resonates with me personally.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

It's also, I don't know if I'm missing something. It's also interesting that it talks about the Bible but not about Jesus or Christ. I would say that most people would focus on the New Testament, if you're part of an Evangelical Church vs. having a blanket over everything.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

Fifteen participants did not believe that the Bible should be literally interpreted but rather treated as an inspired word of God mixed with historical stories, allegories and parables:

Yeah I think that's what most evangelicals would say, the Bible is the authoritative word of God. Maybe not literal, given the figurative language of the Bible in certain sections. But other sections they may say that this is literally a recounting of history. I think they would have a more nuanced view. Even the more rigid folks would acknowledge that.

Male, focus group 1 (liberal church)

I know that what it teaches in Timothy is that all scripture is inspired by God. So we do hold to the tenet that the Bible and its 66 books are the inspired word of God. I mean it's not like we don't believe that, but the Bible says that by itself

Male, focus group 2 (conservative church)

I think "literal" for me means a lot of things are contextual. Like the first thing I was thinking of is a verse in maybe Peter, where women shouldn't braid their hair with gold jewelry. Which we clearly don't believe or follow now. So based on that, some things are based on the context of people, in my opinion. And I think that most people probably think that.

Male, focus group 1 (liberal church)

...Obviously when Jesus was teaching, he used metaphors and allegories and stories to illustrate points, but he always makes that very clear. So other than that, I truly believe that it's the inspired word of God.

Female, focus group 2 (conservative church)

However, there are three participants that did support the belief the Bible is "the word of God" and informed by the "actual breath of God" that inspired men to write it:

I believe it's alive and it's the actual breath of God, and it's something I feel in my soul, my spirit.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

I think the term literally can be misinterpreted, because we all know that the sun doesn't rise, that the earth revolves, and so there are certain things that are used in the Bible that we understand. But, if you took it literally, we would think the sun rises, when it really doesn't. But, I think instead, it should be taken seriously. I believe, like (female participant), that it is God breathed, and God inspired, and as the Holy Spirit inspired men to write. That they didn't do this on their own...

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

Discussion of the term “fundamentalist” was focused on concern over varying interpretation with “too many negative connotations.” A majority believed that cultural and media associations of “fundamentalist” is commonly linked to religious extremism, resulting in many participants opposing the “fundamentalist label:

The “fundamentalist” is not a very good word I don't think. There are many things, fundamentalists might be those who have really strange activities ... a fundamentalist could be me who believes the Bible and tries to follow it

Female, focus group 2 (conservative church)

Fundamentalist, like you said, has come to have a negative connotation.

Female, focus group 2 (conservative church)

I think if someone has any historical understanding of how some Christians became called fundamentalists they might say, "Oh absolutely." But fundamentalists have so many negative connotations nowadays that I think the average evangelical would be inclined to say "Ooh, no way."

Male, focus group 2 (conservative church)

The three who supported the literal interpretation of the bible also affirmed the use of “fundamentalist belief” as an important characteristic of evangelicals. These participants clarified that the fundamentalist characteristic for them was associated with the belief that Jesus Christ is the Son of God:

I think when you look at fundamentals, evangelicals believe in certain things. There's certain parameters, fundamentals that they believe in that there's not gonna be any exception. The virgin birth, the goddess at [inaudible 00:08:20] God. That he was completely man and completely God, that he died on the cross, that he rose from the dead. Those are fundamentals that we are not going to sit there and say, "Well, she might not have been a virgin. He might not have risen from the dead. Maybe he just passed out on the cross, and he wasn't, he didn't really die." Those kinds of things.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

These are rock solid fundamentals that we're not going to accept anything other than that. That's what I understood when you say fundamentals. I would say according to that; I would believe that we are fundamentalists more than a moderate or a liberal point of view.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

The majority of group members discussed whether one had to have a single “born again” experience to be evangelical. Participants instead believed that the core of this experience was defined by having “trusted in Jesus Christ as your personal Lord and savior” or having a “realization of biblical principles”:

The word experience (reference to “born again experience”) is, I don't agree with that.

Female, focus group 2 (conservative church)

I take issue with that (“born again experience”) because it suggests that there's some monumental something happened on a specific day and time and that is not necessarily so. Many here, I think, and that I meet were brought up in a religious family and so we didn't suddenly have this great, we weren't drug addicts and suddenly we were saved it just kind of melds into it. So to say you have to have a “born again experience” I wonder what is mine? I don't remember having a specific born again experience. I run into this a lot when they ask questions like this in Bible study. Some people can say I remember the day and I just, I can't remember the day and a specific happening. That's just kind of sometimes your background just leads you into it and all of a sudden, no not all of a sudden, but over time you begin to understand some of these things you've been hearing for years. So I would consider that a born again experience.

Female, focus group 2 (conservative church)

It's hard to say. What do you mean by “born again experience”? That's the tough thing. I think probably a lot of us grew up as Christians. Well some of us, from a younger age and I don't know that there was one experience where I went from not being a Christian to like right away, now I'm born again. I think it was more gradual. I think there's a growing up and making it your faith your own.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

Maybe the word “repentance” would be like a little bit more of appropriate a word that we would agree with. “Born again” sounds really extreme. Whenever we think about born again, I’m thinking about a very charismatic experience versus saying that you repented of your sins. Even sometimes the word “repent” can sound pretty forceful.

Male, focus group 1 (liberal church)

Conversely, the same small group (3) believed that “born again” was an appropriate definition to identify as evangelical:

I feel like they've all captured it well, the definition of an evangelical.

Female, focus group 2 (conservative church)

I don't think that it would be right to say that you're a Christ follower. It has to be more than that (Referencing a “born again” experience). Because, you can ask a lot of people, "Do you believe in God, do you believe in Jesus, do you know who he is?" A lot of people say, "Oh yes, I know." But, have they put their faith and trust in him as their savior, and you are then born again, and becoming a child. It has to be more than just a believer; does that make sense? I think that this term narrows it even further than just saying, a Christian, or a believer.

Female, focus group 2 (conservative church)

It's heart and soul knowledge. (Referencing a “born again” experience).

Female, focus group 2 (conservative church)

Participants identified two additional characteristics to better define evangelical.

The first characteristic is to have a relationship with Jesus Christ, which is defined as being “redeemed” and “living in faith of Jesus”. This attribute paralleled common

associations with having had a “born again” experience, paired with the belief that Jesus Christ and his teachings are principal components of the “redeemed” experience:

I think what would define an evangelical Christian, they have a faith in Jesus, who's the son of God, and faith in Him... That's a little bit clearer than when we we're talking about fundamentalist faith. 'Cause our faith is in what? It's in Jesus as our savior.

Male, focus group 2 (conservative church)

But if we think of it as basic and the basic is that God sent his son Jesus in the form of a human to redeem us, save us, I mean, that's the basics (sic) of my faith.

Female, focus group 2 (conservative church)

(Being an evangelical is) having trusted in Jesus Christ as your personal Lord and Savior.

Female, focus group 2 (conservative church)

I like the word “redeemed” more than “born again.” “Redeemed” to me is that, you know, Christ has come and redeemed my life. He took my life, has taken ahold of it and he has, you know, saved me and given me redemption. You know? And my process is very similar where I definitely don't remember the day or time but I know that Christ has redeemed me. 'Cause I accepted him in my life as my Lord and Savior and I believe that he is. And that's a redemption

Female, focus group 2 (conservative church)

(Evangelical is) who I am. It should be who I am not what I experience. You know (who) I am through Christ, my faith, I have been redeemed, I have trusted Jesus. Not I've had this experience.

Female, focus group 2 (conservative church)

I don't think that it would be right to say that you're a Christ follower. It has to be more than that. Because, you can ask a lot of people, "Do you believe in God, do you believe in Jesus, do you know who he is?" A lot of people say, "Oh yes, I know." But, have they put their faith and trust in him as their savior, and you are then born again, and becoming a child. It has to be more than just a believer; does that make sense? I think that this term narrows it even further than just saying, a Christian, or a believer.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

The second recommendation participants had regarding the expansion the definition of evangelical was the concept of evangelizing, something not captured within the 2016 General Social Survey. Evangelizing is an important characteristic to share one's faith through a "message of hope with those that God puts in your path," participants said:

The motto of this church is to know Jesus and make him known. So firstly we need to learn as much as we can in order to share and I would guess that would be the motto of a lot of evangelical churches.

Female, focus group 2 (conservative church)

Yes, I think that evangelical means that you're going to be an evangelist, that you are sharing your faith. It isn't that you're just going to go to a church, come home. That you are called to share that message of hope with those that God puts in your path. An evangelical, I believe, is someone that has that fundamental faith that wants others to know. Otherwise, you could maybe call it, come up with something different. But, I think evangelicals are pretty passionate about wanting to share their faith.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

I think the praise alone calls us to evangelize, evangelicals. But we have a God-given job. It goes beyond our earthly needs. Where we have a tendency to withdrawal, and just want to be in our own little comfort zone. He calls us to a higher, his calling.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

Through discussion participants refined, clarified, and expanded the definition of "evangelical." This demonstrated that the evangelical community opposes generalization or association with such terms as "fundamentalist" and "literal." This evolving perspective of evangelicals notes their awareness of negative connotations that can be associated with their faith, and their desire to distance themselves from such terms. Despite the desire for distance from fundamentalism, the dialogue also demonstrated there remains a clear association by evangelicals to live a biblically informed life. It is

also import to share these theological beliefs in all aspects of their lives. The way in which a biblically informed life develops perceptions of gender equality is explored in the following section.

Gender equality.

Perceptions on gender equality are framed by the theological view of complementarianism that has become synonymous with the Evangelical Church. This ideology views men and women in different but complementary roles that define responsibilities by gender in respect to marriage, family life, and religious leadership and also informs other social aspects of individuals' lives. Perceptions of gender roles/equality were both affirmed and challenged throughout the focus groups:

The whole gender equality thing too, needs to be questioned somewhat.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

As a Christian practicing my faith I don't look at these things (gender roles/equality) that happen in the world, in the world that we're living, as being that important. It's just time that we're gonna be here.

Female, focus group 2 (conservative church)

Yeah. Because, even though we were created man and woman, we are not created equal. It's like trying to compare apples and oranges. It's not fair. I don't want to be compared to a man. We're completely two different sexes, and to sit there and say that they're going to be exactly the same, it's not fair. It's not right. We don't have the muscle mass; we don't have some of the attributes that God gave men to do. You know what, I don't want them. I don't want those things.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

He (God) gave us, he granted us as a gender certain things that we do well. That's why he said that he gave us a suitable helper, a suitable mate. Not somebody that's ... He didn't create Steve for Adam. He created something completely different, and I think that it's nice to say, "Oh yeah, everything should be equal," but in reality it can't always be exactly equal. We're gonna do some things better, they're gonna do

some things better. We should try to go towards completing each other, instead of competing against each other.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

Discussions of gender equality outside of the church focused primarily on the qualifications of the individual, not the gender, to justify employment, the opportunity to advance or a raise:

When it has to do with pay I think it should be on how you do the job not whether, okay, this woman doesn't do the job as well 'cause we should give her more money to equal the other guys. I think it's all of your ability and what you do in that job.

Female, focus group 2 (conservative church)

For instance, I definitely believe a female in the workplace, if she's doing the job, you should be definitely equal pay

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

Well, I think in some ways to the secular world, that probably contradicts what they think. They probably think that evangelicals are not going to be favorable in gender equality, as far as if you apply for a job and there's a male and female applying for the job, the best person should get the job.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

Some participants in this study viewed gender equality as a topic that was either framed in complementarian ideals (e.g. men and women are different and should not be compared) or as a social construct that exists outside the church:

I think when you're looking for a secular job outside the church, you're looking through the lens of the world. But, when you're applying for a job within the church, you're looking through the lens of the gospel.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

Even the labels of males and females within the society are like becoming finally irrelevant, not irrelevant but more complicated so, I mean you have to take that into consideration. Like do I identify as male are you like physically you know, I don't know. That also gets into it.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

... if the man were hold open a door for a woman, would that be okay in today's society, or would a woman say, "Oh, well I can open a door myself," or would she appreciate that, and vice versa if the genders were switched? What if a woman were to hold open a door for a man, would that be acceptable?

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

The conversation of gender equality was most directly discussed with participants from a liberal Evangelical Church (11). These participants critique the church with themes that discuss pro-gender equality in the professional realm but not within the church. At its core, participants believed the church reinforced "bias cultural norms" but felt "uncomfortable" having a theological debate with the pastor. Female participants questioned the patriarchy that exists within church leadership and how they hypocritically ignore the dignity that Jesus provided to women as the "ultimate feminist." Gender equality views of the liberal Evangelical Church members (11) were informed by a feminist ideology that acknowledges the church and Bible are patriarchy informed. These members seek equality for both males and females and explore this understanding through literature and conversation outside of the church. Conservative church participants' (18) gender equality beliefs remain informed by a complementarian perspective that existed within the church and literature. This views gender equality as a concept formed by a secular worldview:

Then it's like so confusing when you look at Jesus, right. Jesus was the ultimate feminist. And the first people who noticed the resurrection were women.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

And he (Jesus) consistently dignified women and their status in his interactions.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

And that was like way more radical than now. You know, so you wonder, cool if Jesus was pro women

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

I would say that for me the, that has actually been a struggle with accepting churches in general. The fact that there isn't gender equality has been like a faith struggle for me. But I think, (female participant) just said, if you are looking at Christ and looking at Christ's examples there's no sexism whatsoever there. I think it comes down to the fault of the churches and ultimately the church is human and humans are not perfect. We're flawed. But I think, your question about, is my opinion about female equality coming from the church, I would say no. It's coming from outside of the church, it's coming from my own personal faith journey. Getting to know Christ and what he said, and even in reading the Bible on my own and getting ideas, like what is the Bible saying about women, what kind of leadership stories are told in the Bible about women leaders. I would say that's not really, that never has really come from the church. It's been a self-journey or a journey with other women. (Affirmation) Who are, kind of like Jenn Hatmaker, (American Christian author and speaker) the whole thing, that's coming from women groups who are trying to strengthen each other in faith.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

But I do think some men may perceive, oh yeah, I don't want women to be treated poorly I want women to speak or lead or all of the above. But when we say put them on stage, they're like "No, that's not what I meant by that."

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

Our friend's dad owns a bank and a lot of the bank work for women have high leadership positions (laughter) and that's the indicator and bar. (Laughter) And women are leaders. But no, I think a lot of men think that. I that men our age are like women have rights, go women, we're all paid the same.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

But I do think it's still a culture value, that we value men more than women. For example, (redacted) was telling me about two candidates they had for a new job, man and a woman. And I was asking how old the woman is, and if she's going to have kids. And I was like, whoa, I'm like discriminating. I'm going against the same things I'd want for myself. That's hard wired. You have to unlearn.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

But I think again, there's these cultural norms and you use scripture and you reinforce in the church because it's allowed. (Affirmed by women). Because they allow it there.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

If I think how do I personally feel about women in the church, it's one way but I wouldn't want have a theological battle with my pastor. (laughter) Because I don't have enough to back it up other than my readings of the Bible and how my heart feels (affirmation). But I can't biblically, battle in the biblical text. I wouldn't want to do that (affirmation), I wouldn't be able to, I don't have enough (affirmation) back that up.

Male, focus group 1 (liberal church)

Egalitarianism.

An ideological perspective within the Christian faith that challenges complementarianism is the ideology of egalitarianism. Egalitarianism seeks to prioritize equality for all people based on a fundamental belief that all humans are equal in worth and social status. Egalitarian ideologies expressed in the focus groups are form by a biblical understanding that all are people are viewed as “equal in the eyes of Jesus”:

One thing we do know is the Bible teaches equality. In Jesus Christ all are one, male, female, slave, free, gentile, Jew, all are one in Christ Jesus. Our view as Christians and we're all totally equal. But if we were to go on the basis of society trying to make up for past mistakes then we go into quotas. We say, okay, on the quota system we should have more men and more women just because of the quota we're trying to make up for past mistakes. I think I still go on the basis of merit. Whoever won that job, whoever did the best in school, whoever's the most reliant, whoever it is, that person goes into school, or that person gets the job, or whatever it might be. Just on the basis of the narrative quality of the person and what they've done, whatever they've accomplished.

Male, focus group 2 (conservative church)

Conservative participants (18) believe egalitarian perspectives should not be “supported by mandated government programs or laws” and “society should not have a quota regarding gender that is making up for past mistakes”:

Yeah, I think that's something that's interesting to 'cause I know a lot of evangelicals who believe that men and women are entirely equal in value but also, I don't know, just so happen to believe that the government shouldn't be telling people how much to pay anybody. So I don't know if that's interesting to your research or not but I see that happening a lot.

Male, focus group 2 (conservative church)

...As a Christian, as an evangelical Christian, we believe everybody is created equal, that everybody is equal in the eyes of God but you cannot create laws, you cannot create programs that force equity.

Male, focus group 2 (conservative church)

Yeah. You can't legislate that difference away and I think evangelicals are realistic enough to recognize that but still they believe that there are physical differences that everybody's treated equal.

Male, focus group 2 (conservative church)

Conservatives believe a person's abilities in school and work are the primary factors to be considered if an individual is "deserving a job":

When it has to do with pay I think it should be on how you do the job not whether, okay, this woman doesn't do the job as well 'cause we should give her more money to equal the other guys. I think it's all of your ability and what you do in that job.

Female, focus group 2 (conservative church)

They (Non-Evangelicals) probably think that evangelicals are not going to be favorable in gender equality, as far as if you apply for a job and there's a male and female applying for the job, the best person should get the job.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

It's affirmed that currently gender is not perceived as a barrier in obtaining positions, though it is acknowledged it historically has been. Concerns were raised over mandated programs that "force equality," with one participant questioning whether a woman could save someone from a burning building:

That as a Christian, as an evangelical Christian we believe everybody is created equal. That everybody is equal in the eyes of God but you cannot create laws, you cannot create programs that force equity. Now I'll give you a great example of that. You cannot mandate away physical differences between men and women. I want (male participant) to run into the burning building and drag (me out) rather than (female participant).

Male, focus group 2 (conservative church)

But they (evangelicals) don't necessarily favor programs or laws that would try and create gender equity.

