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Abstract
This thesis has investigated the effect of political influence, religious denomination, and level of equality regarding same-sex marriage legislation among the 28 member states of the European Union (EU). Furthermore, prior research has been related to the topics: same-sex marriage cases within the EU court, religious influence on approval of homosexuality, Conservative, Liberal, and Social democratic ideas regarding same-sex marriage and research about Feminism and equality. It has used a quantititative, comparative, and causal analysis to test the six hypotheses by using Cox Regression.

The thesis has concluded that religious influence had a negative effect on the same-sex marriage legislation, disregarding denomination, and the level of social cohesion and equality had a positive effect on the legislation. Additionally, the result has shown that among the member states of the EU, the phenomenon of same-sex marriage was not a politically polarised, but that there were rather possible other variables not included in the analysis that could explain why half of the member states have legislated same-sex marriage. However, the predicted hazard rate of no legislation has increased and if the trend would continue there could possibly be a consensus among the members of the EU in the future.
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1. Introduction

“People who tend to desire and love other people of the same sex” (Parkinson. 2013:9) could be traced back to Ancient Egypt around 1800 BC where one male god tried to seduce another male god (op.cit:10). Even though homosexuality has a long history, cultures and societies have had a diverse view on how to treat lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual, queer and inter-sexual (LGBTQI) people. An example is that sexual relationships between males were famously celebrated in the ancient Greece in the fifth to fourth century BC (op.cit:47) whereas laws in Christian Europe relied on the bible stating that “god will punish ‘sodomite’ people for their sinful life” (op.cit:16). The Human Rights Watch states that:

“We document and expose abuses based on sexual orientation and gender identity worldwide, including torture, killing and executions, arrests under unjust laws, unequal treatment, censorship, medical abuses, discrimination in health and jobs and housing, domestic violence, abuses against children, and denial of family rights and recognition” (Reuters. 2013).

This quotation describes the context of the world that we live in today and that the idea that LGBTQI people should be treated different from heterosexual people is something that still shapes our societies. However, the world is in constant change and in 1989, Denmark made an important step towards equality as this was the first country that legislated registered partnerships for couples of the same sex (ILGA. 2017). Ever since, an increasingly number of countries have started to recognise same-sex couples in the institution. Moreover, in 2001, the Netherlands made another important step for towards equality as they were the first country that legislated same-sex marriage (ibid).

According to the official webpage of the European Union (EU) the following member states have granted the right for same-sex marriage: “(...) Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom (excluding Northern Ireland)” (Europa.eu. 2017). This means that within the EU there are still countries that have not legislated same-sex marriage despite that Article 21 in the EU charter contains non-discrimination on the grounds of, among others, sexual orientation (Lebeck. 2013:309). Arguably, article 21 could be placed in contrast to
article 9 where “the right to marry and the right to found a family shall be guaranteed in accordance with the national laws governing the exercise of these rights” (FRA. 2017).

In other words, there are no laws within the European Union that grants the right to marriage for same-sex couples, as this issue needs to be granted on a national level. Hamilton explains that “this is because the European Court considers that a consensus in favour of same-sex marriage between member states needs to develop before such a right can be recognized” (2017:1). This causes issues on different levels as it opposed article 21 in the EU charter and created obstacles for article 45 regarding freedom of movement in the EU as is noted in the quotation below (Lebeck. 2013:259; van der Brink. 2016).

“As a result of a lack of uniform rules, national administrations and courts of various EU Member States have been confronted with the question of whether to recognize and give legal effect to same-sex marriages celebrated in other Member States but prohibited under domestic national law. In some instances, these states refused to do so” (van der Brink. 2016:422).

According to Bjereld et. al, a scientific issue can be defined as “the difference between our pre-understanding and the reality as we perceive it” (1999:43, my translation). Using this definition, this thesis endeavours a scientific issue that exists on many levels. The absence of legislation for same-sex marriage on an international level creates a complex of problems concerning discrimination, abuse, not be granted the right to marriage and a family, and limitation of movement. Why the phenomenon of same-sex marriage is so important for the society is something that Knight-Finley explains in her dissertation where she states that “...access to marriage represents an important step in achieving equality for gays and lesbians. Indeed, any step toward recognizing gay and lesbian relationships, represents a step toward including all citizens in full social citizenship” (2017:11).

Prior researchers have mostly focused on measuring attitudes towards homosexuality and different causes for this (Akker et al. 2013; Hooghe. Meeusen. 2013; Kuntz et al. 2015) but I hope to contribute to the research on the subject of homosexuality in the EU as I have used datasets from Quality of Government (Teorell et al. 2018) and World Religion Dataset (Maoz
et al. 2013), which do not measure attitudes towards homosexuality but rather take it one step further to focus on the influence of religion, equality and politics in the society and their effect on legislating same-sex marriage in the constitution among the EU member states.

Another way this thesis has contributed on the subject is further knowledge about this phenomenon as I noticed when I first researched the topic as the most scientific research was shown when I used the words “gay” and “marriage”. Sweden, as an example, uses “könsneutralt äktenskap” or “gender neutral marriage” which is a term that includes LGBTQI-people within the constitution of marriage in contrast to “gay marriage”, as this suggested that there was a difference between the types of marriage. This proposes that there are limited research and knowledge on the subject internationally and I hope to contribute to a better understanding of legislation for same-sex marriage and possibly reasons for it.

1.1 Purpose

The aim for this thesis was to investigate among the member states of the European Union whether there were any relations between legislation of same-sex marriage and religion, the influence of Conservative, Liberal and Social democratic ideology, and equality, such as social inclusion in society for all citizens. The second part aim was to put the former investigation in relation to why some member states in the EU have legislated same sex marriage and some have not, in addition to predict if or when there will be a consensus in the EU about same-sex marriage legislation. The time used in this thesis have ranged between 2001-2018 as, noted in the introduction, the Netherlands was the first country to legislate same-sex marriage in 2001.

The purpose is specified into three research questions, that can be seen below, which together with the aim have been the guidance of this thesis and they will be answered in the conclusion.
1.2 Research questions

- What are the possible reasons for that some EU member states have legislated same-sex marriage, and some have not?

- To what extent do Conservative, Liberal and Social democratic influence, religious denomination, and the level of equality have any effect whether the member state have legislated same-sex marriage or not?

- How likely is it that the trend will continue, in the sense that more member states among the EU members will legislate same-sex marriage in the future?

The first research question was answered by the prior research on the subject and their result. The answer to the second research question have specified what the focus for this thesis and was responded by the result in chapter 5 and the discussion in chapter 6. It was also closely connected to the headline for this thesis, *is the proliferation of same sex marriage legislation a matter of equality, religion, or politics?*

The last research question was, as the previous research question, answered mainly by the method used for this thesis and the result was presented and discussed in chapter 5 and 6. The three research questions was, as noted in the former section, clearly answered in the conclusion of this thesis. Moreover, this thesis had a deductive approach (Bryman. 2015:26) as the research questions was specified in six hypotheses founded by the prior research on the field and then either rejected or confirmed by the result. The conclusion has thus answered the research questions and offered the new theory of this thesis.

1.3 Important terms

The very definition of marriage and same-sex marriage must be provided to prevent further disorientation for this thesis as this was the object of analysis. Therefore, “*a marriage is the*
act, ceremony or process by which the legal relationship between two persons is formed. The legality of the union may be established by civil, religious or other means as recognised by the laws of each country” (Eurostat. 2014). Notably, in this definition it does not state anything about the gender of the two persons, in contrast to article 12 in the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) where it says that “men and women of marriageable age have the right to marry and to found a family, according to the national laws governing the exercise of this right” (ECHR.1953).

