

## Human Sexuality

### National Steering Committee for Human Sexuality Dialogues

REPORT FROM THE PROVINCES TO THE 71ST GENERAL CONVENTION

Resolved, That this General Convention commissions the Bishops and members of each Diocesan Deputation to initiate a means for all congregations in their jurisdiction to enter into dialogue and deepen their understanding of these complex issues [regarding human sexuality]; and further this General Convention directs the President of each Province to appoint one Bishop, one lay deputy and one clerical deputy in that province to facilitate the process, to receive reports from the dioceses at each meeting of their provincial synod and report to the 71st General Convention.

(Fourth Resolve of 1991 General  
Convention Resolution A104sa)

#### A. BACKGROUND

The 1991 General Convention in the Fourth Resolve of Resolution A104sa assigned to "the Bishops and members of each Diocesan Deputation" the task of developing the means and encouraging "all congregations in their jurisdiction to enter into dialogue" on the complex issues surrounding human sexuality. Furthermore, the Convention took the unusual action of assigning directly to the Provinces the task of facilitating the process, receiving reports from the several dioceses, and reporting back to the 1994 General Convention.

At their meeting in the fall of 1991, the Presidents and Vice-Presidents of the provinces responded to the Fourth Resolve by agreeing to establish in each province a Steering Committee made up of a bishop, one clerical deputy and one lay deputy who would oversee the project in their province. (At least one Province, Province 7, had already begun its work.) Further, the Presidents and Vice-Presidents established a national Steering Committee to be made up of persons serving on the Steering Committees of Provinces 2, 7, and 8. The Rt. Rev. O'Kelley Whitaker, then President of Province 2, was asked to chair the national Steering Committee, often called "the Whitaker Committee" to distinguish it from the group dealing with the Fifth Resolve—on the Pastoral Teaching—chaired by the Rt. Rev. Richard F. Grein, Bishop of New York. Throughout the process, the chairs of the two committees have maintained full communication on the work of the respective groups.

The first task of the national Steering Committee on Resolution A104sa was to develop a clear understanding of its task and to interpret as best it could, for itself and for the Church, the intent of General Convention in the Resolution. To that end, a "Context

Statement" was developed and distributed to all bishops and Convention deputies in a mailing dated March 23, 1992. This was the first of eight mailings from the national Steering Committee distributed periodically throughout the study time. However, because of limited funds, subsequent mailings were sent only to diocesan bishops and to provincial Steering Committees.

The Context Statement sought to be very clear about our task and responsibilities:

1. We were *not* being asked to conduct a popular referendum on current attitudes on human sexuality in the Church.
2. We were called to enable and encourage dialogue, including discussions among people who may hold different perspectives.
3. We understood dialogue to be different from debate—the former being a time for conversation that involves honest listening as well as charitable speaking, the latter being an occasion for trying to convince others of one's own position.
4. While recognizing that issues relating to gay and lesbian persons are of great concern both in the Church and in society in general, we saw our task as much broader, upholding all concerns about sex and gender.

We saw it incumbent upon us (a) to develop or identify existing materials to be made available to the several dioceses, to be used at their discretion; (b) to make possible training opportunities for diocesan leaders who, in turn, would offer training to leaders in congregations; and (c) to develop a means by which the learnings from this process could be gathered. We recognized that we were being asked to work in a highly charged area. To move from the prevailing "debate" mode into the "conversational" mode would not be easy. Everyone would need the opportunity to explore new skills, new ways of dealing with one another on sometimes volatile issues.

The shortness of time and the lack of a budget for this work meant the Committee could not design or produce its own study guide. Instead, many existing studies on human sexuality were reviewed by the members of the Whitaker Committee. Some were found to be focused upon one or a few areas of human sexuality. A few, in our opinion, seemed too narrow in their treatment of the issues.

The study guide, "Human Sexuality and the Christian Faith," prepared by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, working in much the same climate as we were, met our criteria in nearly all respects. Augsburg Fortress, the publishing house of the ELCA, was enormously helpful in permitting us to use this study guide freely, to replace Chapter 3 with one designed for Episcopal participants with the title "Episcopalian Perspectives Related to Sexuality," and even to print the Episcopal Edition at much less cost than we could have it done elsewhere. We experienced a warm ecumenical spirit of cooperation in sharing this study guide.