Male, focus group 2 (conservative church)

Participants from the conservative and liberal church did acknowledge that gender barriers exist within the church related to capacity to serve:

I do think some churches are moving away from that and there is more reception, perception, more open to women leadership. But, maybe not.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

I think when you're looking for a secular job outside the church, you're looking through the lens of the world. But, when you're applying for a job within the church, you're looking through the lens of the gospel

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

I just think that there's a perception there that's gonna be a lot different than it would be if you were going to go down and apply for a job or a business. You can be the CEO. My dear friend is CEO of the one of the biggest electrical contractors in the United States, and she does a great job. But, she works with men, contractors. It's not easy, but she's done it. She broke that ceiling, which is fantastic. I think in those situations, I think that it is good for women to try for those positions that traditionally they've been left out of that, right? But, I think in the ministry field, that would be a good question to pose. Because, it's not the same.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

Alternatively, female members of the liberal Evangelical church found empowerment within their faith. Liberal women are enlightened on gender equality through literature, speakers, and small support groups. Some participants acknowledged that these gender equality values often are in conflict with the message taught within the church, but these outside the church, or secular world view, experiences and conversations are valued as more credible:

..Even different denominations favor oh we want to be like the early church. It's like the early church isn't church, and you're just modeling off silent women. Right,

and say that's justification for not having women in leadership. But it's like that wasn't the ideal church, that was the flawed early church in a certain context, so it's like, that's kind of a weird reason. It looks like, it looks like *The Handmaid's Tale* (the dystopian novel about a repressive, religious, patriarchal society). Seriously, like keeping women in power and keeping women quiet.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

At our church right now we have women deacons, which is like unheard of in kind of in the churches in the south. Women can't pray in front of the church (affirmation), just talking about church in general. But that definitely affects the culture and the general as well. There is way more, the idea of masculine power, of women staying at home, of you shouldn't work if you're a mother. A lot more of that, that seems part of the everyday culture that is either both feeding into the church or vice versa. The church is feeding into it. There is, I think, a higher percentage of Christians just in general, I don't think that's an actual fact, in the south. Which maybe feeding keeping those roles that way.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

We have young girls who read the scripture but there they don't. Because they say. You wonder, there's clearly differences in opinion among quote unquote evangelical churches and like what is permissible and what is not. It's like, where are we grasping at straws, and where is it like this is a different context.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

It's kind of a funny time to survey evangelicals. There are even prominent evangelicals now that are talking publicly about ditching the term because it's become so negative. Even people who five years ago would say they're evangelical, now would think it's a distraction. I'm sure you know this

Male, focus group 1 (liberal church)

So like in the 90s there was some emergence, of the Beth Moore's (American Christian author and Bible teacher) and these female speakers, which I love! (laughter). They're pastors and they're preachers and they're at a pulpit and they're preaching to many women, like a room full of women, and sometimes men. But like now that's emerged into other larger gatherings (affirmation), which are televised internationally now and women want to hear women speak. So it's interesting, because, I 100% agree with (female participant), I had to formulate my own perspective of what does it mean to be a female Christian on my own or informed by these other women or women around me. Not because of anything the church has told me. (Affirmation by women)

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

Female roles.

Female gender roles were discussed at a higher rate than male roles (9.32% compared to 3.86%). A topic often revisited in the dialogs is that participants believe “outsiders” have misrepresented evangelicals as forcing their women to be “subservient”. Female participants stressed it is the choice of a woman to stay at home based on “their priority in life.” This was not considered an evangelical value, but a traditional value that happens to align with “Evangelical beliefs”:

I personally, I don't know if this is what you mean. But, I feel God created an order, and that if at all possible, a woman should be home with her children if it's financially possible. Unfortunately, in this day and age, generally it isn't. But, I think it's beneficial to have the man as head of household with the family.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

Patience to be in the home. Where I know others who just desire that staying in the home thing and I say do it. That's your heart? Do it. And I know women who are outside of the evangelical community who also have both views, "I wanna stay home with my kids." Or, "I wanna be at work full time." I think it's just a priority in your life, what you desire. I doesn't have to necessarily be an evangelical thing. It's just, I feel like, a gender role in all. Why does it have to be an evangelical view and a non-evangelical view? Why can't you just say, well what does your family like? Do you have a more traditional value or do you not have that traditional value. Because society is evolving continuously

Female, focus group 2 (conservative church)

I don't think it's surprising, because it's, to me, it's a long history. Men have always been outside working while the women are home looking after the children. It's also a mother's nature to want to look after their own children. I think they will accept it pretty well easily, because it's our own interest to do so. God created us in a way, life, that it's so, we tend to follow it. I think it's not a shocking discover that there's not much of difference.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

Yeah, I think women having to go to work, that's done damage to the family structure.

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

Female participants addressed the roles they are expected to portray in society, the church and at home. Perceptions of the “proper” roles of wife, mother, and successful professional are amplified within the gender roles ascribed by the church. The message within the church suggests women fulfill gender-defined roles pivotal to the success of husband and family. These expectations do not consider women’s own desires or goals beyond traditional gender-defined roles. Women did acknowledge that these conflicting expectations made it difficult to “fit” into various roles and there was added pressure to be successful in both the gender-defined identities of the church, and personal and professional identities:

I think for me, it also feels like it's again putting us in a box. Like we only have this one view. And I know tons of evangelical women who would say, "Heck no, I cannot be a stay-at-home mom."

Female, focus group 2 (conservative church)

It's also, like, I feel like as a woman, it's so tough to fit into all these roles people perceive you as. We live in LA, we want to get ahead in our careers, we hear “be a feminist, get ahead,” but in the church you are supposed to stay at home with your kids and be a good mom. It's like, there's no way, to like to fit into all those boxes. So I think there's a lot of added pressure on what women, coming from the church, or the workplace. Coming from all the roles that, I don't know if men see it the same.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

...women aren't even aloud to read the Bible. Because it's seen as lead up to the sermon. Which only men are only allowed to teach women (It's like *The Handmaid's Tale*, said in the background). (Laughter). And that is their call of justification for it

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

I've seen, I'm much older than you, but I've seen through the years, many times where women do a far better job, but the man is making twice as much money, and they advance the man, because he's got a family to support. I don't think that's right, whether you're evangelical or you're human

Female, focus group 3 (conservative church)

Also having a, women, that are CEOs or vice presidents of companies that are in these roles and then they come down, and can't have that role in the church. And then they have kids, or daughters that see the same thing.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

I don't know that's, think about being that little girl and how confusing that might be. (affirmation). To see that, oh my mom run's the company but she can't pray in front of church and on stage.

Female, focus group 1 (liberal church)

Credibility and dependability of qualitative results.

The third qualitative stage results were validated by assessing and comparing its findings with the other stages of the research study. In both the quantitative (Stage 1) and qualitative (Stage 3) findings, there was an identified association with the evangelical population's perceptions of gender roles and gender equality. Findings from the 2016 General Social Survey determined the evangelicals believe in a complementarian ideology of gender roles. The quantitative study demonstrated this: evangelicals demonstrated a lower perception of gender equality (31.4%) than non-evangelicals (20.5%). In subsequent focus groups evangelicals affirmed this perception with comments demonstrating that genders are not equal but complementary.

The first stage's findings also demonstrated that evangelicals have a higher perception of gender equality (32.0 %) when compared to non-evangelicals (30.3%), which demonstrates a complicated relationship gender equality.

The third stage's findings provided on participant's view on the impact of gender on employment, advancement and pay. Participants opined that gender equality within the professional environment is meant to ensure both males and females are treated equally.

Lastly the view of gender roles/equality by either sex within the Evangelical community demonstrated in the quantitative study shows evangelical males have perceptions different from females. More males have a low perception of gender equality (50.2% compared to 27.4%) but a higher perception of gender equality (68.4% compared to 71.7%) when compared to evangelical females. In dialogs women explained they have challenges with complementarian ideologies outside of the church conflicting with expectations of the church and home. These challenges are not experienced by males, nor do they witness these challenges by wives or friends, the men said. This external validity demonstrates the credibility of large sample qualitative findings are reflected in a smaller sample. Additionally, this comparison of quantitative and qualitative data demonstrates the reliability of questions from the 2016 General Social Survey. Evangelicals offered similar responses to the GSS on their perception of gender roles/equality.

Summary

When comparing the findings of the three stages it is apparent that evangelicals generally perceive gender roles as a religious construct. Additionally, perceptions on gender roles/equality were impacted more by one's faith, whether liberal or conservative, than one's gender. Additionally, gender roles/equality perceptions are discussed and defined outside the church, but discussed only in complementary term within the faith.

The ideologies that define evangelicals are personal and often misunderstood by non-members. This was apparent as participants challenged the three ideological characteristics that used here to define evangelicals: having had a "born again" experience, fundamentalist faith, and a belief in the literal interpretation of the Bible. Outsiders have changed the interpretation of these characteristics, panelists said. Nineteen

participants agreed their faith centers on a biblically informed understanding of the world: a personal relationship with these teaching and commitment to living out and sharing these teachings with others. Panelists are concerned how the description of evangelical characteristics generalizes their beliefs. Despite the fact all panelists identified as evangelical, their definition of that faith is distinctly personal, as are the ways panelists practice their faith. These unique perceptions provided insight into why the quantitative study identified both high perception for and against gender equality among evangelicals.

Evangelicals have a complicated relationship with gender: the topic was considered taboo regardless whether an evangelical is male or female, liberal or conservative. Conservative church members perceived gender from the complementarian perspective. From this perspective gender was not discussed in terms of equality, but in terms of the different and complementary roles of the sexes. This message is delivered by church leadership and affirmed by small groups associated with the church. This ideology aligns with a male headship model.

Members of the liberal church, too, affirmed this ideology is central to their own church leadership and organizational model. A noted difference: members of the liberal church, primarily women, explored the topic of gender roles/equality independent of church teachings. This transpired by studying religious leaders (often women) who were informed by a feminist perspective. The additional perspective led to independent interpretation of gender roles/equality outside traditional church doctrine. This female-informed faith perspective led women to explore, with other women and men, that the church and the teachings of Jesus aligned with feminist empowerment and ideology.

Throughout this study evangelicals demonstrated a commitment to community through biblically inspired ideologies whose practices are meant to better members and their respective families. The roles that evangelicals fulfill are dictated by gender and perceived as complementary to the support of their families, the church organization, society at large and themselves. This message of gender-informed roles is inculcated in church leadership teaching and organizational structures. This biblically informed perspective on gender becomes complicated when applied to societal roles and identities outside of the church. Evangelicals recognize gender roles are being fluid at times; however, these gender role changes are also perceived as challenging to the faith and therefore damaging to the faith structure.

Members of the Evangelical Church have taken personal faith journeys to define gender roles/equality, action met with resistance within the formal church organization. While it is not clear if the Evangelical Church will seek to define or discuss gender roles/equality in the near future, it is clear members are defining this outside the traditional church structure. While gender roles/equality have become concerning for evangelicals, it is yet to be seen if the church organization will turn a blind eye to these ideologies or embrace them.

Chapter Five: Discussion

This study was designated to address the following questions: what are the perceptions of gender roles/equality among members of the Evangelical Church; and do perceptions of gender roles/equality differ by gender? Key findings from each stage of the study are presented according to objective. This chapter presents key findings and places them in a larger context. Additionally, implications of theory, methodology, and practice are offered. Finally, limitations, recommendations, and areas of future research are presented.

Research Question 1 Findings

Exploring evangelicals' perceptions of gender roles\equality delivered multidimensional findings. Building on results of the 2016 General Social Survey, the quantitative portion of this study identified that evangelicals responded at higher rates in favor of gender equality (32.4%) than non-evangelicals (30.3%). Additionally, evangelicals also challenged gender equality at higher rates: 31.4% v. 20.5% by non-evangelicals. The GSS questions explored a wide variety of social perceptions and behaviors associated with low and high perceptions of gender equality. However, when examining gender role expectations and behaviors based on established complementarian principles of the Evangelical Church (Bryant, 2006; Bryant, 2009; Colaner & Giles, 2008; Gundry, 1987; Hull, 1998; Smith, 2000), evangelicals believed, at higher rates than non-evangelicals, in traditional gender roles of men working and women as homemakers. These perceptions are affirmed in previous research (Epstein, 2007; Janseens, 2007; Neitz, 2014). Discussing these findings with focus group participants provided an

important distinction from previous literature. Evangelical participants affirmed the GSS align with how their faith leaders and the church's organizational structure speak to gender roles; however, this does not necessarily reflect the members' beliefs on gender roles/equality. Select participants expressed opinions that varied from the findings and conflicted with the church's teaching of gender roles.

A finding commonly shared by participants is their feeling of misrepresentation within research. Panelists said existing gender role/equality data on evangelicals (Ali et al., 2008; Belcher, 2007; Elisan, 2016; Lundquist and Smith, 1998) does not appropriately represent how evangelicals define themselves or their views of gender roles/equality. This misunderstanding of the faith community led to perceived bias by evangelicals. The intention of this research is to authentically represent perspectives of evangelicals on gender roles/equality.

A complementarian-informed epistemology of the Evangelical Church's organizational and family structure is presented within the GSS and affirmed by focus group members. A headship model is central to complementarian ideologies, which states authority within the church and home is based on a "traditional family model" which exemplifies "morality" (Frederick, 2010). Evangelical focus group members follow this philosophic guidance as a way to live their "personal commitment" to their faith and family while concurrently raising children in a "proper environment." Evangelicals recognize this perspective is criticized by non-evangelical. Evangelicals stress men and women jointly support this model and that these concepts are not forced upon either gender. Responses to the GSS and focus groups affirm this perspective. Evangelicals

recognize that in society at large, especially in the workplace, complementarianism is not followed. Regarding the workplace, Evangelicals believe employment should be gender neutral and based on merit and capability. Evangelical men and women also recognized the benefit the feminist movement has had on women in the workplace, ensuring they are fairly recognized and compensated. Concerns were raised over any political or social movements that place emphasis on gender equality over experience of capability. Panelists are also concerned the feminist movement may undermine headship roles and authority within the home, a perspective found in previous research (Gallagher, 2004).

A key finding here is that evangelicals' definition of gender roles and gender equality is not aligned with the evangelical epistemology of gender. Evangelical ideologies view the differences between men and women as being divinely instituted (Perry, 2013) and their respective positions and roles in relation to one another as complementary, not something that could be seen as equal. This perspective lead to a greater understanding of the GSS results that recorded evangelicals' responses aligned with headship ideologies within the home. Additionally, equality-related questions regarding women in the workplace supported employment as long as it did not negatively affect headship authority or traditional home life. Focus group stated that egalitarian concepts that support gender equality challenge church complementarian ideals and often complicate traditional roles of men and women. There are contrarian view panel members that self-identified as liberal church members acknowledged that the church does not speak in terms associated with gender equality. This population of evangelicals utilized feminist-informed theological literature that challenged perspectives held by their

church leadership and disputed perspectives shared by the majority of Evangelicals within the findings of this study.

Variations on perspectives of gender roles/equality within this study have been informed by alternative biblical understanding. Evangelicals self-identified as conservatives state that dialogue on gender is non-existent; or is discussed within a complementarian framework within their faith community. Members of the liberal Evangelical Church said their organizational structure and leadership is informed by complementarian headship ideologies that challenged feminist ideologies. Variations on complementarian gender perspectives by individual evangelicals are informed outside of the church within feminist-informed biblical literature and studies. This egalitarian biblical understanding of gender roles and gender equality saw Jesus and his teaching as feminist informed and are challenged by the patriarchal organizational structure of the church organization. Despite this conflicting perspective of gender roles and gender equality within the church, these evangelicals remain part of the church and seek feminist biblical understanding outside of the traditional church within small groups and feminist-informed Christian literature. Evangelicals who sought feminist-informed perspectives of gender roles/equality were primarily associated with the liberal church.

Research Question 2 Findings

The secondary research questions explored whether evangelical perceptions of gender roles/equality differ by gender. Findings showed evangelical men and women hold similar perspectives of gender roles/equality in their respective roles within a complementarian ideology. Perception variation between genders grew when evangelicals were informed of gender roles/equality changes outside of the traditional

teachings of the church leadership and organizational structure. Notably, conservative church members reiterated complementarian ideals taught by their church leadership while members of liberal churches adopted more egalitarian gender viewpoints reading feminist Christian teachings outside of the church, and through secular experiences.

Responses to the GSS (Table 1. GSS Gender Equality Questions Responses) had a higher response by female evangelicals that were in favor of gender equality (71.7%) compared to 68.4% of male Evangelicals, while male evangelicals responded at higher rates challenging gender equality (50.2% compared to 42.1 % of female evangelicals). Genders responded similarly when it came to maintaining a headship model, and embraced the concept that gender specific roles are necessary for the wellbeing of their home and children (Table 7. GSS Gender Based Question Affirmative Responses, Evangelical Gendered Responses). Slight variations on perceptions between Evangelical men and women exist: more men believe that men won't get a job over a woman, men hurt the family when they focus too much on work and preschool kids suffer if their mother works. Evangelical women believe more than men that divorce laws should be easier.

Focus groups varied in perspectives on gender roles/equality by genders, most notably whether members self-identified as conservative or liberal churchgoers. Conservatives align with complementarian ideology. Within this church model there is a dominant male voice, supported by passive female voices and rare dominant female affirming voice. Members of the liberal church are aligned with egalitarian ideology, characterized by a church model with is a dominant female voice, supported by passive male voices and rare dominant male affirming voice.

The conservative church members' supported a headship ideology supported by both men and women. Both genders believe the church and home find strength with men a leadership role and women in a supportive, complementary position reflecting traditional values. Gender roles/equality views are formed through by biblical studies directed by church leadership.

Liberal church members' perspectives on gender embrace an egalitarian model that considers equality across genders and has a feminist voice. The women within the liberal church lead dialogue and feminist-informed biblical studies on gender where both men and women's roles are considered within the church, home and society. Those members have had topical discussions outside the church that lead to a richer understanding of contemporary roles, and a desire to fight inequality experienced inside and outside of the church. By learning how each church addressed gender, the research provided a better understanding of the influence of church messaging vs. societal influences on an individual's interpretation of the roles of women and men.

Theoretical Implications

While the quantitative analysis may not have demonstrated significant differences on gender perceptions between evangelicals and non-evangelicals, , the mix of quantitative and qualitative findings throughout the study present theoretical implications from a feminist theory, feminist liberation theology theory and transformative leadership theory.

Feminist theory.

Evangelicals recognize gender inequality but not all recognized the intersectionality of these inequalities within and outside the church culture. Members

acknowledge that social roles and expectations of men and women within the church are guided and dictated from the evangelical complementarian ideology. This ideology exemplifies a patriarchal home life supported by both genders with the shared expectation of a morally balanced home environment. Women notably identified that social structure and noted characteristics that define women differ outside of the church, however there was a distinct variation in perceptions of how this was applied by the church.

Females, particularly from the conservative church, indicated the church supports complementary roles by gender, which allowed women to strengthen their family environment as well as support their children and husbands. Men and women who share a complementary view of gender roles stressed that this is their choice. This choice is presented as dichotomous (feminine or masculine) and necessary for biblically informed moral balance. A variety of challenges faced by society at large, including a moral decline and concern over diminishing masculine identity, were used to support the complementarian perspective. Select females, specifically from the liberal church, noted the church organization ignores feminist informed perspectives, supports social inequalities and plays into internalized sexism. It is fascinating to see that the women shared a common faith but come from two very different conclusions on how the church engages in sexism. One side sees gender-defined roles as necessary to family and moral balance while the other charged the church with utilizing institutionalized sexism and ignoring gender inequalities identified by its members.

From a feminist theoretical point of view greater consideration is needed to acknowledge that a female complementarian role within the Evangelical Church provides women with power and identity even though this identity is informed by gender roles.

Without acknowledging and validating the known identity, engaging in a dialogue of “analytical sensibilities” (Cho et al. 2013, p. 795) becomes incredibly challenging and is often resisted by participants. Additionally, as exemplified by women from the liberal church, women can use their identity and faith to explore and empower their understanding of faith through a feminist lens. A female-informed exploration of faith identity can’t be relied on by the organizational structure of the church. Instead feminist understanding must be applied authentically utilizing multiple subject positions. Without providing a female-informed “matrix orientation” (May, 2015) perspective, a female voice may re-emphasize a “single axis” (May, 2015) complementarian perspective.

Feminist liberation theology.

Findings from the research affirmed that participants who had used their faith as a component to adopt their “humanity of women” (Ruehler, 1983) had applied concepts of feminist liberation theology in their exploratory process. Evangelical women associated with the liberal church predominately engaged with other women in sharing alternative versions of real-world liberation experiences. These women empowered one another through biblically informed studies and dialogue. The personal and spiritual development of the group used feminist-informed biblical studies to define their roles outside the headship of the church (Fiorenza, 1984) and placed women’s roles centrally to their personal theological maturity. The women used a feminist-informed anthropological understanding of the Bible (Bayer, 1986; Berryman, 1987; Floyd-Smith & Pinn, 2010). Using authors such as Sarah Bessy, Carolyn Curtis James, Rachel Held Evans, and Zach Hoag, this inclusive approach (Ackerman, 1988) challenged complementarian gender roles of the church and applied a new interpretation of their faith to experience liberation.