As for the term ‘same-sex marriage’ I allude to the legal right for a couple of the same sex to be able to marry each other under the same legislation as a heterosexual couple. I do not mean a specific type of marriage but rather a gender-neutral legislation of the right to marry. In table 3.5, same-sex marriage will be referred to as marriage equality, but I chose to use the term same-sex marriage in this thesis as this was more established in relation to the prior research. This term was the main object for this thesis as same-sex marriage legislation was the dependent variable.

By the term registered partnership, also referred to as civil unions, a definition is that “2 people who live together as a couple [can] (...) register their relationship with the relevant public authority in their country of residence” (Europe.eu). However, this right differ among the member states and specific rights such as, maintenance and property and adoption were not applied in the same way (ibid). Moreover, there are some countries recognising that civil unions or registered partnerships are equivalent to marriage, but some states do not (ibid). In addition, Table 3.5 showed the status of rights for same-sex couples among the member states of the EU both for registered partnerships and marriage equality, in other words, that the country has legislated same-sex marriage.

1.4 Disposition
The first chapter contains an introduction where the research issues and the context are shown followed by the purpose and the research questions that guided this thesis. The section before this one included a briefing of the important terms for this thesis. The second chapter includes the prior research and the hypothesis founded by this. This chapter is divided in four sections, each focusing on one of the variables included in the third research questions. Each section
contains the hypothesis for this deductive thesis relevant to the variable discussed. The third chapter shows the method and design used to answer the hypothesis and the research questions. Moreover, chapter 3 also provides how the hypothesis is operationalised and how they are analysed in the result. Each operationalisation also contains a descriptive statistics bar chart about the distribution of values among the selected cases. The chapter ends with a discussion about validity and reliability. The result consists of four tables and one graph that presents the analysis and each figure is commented empirically without any personal interpretation.

In chapter five each hypothesis is separately discussed, interpreted, and answered where they either are rejected or confirmed. The chapter ends with a general discussion how to interpret the overall result. Chapter six is divided in the three research questions where they are answered and concluded using this thesis and this chapter ends with a general conclusion what this thesis shows. The seventh chapter contains a discussion what further research can study using this thesis. The final eighth chapter includes the references and chapter number nine includes the Appendix.
2. Prior research and theory
This chapter started by displaying some of the prior research of firstly the dependent variable, same-sex marriage legislation and after that the three independent variables used in the analysis. In other words, different religious denomination, and their influence on the opinion of homosexuality, Feminism, and equality in relation to LGBTQI-rights and the three political ideologies; Conservatism, Liberalism and Social democracy. The aim for this chapter was to offer a prior understanding about the research done by other scientists on the subject and their conclusions. At the end of every episode, as this was a deductive study, the hypothesis for this thesis will be shown and explained. The hypotheses were made mostly by the prior research presented but it was also an interpretation of what I could expect from my result. In the discussion, all hypotheses were once again offered and discussed in relation to what the result presented.

2.1 Same-sex marriage and the context of the EU.
Fenwick (2016) discusses the case of same-sex marriage in the European Court and whether they provided or prevented an opportunity for same-sex couples. Article 12 in the European Convention of Human rights grants the right for men and women to marry, but Fenwick states that:

“they could have been interpreted as meaning that men could marry men or women, as could women, under an evolutive interpretation of Article 12, despite the fact that so doing would appear to depart from the original intention of the founders of the ECHR and would not be the most apt interpretation of the words”
(2016:9).

With this quotation in mind, as the European Convention of the Human Rights came into force in 1953 (ECHR.2018), the context suggests that the founders intentionally excluded same-sex couples under this right. This was because the rights for LGBQTI people were even more limited with no general non-discrimination clause and argumentations about justifying criminalisation of homosexuality (Hamilton. 2017:2 15; Fichera. 2016:389). Fenwick specifically discusses a case named “Oliari and others v Italy” (2016:11) where three same-sex couples were not granted the right to registered partnership as this was not legislated in Italy. The Court decided that as there was no European consensus in this matter that Article 12 did not grant an obligation for member states to consider this for same-sex couples, even though Article 12 in the EU charter could be read with Article 14 about non-discrimination (op.cit:12).
Fenwick concludes that in some cases the Court has shown some progressive steps, but that there are still obstacles in the socially Conservative states in Europe. However, the right to a registered partnership is granted in this case under Article 8, which states that “everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence” (ECHR. 2018). Hamilton (2017) writes a critical analysis about the case of same-sex marriage before the European Court of Human Rights. He argues that even though the privacy argument is very successful for different cases to grant rights for homosexuals this argument has reached its limitation as marriage is one for the public stage (2017:5).

It is not only the convention of the human rights that is related to the right to marriage but also article 9 in the EU charter. This article neither recognises nor prevents marriage between same-sex couples but as the EU charter is founded on the differences in the national regulation there could be a certain difference in treatment as the court recognises all types of marriage if they are not more restricted than the EU charter (Lebeck. 2013:145).

Hamilton claims that the European Court continues to promote a heterosexual more traditional view of marriage and gives a possible explanation for this, which is that marriage has an untouchable moral and religious right where the court can not interfere (2017:17). Hamilton continues to suggest that there might be a change consensus for Article 12 in the future if the equality concept is developed regarding Article 14 and the recognition of same-sex couples as a family concerning Article 8 (ibid).

On the other hand, Fichera’s research is a comparative analysis between the Europe and United States in the different courts; the Court of the Human Rights, the Court of Justice of the European Union and the United States Supreme Court (2016:386). They are compared in their different approaches and case development regarding the legislation of same-sex marriage (ibid). Fichera focuses a lot on the case of same-sex marriage legislation as an example of the influence of transnational law (ibid) as for the influence the changes in one sociocultural landscape have on another landscape (op.cit:385). Moreover, Fichera states that:

“European Parliament (EP) recommendations and EU-level networks of lobbying activists have prepared the ground for significant changes in some of the Member
States, for example. In addition, some politicians at the national and local level have explicitly supported the recognition of gay unions in one way or another. This support has been a feature of both left-wing and right-wing coalitions and electorates and has sometimes been presented as a compromise between traditional family values and individual rights” (op.cit:410).

This claim supports the idea of that a change needs to occur on every level within the European Union for a change in the sociocultural landscape and the attitude towards same-sex marriage. This also supports the research made by Hooghe and Meeusen (2013) about the correlation between attitudes towards homosexuality and the support for same-sex marriage. They conclude that the correlation is strong indicating that this is not a political elite phenomenon (2013:266).

As prior research about same-sex marriage cases in the European Court and ECHR concludes, the result of this thesis should show that same-sex marriage legislation vary among the member states as there is no legal consensus about how to apply the laws of the right to marry for same-sex couples. Thus, the first hypothesis is stated below and will be discussed and answered in the discussion.

- **Hypothesis 1**: The value of the dependent variable will vary among the member states as there is no legal consensus among the member states about the viewpoint regrading same-sex marriage.

2.2 Religion and the opinion about homosexuality

According to the research done by Akker, Ploeg and Scheepers about the disapproval of homosexuality and the influence of religion in 20 European Countries, the result shows that stronger religious beliefs increase disapproval of homosexuality (2013:75). Their research also expose that various religious denomination have significant differences in disapproval of homosexuality as Muslims disapprove of homosexuality the most (ibid), like Adamczyk and Pitt (2009:349). (…) “It is also shown that Jews and Catholics disapprove of homosexuality less than non-religious persons, whereas Protestants, Eastern orthodox, other non-Christians
and other Christians disapprove of homosexuality more than non-religious” (Akker, Ploeg, Scheepers.2013:75). This is also supported by the research done by Gerhards who suggests that “Orthodox Christians, Catholics and especially Muslims are much more likely to say that homosexuality is not justifiable than are Protestants” (2010:19). Among these 20 European countries the average scores on disapproval of homosexuality show that Ukraine, Slovakia, and Poland have the highest score in contrast to Denmark, Netherlands and France who show the lowest score (op.cit:72).