At the same time, Province 7, which had moved ahead in responding to Resolution A104sa, had already engaged a consultant team to prepare a special study guide in response to the Resolution. The national Steering Committee had the opportunity to join in the process of the development of "Human Sexuality: A Christian Perspective." The cost of developing this study guide was borne by private funds collected in Province 7.

Thus, we had two excellent, yet different, study guides to offer the Church. Further, the two distributors of the study guides generously worked with us to keep costs of the

material at the lowest possible level. *At the same time, we made it clear that any diocese that chose to utilize other material should feel free to do so.* The same reporting instrument would provide the opportunity for input no matter what study guide material was used.

Recognizing that Spanish is the second most used language in the Episcopal Church, we proceeded to develop Spanish language translations of the two study guides as well as of the reporting instruments. Here again, Augsburg Fortress readily made available to us the Spanish language translation of their material, a great saving to us.

The national Steering Committee has operated as an instrument of the provinces in their response to General Convention. At the same time, since General Convention provided no funding for this project and provinces usually do not have such resources, we appealed to the Presiding Bishop to seek funding for a budget of approximately \$30,000, which he was graciously able to do. Major expenditures included mailings, support of leadership training, consultancy, and Spanish translations.

In the course of this remarkable process, we were struck by several things:

1. The people—both laity and clergy—chosen by dioceses to facilitate this dialogue process were extraordinarily committed to this endeavor and came to the national training sessions with considerable skill and experience. It was clear to us that the dioceses had chosen their facilitators carefully and thoughtfully.

2. At three national training events, held in Maryland, Kansas and California, some 212 people—from 86 dioceses and all nine provinces (including the Armed Forces and two Canadian dioceses)—were given an introduction to both curricula resources. These three-day sessions included an amazing cross-section of Episcopalians, from the most liberal to the most conservative, all working to see that this dialogue happened.

3. Our experience with these facilitators, and their experience with local participants, indicate that there is a real hunger among our people for caring dialogue, spiritual nourishment, and loving community. The extraordinary care with which thousands of people participated, attending most or all of the sessions, and then completing their questionnaires, is testimony to the commitment they felt toward this endeavor.

4. Real dialogue is very difficult, made even more so by language. We discovered that it was virtually impossible even to design a questionnaire in which the words used to formulate the questions meant the same things to everyone. It is no wonder that miscommunication and misunderstanding abound and that genuine dialogue is hard work.

5. This process of dialogue proved to be useful to people across the Church in a variety of settings, addressing a host of thorny issues. Diocesan and local facilitators quickly saw its potential for increasing communication about topics other than sexuality.

6. The General Convention resolution (A104sa), somewhat hastily brought together in the midst of legislative debate, acknowledging discontinuity and calling for dialogue, turned out to be incredibly wise in its insight and useful in its call for action. This may be living proof that the Holy Spirit can work in and through General Convention.

7. The most powerful experience for many of those who participated was the discovery that in the context of Christian community, an endeavor like this one could truly *build up* the Body of Christ rather than tear it apart.

## B. DATA GATHERING PROCESS

In preparing an instrument to gather data from parishes and dioceses, the Committee agreed on these principles:

1. The questions should be general in nature so that they could be responded to by parish participants regardless of the study materials the group had used.
2. The questions, the Committee agreed, were *not* referendums on Church policy, theology, or legislation. Rather, the questions were to gather the opinions of those who participated in the dialogues, reflecting ways in which the participants' ideas had been reinforced or changed as a consequence. A place for write-in comments and observations was to be included in the questionnaire format as well.
3. Limited funding and the press of time required that the means of tabulating and collating the individual responses should be rapid and completed with a minimum expenditure of funds or effort on the part of parishes, dioceses, or provinces.

### The Questionnaire

The earliest drafts of the questionnaire were prepared by Warren Ramshaw, a sociologist trained in the techniques of data collection and analysis and a lay member of the Whitaker Committee. The whole Committee engaged in revising the wording of questions and question order as well as in suggesting new questions not previously included. Committee members were asked to try out the questions on groups in congregations to see if the wording of questions was clear and unambiguous. The questions were examined and commented upon by parishioners in Southern Virginia, in Central New York, in Rochester, in several places in Province 7 and in Province 8. Additionally, comments and revisions were suggested by participants in the earliest leadership training program. Individuals and groups with special interests in the topics addressed in the questionnaire made further suggestions for improving the questions. Finally, the Committee examined revised drafts of the instrument, paying particular attention to its form, clarity and ease of use.