This study affirmed the use of feminist liberation theology principles (Ruether, 1983) by women to examine root challenges to organizational frameworks by placing women at the center of theological development. Findings from this study highlight the challenges of consciousness, exploration and application of feminist liberations theology within a complementarian organization. From the dawn of feminist liberation theology, challenges existed for the women to find communities that have established a theological identity within the Evangelical church but also shared and acknowledged experiences of oppression based on gender. Additionally, affirmation by males, specifically their partners, is crucial to the evolution of a woman's personal faith journey. Change at a structural level needs further exploration: participants see challenges implementing a feminist liberation theology within their church beyond their individual groups. Similar to the theoretical implications within feminist theory, feminist liberation theology allows for individual possibilities of spiritual discovery, exploration and change, but faces organizational and structural barriers within the church's organizational structure.

Transformative liberation theology.

Transformational leadership found within this study exists in two different approaches. The first is applied by church leaders through complementarian ideologies and the second approach applied among the women of the liberal church who engaged with one another to achieve an agreed-upon feminist understanding of their faith outside of the formal church organization. Church leaders' influence on members was apparent in the moral-ethical dimensions that saw social change existing within the church and the homes of faith members based on complementarian principles and gender roles. What wasn't clear within the study was how the leaders understood and perceived gender

roles\equality. This lack of understanding during dialogue with focus groups resulted in participants questioning how leadership and their families perceived gender roles\equality. This calls into question the units of analysis, including expansion of a focused dyadic relationship between leaders and followers. This gap in application of transformative leadership theory presents room to explore and understand how people's opinions and perspectives of gender roles\equality are shaped within an organization or small-group, and where perspectives by leadership are inculcated into all participants and can be captured in some quantifiable way. From this perspective, despite the church environment being one of transformative design, findings from this research display perception are built off of a legitimate authority by church leadership to influence group or organizational behavior.

Additionally, non-church leaders have the ability to influence small group and organizations. While small groups within the conservative church affirmed the complementarian message of the church leaders, women from the liberal church demonstrated their ability to provide new perspectives from outside the organization. The female liberal church's group used intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999) to develop egalitarian principles not explored within the larger organizational perspective. Both the small group and organizational perspectives are key in transforming how evangelicals understand gender roles\equality. More research is necessary to explore key distinctions and relationships with church leaders, authorities, non-hierarchical powers and other influencers on gender roles/equality beyond the church.

Methodological Implications

Study results can help inform mixed-methods research design. Standardized survey questions that apply current social science definitions and taxonomies are helpful in conducting nationally normed research studies, however the findings from these studies may not reflect the realities of those surveyed based on the methodology. The misalignment of perspectives and understanding became key during the data collection of sequential and concurrent data elements. Collecting evangelical gender role perceptions by gender was conducted prior to the qualitative data collection, as dictated by the expectations of sequential design. It was during this initial stage where variances of perspective through the lens of the research question began to be realized but not fully understood. However, during the full thematic analysis of qualitative and quantitative data the importance of understanding the community's definitions and epistemology on gender became clear, notably during the initial qualitative stage of the study. From this experience, the mixed-methods design proved to be an efficient process by blending data through concurrent timing. While conducting this study it was necessary to revisit the quantitative findings after obtaining a qualitative perspective. From this experience, the need for this research was affirmed based on the limitations of existing literature. The understanding of gender roles\equality perceptions was aligned with and defensible using quantitative data findings. Only through a mixed-methods application of qualitative analysis with quantitative data did this research provide additional insight into the findings and limitations of non-concurrent terminology with evangelical ideologies.

Greater understanding is needed by researchers when using mixed-methodologies. When utilizing a sequential exploratory mixed-methods design the approach calls for

either the quantitative or qualitative portion of the data to expand and explain the findings of each approach. Research design should consider that a two-phase plan might not provide a full understanding through one cycle of analysis. Multiple sequences with the same design need to be applied for the purpose of revision and flexibility, to better understand how the quantitative findings inform the qualitative and vice versa, in order to refine the questions. The progressiveness of a mixed-methods research allows for reflection and critique of current designs, thus allowing for cultivation of a methodology that better utilizes the strengths of quantitative and qualitative phases.

Practical Implications

This study has practical implications for researchers, members of the evangelical community and its leaders. The findings demonstrate the need to consider how researchers can best evaluate large secondary data surveys. The GSS and similar nationally normed surveys are used to gain greater understanding of American attitudes. The questions for the GSS are created by lead social science practitioners using terminology that reflects their field. These findings and similar research studies, such as PEW, help us understand select populations using shared definitions and responses. This study highlights that the research community makes community assumptions with the belief there is a common understanding of the survey questions and their responses. The qualitative portion of this study shows evangelicals feel survey questions regarding gender roles/equality are limited and exclusive of their epistemology which leads to misrepresentation of the community. Researchers need to take culturally responsive consideration of the communities they study.

Evangelicals' gender role perceptions are primarily informed by the ideologies within the church. They feel those outside of their community misrepresent their views on this topic. Within the community, the roles men and women understand are dichotomous, masculine or feminine, a perspective that evangelicals feel guides morality and operations within the church and home. Conversations outside of the church and home are challenging and at times in conflict with the complementarian perspective described within evangelical ideologies. The faithful are concerned with the roles men and women play in society at large. Evangelicals recognize the church operates within a patriarchal hierarchy that oppressed women. Those who identified gender ideology as something socially constructed in society at large and in the church created the opportunity to study and discuss faith-informed gender expectations. This speaks to the need to have opportunities for the faithful to study and understand contemporary perceptions of gender roles. Regardless of complementarian or egalitarian beliefs, these dialogues within the community provide greater opportunity to develop understanding why certain perceptions exist. This in turn can lead to an authentic view of community perceptions to avoid future misrepresentation/ misinformation on their opinions.

A crucial and absent component from the study is input from evangelical leaders. A dialogue between members and their faith leaders is needed to more fully understand ideological perspectives on secular gender roles. Analyzing multiple subject positions on secular experiences allows the community to reflect and communicate to church leaders the members' gender role views. Evangelicals noted the positions of church leaders on gender equality are not clear. Evangelicals also feel concerned and intimidated to talk to church leaders on gender topics out of fear of alienating themselves from the church or

because they believe they lack the biblical knowledge to engage in a meaningful conversation. Church leaders can better engage by acknowledging these concerns.

Limitations

This study experienced several limitations worth noting that will be addressed in the description of each data collection step.

Quantitative data collection.

The initial quantitative data collection stage used 2016 GSS findings. Evangelical's defining characteristics and the subsequent survey questions on gender were limited by the content of questions utilized within the GSS. That GSS allowed respondents to identify religious associations. The survey also queried religious activity and faith-informed beliefs. Respondents did not all share core beliefs of the evangelical faith and some responded with limited to no engagement with religious services, leading to the conclusion that participants self-identified their faith based on cultural associations. This is problematic, necessitating an alternative approach to determine a true population size that from which a representative sample could be culled. This limitation required that the researcher identify and group together participants who responded to questions that aligned with core beliefs within the faith. As explored in the qualitative portion, this new categorization addressed the alignment of participant responses on perceptions of gender roles/equality from an evangelically informed ideology. Future researchers must acknowledge that surveys may not accurately represent communities explored.

Limitations also existed in the questions used to identify perceptions of gender roles. The GSS did explore gender roles/equality in the work place, home, and in political leadership. Within this study, evangelicals did not think gender should be a workplace

consideration; and roles within the home and society are based on the complementarian capabilities of each gender. The evangelical ideological understanding of gender, coupled with the wording of questions on these subjects in the GSS lead to faith-informed definitional confusion. Identifying variables within the quantitative data that reflect community understanding of this topic are difficult to identify, and overlap of shared communication within the variables is absent. This makes accurate estimation of relationships amongst variables difficult using quantifiable information alone. Ideally, a multi-level analysis determines questions that define a faith's belief on gender, and goes further to mine attitudinal detail.

Qualitative data collection.

The sampling strategy for the qualitative data collection worked well to identify evangelicals to engage on a topic considered taboo. The sample size exceeded initial expectations and was diverse in regards to age and gender representation. Additionally, participants were very engaged, providing rich feedback not captured in existing literature and expanding beyond the limitations of survey research for this topic. Population samples were limited by location. Panelists all live, work and attend churches in Southern California. This sample was non-representative of all evangelicals: no participants were from the South, and there were no African Americans. Additionally, no participants hold church leadership positions. This was intentional in order to facilitate an open and authentic conversation unencumbered by any hierarchical pressure from church leaders. This allowed for the free flow of opinions on gender- informed roles, hierarchical structures and teachings uncolored by church authority. An additional limitation to a unified faith view was caused by the inclusion of liberals and conservatives. From a

nationally normed perspective, the Evangelical Church is generally associated with conservative ideologies. While the church is evolving (Danielsen, 2013; Farrell, 2011) to attract younger attendees with a more socially conscious message, this liberal perspective is one that remains a minority within the Evangelical Church.

Aspects of the study were limited in the full use of analysis informed by feminist theory. The study's use of feminist theory did not fully engage in key concepts (e.g. intersections of gender, race and class) and did not explicitly utilize feminist concepts during the thematic analysis of coding. Additionally, the study was able to capture the breadth of perceptions of gender within the Evangelical community through the quantitative and qualitative studies. There was an opportunity within the analysis to further explore the depth of perceptions of gender through multivariate analyses and individual interviews.

Finally, conversations within the focus groups lent more time to the quantitative summary than originally expected. The quantitative executive summary was briefly discussed to provide context to participants of how perceptions of gender roles/equality are defined, measured and analyzed based on the GSS. Sharing the summary prompted conversation and allowed feedback to confirm or correct findings presented. The summary overview of methodology lead to a more granular conversation than expected. Conversations explored the process, questions utilized and number distribution by percentages. These conversations did help provide clarity and lead to discussions on erroneous definitions and ideological misalignment within questions related to gender roles/. However, time spent on these findings limited information gathering from participants regarding their individual experiences and perspectives.

Application of mixed methods.

An exploratory sequential mixed-methods design was incredibly helpful in identifying gaps in current research and providing greater understanding of how evangelicals came to understand and perceive gender roles/. However, I was not able to fully apply the transformative design component of the mixed-methods research design. While the transformative design allowed for consideration of multiple contexts, built trust, and cultivated thoughtful approaches when engaging with the community throughout the research topic, this research was limited in its ability to create social change within the community. Only time will tell if the process within this study actually leads to reflection on how changes resulting from this dialog may be applied to the organization of the respective churches in order improves gender roles\equality ideologies can be into the structure of the church.

This design did allow participants to express their negative views of how the research community and society at large have generalized evangelicals. Participants appreciated the opportunity for a critical, curative dialog. The inability to fully implement the transformative design, and recommendations for future research are in the following section.

Conclusion

Evangelical perceptions of gender roles and gender equality among genders are a multidimensional construct distinct by Evangelical. An individual's understanding of men's' and women's' social roles is informed by expectations that are biblically informed, dictated by personal experiences, interests, and social ideologies. Division across genders is experienced based on association with a liberal or conservative church

organization. Additionally, perceptions are more clearly delineated based on the ability by Evangelicals to take part in a small community outside of the church that is empowering, explores their multiple identities and investigates feminist informed biblical ideologies that may be in conflict with leadership and church patriarchal structure. Previous social science research has either limited framing within the construct of a complementarian Evangelical understanding of gender or ignored the epistemological beliefs of the Evangelical culture causing resistance and negative association by the community based on misrepresentation of key faith ideologies. Findings show that with appropriate framing and culturally responsive engagement, authentic exploration of difficult dialogue can take place to provide authentic responses by Evangelical members and begin dialogue with members who feel silenced and oppressed.

Recommendations on future research within this topic include beginning to apply community informed transformative dialogues that allow church leadership and communities to provide conducive space for gender roles and gender equality. This can begin with the development of a survey or focus group that uses biblically informed ideologies with feminist liberation theology to explore community perceptions and needs when it comes to understanding gender roles and gender equality. Further investigation is needed on how leaders engage in directive or participative perceptions on gender roles and gender equality and how this informs or challenges their community based on individual experiences. Additionally, representative regional perspective needs to be considered among Evangelicals, notably people of color and regional perspective from the South, to better define Evangelical and obtain perspectives of gender role and equality.

From an analytical perspective, future research can better utilize feminist theoretical framing within the analysis. Working with communities to fully engage with a feminist theory that incorporates intersectionalities of gender, race and class. Expand on these feminist theories when identifying themes during thematic analysis coding. Expand on the depth of the study by analyzing the research through multivariate analysis and gain additional insight through individual interviews.

Lastly a common requested perspective requested by community members includes generationally defined perceptions of Evangelicals on the topic of gender roles and gender equality. Attributing findings from past research, efforts made within this study and future research efforts can foster an inclusive understanding of Evangelical ideology while expanding on gender roles and gender equality through ideological awareness and community engagement that addresses oppression within the community.

APPENDICES

Table 1. Transformative, Mixed Methods Checklist (Canales, 2013)

<i>Title</i>
Write a mixed methods title, including the word, “transformative?”
Specify the participants as <i>Mexican Americans</i> or <i>Chicanas/os</i> ?
<i>Identifying data sources and selecting participants</i>
<i>Members of the target group</i>
Use conceptually sophisticated means to identify Mexican Americans?
Use conceptually sophisticated means of assessing Chicanas’/Chicanos’ gender?
<i>Impact of labeling target groups</i>
Avoid deficit-model language in describing the participants?
<i>Diversity within the target population</i>
Ensure that the sociodemographic and sociocultural variability within Mexican Americans was captured in selecting participants?
<i>Identifying or constructing data collection instruments and methods</i>
<i>Mixed methods issues</i>
Collect both quantitative and qualitative data?
Explain how the two types of data were mixed?
<i>Preliminary considerations: Cultural competence, worldview, rationale, and rhetoric</i>
Have the cultural competence necessary for conducting mixed methods studies with Chicanas/os?
State that the worldview underlying the study was transformative?
Explain why a mixed methods approach was best for addressing the research question or issue?
Use rhetoric that was empowering and culturally responsive to Chicanas/Chicanos?
<i>Determining the purpose</i>
<i>Defining the problem and searching the literature</i>
Use the best search terms for locating mixed methods studies?
Use the best search terms for locating mixed methods studies conducted specifically with Mexican Americans?
Consult premier journals/other sources that make Chicanas/os and other Latinas/os) their specific focus?
Study Mexican Americans’ historical and sociopolitical contexts, including their experiences as participants and scholars in psychology?
Learn about the Mexican American community and its perceptions of the issue or problem under study from Mexican Americans themselves (e.g., observation, informal socializing)?
Take sufficient time to establish trust/rapport with the Mexican American community?
Use a theoretical framework that integrated the perspectives of a transformative worldview, Chicana/o psychology, and Chicana feminist psychology (e.g., multiracial feminism)?
Develop balanced research questions about Mexican Americans?
Develop research questions to promote social justice for Mexican Americans?
<i>Identifying the research design</i>
Indicate which of the four major mixed methods research designs was used in the study?
Use an alternative to a “no-treatment” Mexican American control group (e.g., in studies of new drugs or products)?
Justify any comparisons of Mexican American participants with other Groups of Color or to members of the mainstream culture?

Table 1. Transformative, Mixed Methods Checklist (Canales, 2013) (continued)

<i>Transformative, mixed methods issues</i>
<i>Benefits and credibility</i>
Ensure that data collection and its results benefited and/ or empowered Mexican American participants and/or their community?
Ensure that data collection and its results had credibility for participants and/or their community?
<i>Appropriate communication strategies</i>
Understand the significance of using communication strategies best suited to Chicana/o participants, expertise concerning these strategies, and commitment/resources for using them?
Have native Chicana/o bilinguals translate data collection materials (e.g., surveys, interview questions, instructions) from English to Spanish?
Have translators use back-translation procedures?
Make sure that the Spanish translations matched the Chicana/o participants' level of education/literacy?
Have English and Spanish versions of all data collection materials and instructions to accommodate Chicana/o participants' language preferences?
<i>Cultural sensitivity</i>
Have expertise concerning culturally respectful ways of posing questions and Mexican Americans' response tendencies?
Scrutinize the cultural equivalence of research measures?
Validate the culture of Mexican American female participants?
<i>Tying data collection to social transformation</i>
Use data collection to achieve transformative objectives relating to the Chicana/o community?
<i>Analyzing, interpreting, reporting, and using results</i>
<i>Transformative, mixed methods issues</i>
Use qualitative data to accomplish transformative objectives?
<i>Cultural issues</i>
Use statistical procedures allowing the results to be placed in multiple contexts?
Know when culture was/was not a variable relevant to explaining the research question or issue?
<i>Conclusions</i>
<i>Transformative, mixed methods</i>
Present conclusions consistent with the ideals of a transformative (i.e., social justice) worldview?
<i>Cultural</i>
Present conclusions using the lenses of Chicana/o psychology and Chicana feminist psychology (e.g., multiracial feminism)?

Table 2. Transformative-Emancipation Perspective of Mixed Methods Research

Perspective	Transformative-Emancipation (Mertens, 2003)
Context	Response to the need for a framework that embodied researchers' work toward social justice with marginalized groups
Identified as a/an	Perspective and/or paradigm (Mertens, 2003); Purpose (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003)
Purpose for using	Address social inequities; useful for enacting positive social and/or individual changes for marginalized groups
Characterized by	Working with minority groups or typically excluded groups; attention to power, privilege, and voice
Approach to connecting theory to data	Must use a theoretical framework from community's perspective
Researcher's relationship to the research	Have a strong relation to the community involved; maintain some level of objectivity to address potential bias
Methods□	Involves community in design and implementation
Inferences from data	Discuss within relevant community sociohistorical contexts and power dynamics
Implications for mixed methods research	Provides overarching social justice related goals and issues to guide research process

Quantitative Study: 2016 General Social Survey Bivariate Response Alignment

DISCAFFM	Bivariate Output	FEJOBFAFF	Bivariate Output
Very Likely	Likely	Strongly For	For
Somewhat Likely		For	
Somewhat Unlikely	Unlikely	Against	Against
Very Unlikely		Strongly Against	
Missing	Not Applicable	Missing	Not Applicable
DISCAFFW	Bivariate Output	GENDEREQ	Bivariate Output
Very Likely	Likely	Definitely Should Be	Should Be
Somewhat Likely		Probably Should Be	
Somewhat Unlikely	Unlikely	Probably Should Not Be	Should Not Be
Very Unlikely		Definitely Should Not Be	
Missing	Not Applicable	Missing	Not Applicable
FEFAM	Bivariate Output	MEOVRWRK	Bivariate Output
Strongly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree
Agree		Agree	
Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Not Applicable
Strongly Disagree		Disagree	Disagree
Missing	Not Applicable	Strongly Disagree	
DISCWK5	Bivariate Output	Missing	Not Applicable
Yes	Yes	FECHLD	Bivariate Output
No	No	Strongly Agree	Agree
Did Not Work or Did Not Seek Work	Not Applicable	Agree	
Missing	Not Applicable	Disagree	Disagree
DIVLAW	Bivariate Output	Strongly Disagree	
Easier	Easier	Missing	Not Applicable
More Difficult	More Difficult		
Stay Same	Not Applicable		
Missing	Not Applicable		

Quantitative Study: 2016 General Social Survey Bivariate Response Alignment

(Continued)

FEPRESCH	Bivariate Output
Strongly Agree	Agree
Agree	
Disagree	Disagree
Strongly Disagree	
Missing	Not Applicable
FEHIRE	Bivariate Output
Strongly Agree	Agree
Agree	
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Not Applicable
Disagree	Disagree
Strongly Disagree	
Missing	Not Applicable
FEPOL	Bivariate Output
Agree	Agree
Disagree	Disagree
Missing	Not Applicable

Quantitative Study: Evangelical / Non-Evangelical
GSS: DISCAFFM: A man won't get a job or promotion

Evangelical * DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			DISCAFFM_ BIVARIATE	Total
			1.00	
Evangelical	.00	Count	788	788
		% within Evangelical	100.0%	100.0%
	1.00	Count	117	117
		% within Evangelical	100.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	905	905
		% within Evangelical	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests DISCAFFW Evangelical/Non-Evangelical

	Value
Pearson Chi-Square	. ^a
N of Valid Cases	905

a. No statistics are computed because
DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE is a constant.