Moreover, according to Kuntz et. al, religion has a negative influence on the approval of homosexuality both on a country-level concerning religiosity and which religious denomination the respondent identified with (2015:133). On the country-level, regarding religiosity, it shows a negative correlation with approval of homosexuality and the religious denomination that has the most negative correlation was Orthodox followed by Catholic and Muslim (ibid). No religious denomination, Eastern religion and Protestant has, according to the results, a positive correlation with approval of homosexuality (ibid). In addition, religious importance and attendance of religious service have a negative correlation with approval of homosexuality (ibid). Worth noting is that both of those correlations are significantly stronger than religious denomination and country-level of religiosity (ibid).

Knight-Finley argues that “(...) the Catholic Church formally opposes both same-sex marriage and abortion, while most Lutheran denominations have loosened their oppositions to, or even moved to support same-sex marriage” (2017:46). Moreover, Gerhards (2010) states that “the reason for rejecting homosexuality in Islam is the same as in Christianity; namely, the purpose of sexuality is understood to be procreation” (2010:16). Both Catholic and East Orthodox Christian traditions state that homosexuality is unnatural, a sin and a disease (ibid). “The Protestant Church (...) judges homosexual relationships as it does every other interpersonal relationship, namely by whether the relationship is characterized by love for God and for others (ibid).

As noted in prior research used in this thesis, neither have a separate variable for Anglican Christian denomination. Goldingay et. al. (2011) take a critical approach to the same-sex marriage phenomenon in Europe and the West and they find their arguments in Anglican Conservative tradition. The arguments used in this paper are closely related to what Gerhards
(2010) writes about Catholic and Eastern Orthodox approach. An example was that Goldingay et al claim that there is a “(...) lack of clarity on the issue of same-sex attraction on the part of biological and social scientists” (2017:9), meaning that it is unnatural. They also argue that “the case for same-sex marriage does not have the same kind of biblical support and philosophical rationale that women's ordination and a moderate divorce policy have” (op.cit:10).

Throughout the arguments by Goldingay et al. it is clear that Anglican Christians have a negative and critical approach to same-sex marriage.

By using prior research and their conclusions, the hypotheses below provides an assumption of what to expect from the result. The two hypotheses are divided in a positive and negative influence of same-sex marriage legislation. The first one states that non-religious and Protestant Christians will affect same-sex marriage legislation in a positive way whereas the second one positions that Islam, Catholics, Anglicans, and Orthodox Christians will have a negative influence on the phenomenon. The hypotheses were answered in the discussion by using the result of this thesis. Exactly how to measure the hypotheses was provided in section 3.7.

- **Hypothesis 2: Member states with a high non-religious population and Protestant Christian denomination will have a positive influence on the legislation of same-sex marriage.**

- **Hypothesis 3: Islam will have the strongest negative effect on same-sex marriage legislation, followed by Catholics, Anglicans, and Orthodox Christians.**

### 2.3 Equality and homosexuality

Moving on to the second independent variable in this thesis, which is equality, this section focuses on feminist theories and prior research on equality in relation to homosexuality. “The first wave” of feminism was the establishment of feminism where Liberal women in the mid-19th century fought for equality between the sexes in the public life in forms of political and legal rights (Heywood. 2003:241). Thus, the fundamental idea of feminism is that all men are
equal disregarding their sexes. In the 1960s, the “second wave” of feminism emerged where social and radical feminists argued that equality between the sexes could not simply be solved with legal and political rights but that the patriarchal structures even existed within the personal (op.cit:242). This wave raised new issues such as domestic rights and sexual discrimination, where the focus was on women’s liberation (ibid). In the 1970s, radical feminism was adopted as they argued that gender differences in society was the deepest social cleavage (op.cit:258, 259) and they fought for issues within sexual politics such as the right to contraception and abortion (op.cit:262).

However, ever since the 1970s, new postmodern feminist traditions have emerged (ibid) such as Islamic feminism, who argue about the return to traditional and religious values as a way of liberation for Muslim women (2011:196). Moreover “the marginalization of lesbians within feminist thought might naturally have been thought to be a product if the same problematic methodology that marginalized black women – the exclusive focus on gender oppression” (Calhoun. 2000:3).

Calhoun discusses the interception between feminist and lesbian theories but also about the gap as feminists focus on the heterosexual issues for women and do not include homosexual issues, which have led to that lesbian feminists have formed a new branch of feminism focusing on lesbian social and political issues as they are a minority (op.cit:27). In addition, the lesbian feminists where never fully included within the gay rights movement in the 1980s either as this movement had patriarchal structures (ibid). Calhoun argues that not even in the 1990s did feminism manage to fully include lesbians as they focused on the binary sex/gender system which did not fit everyone (op.cit:50). Thus, as Heywood states: “Lesbian feminist may therefore regard the struggle against homophobia as every bit as important as the struggle against patriarchy” (2003:262).

However, Meeusen and Kern focus in their research on correlations between different prejudices and conclude that the strongest correlation between the prejudices was the sexism and anti-gay prejudice, which could be explained by that both are stressing gender roles and sexuality (2016:11). Thus, it can be argued that there is an intersection between the level of equality and homosexuality.
Kuhar and Zobec (2017) speak of the concept of “Gender theory” to explain the massive resistances and demonstrations against gender equality and sexual rights all over Europe the last four years. They argue that what all these different types of resistant have in common is the notion of “Gender theory” or “Gender ideology”. This is a new manifestation of resistance and not just a new form of conservatism against human rights and sexuality (2017:31). Even though there is no clear definition of what this concept really means Kuhar and Zobec state that it is “(...) constructed as a project of social engineering where men are no longer masculine, and women are no longer feminine, and one is free to choose one’s own gender and sexual orientation, even “several times a day” (op.cit:34).

This means that gender theory challenges the concept of the “nuclear family” and the idea that gender is a social construction in contrast to the biological term “sex” (op.cit:33), which is a feminist idea (Heywood. 2003:247-248). Because of this resistance for the gender theory, different groups such as religious, nationalistic, and Conservative actors have joined together (op.cit:36) against the common threat as, for example, same-sex marriage legislation, gender equality and reproductive rights (op.cit:31). In other words, against feminism and the LGBTQI-movement.

This episode provided prior research and theories regarding feminism and equality in relation to homosexuality. It showed that even though there are differences between feminism and the LGBTQI-movement, they intersect in several ways and accordingly, the hypothesis is that a high level of equality should have a positive effect on the legislation of same-sex marriage as stated in the hypothesis below. As noted earlier, the answer whether this hypothesis can be rejected or not will be discoursed in the discussion.

- **Hypothesis 4: There will be a positive relation between same-sex marriage legislation and a higher level of equality between the sexes in the state.**
2.4 The influence of Conservative, Liberal and Social democracy in relation to the opinion about homosexuality and same-sex marriage legislation

As stated by the third research question, another variable that was analysed in this thesis was the influence of political ideology on the same-sex marriage legislation. This section focused on three ideologies by using theories and prior research regarding their positions in attitudes towards homosexuality and same-sex marriage legislation. The three ideologies are; Conservatism, Liberalism and Social democracy and they are presented in that order.

Conservatism is an ideology rooting as a resistance against the French Revolution (Heywood. 2003:69). As they desired to conserve and oppose revolution they defend traditional values, practices, and change (op.cit:72). Tradition is seen as a wisdom of the past that has survived for several generations and should therefore not change (op.cit:73). What the Conservative supporters want to conserve depend on what cultural national context they origin from. It could be Christianity, Capitalism, Libertarianism, or Authoritarianism and thus there are several conflicts within conservatism (op.cit:89-101).