To facilitate the collection of data it was decided to take advantage of the pyramidal structure of the Church as a route of successive levels of reporting. Congregations were provided with a questionnaire tally sheet on which they could indicate the number of persons answering each question and the way the question was answered. Congregations were then instructed to send the individual questionnaire forms and the summary sheet to their diocesan offices, where a new set of tallies was made summarizing the responses from all the congregations in the diocese. These forms were sent on then to a designated person in each province, reporting the answers given for all the participating congregations in the various dioceses. The dioceses were asked to keep the individual questionnaires to await later instructions on their disposition.

The Committee subsequently asked each participating diocese to send its individual questionnaire response forms to a central point where they could be entered into a computer data base. It is fortuitous for the Committee that a small number of volunteers made themselves available to computerize all the data from each individual's questionnaire. This has been an extraordinary task. There were 74 variables for each of the 15,342 responses to be entered, an operation that began early in July and continued essentially on a daily basis

to the middle of December in 1993. This data collection is independent of the one developed through the pyramidal structure of the Church described earlier. The computer-based data has fewer individuals included in it than the one resulting from the pyramidal collection of data because we received fewer questionnaires from the dioceses than were tabulated by the pyramid method. Nevertheless, these two data sources are nearly identical on all items. Both sources provide clear and unambiguous data for our analysis. In this same process the write-in responses (Part B) have been read and a large sample of them has been recorded, omitting duplications.

### C. WHAT THE RESPONSES TELL US

#### Characteristics of Respondents

Responses were received on the human sexuality dialogue questionnaire from 18,219 persons by the pyramidal structure method. The following general descriptive statements are based on those responses. (While we have written responses indicating the participation of between fifteen and twenty thousand persons in the dialogue groups, we estimate from the sale of dialogue guide materials that nearly 30,000 persons were actually involved as leaders and participants in some way in this dialogue process.) As many as 1128 congregations and slightly more than 77 per cent of the dioceses participated in these dialogues and forwarded information through the provinces to the Committee. The chaplains of the Armed Forces participated as well in seven groups in various parts of the world, adding 63 responses.

Responses to the human sexuality questionnaire do not necessarily constitute a representative sample of Episcopalians in all parts of the country. These responses are not intended to speak for the whole Church on any of these topics. Rather, *these are the responses of those who have participated in the dialogues on human sexuality in our parishes*, a program generally consisting of five two-hour sessions. These persons have read the material their parishes elected to use and they have completed the questionnaire form. Moreover, the potential responding population is further screened by the fact that some dioceses chose to participate in this national program and some did not. Further, even in participating dioceses some parishes chose to undertake the study program and some did not. Finally, even in participating congregations only a small proportion of the entire membership actually participated.

The responses, then, need to be understood *not* as a sample of what every Episcopalian might say in answer to these questions, but rather what a very large number of persons believe and express—people who have had an opportunity to participate in these dialogues, to read the material made available to them, and to complete the questionnaire. The number of responses reported in studies from groups as large as those who participated in this dialogue process are very rare indeed. A measure of the opinions of this number of Episcopalians on *any* topic has seldom been undertaken before.

Demographically, half of the responses are in the age category 40 to 59. Two per cent (358 persons) are over 80 and slightly more than one percent (208 persons) are under 20 years of age. Ninety-three per cent of the responses come from lay persons. Seven per cent are ordained. Slightly more than half of the respondents are married. Eight per cent are

widowed. Another eight per cent are divorced, and 13 per cent are divorced and remarried. Eleven per cent were never married. Sixty-four percent of the lay persons among the respondents are women and 23% of the ordained persons are women.

### **Characteristics of the Dialogue Groups**

Sixty per cent of the groups met for five sessions with another 23 per cent meeting six times. Half of the respondents used the study guide, "Human Sexuality and the Christian Faith," the ELCA publication. Thirty-five per cent used the guide, "Human Sexuality: A Christian Perspective," the curriculum prepared by Province 7. The remaining 15 per cent used other material or combinations of these resources. Just under 40 per cent reported attending five sessions of the dialogue groups and nearly thirty per cent more attended four.