Quantitative Study: Evangelical / Non-Evangelical
GSS: DISCAFFM: A man won't get a job or promotion

Evangelical * DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Evangelical	.00	Count	607	211	818
		% within Evangelical	74.2%	25.8%	100.0%
	1.00	Count	80	31	111
		% within Evangelical	72.1%	27.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	687	242	929
		% within Evangelical	74.0%	26.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests DISCAFFW Evangelical/Non-Evangelical

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.231 ^a	1	.631		
Continuity Correction ^b	.133	1	.715		
Likelihood Ratio	.228	1	.633		
Fisher's Exact Test				.645	.353
Linear-by-Linear Association	.231	1	.631		
N of Valid Cases	929				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 28.91.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Evangelical / Non-Evangelical

GSS Source: DISCWK5: Discrimination at work in past 5 years

Evangelical * DISCWK5_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			DISCWK5_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Evangelical	.00	Count	238	969	1207
		% within Evangelical	19.7%	80.3%	100.0%
	1.00	Count	28	110	138
		% within Evangelical	20.3%	79.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	266	1079	1345
		% within Evangelical	19.8%	80.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests DISCWK5 Evangelical/Non-Evangelical

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.025 ^a	1	.873		
Continuity Correction ^b	.002	1	.963		
Likelihood Ratio	.025	1	.873		
Fisher's Exact Test				.910	.474
Linear-by-Linear Association	.025	1	.873		
N of Valid Cases	1345				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.29.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Evangelical / Non-Evangelical
GSS Source: DIVLAW: Divorce law should be easier

Evangelical * DIVLAW_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			DIVLAW_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Evangelical	.00	Count	627	571	1198
		% within Evangelical	52.3%	47.7%	100.0%
	1.00	Count	70	128	198
		% within Evangelical	35.4%	64.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	697	699	1396
		% within Evangelical	49.9%	50.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests DIVLAW Evangelical/Non-Evangelical

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.605 ^a	1	.000		
Continuity Correction ^b	18.931	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	19.857	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	19.591	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	1396				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 98.86.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Evangelical / Non-Evangelical

GSS Source: FEJOBFAFF: Preferential Hiring of Women

Evangelical * FEJOBFAFF_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			FEJOBFAFF_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Evangelical	.00	Count	257	511	768
		% within Evangelical	33.5%	66.5%	100.0%
	1.00	Count	55	65	120
		% within Evangelical	45.8%	54.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	312	576	888
		% within Evangelical	35.1%	64.9%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Evangelical / Non-Evangelical

GSS Source: FEJOBFAFF: Preferential Hiring of Women

Chi-Square Tests FEJOBFAFF Evangelical/Non-Evangelical

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.968 ^a	1	.008		
Continuity Correction ^b	6.436	1	.011		
Likelihood Ratio	6.757	1	.009		
Fisher's Exact Test				.010	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.960	1	.008		
N of Valid Cases	888				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 42.16.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Evangelical / Non-Evangelical

GSS Source: FECHLD: Mother working doesn't hurt children

Evangelical * FECHLD_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			FECHLD_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Evangelical	.00	Count	1242	384	1626
		% within Evangelical	76.4%	23.6%	100.0%
	1.00	Count	162	74	236
		% within Evangelical	68.6%	31.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	1404	458	1862
		% within Evangelical	75.4%	24.6%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Evangelical / Non-Evangelical

GSS Source: FECHLD: Mother working doesn't hurt children

Chi-Square Tests FECHLD Evangelical/Non-Evangelical

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.656 ^a	1	.010		
Continuity Correction ^b	6.245	1	.012		
Likelihood Ratio	6.355	1	.012		
Fisher's Exact Test				.012	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.653	1	.010		
N of Valid Cases	1862				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 58.05.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Evangelical / Non-Evangelical

GSS Source: FEFAM: Better for man to work, woman tend home

Evangelical * FEFAM_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			FEFAM_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Evangelical	.00	Count	389	1231	1620
		% within Evangelical	24.0%	76.0%	100.0%
	1.00	Count	119	118	237
		% within Evangelical	50.2%	49.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	508	1349	1857
		% within Evangelical	27.4%	72.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests FEFAM Evangelical/Non-Evangelical

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	71.410 ^a	1	.000		
Continuity Correction ^b	70.097	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	64.746	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	71.371	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	1857				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 64.83.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Evangelical / Non-Evangelical

GSS Source: FEHIRE: Should hire and promote women

Evangelical * FEHIRE_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			FEHIRE_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Evangelical	.00	Count	596	155	751
		% within Evangelical	79.4%	20.6%	100.0%
	1.00	Count	91	16	107
		% within Evangelical	85.0%	15.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	687	171	858
		% within Evangelical	80.1%	19.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests FEHIRE Evangelical/Non-Evangelical

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.897 ^a	1	.168		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.558	1	.212		
Likelihood Ratio	2.016	1	.156		
Fisher's Exact Test				.196	.104
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.895	1	.169		
N of Valid Cases	858				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Evangelical / Non-Evangelical

GSS Source: FEHIRE: Should hire and promote women

Evangelical * FEPOL_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			FEPOL_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Evangelical	.00	Count	281	1289	1570
		% within Evangelical	17.9%	82.1%	100.0%
	1.00	Count	67	156	223
		% within Evangelical	30.0%	70.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	348	1445	1793
		% within Evangelical	19.4%	80.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests FEPOL Evangelical/Non-Evangelical

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.419 ^a	1	.000		
Continuity Correction ^b	17.650	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	16.732	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.408	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	1793				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 43.28.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Evangelical / Non-Evangelical

GSS Source: FEPRESCH: Preschool kids suffer if mother works

Evangelical * FEPRESCH BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			FEPRESCH BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Evangelical	.00	Count	419	1207	1626
		% within Evangelical	25.8%	74.2%	100.0%
	1.00	Count	94	139	233
		% within Evangelical	40.3%	59.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	513	1346	1859
		% within Evangelical	27.6%	72.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests FEPRESCH Evangelical/Non-Evangelical

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.666 ^a	1	.000		
Continuity Correction ^b	20.943	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	20.314	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	21.655	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	1859				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 64.30.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Evangelical / Non-Evangelical

GSS Source: GENDEREQ: Gov't Responsibility to Promote Gender Equality

Evangelical * GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Evangelical	.00	Count	982	176	1158
		% within Evangelical	84.8%	15.2%	100.0%
	1.00	Count	152	28	180
		% within Evangelical	84.4%	15.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	1134	204	1338
		% within Evangelical	84.8%	15.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests GENDEREQ Evangelical/Non-Evangelical

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.015 ^a	1	.901		
Continuity Correction ^b	.000	1	.990		
Likelihood Ratio	.015	1	.902		
Fisher's Exact Test				.911	.487
Linear-by-Linear Association	.015	1	.901		
N of Valid Cases	1338				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.44.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Evangelical / Non-Evangelical

GSS Source: MEOVRWRK: Men hurt family when focus on work too much

Evangelical * MEOVRWRK BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			MEOVRWRK BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Evangelical	.00	Count	844	552	1396
		% within Evangelical	60.5%	39.5%	100.0%
	1.00	Count	139	72	211
		% within Evangelical	65.9%	34.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	983	624	1607
		% within Evangelical	61.2%	38.8%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Evangelical / Non-Evangelical

GSS Source: MEOVRWRK: Men hurt family when focus on work too much

Chi-Square Tests MEOVRWRK Evangelical/Non-Evangelical

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.266 ^a	1	.132		
Continuity Correction ^b	2.043	1	.153		
Likelihood Ratio	2.298	1	.130		
Fisher's Exact Test				.150	.076
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.264	1	.132		
N of Valid Cases	1607				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 81.93.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: DISCAFFM: A man won't get a job or promotion

Respondents sex * DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Respondents sex	MALE	Count	159	180	339
		% within Respondents sex	46.9%	53.1%	100.0%
		% within DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE	37.0%	37.3%	37.1%
	FEMALE	Count	271	303	574
		% within Respondents sex	47.2%	52.8%	100.0%
		% within DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE	63.0%	62.7%	62.9%
Total		Count	430	483	913
		% within Respondents sex	47.1%	52.9%	100.0%
		% within DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: DISCAFFM: A man won't get a job or promotion

Chi-Square Tests DISCAFFM Male/Female

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.008 ^a	1	.928		
Continuity Correction ^b	.000	1	.982		
Likelihood Ratio	.008	1	.928		
Fisher's Exact Test				.945	.491
Linear-by-Linear Association	.008	1	.928		
N of Valid Cases	913				

- a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 159.66.
- b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: DISCAFFW: A woman won't get a job or promotion

Respondents sex * DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Respondents sex	MALE	Count	344	137	481
		% within Respondents sex	71.5%	28.5%	100.0%
		% within DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE	49.8%	56.1%	51.4%
	FEMALE	Count	347	107	454
		% within Respondents sex	76.4%	23.6%	100.0%
		% within DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE	50.2%	43.9%	48.6%
Total		Count	691	244	935
		% within Respondents sex	73.9%	26.1%	100.0%
		% within DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: DISCAFFW: A woman won't get a job or promotion

Chi-Square Tests DISCAFFW Male/Female

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.924 ^a	1	.087		
Continuity Correction ^b	2.675	1	.102		
Likelihood Ratio	2.931	1	.087		
Fisher's Exact Test				.101	.051
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.921	1	.087		
N of Valid Cases	935				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 118.48.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table.

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: DISCWK5: Discrimination at work in past 5 years

Respondents sex * DISCWK5_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			DISCWK5_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Respondents sex	MALE	Count	133	535	668
		% within Respondents sex	19.9%	80.1%	100.0%
		% within DISCWK5_BIVARIATE	49.4%	48.9%	49.0%
	FEMALE	Count	136	559	695
		% within Respondents sex	19.6%	80.4%	100.0%
		% within DISCWK5_BIVARIATE	50.6%	51.1%	51.0%
Total		Count	269	1094	1363
		% within Respondents sex	19.7%	80.3%	100.0%
		% within DISCWK5_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: DISCWK5: Discrimination at work in past 5 years

Chi-Square Tests DISCWK5 Male/Female

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.025 ^a	1	.874		
Continuity Correction ^b	.008	1	.928		
Likelihood Ratio	.025	1	.874		
Fisher's Exact Test				.892	.464
Linear-by-Linear Association	.025	1	.874		
N of Valid Cases	1363				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 131.84.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: DIVLAW: Divorce law should be easier

Respondents sex * DIVLAW_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			DIVLAW_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Respondents sex	MALE	Count	305	320	625
		% within Respondents sex	48.8%	51.2%	100.0%
		% within DIVLAW_BIVARIATE	43.4%	45.4%	44.4%
	FEMALE	Count	397	385	782
		% within Respondents sex	50.8%	49.2%	100.0%
		% within DIVLAW_BIVARIATE	56.6%	54.6%	55.6%
Total		Count	702	705	1407
		% within Respondents sex	49.9%	50.1%	100.0%
		% within DIVLAW_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: DIVLAW: Divorce law should be easier

Chi-Square Tests DIVLAW Male/Female

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.538 ^a	1	.463		
Continuity Correction ^b	.462	1	.497		
Likelihood Ratio	.538	1	.463		
Fisher's Exact Test				.486	.248
Linear-by-Linear Association	.537	1	.464		
N of Valid Cases	1407				

- a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 311.83.
- b. Computed only for a 2x2 table.

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: FEJOBFAFF: Preferential Hiring of Women

Respondents sex * FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Respondents sex	MALE	Count	117	215	332
		% within Respondents sex	35.2%	64.8%	100.0%
		% within FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE	37.1%	37.0%	37.1%
	FEMALE	Count	198	366	564
		% within Respondents sex	35.1%	64.9%	100.0%
		% within FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE	62.9%	63.0%	62.9%
Total		Count	315	581	896
		% within Respondents sex	35.2%	64.8%	100.0%
		% within FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: FEJOBFAFF: Preferential Hiring of Women

Chi-Square Tests FEJOBFAFF Male/Female

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.002 ^a	1	.967		
Continuity Correction ^b	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.002	1	.967		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.512
Linear-by-Linear Association	.002	1	.968		
N of Valid Cases	896				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 116.72.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: FECHLD: Mother working doesn't hurt children

Respondents sex * FECHLD_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			FECHLD_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Respondents sex	MALE	Count	587	243	830
		% within Respondents sex	70.7%	29.3%	100.0%
		% within FECHLD_BIVARIATE	41.5%	52.5%	44.2%
	FEMALE	Count	828	220	1048
		% within Respondents sex	79.0%	21.0%	100.0%
		% within FECHLD_BIVARIATE	58.5%	47.5%	55.8%
Total		Count	1415	463	1878
		% within Respondents sex	75.3%	24.7%	100.0%
		% within FECHLD_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: FECHLD: Mother working doesn't hurt children

Chi-Square Tests FECHLD Male/Female

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.114 ^a	1	.000		
Continuity Correction ^b	16.671	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	17.028	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.105	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	1878				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 204.63.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: FEFAM: Better for man to work, woman tend home

Respondents sex * FEFAM_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			FEFAM_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Respondents sex	MALE	Count	230	596	826
		% within Respondents sex	27.8%	72.2%	100.0%
		% within FEFAM_BIVARIATE	44.7%	43.9%	44.1%
	FEMALE	Count	285	761	1046
		% within Respondents sex	27.2%	72.8%	100.0%
		% within FEFAM_BIVARIATE	55.3%	56.1%	55.9%
Total		Count	515	1357	1872
		% within Respondents sex	27.5%	72.5%	100.0%
		% within FEFAM_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: FEFAM: Better for man to work, woman tend home

Chi-Square Tests FECHLD Male/Female

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.083 ^a	1	.773		
Continuity Correction ^b	.056	1	.814		
Likelihood Ratio	.083	1	.774		
Fisher's Exact Test				.794	.406
Linear-by-Linear Association	.083	1	.774		
N of Valid Cases	1872				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 227.24.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: FEHIRE: Should hire and promote women

Respondents sex * FEHIRE_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			FEHIRE_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Respondents sex	MALE	Count	334	112	446
		% within Respondents sex	74.9%	25.1%	100.0%
		% within FEHIRE_BIVARIATE	48.2%	65.5%	51.6%
	FEMALE	Count	359	59	418
		% within Respondents sex	85.9%	14.1%	100.0%
		% within FEHIRE_BIVARIATE	51.8%	34.5%	48.4%
Total		Count	693	171	864
		% within Respondents sex	80.2%	19.8%	100.0%
		% within FEHIRE_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: FEHIRE: Should hire and promote women

Chi-Square Tests FEHIRE Male/Female

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.439 ^a	1	.000		
Continuity Correction ^b	15.753	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	16.695	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.420	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	864				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 82.73.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: FEPOL: Women not suited for politics

Respondents sex * FEPOL_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			FEPOL_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Respondents sex	MALE	Count	146	648	794
		% within Respondents sex	18.4%	81.6%	100.0%
		% within FEPOL_BIVARIATE	41.4%	44.6%	43.9%
	FEMALE	Count	207	806	1013
		% within Respondents sex	20.4%	79.6%	100.0%
		% within FEPOL_BIVARIATE	58.6%	55.4%	56.1%
Total		Count	353	1454	1807
		% within Respondents sex	19.5%	80.5%	100.0%
		% within FEPOL_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: FEPOL: Women not suited for politics

Chi-Square Tests FEPOL Male/Female

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.186 ^a	1	.276		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.059	1	.303		
Likelihood Ratio	1.190	1	.275		
Fisher's Exact Test				.283	.152
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.185	1	.276		
N of Valid Cases	1807				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 155.11.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: FEPRESHCH: Preschool kids suffer if mother works

Respondents sex * FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Respondents sex	MALE	Count	272	561	833
		% within Respondents sex	32.7%	67.3%	100.0%
		% within FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE	52.3%	41.4%	44.4%
	FEMALE	Count	248	794	1042
		% within Respondents sex	23.8%	76.2%	100.0%
		% within FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE	47.7%	58.6%	55.6%
Total		Count	520	1355	1875
		% within Respondents sex	27.7%	72.3%	100.0%
		% within FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: FEPRESCH: Preschool kids suffer if mother works

Chi-Square Tests FEPRESCH Male/Female

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.102 ^a	1	.000		
Continuity Correction ^b	17.663	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	18.029	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.092	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	1875				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 231.02.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: GENDEREQ: Gov't Responsibility to Promote Gender Equality

Respondents sex * GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Respondents sex	MALE	Count	471	83	554
		% within Respondents sex	85.0%	15.0%	100.0%
		% within GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE	41.2%	40.5%	41.1%
	FEMALE	Count	671	122	793
		% within Respondents sex	84.6%	15.4%	100.0%
		% within GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE	58.8%	59.5%	58.9%
Total		Count	1142	205	1347
		% within Respondents sex	84.8%	15.2%	100.0%
		% within GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: GENDEREQ: Gov't Responsibility to Promote Gender Equality

Chi-Square Tests GENDEREQ Male/Female

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.041 ^a	1	.840		
Continuity Correction ^b	.016	1	.900		
Likelihood Ratio	.041	1	.839		
Fisher's Exact Test				.878	.451
Linear-by-Linear Association	.041	1	.840		
N of Valid Cases	1347				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 84.31.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: MEOVRWRK: Men hurt family when focus on work too much

Respondents sex * MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

			MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE		Total
			1.00	2.00	
Respondents sex	MALE	Count	508	226	734
		% within Respondents sex	69.2%	30.8%	100.0%
		% within MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE	51.3%	35.8%	45.3%
	FEMALE	Count	482	406	888
		% within Respondents sex	54.3%	45.7%	100.0%
		% within MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE	48.7%	64.2%	54.7%
Total		Count	990	632	1622
		% within Respondents sex	61.0%	39.0%	100.0%
		% within MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Male / Female

GSS Source: MEOVRWRK: Men hurt family when focus on work too much

Chi-Square Tests MEOVRWRK Male/Female

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	37.667 ^a	1	.000		
Continuity Correction ^b	37.042	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	38.022	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	37.644	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	1622				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 286.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: DISCAFFM: A man won't get a job or promotion

Respondents sex * DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
.	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	1	1	2
			% within Respondents sex	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
		FEMALE	Count	3	3	6
			% within Respondents sex	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%
	Total			Count	4	4
				% within Respondents sex	50.0%	100.0%
				% within DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%
.00 (Non-Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	129	169	298
			% within Respondents sex	43.3%	56.7%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE	36.1%	39.2%	37.8%
		FEMALE	Count	228	262	490
			% within Respondents sex	46.5%	53.5%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE	63.9%	60.8%	62.2%
	Total			Count	357	431
				% within Respondents sex	45.3%	54.7%
				% within DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: DISCAFFM: A man won't get a job or promotion

Respondents sex * DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	1	1	2
			% within Respondents sex	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
		FEMALE	Count	3	3	6
			% within Respondents sex	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%
	Total		Count	4	4	8
			% within Respondents sex	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1.00 (Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	29	10	39
			% within Respondents sex	74.4%	25.6%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE	42.0%	20.8%	33.3%
		FEMALE	Count	40	38	78
			% within Respondents sex	51.3%	48.7%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE	58.0%	79.2%	66.7%
	Total		Count	69	48	117
			% within Respondents sex	59.0%	41.0%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFM_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: DISCAFFM: A man won't get a job or promotion

Chi-Square Tests DISCAFFM Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

Evangelical		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
.	Pearson Chi-Square	.000 ^a	1	1.000		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.000	1	1.000		
	Likelihood Ratio	.000	1	1.000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.786
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	1.000		
	N of Valid Cases	8				
.00 (Non-Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	.786 ^c	1	.375		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.661	1	.416		
	Likelihood Ratio	.787	1	.375		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.417	.208
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.785	1	.376		
	N of Valid Cases	788				
1.00 (Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	5.723 ^d	1	.017		
	Continuity Correction ^b	4.809	1	.028		
	Likelihood Ratio	5.924	1	.015		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.018	.013
	Linear-by-Linear Association	5.674	1	.017		
	N of Valid Cases	117				

a. 4 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.00.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 135.01.