Conservatism nowadays has a tense relationship to Postmodernism (op.cit:103), where modernity and postmodernity threatens the very basis of tradition and the fact that globalization leads to a “de-traditionalization” with a diverse population (op.cit:104). Going back to the result of Kuntz et al, the result show that there is a strong negative correlation between “conservation”, which is an operationalisation of conservatism, and approval of homosexuality (2015:133). This is supported by the statement that:

“Individuals who prioritize obeying prevailing social norms and expectations (conformity values), preserving traditional practices and customs (tradition), and avoiding disruption of the status quo of social arrangements (security) should disapprove of homosexuality because it threatens the realization of these values”
(op.cit: 122)

In other words, same-sex marriage and approval of homosexuality challenges the very core of conservatism as tradition and religion are highly valued. This also support the claim by Kuhar
and Zobec (2017) where the protests around Europe were partly done by Conservative supporters. They are not traditional groups, but rather new organisations who share the same value as Conservatives about returning to traditional family values.

Prejudice and tradition are of importance in Meeusen and Kern’s research who state that “social norms and stereotypes are, however, strongly related to prejudice” (2016:5). As social norms are important for Conservative people, there can be a tendency that they are less open-minded and have more prejudices than others. The authors confirm that generalized prejudices exist, which means that if someone has a prejudice about a certain group in the society they are more likely to have a prejudice about another group (2016:11).

As for Liberalism, it has developed ever since the 19th century or even earlier with their radical ideas in the English, American and French revolution (op.cit:25). Heywood explains that the central term is the freedom for the individual where classical Liberals promote the absence of state control whereas modern Liberals advocate for the influence of the state to support the freedom of the people (op.cit:32). Liberals also believe in pluralism, which promote toleration and diversity in a sense that multiculturalism and democracy is a preference (op.cit:37-38). In the 21st century, the universalism of Liberalism is questioned by multiculturalists and feminists who have taken a new approach to “the politics of difference” (op.cit:66). However, as for feminism, the first wave of feminism, as I discussed before, was a form of Liberal feminism promoting political and legal equality between the sexes, thus influenced by Liberalism.

To go back once again to Kuntz et al and their result, it shows that “openness to change” had a positive correlation with approval of homosexuality (2015:133). This suggests that as Liberalism promote freedom, pluralism and as they have earlier supported revolutions they should support “openness to change”. Moreover, in several prior researches, the authors use the term “liberal” as another way to say that they are more positive to approval of homosexuality (Adamczyk. Pitt. 2009; Fichera. 2016; Akker et al. 2013). Akker et al suggest that “being acquainted with a homosexual and a Liberal political party preference appeared to be correlated with a positive attitude towards homosexuals” (2013:65).
Moving on to Social democracy, it emerged from Socialism and Marxism and evolved in the early 20th century (op.cit:139). This ideology endorses Liberal-democracy principles with political pluralism, relative equality, and a mixed economy (op.cit:145). Some other principles for Social democrats are social justice, social rights, and concern for underdog (op.cit:152). Heywood states that “socialists were attracted to the welfare state as the principal means of reforming or humanizing capitalism” (op.cit:144).

As Knight-Finley’s result shows, “Social democratic states are 9 times more likely to adopt policy than their counterparts to adopt SSRR [same-sex relationships recognition] policy” (2017:55). This is not surprising as Social democrats, as noted, are attracted to the welfare state and the concern for the underdog. The counterparts that she talks about is Liberal and Conservative states (ibid). Moreover, according to Knight-Finley’s figure about when the cases first adopted SSRR policies by welfare state regime type, Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway were first and they all are Social democratic regime types (op.cit:51).

The prior research about Conservative, Liberal and Social democratic influence, and values regarding attitudes towards homosexuality and same-sex legislation provided the hypotheses that same-sex marriage legislation is less likely with an influence of Conservative parties and more likely if it is a stronger influence of Liberal and Social democratic parties. As with the hypotheses on the theme of religion, these hypotheses were also divided into negative and positive influence. The hypotheses are stated below and are, as earlier hypotheses, rejected or confirmed in the discussion using the result.

- **Hypothesis 5:** Member states with a more influential Conservative politics will be less likely to have a legislation of same-sex marriage.

- **Hypothesis 6:** If the country has a strong influence of Liberal parties, it will be more likely to have legislated the right to same-sex marriage in the constitution. Social democratic influence will have the most positive influence of legislating same-sex marriage.
This chapter was divided into four themes all providing prior research and theories on firstly
the dependent variable same-sex marriage legislation and secondly, the three independent var-
iables religious denomination, equality, and political ideology. Each section ended with the
stating of the hypotheses created by using the prior research and not my own thoughts and
prejudices on the theme. Next chapter have discussed the use of method to be able to answer
these hypotheses and how they are operationalised to be able to measure them.
3. Method
This section discussed the method used to investigate the research questions and the hypotheses in this analysis. It argued for the use of method but also provided alternative methods for this thesis. It also clearly presented the method of selection and provided descriptive bar charts of the range of values of the independent variables in relation to the dependent variables. The chapter ended by discussing the validity and reliability.

3.1 Quantitative, comparative method
This thesis chooses a quantitative strategy because this strategy, compared to a qualitative, makes it easier to generalise the results and to clearer see correlations and relations between variables (Bryman. 2015:150). Another advantage with using a quantitative strategy is to have an objective approach to the results compared to qualitative strategy where it is more common to interpret the results and thus have a subjective approach.

Furthermore, as my research subjects were EU member states I can use all the 28 member-states due to the use of quantitative methods (Landman. 2008:52). Where “the main underlying assumption of statistical analysis is that events and facts in the world exhibit certain distributions, which can be described, compared and analysed” (op.cit:53). This quotation describes why I chose a comparable design for my thesis as I wanted to investigate similarities and differences among the member states of the EU in relation to the dependent variable, legislation of same-sex marriage (Anckar et al. 2013:287).

An advantage of using a comparative design is to get an increased understanding of why a phenomenon has happened in some countries and some not (ibid). The independent variables (Esaiasson et. al. 2007:54) analysed are religious denominations, Conservative, Liberal and Social democratic parties influence and equality. The chosen selection for this causal analysis vary in these variables and it is only half of the total number of member states, or cases (Landman. 2008:313) that have legislated same-sex marriage. The cases are analysed in what is called “variable-oriented” as the focus is the relationship between variables at a European level of analysis (op.cit:53).
Even though there are many advantages with comparing many countries, a disadvantage is that this method could not reveal complex historical, political, and sociological variables as much as a limited amount of cases and a qualitative analysis can (op.cit:64).

However, as I am aware of this issue I need to make sure that this is an analysis about the effect of the chosen variables on the dependent variable and nothing else. This comparative design has followed the “most similar system design” which grants that the cases are different in the dependent variable but similar in that they are all members of the EU (Anckar et al. 2013:291).

3.2 Alternative method

As the former section showed, there are both advantages and disadvantages by using a quantitative, comparative method. However, an alternative method for this thesis can be to make a qualitative case study (Bryman. 2015:73) on one of the member states in the European Union and thoroughly analyse the process in same-sex marriage legislation. The advantage by using this design would be to get a profounder understanding about the circumstances for the legislation. In addition to really get to the root cause for the phenomenon to occur. Possibly surveys or interviews (op. cit: 344) can be an alternative use of method if a case study is to be made where the focus can be on the debate of same-sex marriage legislation in a member states with both sides’ experiences and approaches towards the phenomenon.

Nevertheless, neither the research questions for this thesis nor the hypotheses can be as clearly answered by an alternative use of method as with a comparative quantitative design. Possibly one of the alternative methods provided in this section can be possible for further research.

3.3 Causal analysis

An important thing in a causal analysis is the relationship between at least two variables, in other words, that one variable has an effect of the other. Djurfeldt et al. write about two criteria that can help to determine whether a statistical correlation is a causal relationship and one of those criteria are time (2003:144). Firstly, the independent variable needs to have occurred
before the dependent. To clarify that the chosen variables for this analysis have fulfilled this criterium the analysis scheme is shown below.