The topics most frequently included in the dialogues were these: Biblical understanding of sexuality, Christian marriage and family, psychological and social aspects of sexuality, and gay and lesbian relationships. These topics were followed in rank order by considerations of gender—the social consequences of being male or female—and the Anglican/Episcopal views of sexuality.

The climate of their dialogue groups is described by nearly 60 per cent of the respondents as always free and open. Another 30 per cent report their groups were usually but not always free and open. Only two per cent say their group experience was often or most always painful or difficult.

Forty-five per cent say the leadership of their group was very effective (5 on a scale of 5 to 1). Thirty-four per cent rate the leadership as a 4. Thus, nearly 80 per cent of the respondents found the leadership of their groups very good. More than 80 per cent agree or strongly agree that their group was made up of a wide variety of persons with different life experiences, people who are quite different from each other. Sixteen per cent disagreed with that description of their group.

### **Learning and Outcomes**

In naming the topics in which the participants believe that they have grown as a result of the study and dialogue program in which they have participated, the most frequent response is Biblical understandings of human sexuality. This response is followed, in order, by the Church's teachings on human sexuality, and by understandings of gay and lesbian relationships.

To help participants focus on specific persons they know who can be thought of in sexual categories, they were asked if they know persons—friends or relatives—whom they understand to be in one or another of a listed set of categories. The Committee felt this question was useful to help respondents recall that lists of sexual categories are more than disembodied cells but rather are statements about persons, some of whom the respondents know.

In this question the most frequent responses indicate that everyone knows persons who are married, divorced, or divorced and remarried. Next most frequently identified as persons they know are those who are single by choice, gay men, persons of the opposite sex living together although not married, and persons sexually active outside of marriage.

Under what circumstances is it possible to be a faithful Christian and be identified in one or another sexual category? Almost 100 per cent of the respondents say that one can be a faithful Christian and be divorced or divorced and remarried. Three quarters report that one can be faithful and live with someone of the opposite sex without marriage. Seventy per cent indicate that being sexually active as a gay or lesbian person is not contrary to being a faithful Christian. Respondents are equally divided in affirming or denying that bisexual persons can be faithful Christians.

Replies to other items on which the opinions of respondents were asked can be grouped by degrees of agreement or disagreement with a series of questionnaire statements. More than 85 per cent say they *strongly agree* or *agree* with these assertions:

- Human sexuality is a gift from God and it is good (96%);
- Sexual abuse is a major problem in the United States (90%);
- The Church should take an active and responsible role in teaching young people about human sexual issues (92%);
- Women and men should be equals in the Church (90%);
- Gender should not be a factor in determining people's daily work and vocation (87%).

Less widely affirmed, these statements are *strongly agreed* or *agreed* to by fifty to eight-five per cent of the respondents:

- Homosexuality is a genuine sexual orientation for some people (81%);
- The chief standard for right and wrong is not specific texts but the character of Jesus revealed in the Gospels (80%);
- Single people should abstain from genital sexual relations (57%);
- Supporting committed relationships between gay or lesbian persons could strengthen the Christian community (53%);
- If I were single, I would abstain from genital sexual relations (50%).

At the same time, the respondents disagree with some of these assertions. Respondents *disagree* or *strongly disagree* with the following statements:

- The Bible teaches that men and women are not equal (87%);
- Short term sexual relationships are acceptable if both adult parties agree to participate in them (64%);
- It is more important for the Church to offer guidance on *what* to think about human sexual issues than on *how* to think about them (52%).

### Further Analysis

Using the computer-based data (15,342 persons) a number of other relationships and insights can be gleaned. All of the relationships reported here are statistically significant. (That is, there is less than one chance in 1000 that the reported relationships are produced by chance alone. Rather, the statements are significant because there is a *real* relationship between the reported variables.)

- 75% of ordained persons and 59% of lay persons *disagree* that it is more important for the Church to offer guidance on *what* to think on human sexual issues than on *how* to think about them;
- Women are much more likely (62%) than men (43%) to agree that they would abstain from genital sexual relations if they were single;
- Each succeeding age level from 20 to 80 has larger proportions of individuals who say they would abstain from genital sexual relations if they were single;
- A greater proportion of women than men, and ordained persons than lay persons believe that homosexuality is a genuine sexual orientation for some people;
- Agreement with the belief that supporting committed relationships between gay or lesbian persons could strengthen the Christian community is greater among women than men, among ordained persons than lay persons, and among young persons than older persons;
- Men more than women and young persons more than older persons agree that short term sexual relationships are acceptable if both adult parties agree to participate in them.