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.00.

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: DISCAFFW: A woman won't get a job or promotion

Respondents sex * DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	2	0	2
			% within Respondents sex	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE	50.0%	0.0%	33.3%
		FEMALE	Count	2	2	4
			% within Respondents sex	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE	50.0%	100.0%	66.7%
	Total		Count	4	2	6
			% within Respondents sex	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
.00 (Non-Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	308	122	430
			% within Respondents sex	71.6%	28.4%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE	50.7%	57.8%	52.6%
		FEMALE	Count	299	89	388
			% within Respondents sex	77.1%	22.9%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE	49.3%	42.2%	47.4%
	Total		Count	607	211	818

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: DISCAFFW: A woman won't get a job or promotion

Respondents sex * DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	2	0	2
			% within Respondents sex	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE	50.0%	0.0%	33.3%
		FEMALE	Count	2	2	4
			% within Respondents sex	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE	50.0%	100.0%	66.7%
	Total		Count	4	2	6
			% within Respondents sex	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1.00	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	34	15	49
			% within Respondents sex	69.4%	30.6%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE	42.5%	48.4%	44.1%
		FEMALE	Count	46	16	62
			% within Respondents sex	74.2%	25.8%	100.0%
			% within DISCAFFW_BIVARIATE	57.5%	51.6%	55.9%
	Total		Count	80	31	111

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: DISCAFFW: A woman won't get a job or promotion

Chi-Square Tests DISCAFFW Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

Evangelical		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
.	Pearson Chi-Square	1.500 ^a	1	.221		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.094	1	.759		
	Likelihood Ratio	2.093	1	.148		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.467	.400
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.250	1	.264		
	N of Valid Cases	6				
.00 (Non- Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	3.146 ^c	1	.076		
	Continuity Correction ^b	2.869	1	.090		
	Likelihood Ratio	3.158	1	.076		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.079	.045
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3.143	1	.076		
	N of Valid Cases	818				
1.00 (Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	.314 ^d	1	.575		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.121	1	.728		
	Likelihood Ratio	.313	1	.576		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.671	.363
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.311	1	.577		
	N of Valid Cases	111				

a. 4 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .67.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 100.08.

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.68.

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: DISCWK5: Discrimination at work in past 5 years

Respondents sex * DISCWK5_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				DISCWK5_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	1	8	9
			% within Respondents sex	11.1%	88.9%	100.0%
			% within DISCWK5_BIVARIATE	33.3%	53.3%	50.0%
		FEMALE	Count	2	7	9
			% within Respondents sex	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%
			% within DISCWK5_BIVARIATE	66.7%	46.7%	50.0%
	Total		Count	3	15	18
			% within Respondents sex	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
			% within DISCWK5_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
.00 (Non-Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	118	484	602
			% within Respondents sex	19.6%	80.4%	100.0%
			% within DISCWK5_BIVARIATE	49.6%	49.9%	49.9%
		FEMALE	Count	120	485	605
			% within Respondents sex	19.8%	80.2%	100.0%
			% within DISCWK5_BIVARIATE	50.4%	50.1%	50.1%
	Total		Count	238	969	1207
			% within Respondents sex	19.7%	80.3%	100.0%
			% within DISCWK5_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: DISCWK5: Discrimination at work in past 5 years

Respondents sex * DISCWK5_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				DISCWK5_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	1	8	9
			% within Respondents sex	11.1%	88.9%	100.0%
			% within DISCWK5_BIVARIATE	33.3%	53.3%	50.0%
		FEMALE	Count	2	7	9
			% within Respondents sex	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%
			% within DISCWK5_BIVARIATE	66.7%	46.7%	50.0%
	Total		Count	3	15	18
			% within Respondents sex	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
			% within DISCWK5_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	1.00 (Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	14	43
% within Respondents sex				24.6%	75.4%	100.0%
% within DISCWK5_BIVARIATE				50.0%	39.1%	41.3%
FEMALE			Count	14	67	81
			% within Respondents sex	17.3%	82.7%	100.0%
			% within DISCWK5_BIVARIATE	50.0%	60.9%	58.7%
Total		Count	28	110	138	
		% within Respondents sex	20.3%	79.7%	100.0%	
		% within DISCWK5_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: DISCWK5: Discrimination at work in past 5 years

Chi-Square Tests DISCWK5 Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

Evangelical		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
.	Pearson Chi-Square	.400 ^a	1	.527		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.000	1	1.000		
	Likelihood Ratio	.407	1	.524		
	Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.500
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.378	1	.539		
	N of Valid Cases	18				
.00 (Non-Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	.010 ^c	1	.919		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.001	1	.976		
	Likelihood Ratio	.010	1	.919		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.942	.488
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.010	1	.919		
	N of Valid Cases	1207				
1.00 (Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	1.096 ^d	1	.295		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.692	1	.406		
	Likelihood Ratio	1.084	1	.298		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.390	.202
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.088	1	.297		
	N of Valid Cases	138				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.50.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 118.70.

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.57.

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: DIVLAW: Divorce law should be easier

Respondents sex * DIVLAW_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				DIVLAW_BIVARIATE		Total	
				1.00	2.00		
	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	1	3	4	
			% within Respondents sex	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%	
			% within DIVLAW_BIVARIATE	20.0%	50.0%	36.4%	
		FEMALE	Count	4	3	7	
			% within Respondents sex	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%	
			% within DIVLAW_BIVARIATE	80.0%	50.0%	63.6%	
		Total		Count	5	6	11
				% within Respondents sex	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
				% within DIVLAW_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	(Non-Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	283	262	545
				% within Respondents sex	51.9%	48.1%	100.0%
				% within DIVLAW_BIVARIATE	45.1%	45.9%	45.5%
FEMALE			Count	344	309	653	
			% within Respondents sex	52.7%	47.3%	100.0%	
			% within DIVLAW_BIVARIATE	54.9%	54.1%	54.5%	
Total		Count	627	571	1198		
		% within Respondents sex	52.3%	47.7%	100.0%		

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: DIVLAW: Divorce law should be easier

Respondents sex * DIVLAW_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				DIVLAW_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	1	3	4
			% within Respondents sex	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
			% within DIVLAW_BIVARIATE	20.0%	50.0%	36.4%
		FEMALE	Count	4	3	7
			% within Respondents sex	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
			% within DIVLAW_BIVARIATE	80.0%	50.0%	63.6%
	Total	Count		5	6	11
		% within Respondents sex		45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
		% within DIVLAW_BIVARIATE		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1.00 (Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	21	55	76
			% within Respondents sex	27.6%	72.4%	100.0%
			% within DIVLAW_BIVARIATE	30.0%	43.0%	38.4%
		FEMALE	Count	49	73	122
			% within Respondents sex	40.2%	59.8%	100.0%
			% within DIVLAW_BIVARIATE	70.0%	57.0%	61.6%
	Total	Count		70	128	198
		% within Respondents sex		35.4%	64.6%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: DIVLAW: Divorce law should be easier

Chi-Square Tests DIVLAW Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

Evangelical		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
	Pearson Chi-Square	1.061 ^a	1	.303		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.160	1	.689		
	Likelihood Ratio	1.099	1	.295		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.545	.348
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.964	1	.326		
	N of Valid Cases	11				
.00 (Non-Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	.068 ^c	1	.795		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.041	1	.840		
	Likelihood Ratio	.068	1	.795		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.816	.420
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.068	1	.795		
	N of Valid Cases	1198				
1.00 (Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	3.218 ^d	1	.073		
	Continuity Correction ^b	2.693	1	.101		
	Likelihood Ratio	3.274	1	.070		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.093	.050
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3.202	1	.074		
	N of Valid Cases	198				

a. 4 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.82.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 259.76.

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.87.

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: FEJOBFAFF: Preferential Hiring of Women

Respondents sex * FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
.	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	0	2	2
			% within Respondents sex	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
			% within FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE	0.0%	40.0%	25.0%
		FEMALE	Count	3	3	6
			% within Respondents sex	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
			% within FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE	100.0%	60.0%	75.0%
	Total		Count	3	5	8
			% within Respondents sex	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
			% within FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
.00 (Non-Evangelicals)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	98	192	290
			% within Respondents sex	33.8%	66.2%	100.0%
			% within FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE	38.1%	37.6%	37.8%
		FEMALE	Count	159	319	478
			% within Respondents sex	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
			% within FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE	61.9%	62.4%	62.2%
	Total		Count	257	511	768
			% within Respondents sex	33.5%	66.5%	100.0%
			% within FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: FEJOBFAFF: Preferential Hiring of Women

Respondents sex * FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	0	2	2
			% within Respondents sex	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
			% within FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE	0.0%	40.0%	25.0%
		FEMALE	Count	3	3	6
			% within Respondents sex	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
			% within FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE	100.0%	60.0%	75.0%
		Total	Count	3	5	8
			% within Respondents sex	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
			% within FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1.00	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	19	21	40
			% within Respondents sex	47.5%	52.5%	100.0%
			% within FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE	34.5%	32.3%	33.3%
		FEMALE	Count	36	44	80
			% within Respondents sex	45.0%	55.0%	100.0%
			% within FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE	65.5%	67.7%	66.7%
		Total	Count	55	65	120
			% within Respondents sex	45.8%	54.2%	100.0%
			% within FEBOJFAFF_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: FEJOBFAFF: Preferential Hiring of Women

Chi-Square Tests FEJOBFAFF Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

Evangelical		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
.	Pearson Chi-Square	1.600 ^a	1	.206		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.178	1	.673		
	Likelihood Ratio	2.267	1	.132		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.464	.357
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.400	1	.237		
	N of Valid Cases	8				
.00 (Non-Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	.023 ^c	1	.880		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.005	1	.943		
	Likelihood Ratio	.023	1	.880		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.937	.471
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.023	1	.880		
	N of Valid Cases	768				
1.00 (Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	.067 ^d	1	.796		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.004	1	.948		
	Likelihood Ratio	.067	1	.796		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.847	.473
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.067	1	.796		
	N of Valid Cases	120				

- a. 4 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .75.
- b. Computed only for a 2x2 table
- c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 97.04.
- d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.33.

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: FECHLD: Mother working doesn't hurt children

Respondents sex * FECHLD_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				FECHLD_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
.	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	5	1	6
			% within Respondents sex	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
			% within FECHLD_BIVARIATE	45.5%	20.0%	37.5%
		FEMALE	Count	6	4	10
			% within Respondents sex	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
			% within FECHLD_BIVARIATE	54.5%	80.0%	62.5%
	Total		Count	11	5	16
			% within Respondents sex	68.8%	31.3%	100.0%
			% within FECHLD_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
.00 (Non-Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	525	209	734
			% within Respondents sex	71.5%	28.5%	100.0%
			% within FECHLD_BIVARIATE	42.3%	54.4%	45.1%
		FEMALE	Count	717	175	892
			% within Respondents sex	80.4%	19.6%	100.0%
			% within FECHLD_BIVARIATE	57.7%	45.6%	54.9%
	Total		Count	1242	384	1626
			% within Respondents sex	76.4%	23.6%	100.0%
			% within FECHLD_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: FECHLD: Mother working doesn't hurt children

Respondents sex * FECHLD_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				FECHLD_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	5	1	6
			% within Respondents sex	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
			% within FECHLD_BIVARIATE	45.5%	20.0%	37.5%
		FEMALE	Count	6	4	10
			% within Respondents sex	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
			% within FECHLD_BIVARIATE	54.5%	80.0%	62.5%
	Total		Count	11	5	16
			% within Respondents sex	68.8%	31.3%	100.0%
			% within FECHLD_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1.00 (Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	57	33	90
			% within Respondents sex	63.3%	36.7%	100.0%
			% within FECHLD_BIVARIATE	35.2%	44.6%	38.1%
		FEMALE	Count	105	41	146
			% within Respondents sex	71.9%	28.1%	100.0%
			% within FECHLD_BIVARIATE	64.8%	55.4%	61.9%
	Total		Count	162	74	236
			% within Respondents sex	68.6%	31.4%	100.0%
			% within FECHLD_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: FECHLD: Mother working doesn't hurt children

Chi-Square Tests FECHLD: Mother working doesn't hurt children

Evangelical		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
.	Pearson Chi-Square	.950 ^a	1	.330		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.175	1	.676		
	Likelihood Ratio	1.008	1	.315		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.588	.346
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.891	1	.345		
	N of Valid Cases	16				
.00 (Non-Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	17.504 ^c	1	.000		
	Continuity Correction ^b	17.016	1	.000		
	Likelihood Ratio	17.438	1	.000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	17.493	1	.000		
	N of Valid Cases	1626				
1.00 (Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	1.906 ^d	1	.167		
	Continuity Correction ^b	1.528	1	.216		
	Likelihood Ratio	1.889	1	.169		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.194	.109
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.898	1	.168		
	N of Valid Cases	236				

a. 3 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.88.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 173.34.

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 28.22.

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: FEFAM: Better for man to work, woman tend home

Respondents sex * FEFAM_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				FEFAM_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
.	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	2	3	5
			% within Respondents sex	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
			% within FEFAM_BIVARIATE	28.6%	37.5%	33.3%
		FEMALE	Count	5	5	10
			% within Respondents sex	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
			% within FEFAM_BIVARIATE	71.4%	62.5%	66.7%
	Total		Count	7	8	15
			% within Respondents sex	46.7%	53.3%	100.0%
			% within FEFAM_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	.00 (Non-Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	185	546
% within Respondents sex				25.3%	74.7%	100.0%
% within FEFAM_BIVARIATE				47.6%	44.4%	45.1%
FEMALE			Count	204	685	889
			% within Respondents sex	22.9%	77.1%	100.0%
			% within FEFAM_BIVARIATE	52.4%	55.6%	54.9%
Total		Count	389	1231	1620	
		% within Respondents sex	24.0%	76.0%	100.0%	
		% within FEFAM_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: FEFAM: Better for man to work, woman tend home

Respondents sex * FEFAM_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				FEFAM_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	2	3	5
			% within Respondents sex	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
			% within FEFAM_BIVARIATE	28.6%	37.5%	33.3%
		FEMALE	Count	5	5	10
			% within Respondents sex	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
			% within FEFAM_BIVARIATE	71.4%	62.5%	66.7%
	Total	Count	7	8	15	
		% within Respondents sex	46.7%	53.3%	100.0%	
		% within FEFAM_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
1.00 (Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	43	47	90
			% within Respondents sex	47.8%	52.2%	100.0%
			% within FEFAM_BIVARIATE	36.1%	39.8%	38.0%
		FEMALE	Count	76	71	147
			% within Respondents sex	51.7%	48.3%	100.0%
			% within FEFAM_BIVARIATE	63.9%	60.2%	62.0%
	Total	Count	119	118	237	
		% within Respondents sex	50.2%	49.8%	100.0%	
		% within FEFAM_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: FEFAM: Better for man to work, woman tend home

Chi-Square Tests FEFAM: Better for man to work, woman tend home

Evangelical		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
.	Pearson Chi-Square	.134 ^a	1	.714		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.000	1	1.000		
	Likelihood Ratio	.135	1	.714		
	Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.573
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.125	1	.724		
	N of Valid Cases	15				
.00 (Non-Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	1.225 ^c	1	.268		
	Continuity Correction ^b	1.099	1	.294		
	Likelihood Ratio	1.223	1	.269		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.293	.147
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.224	1	.268		
	N of Valid Cases	1620				
1.00 (Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	.344 ^d	1	.558		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.205	1	.651		
	Likelihood Ratio	.344	1	.558		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.594	.326
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.342	1	.559		
	N of Valid Cases	237				

a. 3 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 175.53.

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 44.81.

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: FEHIRE: Should hire and promote women

Respondents sex * FEHIRE_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				FEHIRE_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
.	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	3		3
			% within Respondents sex	100.0%		100.0%
			% within FEHIRE_BIVARIATE	50.0%		50.0%
		FEMALE	Count	3		3
			% within Respondents sex	100.0%		100.0%
			% within FEHIRE_BIVARIATE	50.0%		50.0%
	Total	Count		6		6
		% within Respondents sex		100.0%		100.0%
		% within FEHIRE_BIVARIATE		100.0%		100.0%
	.00 (Non-Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	293	102
% within Respondents sex				74.2%	25.8%	100.0%
% within FEHIRE_BIVARIATE				49.2%	65.8%	52.6%
FEMALE			Count	303	53	356
			% within Respondents sex	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
			% within FEHIRE_BIVARIATE	50.8%	34.2%	47.4%
Total		Count		596	155	751
		% within Respondents sex		79.4%	20.6%	100.0%
		% within FEHIRE_BIVARIATE		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: FEHIRE: Should hire and promote women

Respondents sex * FEHIRE_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				FEHIRE_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	3		3
			% within Respondents sex	100.0%		100.0%
			% within FEHIRE_BIVARIATE	50.0%		50.0%
		FEMALE	Count	3		3
			% within Respondents sex	100.0%		100.0%
			% within FEHIRE_BIVARIATE	50.0%		50.0%
	Total		Count	6		6
			% within Respondents sex	100.0%		100.0%
			% within FEHIRE_BIVARIATE	100.0%		100.0%
	1.00 (Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	38	10
% within Respondents sex				79.2%	20.8%	100.0%
% within FEHIRE_BIVARIATE				41.8%	62.5%	44.9%
FEMALE			Count	53	6	59
			% within Respondents sex	89.8%	10.2%	100.0%
			% within FEHIRE_BIVARIATE	58.2%	37.5%	55.1%
Total		Count	91	16	107	
		% within Respondents sex	85.0%	15.0%	100.0%	
		% within FEHIRE_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: FEHIRE: Should hire and promote women

Chi-Square Tests FEHIRE: Should hire and promote women

Evangelical		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
.	Pearson Chi-Square	. ^a				
	N of Valid Cases	6				
.00 (Non- Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	13.670 ^b	1	.000		
	Continuity Correction ^c	13.010	1	.000		
	Likelihood Ratio	13.901	1	.000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	13.651	1	.000		
	N of Valid Cases	751				
1.00 (Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	2.367 ^d	1	.124		
	Continuity Correction ^c	1.602	1	.206		
	Likelihood Ratio	2.362	1	.124		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.173	.103
	Linear-by-Linear Association	2.345	1	.126		
	N of Valid Cases	107				

a. No statistics are computed because FEHIRE_BIVARIATE is a constant.

b. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 73.48.

c. Computed only for a 2x2 table

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.18.