Secondly, the other criterium concerns common sense prejudices about our reality (op.cit:145), but I choose to rely on prior research and their understanding of what the possible reasons for same-sex legislation can be. However, possible intermediate variables that can have a possible causal relation with the dependent variable are cultural differences and economy, as noted in prior research by Adamczyck and Pitt (2009), Knight-Finley (2017), Akker et. al. (2013), and Meeusen and Kern (2016). Nevertheless, these variables are not included in the analysis. The figure below presents the analysis scheme used in the analysis to get a clearer view of the independent variables included in the analysis and which categories each variable has. Moreover, the arrows represent the independent variables influence on the dependent.

### 3.3.1 Analysis scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious denomination in percentage of the population</th>
<th>If/when same-sex marriage was legislated.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Protestant, Eastern orthodox, Catholic, Anglican, Muslim and Non-religious)</td>
<td>If: (Yes/No) When: (2001-2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of equality and social cohesion (1-10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology influence</td>
<td>(share of votes: Conservative, Liberal and Social democratic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4. Cox Regression

To be able to investigate if the analysis scheme above is correct I have chosen a survival analysis called Cox Regression. This design is developed to estimate the time it takes until a certain event occurs, in my case, when the member state has legislated same-sex marriage. In this model it is also possible to include several variables that can influence the result. This analysis has been used earlier in medical research to investigate, for example, time of survival from diagnosis to death, but also in banking, economy, and social examples (Chan. 2004:249).

In my case, the time variable is, as will be discussed further in 3.6 the chosen period for this thesis. As the Netherlands was the first member state to legislate same-sex marriage in 2001 the period starts in 2001 and ends with the year this thesis was written, 2018. Thus, the member states that have not legislated same-sex marriage are all placed at 2018 as the event has not occurred for them, which will be further commented in the graph 4.5.

The equation for Cox Regression is the following:

\[ h(t) = [h_0(t)] e^{(b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + \ldots b_kX_k)} \]

Where \( h(t) \) = hazard function of time and the time range between the years 2001-2018, which as was noted in section 1.1 was the time for this thesis. More about the details for this can be found in section 3.6.

\( H_0(t) \) = hazard for an individual when the value of all independent variables = 0. This indicate the time it would take for the case to legislate same-sex marriage without the inclusion of the independent variables.

\( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \) = the predictors, covariates, or independent variables. In this case, religious denominations, equality, and Conservative, Liberal and Social democratic party influence.
B₁ and b₂ = the coefficients or ratio for the value of X₁ and X₂, or the Hazard ratios. These are the unstandardized coefficients (Bjerling, Ohlsson. 2010:8). In other words, if the variable has a positive or negative effect on the event, the dependent variable, occurring. If the value for B is above zero, it means that this variable has a positive effect on the event and on the contrary if the value is below zero, it has a negative effect.

Exp(b) = This is the anti-logarithmised odds ratio (ibid). In other words, if the value for this is larger than 1, it indicates that the event, which is the legislation of same-sex marriage in this case, is more likely to occur. If the value for the Exp(b) is smaller than 1 it means that the independent variable decreases the risk of the event occurring. Moreover, if the value for this is 1, it suggests that the independent variable has no effect on the event occurring or not.

In table 4.2, which shows the omnibus tests of model covariates, the -2 log likelihood will be commented. The value for the -2 log likelihood shows if the adding of the independent variables in the analysis has any effect on the dependent. Or if the event is more likely to occur with or without the included independent variables.

The result firstly contained a table of case processing summary, this table shows the cases included in the analysis and the amount of event occurring and censoring. The meaning of censoring cases is the member states of the EU that have not legislated same-sex marriage. In other words, when the event did not occur. The second table showed the Omnibus tests where -2 log likelihood, the chi-square value and the statistical significance was commented. The third table covered the variables in the equation and the B value of X about the effect they might have had on the dependent variable and the expected B value about the proportion of the effect.

The statistical significance was only briefly commented as it was only of importance when the selected cases are random, as will be further discussed in section 3.8. As this thesis included all 28 member states of the EU, it was a strategic selection including all relevant cases and not a random. Thus, an assumption of the result was that it was statistically significant. The third table offered the mean of covariates and a comment about this. The graphs presented the
hazard rate of the survival of the event not occurring, or in other words, answered the third research question about if the trend for same-sex marriage will likely continue. What the result told us will be empirically commented below and in the section of discussion, my interpretation of the result will be accentuated. Next section has presented a table showing the present state for LGBTQI-rights and when they were legislated in terms of marriage equality and registered partnerships.

3.5 Table of the EU member states and the status of rights for same-sex couples

This table shows all the European member states and whether they have legislated marriage equality, or in other words same-sex marriage. The states that have both marriage equality and registered partnerships are shown in pink. The states that only have registered partnerships are green, the states with marriage equality and registered partnerships, but one is limited are blue. In addition, the states that do not have marriage equality but limited rights for registered partnerships are orange and the states with neither of the rights are yellow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of member state</th>
<th>Marriage equality</th>
<th>Year they legislated marriage equality</th>
<th>Registered partnership</th>
<th>Year they legislated registered partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Yes, but limited rights</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes, but limited rights</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>No, not since 2012</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Yes, but limited rights</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Poland | No | - | No | - | Portugal | Yes | 2010 | No | - | Romania | No | - | No | - | Slovakia | No | - | No | - | Slovenia | No | - | Yes | 2017 | Spain | Yes | 2005 | Yes, except in four regions. | - | Sweden | Yes | 2009 | No, not since 2009 | 1994 (Riksdagen.1994). | United Kingdom | Yes, but not in Northern Ireland | 2014 | Yes | - | -


3.6 Method of selection

As for the method of selection, this thesis has chosen two datasets. The first one is from the Quality of Government (QoG) institute in Gothenburg, Sweden, from 2018 (Teorell et. al. 2018). The institute is an independent research institute within the Department of Political Science at the University of Gothenburg. “The main objective of the research is to address the theoretical and empirical problems of how political institutions of high quality can be created and maintained” (op.cit: 4). This dataset has compiled data from several data sources where the aim is to be able to make comparable research on the topic of Quality of Government (ibid).

Moreover, the other dataset, for the measurement of different religious denomination, is, just as Knight-Finley (2017), data from the World Religion Dataset 1945-2010 (Maoz. Henderson. 2013). This dataset is a “collection of data on the distribution of the population of all states in the international system across these religious categories, over the period of 1945–2010” (op.cit:265).

Even though the chosen datasets have respondents from all over the world this thesis chose to narrow the selection down to only member states of the EU. Why I only chose data from members of the EU was due to that these countries had transnational laws to approach to as described in section 2.1. This made these member states especially interesting as only 14 out of 28 of them had legislated same-sex marriage, which could be explained by the fact that the

Moreover, this made the method for selection a systematic one instead of a random sample (Djurfeldt. 2003:117), meaning that I have included all the relevant cases in the analysis instead of a sample. This will be discussed further in section 3.8 as this made that statistical significance irrelevant because that is a method for a random sample of selection (Bryman. 2012: 349).

It was particularly interesting to investigate the reasons for why some member states have legislated same-sex marriage in a transnational landscape that specifically states that a consensus about this legislation need to be accepted before EU will change its laws about this. Worth noting was that in the beginning I wanted to use data from European Social Survey as many of the prior researches had done that, but that dataset focused more on the opinion and did not include all member states, whereas QoG data and World Religion Dataset did not measure attitudes but rather had data stating the context of the member states. To exclude all the countries that were not member states I firstly created a dummy variable where 1 = not a member of the EU and 2 = a member of the EU. After that, I made a filter variable (2003:428) where the country had to respond with a 2 or elsewise was excluded from the analysis. Next section created a deeper understanding of how I operationalised the hypotheses used in the analysis.