(The Appendix at the end of this report provides additional data in tabular form for those who want to explore these relationships more fully.)

#### D. CONCLUSIONS

The responses from thousands of Episcopalians who have participated in the study and dialogue on issues of human sexuality understood within the context of a Christian perspective show the range of belief and opinion which exists within the Church today. Those who have completed the study questionnaire acknowledge that they have grown most in Biblical understandings of human sexuality, the Church's teachings on those issues, and in their understandings of gay and lesbian relationships. They affirm that human sexuality is a gift from God and it is good. While affirming that homosexuality is a genuine sexual orientation for some people, they also say that single people should abstain from genital sexual relations. A slight majority of the respondents say that supporting committed relationships between gay or lesbian persons could strengthen the Christian community. A substantial majority reject the idea that the Bible teaches that men and women are unequal or that short term sexual relationships are acceptable if they are agreed to by the participants.

For all of the respondents these issues of human sexual behavior are personalized by the large number of friends and/or relatives they acknowledged who fitted various sexual categories or descriptions. For such people the topic of human sexuality and Christian perspective is not an abstraction. It is part of their own self-consciousness in their attempt to become faithful Christians.

The original Context Statement prepared by the Whitaker Committee as an explanation and guide to the dialogue process and released in March, 1992, in part, says this:



We are being called to a dialogue, including discussions with people who may hold different perspectives. A dialogue is not a debate, not an occasion for seeking to convince others of the rightness of our position and the wrongness of theirs. Rather, it is an opportunity to be open with each other, both to share our own insights and to listen carefully to those of others. It is time to discern the leading of God's Spirit.

The descriptions of their dialogue groups by the respondents, the topics they discussed, and the areas in which they claim growth all appear to approach the goals of that statement.

### E. SUMMARY

The deputies and bishops of the 1991 General Convention charged themselves to *initiate* a means whereby all congregations in this Church might enter into *dialogue* and deepen their understanding of the complex issues of human sexuality in our time. It is clear that that dialogue for many has now begun. The most conservative estimate is that a minimum of 30,000 people have involved themselves in this dialogue, some 18,000 or more making the added effort of completing a questionnaire. This took place through the good efforts of a large number of congregational trainers who, in turn, were prepared by diocesan trainers who gave much time and energy to participate in a national training event and to conduct the diocesan training. The provincial Steering Committees provided the encouragement needed in every area of this church. Untold volunteer hours have been offered. The work of our national Steering Committee facilitator and a variety of special consultants has been critical. The written testimony from many of the questionnaires is one of deep appreciation for the gifts of new respect and understanding—if not agreement—that dialogue brings, as well as for new insight into the wonder of God and the rich diversity of God's creation. Those congregations which have not yet participated are encouraged to do so. Much of the material is still available. Dioceses that lack their own trainers can invite those from a neighboring diocese to help.

This report must express the deep appreciation of the national A104sa Steering Committee to all who have had a part in this tremendous exercise in developing and utilizing the skills of dialogue. As many said in one form or another, this time together is much too brief; the dialogue must go on. Indeed, it must continue and broaden, especially as new issues of human sexuality continue to emerge as a result of new sensitivities on our part. Further, the skills of dialogue can well serve the church on all strongly felt issues. We now have trainers in most dioceses and in many congregations whose abilities can assist us in many ways. We hope this resource will continue to be utilized.

It has been a special privilege for the members of this national Steering Committee, also members of the 1991 General Convention, to serve the Convention and the Church in this way, to experience the power that arises for the Church when so many of its members join forces in a common endeavor, and to perceive in a specially privileged fashion the healing and informing force, yes, the miracle of Christian dialogue. Over thirty years ago a prophetic voice that this Church knew well wrote:

THE MIRACLE OF DIALOGUE

*Every person is a potential adversary,  
even those whom we love.  
Only through dialogue are we saved  
from this enmity toward one another.  
Dialogue is to love  
what blood is to the body.  
When the flow of blood stops,  
the body dies.  
When dialogue stops, love dies  
and resentment and hate are born.  
But dialogue can restore a dead relationship.  
Indeed, this is the miracle of dialogue:  
it can bring relationship into being,  
and it can bring into being once again  
a relationship that has died.*