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: FEPOL: Women not suited for politics

Respondents sex * FEPOL_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				FEPOL_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
.	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	1	3	4
			% within Respondents sex	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
			% within FEPOL_BIVARIATE	20.0%	33.3%	28.6%
		FEMALE	Count	4	6	10
			% within Respondents sex	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
			% within FEPOL_BIVARIATE	80.0%	66.7%	71.4%
	Total		Count	5	9	14
			% within Respondents sex	35.7%	64.3%	100.0%
			% within FEPOL_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
.00 (Non-Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	119	586	705
			% within Respondents sex	16.9%	83.1%	100.0%
			% within FEPOL_BIVARIATE	42.3%	45.5%	44.9%
		FEMALE	Count	162	703	865
			% within Respondents sex	18.7%	81.3%	100.0%
			% within FEPOL_BIVARIATE	57.7%	54.5%	55.1%
	Total		Count	281	1289	1570
			% within Respondents sex	17.9%	82.1%	100.0%
			% within FEPOL_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: FEPOL: Women not suited for politics

Respondents sex * FEPOL_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				FEPOL_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	1	3	4
			% within Respondents sex	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
			% within FEPOL_BIVARIATE	20.0%	33.3%	28.6%
		FEMALE	Count	4	6	10
			% within Respondents sex	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
			% within FEPOL_BIVARIATE	80.0%	66.7%	71.4%
	Total	Count	5	9	14	
		% within Respondents sex	35.7%	64.3%	100.0%	
		% within FEPOL_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
1.00 (Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	26	59	85
			% within Respondents sex	30.6%	69.4%	100.0%
			% within FEPOL_BIVARIATE	38.8%	37.8%	38.1%
		FEMALE	Count	41	97	138
			% within Respondents sex	29.7%	70.3%	100.0%
			% within FEPOL_BIVARIATE	61.2%	62.2%	61.9%
	Total	Count	67	156	223	
		% within Respondents sex	30.0%	70.0%	100.0%	
		% within FEPOL_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: FEPOL: Women not suited for politics

Chi-Square Tests FEPOL: Women not suited for politics

Evangelical		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
.	Pearson Chi-Square	.280 ^a	1	.597		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.000	1	1.000		
	Likelihood Ratio	.290	1	.590		
	Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.545
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.260	1	.610		
	N of Valid Cases	14				
.00 (Non-Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	.904 ^c	1	.342		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.782	1	.376		
	Likelihood Ratio	.906	1	.341		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.355	.188
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.903	1	.342		
	N of Valid Cases	1570				
1.00 (Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	.019 ^d	1	.890		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.000	1	1.000		
	Likelihood Ratio	.019	1	.890		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.882	.503
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.019	1	.890		
	N of Valid Cases	223				

- a. 3 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.43.
- b. Computed only for a 2x2 table
- c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 126.18.
- d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 25.54.

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: FEPRESHCH: Preschool kids suffer if mother works

Respondents sex * FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
.	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	2	4	6
			% within Respondents sex	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
			% within FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE	28.6%	44.4%	37.5%
		FEMALE	Count	5	5	10
			% within Respondents sex	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
			% within FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE	71.4%	55.6%	62.5%
	Total		Count	7	9	16
			% within Respondents sex	43.8%	56.3%	100.0%
			% within FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
.00 (Non-Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	227	510	737
			% within Respondents sex	30.8%	69.2%	100.0%
			% within FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE	54.2%	42.3%	45.3%
		FEMALE	Count	192	697	889
			% within Respondents sex	21.6%	78.4%	100.0%
			% within FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE	45.8%	57.7%	54.7%
	Total		Count	419	1207	1626
			% within Respondents sex	25.8%	74.2%	100.0%
			% within FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: FEPRESCH: Preschool kids suffer if mother works

Respondents sex * FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	2	4	6
			% within Respondents sex	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
			% within FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE	28.6%	44.4%	37.5%
		FEMALE	Count	5	5	10
			% within Respondents sex	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
			% within FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE	71.4%	55.6%	62.5%
	Total		Count	7	9	16
			% within Respondents sex	43.8%	56.3%	100.0%
			% within FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	1.00	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	43	47
% within Respondents sex				47.8%	52.2%	100.0%
% within FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE				45.7%	33.8%	38.6%
FEMALE			Count	51	92	143
			% within Respondents sex	35.7%	64.3%	100.0%
			% within FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE	54.3%	66.2%	61.4%
Total		Count	94	139	233	
		% within Respondents sex	40.3%	59.7%	100.0%	
		% within FEPRESHCH_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: FEPRESCH: Preschool kids suffer if mother works

Chi-Square Tests FEPRESCH: Preschool kids suffer if mother works

Evangelical		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
.	Pearson Chi-Square	.423 ^a	1	.515		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.017	1	.896		
	Likelihood Ratio	.429	1	.513		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.633	.451
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.397	1	.529		
	N of Valid Cases	16				
.00 (Non- Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	17.842 ^c	1	.000		
	Continuity Correction ^b	17.364	1	.000		
	Likelihood Ratio	17.786	1	.000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	17.831	1	.000		
	N of Valid Cases	1626				
1.00 (Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	3.368 ^d	1	.066		
	Continuity Correction ^b	2.883	1	.090		
	Likelihood Ratio	3.354	1	.067		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.075	.045
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3.353	1	.067		
	N of Valid Cases	233				

a. 3 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.63.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 189.92.

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 36.31.

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: GENDEREQ: Gov't Responsibility to Promote Gender Equality

Respondents sex * GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	2	1	3
			% within Respondents sex	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
			% within GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE	25.0%	100.0%	33.3%
		FEMALE	Count	6	0	6
			% within Respondents sex	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
			% within GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE	75.0%	0.0%	66.7%
	Total	Count		8	1	9
		% within Respondents sex		88.9%	11.1%	100.0%
		% within GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	.00 (Non-Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	417	68
% within Respondents sex				86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
% within GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE				42.5%	38.6%	41.9%
FEMALE			Count	565	108	673
			% within Respondents sex	84.0%	16.0%	100.0%
			% within GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE	57.5%	61.4%	58.1%
Total		Count		982	176	1158
		% within Respondents sex		84.8%	15.2%	100.0%
		% within GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: GENDEREQ: Gov't Responsibility to Promote Gender Equality

Respondents sex * GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	2	1	3
			% within Respondents sex	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
			% within GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE	25.0%	100.0%	33.3%
		FEMALE	Count	6	0	6
			% within Respondents sex	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
			% within GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE	75.0%	0.0%	66.7%
	Total	Count		8	1	9
		% within Respondents sex		88.9%	11.1%	100.0%
		% within GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1.00 (Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	52	14	66
			% within Respondents sex	78.8%	21.2%	100.0%
			% within GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE	34.2%	50.0%	36.7%
		FEMALE	Count	100	14	114
			% within Respondents sex	87.7%	12.3%	100.0%
			% within GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE	65.8%	50.0%	63.3%
	Total	Count		152	28	180
		% within Respondents sex		84.4%	15.6%	100.0%
		% within GENDEREQ_BIVARIATE		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: GENDEREQ: Gov't Responsibility to Promote Gender Equality

Chi-Square Tests GENDEREQ: Gov't Responsibility to Promote Gender Equality

Evangelical		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
.	Pearson Chi-Square	2.250 ^a	1	.134		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.141	1	.708		
	Likelihood Ratio	2.460	1	.117		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.333	.333
	Linear-by-Linear Association	2.000	1	.157		
	N of Valid Cases	9				
.00 (Non-Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	.899 ^c	1	.343		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.748	1	.387		
	Likelihood Ratio	.904	1	.342		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.362	.194
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.898	1	.343		
	N of Valid Cases	1158				
1.00 (Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	2.538 ^d	1	.111		
	Continuity Correction ^b	1.904	1	.168		
	Likelihood Ratio	2.464	1	.116		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.136	.085
	Linear-by-Linear Association	2.524	1	.112		
	N of Valid Cases	180				

a. 3 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 73.71.

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.27.

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: MEOVRWRK: Men hurt family when focus on work too much

Respondents sex * MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE		Total
				1.00	2.00	
	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	4	2	6
			% within Respondents sex	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
			% within MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE	57.1%	25.0%	40.0%
		FEMALE	Count	3	6	9
			% within Respondents sex	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
			% within MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE	42.9%	75.0%	60.0%
		Total	Count	7	8	15
			% within Respondents sex	46.7%	53.3%	100.0%
			% within MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	.00 (Non-Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	442	200
% within Respondents sex				68.8%	31.2%	100.0%
% within MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE				52.4%	36.2%	46.0%
FEMALE			Count	402	352	754
			% within Respondents sex	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%
			% within MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE	47.6%	63.8%	54.0%
Total			Count	844	552	1396
			% within Respondents sex	60.5%	39.5%	100.0%
			% within MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: MEOVRWRK: Men hurt family when focus on work too much

Respondents sex * MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE Crosstabulation

Evangelical				MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE		Total	
				1.00	2.00		
.	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	4	2	6	
			% within Respondents sex	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
			% within MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE	57.1%	25.0%	40.0%	
		FEMALE	Count	3	6	9	
			% within Respondents sex	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	
			% within MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE	42.9%	75.0%	60.0%	
	Total			Count	7	8	15
				% within Respondents sex	46.7%	53.3%	100.0%
				% within MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1.00 (Evangelical)	Respondents sex	MALE	Count	62	24	86	
			% within Respondents sex	72.1%	27.9%	100.0%	
			% within MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE	44.6%	33.3%	40.8%	
		FEMALE	Count	77	48	125	
			% within Respondents sex	61.6%	38.4%	100.0%	
			% within MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE	55.4%	66.7%	59.2%	
	Total			Count	139	72	211
				% within Respondents sex	65.9%	34.1%	100.0%
				% within MEOVRWRK_BIVARIATE	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Quantitative Study: Evangelical and Non-Evangelical Male / Female

GSS Source: MEOVRWRK: Men hurt family when focus on work too much

Chi-Square Tests MEOVRWRK: Men hurt family when focus on work too much

Evangelical		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
	Pearson Chi-Square	1.607 ^a	1	.205		
	Continuity Correction ^b	.547	1	.460		
	Likelihood Ratio	1.632	1	.201		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.315	.231
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.500	1	.221		
	N of Valid Cases	15				
.00 (Non- Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	34.990 ^c	1	.000		
	Continuity Correction ^b	34.344	1	.000		
	Likelihood Ratio	35.302	1	.000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	34.965	1	.000		
	N of Valid Cases	1396				
1.00 (Evangelical)	Pearson Chi-Square	2.495 ^d	1	.114		
	Continuity Correction ^b	2.050	1	.152		
	Likelihood Ratio	2.527	1	.112		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.140	.076
	Linear-by-Linear Association	2.484	1	.115		
	N of Valid Cases	211				

a. 4 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.80.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 253.86.

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 29.35.

Focus Group Recruitment– Known Participant

Recruitment Script for

Investigator Initiated In-person or Over the Phone Contact

This script was adapted from an exemplar provided by San Francisco State University.

1. Introduction of Investigator

Excuse me, sir/ madam OR

Excuse me, Mrs. Smith?

- (confirm that you have the correct person if you are contacting a specific patient or potential subject)

Do you have a minute? My name is C.J. Bishop

I am a doctoral student at Chapman University, at the Donna Ford Attallah College of Educational Studies and I am working on a research study.

You received information about this study in the form of an email or hard copy letter sent to you in the past week. The hard copy letter was provided to you by a member of your church.

2. Immediate opportunity to opt-out

I'm here to follow up on the request to participate and to see if you are interested in hearing more about the study. Is it OK for me to continue?

- If individual says “no, not interested” = stop, say thank you but do not continue.
- If he/she says yes, then continue or make plans to revisit at a more convenient time.

3. Make a BRIEF statement about why he/she was selected. Make sure the individual understands that this research is confidential. For example:

- I am approaching you to see if you would like to be in the study. We are looking for men and women above the ages of 18 who are practicing members of an Evangelical church. This research is confidential as well and the name and location of your church will be confidential as well to ensure your privacy is protected.

4. Ask if he/she is interested in hearing more details.

So, are you interested in hearing some details about the research study?

- If not interested, thank the individual for his/ her time.
- If interested, then move to the consent form.

Focus Group Written Recruitment Script Template

Dear [Name],

My name is C.J. Bishop, and I am a doctoral student in the Donna Ford Attallah College of Educational Studies at Chapman University. I am conducting a research study examining perceptions of gender roles and equality among members of the Evangelical church and to determine whether these perceptions differ by gender and you are invited to participate in the study. If you agree, you are invited to participate in a focus group or an individual interview.

The study is anticipated to take no more than 45 minutes to an hour and a half of your time.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your identity as a participant will remain confidential during and after the study. All identifiable information collected about you will be removed and replaced with a code. A list linking the code and your identifiable information will be kept separate from the research data. Personal identifiers will be retained for purposes of potential outreach by the researcher in circumstances of answer clarity. Participants will need to consent to be contacted by the researcher at a future date for outreach to take place.

If you have questions or would like to participate, please contact me at 909-240-7754 or via email at bisho105@mail.chapman.edu

Thank you for your participation,

C.J. Bishop

Chapman University

the Donna Ford Attallah College of Educational Studies

Doctoral Student

Qualitative Study: Informed Consent Form

CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY
CONSENT TO ACT AS A HUMAN RESEARCH SUBJECT

Exploring Gender Equality within the Evangelical Church

You are being asked to participate in a research study. Participation is completely voluntary. Please read the information below and ask questions about anything that you do not understand. A researcher listed below will be available to answer your questions.

RESEARCH TEAM

Lead Researcher

C.J. Bishop, M.A., Ph.D. Student

Donna Ford Attallah College of Educational Studies

909-240-7754 bisho105@mail.chapman.edu

Faculty Advisors

Kris DePedro, Ph.D.

Donna Ford Attallah College of Educational Studies

714-997-6681 depedro@chapman.edu

Donald Cardinal, Ph.D.

Donna Ford Attallah College of Educational Studies

cardinal@chapman.edu 714-997-6920

Gail Stearns, Ph.D.

Wilkinson College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences; Department of Religious
Studies

stearns@chapman.edu 714-628-7397

STUDY LOCATION(S): Evangelical Churches and Online

STUDY SPONSOR(S): Chapman University

Qualitative Study: Informed Consent Form (Continued)

Investigator Financial Conflict of Interest

No one on the study team has a disclosable financial interest related to this research project.

WHY IS THIS RESEARCH STUDY BEING DONE?

The purpose of this research study is to examine perceptions of gender roles and equality among members of the Evangelical church and to determine whether these perceptions differ by gender.

HOW MANY PEOPLE WILL TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

It is expected that 20 participants will be involved in this research study. All study procedures will be done with participants at a public location. The researcher will rent a room through a city or public library that is appropriate and convenient based on the location of the participant(s).

WHAT PROCEDURES ARE INVOLVED WITH THIS STUDY AND HOW LONG WILL THEY TAKE?

1. PHASE 1: Analysis of Secondary Data (Duration: 3 weeks)

The initial phase of the research will involve the analysis of secondary data. This process will be informed by examining outputs of the General Social Science survey through the use of IBM SPSS Statistics software to find commonalities and trends between gender equality based questions and demographic data including the identification of members of the Evangelical Faith. The IBM SPSS Statistics software will specifically be used to generate cross-classification tables and conduct chi-square of association, comparing rates of gender equality. These findings will also be informed by similar analysis conducted by PEW. The results of this phase will be used to inform questions for the focus groups and individual interviews. This iteration technique is one that represents a long-standing inquiry practice in multiple methodological traditions.

PHASE 2: Focus Group and Individual Interview Question Development (Duration: 4 weeks)

Informed by the findings from phase 1, the development of questions for the focus groups and individual interviews will capture key findings and address gaps on perception of gender equality and utilize a more personalized and in depth understanding through personal experiences. The focus group and individual interviews will provide essential perspectives that clarify gender equality from a faith perspective. Additionally, questions reflecting the participant's perspectives of equality within their church's organizational design will be discussed within our conversations.

Qualitative Study: Informed Consent Form (Continued)

PHASE 3: Conducting Focus Group and Individual Interviews (Duration: 9 Weeks)

The identification of eligible participants will take place throughout reach efforts by the investigator over a 5-week time frame. The investigator will coordinate a scheduled date and time for focus groups and individual interviews to take place with participants. The researcher will rent a room through a city or public library that is appropriate and convenient based on the location of the participant(s). To be eligible to participate, respondents will be provided an informed consent form. This form must be read, understood and signed prior to engaging in the focus group or individual interview. There will be no compensation for taking the survey. The focus groups or personal interviews will be expected to take forty-five minutes to an hour and a half to complete. After completing the focus group or individual interview, a debriefing will take place to ensure participants understood all aspects of the study and associated questions. The expected timeline to coordinate scheduling and complete the focus groups and individual interviews is expected to be 4 weeks.

For visual representation please see “Procedure Timeline” Excel document

2. Participation in the study will include a focus group or individual interview that is expected to take 45 minutes to an hour and a half, conducted over a period of 4 weeks.

AM I ELIGIBLE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY?

Please note this may not be a complete list of eligibility criteria. We have included a few examples of study criteria to help you better understand how your eligibility in the study will be determined; your study team will go through the study eligibility criteria with you to verify if you qualify for participation in this study.

Inclusion Requirements

You can participate in this study if you are at least 18 years of age or older and are a member of an Evangelical church.

Exclusion Requirements

You cannot participate in this study if you are under 18 years of age.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE DISCOMFORTS OR RISKS RELATED TO THE STUDY?

There are no known harms or discomforts associated with this study beyond those encountered in normal daily life.

Qualitative Study: Informed Consent Form (Continued)

ARE THERE BENEFITS TO TAKING PART IN THE STUDY?

Participant Benefits

You will not directly benefit from participation in this study.

Benefits to Others or Society

Your participation will provide a greater understanding of how equality is experienced and how it may be supported within your church and faith community.

WILL I BE PAID FOR TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

Compensation

You will not be compensated for your participation in this research study.

Reimbursement

You will not be reimbursed for any out of pocket expenses, such as parking or transportation fees.

HOW WILL MY PERSONAL INFORMATION BE KEPT?

Subject Identifiable Data

All identifiable information collected about you will be removed and replaced with a code. A list linking the code and your identifiable information will be kept separate from the research data. Personal identifiers will be retained for purposes of potential outreach by the researcher in circumstances of answer clarity. Participants will need to consent to be contacted by the researcher at a future date for outreach to take place. This consent is identified within the informed consent form.

Data Storage

Research data will be stored electronically on a laptop computer in an encrypted file and is password protected.

The audio recordings will also be stored in a secure location and transcribed. The recordings will be retained with the other research data.

Data Retention

The researchers intend to keep the research data until the research is published and/or presented.

Qualitative Study: Informed Consent Form (Continued)

WHO WILL HAVE ACCESS TO MY STUDY DATA?

The research team, authorized Chapman University personnel, and regulatory entities such as the Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP), may have access to your study records to protect your safety and welfare.

Any information derived from this research project that personally identifies you will not be voluntarily released or disclosed by these entities without your separate consent, except as specifically required by law. Study records provided to authorized, non-Chapman University entities will not contain identifiable information about you; nor will any publications and/or presentations without your separate consent.

While the research team will make every effort to keep your personal information confidential, it is possible that an unauthorized person might see it. We cannot guarantee total privacy.

WHO CAN ANSWER MY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE STUDY?

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or think the research has hurt you, talk to the research team at [909-240-7754](tel:909-240-7754) or bisho105@mail.chapman.edu.