3.7. Operationalisation of the theory

The aim for the operationalisation of the theory was to provide one way to make the hypotheses measurable for the analysis. In other words, the operationalisation was the step between an intangible theory and a tangible measurable data.

To make this clearer I chose to firstly present the hypotheses and secondly provide an explanation of how they have been operationalised for them to be quantifiable for the analysis. Each explanation has also included how the variables were coded and what data that had been used. In addition, a descriptive statistics bar chart was included to be able to present the
distribution of how the value of the variable range among the chosen cases, in other words the member states of the EU.

- **Hypothesis 1: The values of the independent variables will vary among the member states as there is no legal consensus among the member states about the viewpoint regarding same-sex marriage.**

The first hypothesis is operationalised consistently in the result as same-sex marriage legislation is the dependent variable, but the variance of same-sex marriage legislation is shown in the graph below. The dependent variable has two different indicators measuring “if” a legislation was present and “when” the legislation was made.

The first indicator is made as a dummy variable called: 

\textit{legsamesex} = “Legislation of same-sex marriage has occurred”

This indicator was measured in:

\begin{align*}
0 &= \text{No legislation} \\
1 &= \text{Legislation}
\end{align*}

The information and the distribution to be able to make this variable was shown in table 3.5.

The other variable for operationalising same-sex marriage legislation is made a time variable called:

\textit{yearlegsamesex} = Year the country legislated same-sex marriage

This time variable ranges from 2001-2018 where the number 2001-2017 were years when the case legislated same-sex marriage, in other words, when the event occurred (shown in blue in the bar chart), and 2018 indicates the cases where the phenomenon of same-sex marriage legislation has not occurred (shown in purple in the bar chart).
3.7.1 Descriptive statistics of the year the country legislated same-sex marriage


- **Hypothesis 2**: Member states with a high non-religious population and Protestant Christian denomination will have a positive influence on the legislation of same-sex marriage.

- **Hypothesis 3**: Islam will have the strongest negative correlation with same-sex marriage legislation, followed by Catholics Anglicans and Orthodox Christians.

As for these hypotheses, the religious denominations are of importance. These hypotheses are operationalised by using the following variables:

\[ \text{chrprtpct} = \text{percentage of Protestants} \]

\[ \text{chcatpct} = \text{percentage of Catholics} \]
\textit{chortpct} = percentage of Christian Eastern Orthodox

\textit{changpct} = percentage of Christian Anglicans

\textit{isgenpct} = percentage of Muslims

\textit{norelpct} = percentage of non-religious

These variables measure the percentage of Protestants, Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, Anglican, Muslim and Non-religious as for the population of each case in 2010 (Maoz. Henderson. 2013). The percentage range between 0-100\% where the bar chart below shows the distribution of the religious denominations and their percentage with an explanation of the colours below.

3.7.2 Descriptive statistics of the percentage of the population belonging to a specific religious denomination among the member states of the EU.

![Bar chart showing percentage of religious denominations in EU member states.]

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Name of member state of the EU & Percentage of population belonging to a specific religious denomination & \hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Explaination:} & \\
\hline
Blue = Protestants percentage, & \\
Green = Catholics percentage & \\
Bright purple = Christianity: Eastern Orthodox, percentage & \\
Dark pink = Christianity: Anglican, percentage & \\
Yellow = Muslim, percentage, & \\
Red = Non-religious percentage & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

• Hypothesis 4: There will be a positive relation between same-sex marriage legislation and a higher level of equality and feminism

To be able to measure if there is a positive relation between legislating same-sex marriage and the influence of equality and feminism I sought to use a similar measurement as with Conservative, Liberal, and Social democratic influence, but the values were very low or non-existent with this measurement. An explanation for this could be that feminist ideas are not divided by party politics to the same extent but emerge in several parties. Thus, the following variable was used instead:

\[ bs_{scnd} = \text{Level of social cohesion and equality}. \]

“This dimension enables the examination of the extent to which trends towards social polarization, exclusion and the discrimination of specific groups are successfully countered” (Teorell et. al:104). This variable measures the core principles for feminism and equality as equal opportunity, non-discrimination and non-polarization are the focus. The rating scale range between 1-10 where a higher number indicate a higher level of social cohesion and equality. The distribution is shown in the graph below.

3.7.3 Descriptive statistics of the level of social cohesion and equality among the member

• **Hypothesis 5:** Member states with a more influential Conservative politics will be less likely to have a legislation of same-sex marriage.

• **Hypothesis 6:** If the country has a strong influence of Liberal parties, it will be more likely to have legislated the right to same-sex marriage in the constitution and a strong influence of Social democratic parties will be most likely.

These hypotheses are operationalised by the variables:

\[ cpds\_vcon = \text{share of votes: Conservative} \]
\[ cpds\_vl = \text{share of votes: Liberal} \]
\[ cpds\_vs = \text{share of votes: Social democratic} \]

These variables measure “share of votes in parliament” (op.cit:145) for the chosen parties. The advantage with the use of this measurement is that the share of votes in parliaments tells us how much influence the parties have within the parliament in relation to each other and it includes parties that can be defined as Conservative, Liberal and Social democratic. Thus, the measurement was relevant as the influence of that ideology presented in the parties is considered whereas national context is not. A limitation is that the measurement does not contemplate about possible coalitions between parties. The distribution among the member states regarding the share of votes for Conservative, Liberal and Social democratic parties are shown on the following page with an explanation below the chart about the different colours.
3.7.4 Descriptive statistics of share of votes for Conservative, Liberal and Social democratic parties among the cases.

![Bar chart showing share of votes for Conservative, Liberal, and Social democratic parties across EU states.]

**Explanation:**
- **Blue** = Share of votes: Conservative
- **Green** = Share of votes: Liberal
- **Red** = Share of votes: Social democratic

3.8 Validity and reliability

The validity for this thesis is controlled by an analysis scheme where it is clear to see the relations between my hypotheses and the actual questions and variables used in the method. Moreover, an overall clarification where every chapter is argued for is included (Djurfeldt, 2003:108). In addition, the section regarding operationalisation makes it easier to understand this path and the gap between theory and the real-world decreases (Esaiasson et al. 2007:64). In the former chapter about operationalisation I tried to be very detailed about exactly how I have operationalised the different variables and to show that I am aware of its limitations.

Moreover, as for the validity I have been very transparent about exactly what I have been doing, which as for example the paragraph about operationalisation of the theory is an example of, where I explain the datasets used, the variables and how I recoded or made them, as measurement validity requires (Bryman 2015:50). The internal validity controls whether the causality is credible or not (op.cit:52) and this is controlled by that the variables are highly anchored in prior research and that the method of selection and operationalisation is detailed.

Moving on to the reliability, as was noted in the section 3.6, the method for selection is systematic and not random. Thus, all relevant cases for this analysis are included, which means that it can be assumed that the result is statistically significant.

Moreover, as the measurements for social cohesion and equality and share of votes are from Quality of Government dataset 2018, which is an updated version of the data and such, the problem with that measurements and definitions change from year to year is controlled (op.cit:307). Nevertheless, measurements for the percentage of religious denomination is from World Religion Dataset 2010, but as the percentage of people belonging to a specific religious denomination do not change frequently but is rather constant I would argue that this is controlled.

I have also made sure in the operationalisation paragraphs that I am transparent what my measurements have measured and how I have recoded the relevant variables. In addition, I am aware of the limitations coming with interjudgement predictability (op.cit:160) as my subjective view of the results may differ from another person. Therefore, I have chosen to simply
comment the result in an empirical view in the result, meaning that I commented what is there and waited to subjectively interpret the result to the discussion. The discussion was divided into the different hypothesis to make it clearer what the result showed. This makes the result more reliable as I could not manipulate what was there. The internal reliability where measurements with multiple indicators is problematic. I have controlled this by using one direct measurement for every independent variable.