—Reuel L. Howe (1963)

Respectfully submitted,

The Rt. Rev. O'Kelley Whitaker, *Chair*, Portsmouth, Virginia

Province 2:

The Rt. Rev. David C. Bowman, Buffalo, New York  
The Rev. María Aris-Paúl, New York, New York  
Dr. Warren Ramshaw, Hamilton, New York

Province 7:

The Rt. Rev. William E. Smalley, Topeka, Kansas  
The Rev. Rayford High, Waco, Texas  
Ms. Cynthia H. Schwab, Joplin, Missouri

Province 8:

The Rt. Rev. Richard L. Shimpfky, Monterey, California  
The Rev. Warner R. Traynham, Los Angeles, California  
Ms. Elizabeth Cole, Flagstaff, Arizona

**APPENDIX: Gross Tabulations**

The following figures are derived from the 15,342 response forms which had been received for computer tabulation by 10 December 1993. The wording of the questions is, in each case, as it appeared on the questionnaire.

**About Your Discussion Group**

**1. What topics did your discussion group on human sexuality include? (Check as many as apply):**

7,269	47.4%	(a)	Biological aspects of sexuality
12,117	79.0%	(b)	Psychological and social aspects of sexuality
11,983	78.1%	(c)	Christian marriage and family
12,918	84.2%	(d)	Biblical understanding of sexuality
9,900	64.5%	(e)	Sexual abuse
10,711	69.8%	(f)	Gender: social consequences of being male or female
12,893	84.0%	(g)	Gay and lesbian relationships
10,529	68.6%	(h)	Anglican/Episcopal views of sexuality
9,939	64.8%	(i)	Role of the church in sexual education
1,466	9.6%	(j)	Other topics of human sexuality ( Please name other topics discussed): _____
304	2.0%		No Answer

**2. What study guide did your group use? (Check one):**

6,459	42.1%	(a)	"Human Sexuality: A Christian Perspective" (Province VII curriculum)
7,620	49.7%	(b)	"Human Sexuality and the Christian Faith" (ELCA curriculum)
1,980	12.9%	(c)	Another study guide (Please name): _____
747	4.9%		No Answer

**3. How many discussion sessions were there in your program?**

3,406	22.2%	Six
8,770	57.2%	Five
1,346	8.8%	Four
1,507	9.8%	Other
313	2.0%	No Answer

**4. How many discussion groups did you attend? (Check one):**

1,606	10.5%	Six
5,687	37.1%	Five
4,369	28.5%	Four
3,497	22.8%	Other
183	1.2%	No Answer

**5. While groups do vary from time to time, which of these words overall best describes the general character of your group's discussions? (Check one):**

8,628	56.2%	(a)	Always free and open
4,183	27.3%	(b)	Usually but not always free and open
1,973	12.9%	(c)	Mixed: free and open about half the time, and reserved and difficult about half the time.
359	2.3%	(d)	Often painful and difficult
55	0.4%	(e)	Most always painful and difficult
144	0.9%		No Answer

NOTE: Because some respondents checked more than one answer for Question 2, the total of the percentages for that question is more than 100. For all other questions which specified "Check one," the percentages total approximately 100; slight variations are due to rounding.

**SEXUALITY DIALOGUES**

**6. On a scale of Very Effective (5) to Very Ineffective (1), how would you rate the effectiveness of your group's leader(s) in promoting discussion and learning on the topics of human sexuality? (Circle one number):**

6,887	44.9%	5/Very Effective
5,462	35.6%	4
1,949	12.7%	3
403	2.6%	2
191	1.2%	1/Very Ineffective
450	2.9%	No Answer

**7. This discussion group was made up of persons who represent a wide variety of life experiences and quite different from each other. (Circle one):**

3,771	24.6%	Strongly agree		12,368	80.6%	Strongly Agree
8,597	56.0%	Agree				or Agree
2,387	15.6%	Disagree				
234	1.5%	Strongly Disagree		2,621	17.1%	Disagree or
353	2.3%	No Answer				Strongly Disagree

**Learning and Outcomes:**

**8. On which of these topics do you believe you have grown in your understanding as a result of this study and discussion program? (Check all that apply):**