This research has been reviewed and approved by an Institutional Review Board ("IRB"). You may talk to them at 714-628-2833 or irb@chapman.edu if:

- Your questions, concerns, or complaints are not being answered by the research team.
- You cannot reach the research team.
- You want to talk to someone besides the research team.
- You have questions about your rights as a research participant.
- You want to get information or provide input about this research.

Qualitative Study: Informed Consent Form (Continued)

HOW DO I AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY?

You should not sign this consent form until all of your questions about this study have been answered by a member of the research team listed at the top of this form. You will be given a copy of this signed and dated consent form to keep. Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to answer any question or discontinue your involvement at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you might otherwise be entitled. Your decision will not affect your future relationship with Chapman University.

AUDIO RECORDING:

I have received an adequate description of the purpose and procedures for audio-recording sessions during the course of the proposed research. I give my consent to allow myself to be audio-recorded during participation in this study, and for those records to be reviewed by persons involved in the study, as well as for other professional purposes as described to me.

_____ Yes, I agree to allow the research team to audio record my interview(s).

_____ No, I do not wish to have my interview audio recorded.

Signature of Participant

Date

Your signature below indicates you have read the information in this consent form and have had a chance to ask any questions you have about this study.

I agree to participate in the study.

Subject Signature

Date

Printed Name of Subject

Researcher Signature

Date

Printed Name of Researcher

Qualitative Study: Informed Consent Form (Continued)

CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY

Experimental Subject's Bill of Rights

The rights listed below are the right of every individual asked to participate in a research study. You have the right:

1. To be told about the nature and purpose of the study.
 2. To be told about the procedures to be followed in the research study, and whether any of the drugs, devices, or procedures is different from what would be used in standard practice.
 3. To receive a description of any side effects, discomforts, or risks that you can reasonably expect to occur during the study.
 4. To be told of any benefits that you may reasonably expect from the participation in the study, if applicable.
 5. To receive a description of any alternative procedures, drugs, or devices that might be helpful, and their risks and benefits compared to the proposed procedures, drugs or devices.
 6. To be told of what sort of medical treatment, if any, will be available if any complications should arise.
 7. To be given a chance to ask any questions concerning the research study both before agreeing to participate and at any time during the course of the study.
 8. To refuse to participate in the research study. Participation is voluntary. You may refuse to answer any question or discontinue your involvement at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you might otherwise be entitled. Your decision will not affect your right to receive the care you would receive if you were not in the experiment.
 9. To receive a copy of the signed and dated written consent form and a copy of this form.
 10. To be given the opportunity to freely decide whether or not to consent to the research study without any force, coercion, or undue influence.
-

If you have any concerns or questions regarding the research study you should contact the research team listed at the top of the consent form.

If you are unable to reach a member of the research team and have general questions, or you have concerns or complaints about the research study, research team, or questions about your rights as a research subject, please contact the Chapman University IRB staff at 714-628-2833 or irb@chapman.edu.

REFERENCES

- Acker, J. (1992). From sex roles to gendered institutions. *Contemporary Sociology* (21), 565-569. doi: 10.2307/2075528
- Ackerman, D. (1988). Feminist liberation theology a contextual option. *Journal of Southern Africa*, 62, 14 – 28. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Feminist+liberation+theology+a+contextual+option&btnG=
- Adamczyk, A. (2013). The effect of personal religiosity on attitudes toward abortion, divorce, and gender equality - Does cultural context make a difference? *EurAmerica* (1), 213-253. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=edsgao&AN=edsgcl.329898449&site=eds-live>
- Adams, J. (2007). Stained glass makes the ceiling visible: Organizational opposition to women in congregational leadership. *Gender and Society* (21) 80-105. doi: 10.1177/0891243206293773
- Alwin, D.F., Beattie, B.A., & Baumgartner, E.M. (2015). Assessing the reliability of measurement in the general social survey: Results for the content and context of GSS questions. Retrieved from: http://www.aapor.org/AAPOR_Main/media/AnnualMeetingProceedings/2015/B4-1-Alwin.pdf
- Amato, P. R., & Booth, A. (1995). Changes in gender role attitudes and perceived marital quality. *American Sociological Review*, 60(1), 58-66. doi: 10.2307/2096345

- Ammons, S.K., & Edgell,, P. (2007). Religious influences on work–family trade-offs. *Journal of Family Issues* 28(6):794–826. doi: 10.1177/0192513x07299682
- Andersen, M.L., and Collins, P.H. (1994). *Race, class, and gender: An anthology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M., & Jung, D.I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(4), 441 – 462. doi: 10.1348/096317999166789
- Avolio, B.J. & Luthans, F. (2006). *The high impact leader: Moments that matter in accelerating authentic leadership development*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill
- Bailey, C. (1997). Making waves and drawing lines: The politics of defining the vicissitudes of feminism. *Sex Roles*, 32(11-12), 753 – 784. doi: 10.2979/HYP.1997.12.3.17
- Baker-Fletcher, G.K. (2011). Liberation theologies in the United States: An introduction – Edited by Stacey M. Floyd-Baker and Anthony B. Pinn. *Religious Studies Review*, 37 (4), 297-298. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=edsgao&AN=edsgcl.274420031&site=eds-live>
- Balswick, J. K., and J. O. Balswick. (1999). *Authentic human sexuality: An integrated christian approach*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Bartkowski, J. P. (1995). Spare the rod..., or spare the child? Divergent perspectives on conservative Protestant child discipline. *Review of Religious Research* 37, 97-116. doi: 10.2307/3512395

- Bartkowski, J. P. (1998). Changing of the gods: The gender and family discourse of American evangelicalism in historical perspective. *The History of the Family* 3, 97- 117. doi: 10.1016/s1081-602x(99)80236-x
- Bartkowski, J. P. (1999b). One step forward, one step back: "Progressive traditionalism" and the negotiation of domestic labor within evangelical families. *Gender Issues* 17, 40-64. Doi:10.1007/s12147-998-0003-3
- Bartkowski, J. P., (2001). *Remaking the godly marriage: Gender negotiation in evangelical families*. Rutgers, NJ: Rutgers University Press. doi: 10.2307/3089076
- Bartkowski, J. P. (2004). *The promise keepers: Servants, soldiers, and godly men*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. doi: 10.5860/choice.42-0883
- Bartkowski, J.P., & Read, J.G. (2003). Veiled submission: Gender, power, and identity among evangelical and Muslim women in the United States. *Qualitative Sociology* (1) 71–92. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=edsbl&AN=RN125080376&site=eds-live>
- Bartkowski, J. P., Wilcox, W. B., & Ellison, C. G. (2000). Charting the paradoxes of evangelical family life: gender and parenting in conservative protestant households. *Journal Of Family Ministry*, 14(4), 9-21. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=rfh&AN=ATLA0001281816&site=eds-live>

- Bartkowski, J. P., & Xu, X. (2000). Distant patriarchs or expressive dads? The discourse and practice of fathering in conservative Protestant families. *The Sociological Quarterly* 41, 465-485. doi: 10.1111/j.1533-8525.2000.tb00088.x
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 181–217. doi: 10.1016/s1048-9843(99)00016-8
- Bayer, C.H. (1986). *A guide to liberation theology for middle-class congregations*. St. Luis, MO: CBP Press
- Beere, C.A., King, D.W., Beere, D.B., & King, L.A. (1984). The sex-role egalitarianism scale: A measure of attitudes toward equality between the sexes, *Sex Roles*, 10(7-8), 563 – 576. doi: 10.1007/BF00287265
- Bem, S.L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: Transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Bendroth, M. L. (1993). *Fundamentalism and gender, 1875 to the present*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press
- Berryman, P. (1987). *Liberation theology: Essential facts about the revolutionary movement in latin America and beyond*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press
- Biesta, G. (2010). Pragmatism and the philosophical foundations of mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Sage handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (2nd ed., pp. 95-118). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Bilezikian, G. G. (1985). *Beyond sex roles: A guide for the study of female roles in the bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Bk House.

- Bing, J.M., & Bergvall, V.L.(1996). The question of questions: Beyond binary thinking. In V.L.Bergvall, J.M.Bing, & A.F.Freed, (Eds.), *Rethinking language and gender research: Theory and practice* (pp. 1–30). New York, NY: Longman.
- Black, M.M. & Ricardo, I.B. (1994). Drug use, drug trafficking, and weapon carrying among low-income, African-American, early adolescent boys. *Pediatrics*. 93(6), 1065-1072. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=edsgih&AN=edsgcl.16156342&site=eds-live>
- Bloom, L.R. (2002). From self to society: Reflections on the power of narrative inquiry. In *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*, ed. S.B. Merriam, 310–313. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyatzis, R.E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Bolzendahl, C.I., & Myers, D.J. (2004). Feminist attitudes and support for gender equality: Opinion change in women and men, 1974 – 1998. *Social Forces*, 83(2), 759 – 789. doi: 10.1353/sof.2005.0005
- Braun, V. & Clarke V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology, *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Brasher, B. (1998). *Godly women: Fundamentalism and female power*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. doi: 10.5860/choice.35-5013
- Brewster, K.L., & Padavic, I. (2000). Change in gender-ideology, 1977-1996: The contribution of intracohort change and population turnover. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(2), 477-487. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00477.x

- Bronzaft, A. L. (1991). Career, marriage, and family aspirations of young black college women. *Journal Of Negro Education*, 60(1), 110-118. doi: 10.2307/2295537
- Bryant, A.N. (2006). Assessing the gender climate of an evangelical student subculture in the united states. *Gender and Education* 18 (6), 613-634. doi: 10.1080/09540250600980170
- Bryant, A.N. (2009). Negotiating the complementarian ideology of an evangelical student subculture: Further evidence for women's narratives. *Gender & Education*, (21) 549-565. doi: 10.1080/09540250802680057
- Burke, K. (2012). Women's agency in gender-traditional religions: A review of four approaches. *Sociology Compass* 6(2).122-123. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9020.2011.00439.x
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harperand Row
- Burns, J.M. (2013). *Transforming Leadership*. New York, NY: Grove Press
- Canales, G. (2013). Transformative, Mixed Methods Checklist for Psychological Research with Mexican Americans. *Journal Of Mixed Methods Research*, 7(1), 6-21. Doi:10.1037/t21436-000
- Casanova, J. (1994). *Public religions in the modern world*. University of Chicago Press. Chicago, IL. doi: 10.7208/chicago/9780226190204.001.0001
- Charlton, J. (1987). Women in seminary: a review of current social science research. *Review Of Religious Research*, 28(4), 305-318. doi: 10.2307/3511636
- Chaves, M. (1997). *Ordaining women: culture and conflict in religious organizations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

- Chaves, M., & Cavendish, J. C. (1997). Recent changes in women's ordination conflicts: The effect of a social movement on intraorganizational controversy. *Journal For The Scientific Study Of Religion*, 36(4), 574-584. doi: 10.2307/1387691
- Chomsky, N.A. (2016) *Who rules the world?* New York, NU: Metropolitan Books
- Chong, K. (2006). Negotiating patriarchy: South Korean evangelical women and the politics of gender. *Gender & Sociology* 20(6), 697- 724. doi: 10.1177/0891243206291111
- Christians for Biblical Equality. (1989). Statement on Men, Women, and Biblical Equality. Retrieved from <http://www.cbeinternational.org/>
- Ciabattari, T. (2001). Changes in men's conservative gender ideologies: Cohort and period influences. *Gender & Society*, 15(4), 574-591. doi: 10.1177/089124301015004005
- Clapp, R. (1993). *Families at the crossroads: Beyond traditional and modern options*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Cochran, P. D. H. (2005). *Evangelical feminism: A history*. New York, NU: New York University Press.
- Colaner, C. W., & Giles, S. M. (2008). The baby blanket or the briefcase: The impact of evangelical gender role ideologies on career and mothering aspirations of female evangelical college students. *Sex Roles*, 58(7-8), 526-534. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9352-8

- Colaner, C.W., & Warner, S.C. (2005). The effect of egalitarian and complementarian gender role attitudes on career aspirations in evangelical female undergraduate college students. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*. 33(3). 225-229. Doi: 10.1177/009164710503300307
- Coltrane, S. & Adams, M. (2008). *Gender and families*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Connell, R. (2009). *Gender*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Connolly, W. (2009). Capitalism and christianity: American style. *Political Theory: An International Journal Of Political Philosophy*, 37(3), 442-445. Retrieved from <https://academic.oup.com/jcs/article-abstract/51/1/186/845698>
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., Clark, V. L. P., Gutmann, M. L., & Hanson, W. E. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research* (pp. 209-240). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Dahlving, J.E. (2013). A narrative study of women leading within the council for Christian colleges & universities. *Christian Higher Education*. 12(1-2), 92-109. doi: 10.1080/15363759.2013.739435

- Dahlving, J.E. & Longman, K. A., (2010). Women's leadership development: A study of defining moments. *Christina Higher Education*, (9), 238-258. doi: 10.1080/15363750903182177
- Dart, J. (2002). Gender and the Bible: evangelicals wrangle over new translations. *The Christian Century*, 119(14), 11-13. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=rh&AN=ATLA0001329837&site=eds-live>
- Danielsen, S. (2013). Fracturing over creation care? Shifting environmental beliefs among evangelicals, 1984—2010. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 52(1), 198. DOI: 10.1111/jssr.12017
- Davidman, L. (1991). *Tradition in a restless world: women turn to orthodox judaism*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Davidson, J.C. and Caddell, D.P. (1994) Religion and the meaning of work. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, (33), 135-147. doi: 10.2307/1386600
- DeBerg, B. A. (2000). *Ungodly women: gender and the first wave of American fundamentalism*. Atlanta, GA: Mercer University Press
- DeLiesle, J., (2011), The benefits and challenges of mixing methods and methodologies: Lessons learnt from implementing qualitatively led mixed methods research designs in Trinidad and Tobago. *Caribbean Curriculum*. (18) 87 – 120. Retrieved from <http://www.uwispace.sta.uwi.edu/dspace/handle/2139/11308>
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2005). *The Sage hand- book of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Diekman, A.B., Eagly, A.H., & Kulsea, P. (2002). Accuracy and bias in stereotypes about the social and political attitudes of women and men. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 38(3), 268-282. doi: 10.1006/jesp.2001.1511
- Djupe, P.A., & Grant, J.T. (2001). Religious Institutions and Political Participation in America. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 40(2), 303-14. doi: 10.1111/0021-8294.00057
- Dobson, J. C. (1998). Dr. Dobson's newsletter. (July 1998). Retrieved from <http://www.family.org/docstudy/newsletters/a0002203.html>
- Gerber, A.S., Green, D.P. & Larimer, C.W. (2008). Social Pressure and Voter Turnout: Evidence from a Large-Scale Field Experiment. *American Political Science Review* 102 (01), 33-48. doi: 10.1017/s000305540808009x
- Eagly, A.H., Diekman, A.B., Johannesen-Schmidt, M.C., & Koenig, A.M. (2004). Gender gaps in sociopolitical attitudes: A social psychological analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(6), 798-816. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.87.6.796
- Ellison, C. G., & Bartkowski, J. P. (2002). Conservative Protestantism and the division of household labor among married couples. *Journal Of Family Issues*, 23(8), 950-985. doi: 10.1177/019251302237299
- Ellison, C. G., & Sherkat, D. E. (1993a). Obedience and autonomy: Religion and parental values reconsidered. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 32, 313-329. doi: 10.2307/1387172

- Ellison, C. G., & Sherkat, D. E. (1993b). Conservative Protestantism and support for corporal punishment. *American Sociological Review* 58, 131-144. doi: 10.2307/2096222
- Endicott, J. (2002). *Can the dunn MREI be revised to measure egalitarian and complementarian expectations of marriage in christian women?* Unpublished manuscript. Cedarville University. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Can+the+dunn+MREI+be+revised+to+measure+egalitarian+and++complementarian+expectations+of+marriage+in+christian+women%3F&btnG=
- Epstein, C.F. (2007). Great divides: The cultural, cognitive, and social bases of the global subordination of women. *American Sociological Review* (72), 1-22. doi: 10.1177/000312240707200101
- Farrell, J. (2011). The young and the restless? The liberalization of young evangelicals. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 50(3), 517. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-5906.2011.01589.x
- Fassinger, R.E. (1994). Development and testing Attitudes Toward Feminism and the Women's Movement (FWM) Scale. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 18(3), 389-402. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=edsgea&AN=edsgcl.16084167&site=eds-live>
- Faulkner, J.E. & DeJong, G.F. (1966). Religiosity in 5-D: An empirical analysis. *Social Forces*, 45, 246-254. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1994.tb00462.x

- Ferguson, K. E. (2011). Bringing gender into the evangelical-capitalist resonance machine. *Political Theology*, 12(2), 184-194. doi: 10.1558/poth.v12i2.184
- Ferguson, K.E. (2017). Feminist Theory today. *Annual Review of Political Science*, (20), 269-286. doi: 10.1146/annurev-polisci-052715-111648
- Fiorenza, E.Z. (1984). *In memory of her*. New York, NY: New York Crossroad
- Frederick, T.V. (2010). An interpretation of evangelical gender ideology: implications for a theology of gender. *Theology & Sexuality*, 16(2), 183-192. doi: 10.1558/tse.v16i2.183
- Frederick, T. V., and J. O. Balswick. (2006). Evangelical gender ideology: A view from christianity today readers. *Journal of Religion & Society* 8. Retrieved from <http://moses.creighton.edu/jrs/2006/2006-13.html>
- Freitas, D. (2008). *Sex and the soul: Juggling, sexuality, spirituality, romance and religion on america's college campuses*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Freshwater, D., & Cahill, J. (2013). Paradigms lost and paradigms regained. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 7(3), 3-5. doi: 10.1177/1558689812471276
- Frieze, I.H., & McHugh, M.C. (1998). Measuring feminism and gender role attitudes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22(3), 349 – 352. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1998.tb00159.x
- Gallagher, S. K. (2003). *Evangelical Identity and Gendered Family Life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Gallagher, S. K. (2004). The marginalization of evangelical feminism. *Sociology Of Religion*, 65(3), 215-237. doi: 10.2307/3712250

- Gallagher, S. K., and C. Smith. (1999). Symbolic traditionalism and pragmatic egalitarianism: Contemporary evangelicals, families, and gender. *Gender & Society* 13(2), 211-33. doi: 10.1177/089124399013002004
- Galvin, K., Bylund, C., & Brommel, B. (2004). *Family communication: Cohesion and change* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gay, D., Ellison, C., & Powers, A. (1996.) In search of denominational subcultures: Religious affiliation and 'pro-family' issues revisited. *Review of Religious Research* 38(1), 3-17. doi: 10.2307/3512537
- Gerson, K. (2002). Moral dilemmas, moral strategies, and the transformation of gender: Lessons from two generations of work and family change. *Gender & Sociology*. 16(1), 8 – 28. doi: 10.1177/0891243202016001002
- Gill, R. (2011). *Theory and practice of leadership*. London: Sage Publications
- Glass, J. & Jacobs, J.J. (2005). Childhood religious conservatism and adult attainment among black and white women. *Social Forces* 84(1), 555-579. doi: 10.1353/sof.2005.0098
- Glass, J., & Nath, L. E. (2006). Religious conservatism and women's market behavior following marriage and childbirth. *Journal Of Marriage And Family*, 68(3), 611-629. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00278.x
- Grasmick, H., Bursik, R., & Kimpel, M. (1991). Protestant fundamentalism and attitudes toward corporal punishment of children. *Violence and Victims* 6,(4) 283-297.
- Retrieved from
<http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=cja&AN=58716828&site=eds-live>