However, with the dependent variable, I used multiple indicators (op.cit:159) including both a time variable that showed which year same-sex marriage was legislated, beyond one dummy variable that demonstrated whether same-sex marriage legislation was present or not. The time variable was relevant for the Cox Regression and so was the event variable resulting in that the dependent variable gets both a “if” and “when” indicator, making it more reliable in that sense.
4. Result
In this section, the results from Cox Regression was shown. Below every table and graph, there was empirical comments to what the result showed, and the discussion and interpretation was deliberated instead in the next chapter. The first table showed the cases available in the analysis and the amount of cases where the event has happened. The next table presented the Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients, analysing if the likelihood of the event occurring changed when the independent variables were included in the analysis. In this table, the statistical significance and chi-square value was also commented.

The following table presented the independent variables available in the analysis and the value of B and Exp(B), relating back to the equation in section 3.4, was commented showing the distribution of the effect the independent variables had on the dependent. The third table offered the mean value of the independent variables, which indicated the range among the member states. The graph presented lastly was strongly related to the third research questions about whether the trend for same-sex marriage will most likely continue.
4.1 Table of Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of the dependent variable – Same-sex marriage has occurred</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases available in analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censored</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases dropped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases with missing values</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases with negative time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censored Cases before the earliest event in the stratum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Comment: The event variable in this table is the “legislation of same-sex marriage has occurred” and is, as noted in section 3.7, a dummy variable coded: 1 = legislation has occurred and 0 = no same-sex marriage legislation. The censored cases represent the member states that did not have a same-sex marriage legislation in the period, 2001-2018. This table shows that there are 28 cases available in the analysis and that the event has occurred for 14 of these 28. This could also be verified in table 3.5.

4.2 Tables showing Omnibus tests of model coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before covariates entered</th>
<th>Overall (score)</th>
<th>Change from Previous Step</th>
<th>Change from Previous Block</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood</td>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood</td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86,082</td>
<td>44,680</td>
<td>20,620</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Comment: According to the Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients, compared to the likelihood of a chance, 86,082, the likelihood of the model with the variables considered is 44,680, which means that the -2 Log likelihood has had a decrease in 41,402. This means that the new model with the variables included, compared to the baseline explains more of the variance in the outcome. Thus, the independent variables added to the analysis have an effect of the
occurrence of same-sex marriage among the member states of the EU. As for the significance, this analysis is significant at 0.024 level. This means that if the method of selection was random instead of systematic, as noted in section 3.8, the result would still be significant at a 97.6% level and the null hypothesis, that there is no causal relation, can still be rejected (Djurfeldt. 2003:216).

As for the chi-square test, the value is 20.620 and the degrees of freedom are 10. According to the critical value table, this means that the risk that the null hypothesis is falsely rejected is less than 1% (op.cit:494). In other words, that it is more likely that there exists a causal relationship between the independent variables and the dependent. Next table shows the independent variables and the values for this in the Cox Regression equation, which was earlier presented in section 3.4.
4.3 Table of variables in the equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% CI for Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social cohesion and equality</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>3,466</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,063</td>
<td>4,878</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of votes: Conservative</td>
<td>0,112</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>5,326</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,021</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>1,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of votes: Liberal</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>0,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,982</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>0,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of votes: Social democratic</td>
<td>0,067</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,281</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>0,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants %</td>
<td>-0,553</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>5,846</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,016</td>
<td>0,575</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics %</td>
<td>-0,537</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>5,795</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,016</td>
<td>0,584</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity: Eastern Orthodox %</td>
<td>-3,152</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>7,315</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,007</td>
<td>0,043</td>
<td>0,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity: Anglican %</td>
<td>-0,895</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>5,771</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,016</td>
<td>0,409</td>
<td>0,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim %</td>
<td>-0,611</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,171</td>
<td>0,543</td>
<td>0,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious %</td>
<td>-0,609</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>6,210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,013</td>
<td>0,544</td>
<td>0,337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data: See data from table 4.2.

Comment: As the figure above shows, the following variables are significant: social cohesion and equality, share of votes: Conservative, Protestants percentage, Catholics percentage, Anglican percentage, and non-religious percentage as the significance value of all these variables are less than 0.05. The variables with an expressly higher significance value than 0.05 are however not excluded from the following analysis as, noted in section 3.8, the method for selection is systematic.

Moving on to the different values for B, which is the coefficient for the value of X, this shows the hazard ratio and if the independent variable has a positive or negative effect on the dependent. The variable Social cohesion and equality has the highest positive value of b, thus have the highest positive effect of the dependent variable. Share of votes: Conservative also has a positive value but a lower one, meaning that it has a positive effect of the dependent but not as strong. The variables share of votes: Liberal and Social democratic have a very low positive value for B, which suggest that their effect is almost insignificant.
All the religious denominations are showing a negative value of B where Eastern Orthodox has the most negative value, followed by Anglican, Muslim, non-religious, Protestants and the least negative significant value has Catholics. This means that religious denominations have a negative effect on the occurrence of same-sex marriage legislation.

The Exp (B) value shows that Social cohesion is more than 4 times more likely to introduce same-sex marriage legislation compared to if the case has a high number of share of votes: Conservative. Nevertheless, share of votes: Conservative still affects the event of same-sex marriage legislation to occur slightly more than Social democratic and Liberals. The Exp(B) for Liberals is almost non-existent as it is only 0.001 over 1. Meaning that share of votes: Liberal do not affect the legislation of same-sex marriage.

As presented in section 3.4, an Exp (B) value lower than 1 means that the variable has the more negative effect on the event occurring. For the religious denominations, Eastern Orthodox has the strongest effect on the event not occurring, followed by Anglicans, Muslim, Non-religious, Protestants and lastly Catholics. Consequently, Eastern Orthodox has by far the most negative effect on same-sex marriage legislation not occurring.
4.4 Table of covariate means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariate/Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Cohesion and Equality</td>
<td>5,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of votes: Conservative</td>
<td>16,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of votes: Liberal</td>
<td>16,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of votes: Social Democratic</td>
<td>24,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants %</td>
<td>13,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics %</td>
<td>44,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity: Eastern Orthodox %</td>
<td>14,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity: Anglican %</td>
<td>1,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim %</td>
<td>3,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious %</td>
<td>18,005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Comment: This table shows the mean of every independent variable among the cases. The mean is the sum of all the value of the observations divided by number of observations (Djurfeldt. 2003:59). As we know, the range of possible values for every variable this table shows the distribution among the cases and thus among the member states of the EU. Starting with the Social cohesion and equality variable, the range is between 0-10 and as the mean is 5,888, this means that overall, among the EU member states, the level for social cohesion and equality is moderate. Comparing the means for the share of votes for Conservative, Liberal, and Social democratic the table shows that overall, Social democratic parties have more votes for parliament than the other two and thus it is possible to say that they have a higher influence on the politics of the EU.