3,894	25.4%	(a) Marriage
1,851	12.1%	(b) Divorce
1,926	12.6%	(c) Divorce and re-marriage
6,726	43.8%	(d) Gay and lesbian relationships
1,428	9.3%	(e) Bisexuality
4,042	26.4%	(f) Family Life
8,911	58.1%	(g) Biblical understandings of human sexuality
6,836	44.6%	(h) The Church's teachings on human sexuality
2,787	18.2%	(i) Ordination and human sexuality
929	6.1%	(j) Other (Please specify): _____
2,528	16.5%	No Answer

**9. I believe sexual abuse is a major problem in the United States. (Circle one):**

7,774	50.7%	Strongly agree		14,291	93.2%	Strongly Agree
6,517	42.5%	Agree				or Agree
673	4.4%	Disagree				
46	0.3%	Strongly Disagree		719	4.7%	Disagree or
332	2.2%	No Answer				Strongly Disagree

**10. It is more important for the Church to offer guidance on what to think about human sexual issues than on how to think about them. (Circle one):**

1,706	11.1%	Strongly agree		5,517	36.0%	Strongly Agree
3,811	24.8%	Agree				or Agree
4,134	27.0%	Disagree				
4,245	27.7%	Strongly Disagree		8,379	54.6%	Disagree or
1,446	9.4%	No Answer				Strongly Disagree

**THE BLUE BOOK**

**11. Do you yourself know persons—friends or relatives—who are....? (Check all that apply).**

15,147	98.7%	(a) Married
15,010	97.8%	(b) Divorced
14,591	95.1%	(c) Divorced and re-married
12,801	83.4%	(d) Single by choice
12,057	78.6%	(e) Gay Men
9,079	59.2%	(f) Lesbian Women
4,122	26.9%	(g) Bisexual
8,834	57.6%	(h) Male living with another male
8,783	57.3%	(i) Female living with another female
13,378	87.2%	(j) Living with a person of the opposite sex although not married
10,848	70.7%	(k) Sexually active outside of marriage
6,131	40.0%	(l) Persons with HIV or AIDS
4,485	29.2%	(m) Ordained and who are gay or lesbian
1,413	9.2%	(n) Cross-dressers
8,251	53.8%	(o) Sexually abused
86	0.6%	No Answer

**12. Do you think it is possible to be a faithful Christian person and be...? (Check yes or no for each)**

(a) Divorced ( ) Yes ( ) No			
Yes	15,050 (98.1%);	No	79 (0.5%); No Answer 213 (1.4%)
(b) Divorced and re-married ( ) Yes ( ) No			
Yes	14,896 (97.1%);	No	154 (1.0%); No Answer 292 (1.9%)
(c) Sexually active as a gay or lesbian ( ) Yes ( ) No			
Yes	9,923 (64.7%);	No	4,251 (27.7%); No Answer 1,168 (7.6%)
(d) Sexually active outside of marriage ( ) Yes ( ) No			
Yes	6,913 (45.1%);	No	7,155 (46.6%); No Answer 1,274 (8.3%)
(e) Sexually active as a bisexual ( ) Yes ( ) No			
Yes	6,278 (40.9%);	No	6,813 (44.4%); No Answer 2,251 (14.7%)
(f) Living with another person of the opposite sex without ( ) Yes ( ) No			
Yes	10,862 (70.8%);	No	3,522 (23.0%); No Answer 958 (6.2%)

**13. Homosexuality is a genuine sexual orientation for some people. (Circle one):**

5,639	36.8%	Strongly agree	12,398	80.8%	Strongly Agree
6,759	44.1%	Agree			or Agree
1,250	8.2%	Disagree			
846	5.5%	Strongly Disagree	2,096	13.7%	Disagree or
848	5.5%	No Answer			Strongly Disagree

**14. Supporting committed relationships between gay or lesbian persons could strengthen the Christian community. (Circle one):**

3,355	21.9%	Strongly agree	8,314	54.2%	Strongly Agree
4,959	32.3%	Agree			or Agree
3,065	20.0%	Disagree			
2,805	18.3%	Strongly Disagree	5,870	38.3%	Disagree or
1,158	7.6%	No Answer			Strongly Disagree