- Greene, J.C., Caracelli, V.J., & Graha, W.F. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11(3), 255-275. doi: 10.2307/1163620
- Greenstein, T. N. (1996). Gender Ideology and Perceptions of the Fairness of the Division of Household Labor: Effects on Marital Quality. *Social Forces*, 74(3), 1029-1042. doi: 10.2307/2580391
- Griffith, R. M. (Ruth Marie). (1997). *God's daughters: evangelical women and the power of submission*. Berkeley, CA: Univity of California Press
- Gundry, P. (1987). *Neither Slave nor free: Helping women answer the call to church leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Harper, R. (2012). New Frontiers: Wild at heart and post-promise keeper evangelical manhood. *Journal Of Religion And Popular Culture*, 24(1), 97-112. doi: 10.1353/rpc.2012.0014
- Harris, R.J. & Firestone, J. (1998). Changes in predictors of gender role ideologies among women: A multivariate analysis. *Sex Roles* (38), 239-252. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=edsbl&AN=RN042006944&site=eds-live>
- Hayes, N. (1997). *Doing qualitative analysis in psychology*. Hove, England: Psychology Press/Erlbaum (UK) Taylor & Francis
- Hesse-Biber, S.N. (Eds.) (2012). *Handbook of feminist research*. Washington, D.C.: Sage Publishing

- Hesse-Biber, S.N., and Leckenby, D. (2004). *How feminist practice social research*. (209 – 226) Feminist perspective on social research. New York, NY: Oxford University Press
- Hoffmann, J., & Bartkowski, J. (2008). Gender, religious tradition, and biblical literalism. *Social Forces*, 86(3), 1245-1272. doi: 10.1353/sof.0.0013
- Hochschild, A.R. (1990). The second shift: Employed women are putting in another day of work at home. *Utne Reader* (87500256), (38), 66-73. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=edsgr&AN=edsgr.8909339&site=eds-live>
- hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics*. Boston, MA: South End Press
- Hull, G.G. (1998). *Equal to serve: Women and men working together revealing the gospel*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Hunter, J. D. (1983). *American evangelicalism: Conservative religion and the quandary of modernity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Hunter, J. D. (1987). *Evangelicalism: The coming generation*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Ingersoll, J. (2003). *Evangelical Christian women: War stories in the gender battles*. New York, NY: New York University Press
- Irby, C. A. (2014). Dating in light of christ: Young evangelicals negotiating gender in the context of religious and secular american culture. *Sociology Of Religion*, 75(2), 260-283. doi: 10.1093/socrel/srt062

- Janssens, A. (2007). Introduction. *Gendering the Fertility Decline in the Western World*, Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang. p. 1 – 23. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=edsnar&AN=edsnar.oai.repository.ubn.ru.nl.2066.44196&site=eds-live>
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-26. Doi: 10.3102/0013189X033007014
- Jost, J.T. (2006). The end of the end of ideology. *American Psychologist*, 61(7), 651-670. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=edsbl&AN=RN196344250&site=eds-live>
- Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, R.P., Dierckx, J., & Rosenthal, R.A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. Oxford, England: John Wiley.
- Keohane, N.O., Rosaldo, M.Z., & Gelpi, B.C. (1982). *Feminist Theory: A Critique of Ideology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago
- Kepler, E., Shane, S., & Heights, S. (2007). Are male and female entrepreneurs really that different? Retrieved from www.sba.gov/advo/research/women.html
- Keyes, M. (1995). *Feminism and the bible*. Downers Grove, IN: InterVarsity Press
- Kintz, L. (1997). *Between Jesus and the market: the emotions that matter in Right-wing America*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Kitchenham, A.D. (2010). Mixed methods in case study research. In (Eds). Mills, A.J., Durepos, G., & Wiebe, E. (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research*. 561-562. Thousand Oaks, Case: SAGE
- Kleinman, S. (1984). *Equals before god: Seminarians as humanistic professionals*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Knudson-Martin, C. & Mahoney, A.R. (2005). Moving beyond gender: Processes that create relationship equality, *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 31(2), 235 – 246. doi: 10.1111/j.1752-0606.2005.tb01557.x
- Lavee, Y., & Katz, R. (2002). Division of labor, perceived fairness, and marital quality: The effect of gender ideology. *Journal Of Marriage And Family*, 64(1), 27-39. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00027.x
- Leckenby, D., & Hesse-Biber, S. N. (2007). Feminist approaches to mixed-methods research. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. L. Leavy (Eds.), *Feminist research practice: A primer*, 249-291. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. doi: 10.4135/9781412984270.n9
- Lee-Barnewall, M. (2016). *Neither complementarian nor egalitarian: a kingdom corrective to the evangelical gender debate*. Baker Academic. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=rfh&AN=ATLAn3976761&site=eds-live>
- Lee-Barnewall, M., & Spender, A. B. (2016). Review of Neither Complementarian nor Egalitarian: A Kingdom Corrective to the Evangelical Gender Debate. *Priscilla Papers*, 30(3), 28-30. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=aph&AN=117376314&site=eds-live>

- Lefkowitz, E. S., & Gillen, M. M. (2006). "Sex Is Just a Normal Part of Life": Sexuality in Emerging Adulthood. In J. J. Arnett & J. L. Tanner (Eds.), *Emerging adults in America: Coming of age in the 21st century*, 235-255. doi: 10.1037/11381-010
- Lehrer, E. L. (1995). The effects of religion on the labor supply of married women. *Social Science Research* 24(3):281–301. doi: 10.1006/ssre.1995.1011
- Lehrer, E.L. (1999). Religion as a determinant of educational attainment: An economic perspective. *Social Science Research* (28), 358-379. doi: 10.1006/ssre.1998.0642
- Liss, M., Hoffner, C., & Crawford, M. (2000). What do feminist believe? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, (4), 279-284. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=edsbl&AN=RN090307400&site=eds-live>
- Longman, K.A., & Anderson, P.S. (2016). Women in leadership: The future of Christian higher education. *Christian Higher Education*, 15(1-2), 24-37. doi: 10.1080/15363759.2016.1107339
- Longman, K.A., Daniels, J.O., Candy M., Wikkerink, R.J., Dahlving, Jolyn E.; Harden Fritz, J.M. (2015). Gendered definitions and self-perceptions of leadership in Christian Higher Education: The Centrality Of Relationships, Authenticity, and Communicative Influence. *Journal of Communication & Religion*, 38(20), 20-41. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=ufh&AN=114350654&site=eds-live>

- Lowe, M.E. (2011). Breaking the stained glass ceiling: Women's collaborative leadership style as a model for theological education. *Journal Of Research On Higher Education*, 20(3), 309-329. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=eric&AN=EJ948768&site=eds-live>
- Lundquist, M., and Smith, C. (1998). The triumph of ambivalence: American evangelicals on sex-roles and marital decision-making. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion*. Montreal, Quebec, Canada. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=The+triumph+of+a+mbivalence%3A+American+evangelicals+on+sex-roles+and+marital+decision-making.&btnG=
- Manning, C. (1999). *God gave us the right: Conservative Catholic, evangelical Protestant, and Orthodox Jewish women grapple with feminism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Mason, K. (2001). Gender and family systems in the fertility transition. *Population and Development Review* (27), 160-176. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.3115254&site=eds-live>
- Maynard, M, Purvis, J. (Eds.) (1994). *Reaching women's lives from a feminist perspective*. London, England: Taylor & Francis
- McCreary, D.R. (1994). The male role and avoiding femininity. *Sex Roles*, 31(9-10), 517 – 531. doi: 10.1007/bf01544277

- McDonald, P. (2000). Gender equity in theories of fertility transition. *Population and Development Review* (26), 427-439. doi: 10.1111/j.1728-4457.2000.00427.x
- McHugh, M.C., & Freezse, I.H. (1997). The measurement of gender role attitudes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 1(1), 1 – 16. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=edsbl&AN=RN023115347&site=eds-live>
- McMahon, S. (2007). Understanding community-specific rape myths. *Affilia*, 22(4), 357-370. doi: 10.1177/0886109907306331
- Merriam, S. B., & Simpson, E. L. (2000). *A guide to research for educators and trainers of adults* (2nd ed with updated material ed.). Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.
- Mertens, D. M. (2003). Mixed methods and the politics of human research: The transformative-emancipatory perspective. In A. Tashakkori and C. Teddlie, (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral Research*. 135–164. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mertens, D. M. (2005). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Mertens, D. M. (2010). Transformative mixed methods research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(6), 469-474. doi: 10.1177/1077800410364612
- Mertens, D. M. (2012). What comes first? The paradigm or the approach? *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 6(4), 255-257. doi: 10.1177/1558689812461574
- Messner, M.A. (2000). *Politics of masculinities*. New York, NY: Altamira Press

- Moghaddam, F. M., Walker, B. R., & Harre', R. (2003). Cultural distance, levels of abstraction, and the advantages of mixed methods. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research*. 111-134. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Mohanty CT. (2003). *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
- Morgan, D.L. (1998). Practical strategies for combining qualitative and quantitative methods: Applications to health research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 8(3), 362-376. doi: 10.1177/104973239800800307
- Morgan, D. (2007). Paradigms lost and pragmatism regained: Methodological implications of combining qualitative and quantitative methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 48-76. Doi: 10.1177/2345678906292462
- Morse, J.M. (1991). Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation. *Nursing Research*, 40 (2), 120-123. doi: 10.1097/00006199-199103000-00014
- Morse, J.M. & Niehaus, L. (2009). *Mixed methods design: Principles and procedures*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Morton, S. (2007). *Funding your personal ministry*, 2nd ed. Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress.
- Naples, N.A. (2003). *Feminism and method: Ethnography, discourse, analysis, and activist research*. New York, NY: Rutledge.
- Neitz, M. (2014). Becoming visible: Religion and gender in sociology. *Sociology of Religion* 75(4) 511-523. doi: 10.1093/socrel/sru058

- Nortomaa, A.I. (2016). Who is not ordained and why? A mixed-method analysis of dropped ordination in the evangelical lutheran church of finland. *International Journal of Practical Theology*, 20(1), 51 – 68. Retrieved from <https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/ijpt.2016.20.issue-1/ijpt-2014-0021/ijpt-2014-0021.xml?format=INT&intcmp=trendmd>
- Oates, K. M., Hall, M. L., & Anderson, T. L. (2005). Calling and conflict: a qualitative exploration of interrole conflict and the sanctification of work in Christian mothers in academia. *Journal Of Psychology & Theology*, 33(3), 210-223. doi: 10.1177/009164710503300306
- Peek, C. W., & Lowe, G. D. (1991). Gender and God's Word: Another Look at Religious Fundamentalism and Sexism. *Social Forces*, 69(4), 1205-1221. doi: 10.2307/2579309
- Perry, S. (2012). Diversity, donations, and disadvantage: the implications of personal fundraising for racial diversity in evangelical outreach ministries. *Review Of Religious Research*, 53(4), 397-418. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.41940750&site=eds-live>
- Perry, S. (2012). Racial habitus, moral conflict, and white moral hegemony within interracial evangelical organizations. *Qualitative Sociology*, 35(1), 89-108. doi: 10.1007/s11133-011-9215-z
- Perry, S. (2013). She works harder(er) for the money: Gender, fundraising, and employment in evangelical parachurch organizations. *Sociology of Religion*, 74(3) 392-415. doi: 10.1093/socrel/srt024

- Perry, E., & Armstrong, E. (2007). Evangelicals on campus. *Social Science Research Council*. Retrieved from <http://religion.ssrc.org/reforum/>
- Pew Research Center. (2016). *The gender gap in religion around the world*. Retrieved from: <http://www.pewforum.org/2016/03/22/the-gender-gap-in-religion-around-the-world/>
- Piper, J., & Grudem, W. (1991). *Recovering Biblical manhood and womanhood*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway
- Pohli, C. V. (1983). Church closets and back doors: a feminist view of moral majority women. *Feminist Studies*, 9(3), 529-558. doi: 10.2307/3177615
- Regnerus, M. D., Sikkink, D., & Smith, C. (1999). Voting with the Christian right: contextual and individual patterns of electoral influence. *Social Forces* (University Of North Carolina Press), 77(4), 1375-1401. doi: 10.2307/3005880
- Reynolds, A. (2014). Gender dynamics in evangelical institutions: Women and men leading in higher education and the nonprofit sector. *Report for the Women in Leadership National Study*. Wenham, MA: Gordon College
- Rhodes, A. L. (1983). Effects of religious denomination on sex differences in occupational expectations. *Sex Roles*, 9(1), 93-108. doi: 10.1007/bf00303113
- Rhodes, J. J. (2010). Choosing sides: An exploration of role conflict among evangelical democrats. *Sociology Of Religion*, 72(1), 28-49. doi: 10.1093/socrel/srq066
- Ribuffo, L. P. (2006). Family policy past as prologue: Jimmy carter, the white house conference on families, and the mobilization of the new Christian right. *Review of Policy Research*, 23(2), 311-338. doi: 10.1111/j.1541-1338.2006.00203.x

- Riddell, T., Ford-Gilboe, M., & Leipert, B. (2008). Strategies used by rural women to stop, avoid or prevent intimate partner violence. *Health Care for Women International*, 30 (1-2), 134-159. Doi: 10.1080/07399330802523774
- Richards, L. (2015). *Handling qualitative data: A proper guide*. London, England: Sage Publishing.
- Ridgeway, C. L. (1978). Predicting college women's aspirations from evaluations of the housewife and work role. *Sociological Quarterly*, 19(2), 281-291. doi: 10.1111/j.1533-8525.1978.tb01170.x
- Rindfuss, R. R., Brewster, K. L., & Kavee, A. L. (1996). Women, Work, and Children: Behavioral and Attitudinal Change in the United States. *Population & Development Review*, 22(3), 457-482. doi: 10.2307/2137716
- Rubin, L. & Nemeroff, C. (2001). Feminism's third wave: Surfing to oblivion? *Women & Therapy*, 23(2), 91-104. doi: 10.4324/9781315786131-7
- Ruether, R.R. (1983). *Sexism and God-talk*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Schnittker, J., Freese, J. & Powell, B. (2003). Who are feminist and what do they believe? The role of generations. *American Sociological Review*, 68(4), 607-622. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.1519741&site=eds-live>
- Schmalzbauer, J. (1993). Evangelicals in the new class: Class versus subcultural predictors of ideology. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 32(4), 330-342. Doi: 10.2307/1387173

- Seller, T. S., Thomas, K., Batts, J., & Ostman, C. (2005). Women called: a qualitative study of Christian women dually called to motherhood and career. *Journal Of Psychology & Theology*, 33(3), 198-209. doi: 10.1177/009164710503300305
- Shannon-Baker, P. (2016). Making paradigms meaningful in mixed methods research. *Journal Of Mixed Methods Research*, 10(4), 319-334. doi: 10.1177/1558689815575861
- Sherkat, D.E. (2000). That they be keepers of the home: The effect of conservative religion on early and late transitions into housewifery. *Review of Religious Research* 41(3), 344–58. doi: 10.2307/3512034
- Shibley, M. A. (1996). *Resurgent evangelicalism in the United States: Mapping cultural change since 1970*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Shibley, M. A. (1998). Contemporary evangelicals: born-again and world affirming. *Annals Of The American Academy Of Political & Social Science*, 558(1), 67-87. doi: 10.1177/0002716298558001007
- Smith, C. (1998). *American evangelicalism: Embattled and thriving*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, C. (2000). *Christian america? What evangelicals really want*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Smith, C., Emerson, M., Gallagher, S., Kennedy, P., & Sikkink, D. (1998), *American evangelicalism: Embattled and thriving*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press

- Smith, C.J., Noll, J.A., & Bryant, J.B. (1999). The effect of social context of gender self-concept, *Sex Roles*, 40(5-6), 499 -512. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=edsbl&AN=RN062429641&site=eds-live>
- Smith, T.W., Marsden, P., Hout, M., and Kim, J. *General Social Surveys, 1972-2016* [machine-readable data file] /Principal Investigator, Tom W. Smith; Co-Principal Investigator, Peter V. Marsden; Co-Principal Investigator, Michael Hout; Sponsored by National Science Foundation. -NORC ed.- Chicago: NORC at the University of Chicago [producer and distributor]. Data accessed from the GSS Data Explorer website at gssdataexplorer.norc.org.
- Sommer, P. (1999). *Getting sent: a relational approach to support raising*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press
- Stacey, J. (1990). *Brave new families*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Stackhouse, J. G. (2000). History Teaches--What? The Uses of History in Evangelical Gender Debates. *Crux*, 36(1), 11-15. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=rfh&AN=ATLA0000911816&site=eds-live>
- Stasson, A. (2014). The politicization of family life: how headship became essential to evangelical identity in the late twentieth century. *Religion And American Culture*, 24(1), 100-138. doi: 10.1525/rac.2014.24.1.100

- The Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: The Danvers Statement.
- (1989). *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, 53(1-2), 92-96. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=rh&AN=ATLA0000814974&site=eds-live>
- Stewart, A. J., & Cole, E. R. (2007). Narratives and numbers: Feminist multiple methods research. In S. N. Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *Handbook of feminist research: Theory and praxis* (pp. 327-344). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sweetman, D., Badiee, M., & Creswell, J. W. (2010). Use of the Transformative Framework in Mixed Methods Studies. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(6), 441-454. doi: 10.1177/1077800410364610
- Taylor, D. L. (2013). Culturally Relevant Pedagogy and Behaviors: A Study of Faculty Beliefs at Six Christian Postsecondary Institutions. *Christian Higher Education*, 12(1-2), 51-73. doi: 10.1080/15363759.2013.739443
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tichy, N.M. & Devanna, M.A. (1986). *The Transformational Leader*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons
- Tong, R. (2007). Feminist thought in transition: Never a dull moment. *The Social Science Journal*, 44(1), 23-20. Doi: 10.1016/j.soscij.2006.12.003

- Undry, J.R. (1994). The nature of gender. *Demography*, 31(4), 561- 573
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D.H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*. 1(2), 125 – 151. Retrieved from
<http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.189945&site=eds-live>
- Wilcox, C. (1989). Feminism and anti-feminism among evangelical women. *The Western Political Quarterly* 42(1), 147-160. doi: 10.2307/448661
- Wilcox, W. B. (1998). Conservative Protestant parenting: Authoritarian or authoritative? *American Sociological Review*, 63(6), 796-809. doi: 10.2307/2657502
- Wilcox, W. B. (1999). Emerging attitudes about gender roles and fatherhood. In D. E. Lanham (Ed.), *The faith factor in fatherhood* (pp. 219-239). Retrieved from
<http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=rh&AN=ATLA0000011186&site=eds-live>
- Wilcox, W. B. (2004). *Soft patriarchs, new men: How christianity shapes fathers and husbands*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilcox, W. B., and Bartkowski, J. P. (1999). The evangelical family paradox: Conservative rhetoric, progressive practice. *The Responsive Community*, (3), 34-39. Retrieved from
<http://libproxy.chapman.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=edsbl&AN=RN065060383&site=eds-live>
- Wilcox, W. B., & Nock, S. L. (2006). What's love got to do with it? Equality, equity, commitment and women's marital quality. *Social Forces*, 84(3), 1321-1345. doi: 10.1353/sof.2006.0076

- Wilkins, A. (2008). *Wannabes, goths, and christians: The boundaries of sex, style, and status*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilson, D. (1999). When women raise support. *In Getting Sent: A Relational Approach to Support Raising* 145 – 56. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.
- Wuthnow, R., & Lawson, M. P. (1994). Sources of Christian fundamentalism in the United States. In M. Marty & R. S. Appleby (Eds.), *Accounting for fundamentalisms: The dynamic character of movements*, (pp. 18-56). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.