**SEXUALITY DIALOGUES**

**15. I understand that the Bible teaches men and women are not equal. (Circle one):**

1,049	6.8%	Strongly agree		5,246	34.2%	Strongly Agree
4,197	27.4%	Agree				or Agree
4,852	31.6%	Disagree				
4,201	27.4%	Strongly Disagree		9,053	59.0%	Disagree or
1,043	6.8%	No Answer				Strongly Disagree

**16. I believe that men and women should be equals in the Church. (Circle one):**

9,049	59.0%	Strongly agree		14,165	92.3%	Strongly Agree
5,116	33.4%	Agree				or Agree
592	3.9%	Disagree				
162	1.1%	Strongly Disagree		754	4.9%	Disagree or
423	2.8%	No Answer				Strongly Disagree

**17. People's gender — being male or female — should not be a factor in determining their daily work and vocation. (Circle one):**

8,575	55.9%	Strongly agree		13,591	88.6%	Strongly Agree
5,016	32.7%	Agree				or Agree
1,127	7.4%	Disagree				
227	1.5%	Strongly Disagree		1,354	8.8%	Disagree or
397	2.6%	No Answer				Strongly Disagree

**18. Human sexuality is a gift from God and it is good. (Circle one):**

10,220	66.6%	Strongly agree		14,705	95.9%	Strongly Agree
4,485	29.2%	Agree				or Agree
162	1.1%	Disagree				
52	0.3%	Strongly Disagree		214	1.4%	Disagree or
423	2.8%	No Answer				Strongly Disagree

**19. It is important for the Church to take an active and responsible role in teaching young people about human sexual issues. (Circle one):**

8,145	53.1%	Strongly agree		14,198	92.5%	Strongly Agree
6,053	39.5%	Agree				or Agree
600	3.9%	Disagree				
113	0.7%	Strongly Disagree		713	4.7%	Disagree or
431	2.8%	No Answer				Strongly Disagree

**20. Single people should abstain from genital sexual relations. (Circle one):**

2,180	14.2%	Strongly agree		7,496	48.9%	Strongly Agree
5,316	34.7%	Agree				or Agree
5,176	33.7%	Disagree				
1,535	10.0%	Strongly Disagree		6,711	43.7%	Disagree or
1,135	7.4%	No Answer				Strongly Disagree

**21. The chief standard for right and wrong is not specific texts but the character of Jesus revealed in the Gospels. (Circle one):**

5,856	38.2%	Strongly agree		12,519	81.6%	Strongly Agree
6,663	43.4%	Agree				or Agree
1,154	7.5%	Disagree				
473	3.1%	Strongly Disagree		1,627	10.6%	Disagree or
1,196	7.8%	No Answer				Strongly Disagree

## THE BLUE BOOK

**22. Short term sexual relationships are acceptable if both adult parties agree to participate in them. (Circle one):**

553	3.6%	Strongly agree		4,335	28.3%	Strongly Agree
3,782	24.7%	Agree				or Agree
6,602	43.0%	Disagree				
3,378	22.0%	Strongly Disagree		9,980	65.1%	Disagree or
1,027	6.7%	No Answer				Strongly Disagree

**23. If I were single, I would abstain from genital sexual relations. (Circle one):**

2,705	17.6%	Strongly agree		7,599	49.5%	Strongly Agree
4,894	31.9%	Agree				or Agree
4,970	32.4%	Disagree				
1,469	9.6%	Strongly Disagree		6,439	42.0%	Disagree or
1,304	8.5%	No Answer				Strongly Disagree

### About You

**24. What is your age group?**

158	1.0%	(a) Under 20
2,546	16.6%	(b) 20-39
7,397	48.2%	(c) 40-59
4,712	30.7%	(d) 60-79
334	2.2%	(e) 80 or older
195	1.3%	Not specified

**25. What is your sex?**

9,108	59.4%	(a) Female
5,682	37.0%	(b) Male
552	3.6%	Not specified

**26. Are you...**

13,387	87.3%	(a) A lay person
1,057	6.9%	(b) An ordained person
898	5.9%	Not specified

**27. What is your marital status?**

1,268	8.3%	(a) Never married
8,796	57.3%	(b) Presently married
1,241	8.1%	(c) Widowed
396	2.6%	(d) Living with a partner, but not married
163	1.1%	(e) Separated
1,309	8.5%	(f) Divorced
1,978	12.9%	(g) Divorced and remarried
191	1.2%	Not specified