Moving on to the different religious denomination. The mean for Catholics percentage is three times higher than of any other religious denomination, which means that a higher percentage of Catholics in relation to other religious denominations is more common among the member states. In addition, the mean of Anglican and Muslim denomination percentages are very low, which indicate that it is not that common for a European citizen to identify as a Muslim or an Anglican. The mean for non-religious percentage is notably higher than all religious denominations, except for Catholics, indicating that 18% of the European population is on average, non-religious.
4.5 Graph of hazard function at mean of covariates


Comment: This graph shows the probability of hazard using the mean of covariates. It shows that the values of cum hazard increases by time, first slower and then in 2015, a noteworthy increase. Worth noting is that it was another increase after 2017, however this is because the cases that have not legislated same-sex marriage are all placed at the year 2018, as was noted in chapter 3.7 indicating that the event has not occurred for them in 2018. Consequently, the hazard rate is only significant until 2017. However, the graph shows that the rate of legislation of same-sex marriage among the member states are increasing and especially since 2015. This followed the table 3.5. as three countries legislated same-sex marriage in 2015 and an additional three in 2017. Overall, this graph shows that the probability of the hazard rate, in other words that the member states will legislate same-sex marriage, increases by time.
5. Discussion

This chapter was divided into the different hypotheses for this thesis and my own interpretation and assumptions concerning the result was the focus in relation to prior research. A statement whether to reject or confirm each hypothesis was also a part of the discussion. This chapter ended with a general discussion about future predictions and the overall result.

5.1. Hypothesis 1

- *The value of the independent variables will vary among the member states as there is no legal consensus among the member states about the viewpoint regarding same-sex marriage.*

This hypothesis cannot be falsified as the result showed that the existence of same-sex marriage varied among the member states as table 4.1 and 3.5 clarified. The table showed that the event had occurred among 14 out of 28 member states. This supports the claim that the European Court of Justice and the European Human Rights Courts arguments and charters were contradictory, and that the guidelines are interpreted differently across Europe.

As the 4.5. Graph of hazard function presented, the probability for a member state to legislate same-sex marriage is increasing and especially since 2015. My idea is that as the legal cases regarding this possibly can continue to rule in the same-sex couples favour, in both courts in the European Union the court will eventually have to agree on a consensus. However, specifically Charter 8 the laws of the EU needs to, as stated by Hamilton (2017), recognise same-sex couples as a family within the right to marriage in EHCR Article 12 before a consensus can be reached.

However, the result in this thesis was relatively hopeful as the possibility of same-sex marriage legislation have increased expressively since 2001, which graph 4.5 presented. In addition, prior research by Hamilton (2017) and Fenwick (2016) also supported the result as they argue that both politicians on a national and local level supports the legislation of same-sex marriage disregarding their position on the left/right-scale. Furthermore, the research done by
Hooghe and Meeusen (2013) showed that the attitudes among the citizens were changing to a more acceptant and this could also be confirmed by the result.

5.2 Hypothesis 2:

- Member states with a high non-religious population and Protestant Christian de-
  nomination will have a positive influence on the legislation of same-sex marriage.

The results in this thesis give support for a rejection of the second hypothesis as table 4.3. showed that both the non-religious percentage and Protestant percentage had a negative causal relation with same-sex marriage legislation. In addition, the results showed that identifying as non-religious had a more negative effect on same-sex legislation than being a Protestant. Nevertheless, this can be explained by the dataset used as it presented that most cases had a high religious population. Regarding the expected (B)-value, it was a bit higher for Protestants meaning that the effect is highly more likely if the member state has a high percentage of Protestants compared to non-religious.

The results for this thesis contradict the results by Kuntz et al. (2015) who find that it is a positive relation between protestants and approval of homosexuality. However, there is a difference between approving of homosexuality and recognising same-sex marriage, which can explain that maybe Protestants approve more of homosexuality but sees marriage exclusively as an institution for heterosexual couples.

Furthermore, the research by Akker et al (2013) and Adamczyk and Pitt (2009) confirm that Protestants have a negative effect on the approval of homosexuality even though it is lower than that of Catholics and Muslims. The result of this thesis shows that Protestants have a more negative effect than Catholics but a more positive effect than Muslims. Thus, their research can only partially be confirmed.

Moreover, as the result shows that non-religious people also have a negative effect on same-sex marriage legislation, this oppose the result by prior researchers. Once again this can be explained by the research by Hooghe and Meeusen (2013) who conclude that even though there
is a strong positive correlation between approval of homosexuality and same-sex marriage legislation, there is still a difference depending on the definition of marriage. Perhaps the result can also assume that religious denomination is not the only plausible factor for legislation of same-sex marriage.

5.3 Hypothesis 3:

- *Islam will have the strongest negative effect on same-sex marriage legislation, followed by Orthodox Christians, Anglicans, and Catholics.*

This hypothesis can partially be confirmed as the four religious denominations above have a negative effect on same-sex marriage legislation, but not in the order prior research stated. The result showed that Eastern Orthodox denomination have the most negative effect on same-sex legislation. Accordingly, Gerhards (2010) presents that Catholics and Eastern Orthodox have a history of disapproving of homosexuality and having the opinion that it is unnatural, which is supported in the result as both had a negative effect on same-sex marriage legislation. Thus, his theory is confirmed with the results from this analysis. Moreover, going back to Bar Chart 3.7.4, the four member states with a high Eastern Orthodox percentage, are Bulgaria, Cyprus, Greece, and Romania and those four states did not, according to table 3.5, have a legislation of same-sex marriage, which is most likely not a coincidence.

Correspondingly, Goldingay’s (2011) critical arguments from an Anglican Conservative point of view is also confirmed by the result, even though the mean percentage of Anglican denomination is notably lower than other Christian denominations. Interestingly, all religious denominations available in this analysis have a negative causal effect on same-sex marriage legislation.

However, the graph 4.5 of Hazard rate showed that same-sex marriage has been legislated more frequently in countries ever since 2001, and especially after 2015. On the contrary, the religious denominations continue to be strong and they might be a high obstacle for the legislation. Hence, even though the legislation is increasing among the member states, it might be a slow process due to the influence of religion.
5.4 Hypothesis 4:

- There will be a positive relation between same-sex marriage legislation and a higher level of equality and feminism in the state.

This hypothesis was operationalised by the variable “social cohesion and equality” and can be confirmed by the result. Heywood (2011) and Kuhar and Zobec (2017) both agree that feminism has had an important role in promoting equality in the society. Kuhar and Zobec (2017) even note that Conservative and religious groups have ‘joined forces’ in demonstrating against same-sex marriage and equality. Calhoun (2000) is a bit more critical in her analysis but she states, as did Heywood (2011) that there is a branch within feminism called lesbian feminism that uses the ideologies of feminism to advocate for their rights as lesbians.

The result showed that social cohesion and equality have a positive causal effect on same-sex marriage legislation and that it has the highest effect on legislating same-sex marriage among the variables analysed. This supports the hypothesis and confirmed the prior research about equality. Moreover, as feminism is closely related to the advocation of equality for all people, the operationalisation of the variable was relevant. Nevertheless, as noted in Bar chart 3.7.3, the level of Social Cohesion and Equality is high even among member states that have not legislated same-sex marriage, such as Luxembourg.

The result did not surprise me as the variable used in the analysis measures to what extent social polarization and discrimination of specific groups are successfully opposed in the society. That conformed with the arguments for same-sex marriage legislation about the importance of equivalence between heterosexual and homosexual couples. Those who support the legislation recognize homosexual couples as no different from heterosexual couples. Compared to those who oppose the legislation as Eastern Orthodox and Anglicans who find that homosexual couples are unnatural and resentful, as stated earlier in this thesis.
5.5 Hypothesis 5:

- Member states with a more influential Conservative politics will be less likely to have a legislation of same-sex marriage.

This hypothesis is rejected, as the result showed that this variable has a positive effect on the dependent variable. In comparison to social cohesion and equality, it is a rather weak effect, but it is still existent. Table 4.4 about the covariates mean showed that Conservative parties at average have 16% of the votes in parliament in the EU, which can lead to an influence in the parliament that can possibly be beneficial for same-sex marriage legislation.

The result of this thesis opposes what prior research such as Heywood (2003), Kuhar and Zobeć (2017), Knight-Finely (2017), Kuntz et al. (2015), Meeusen and Kern (2016) state about conservatism, and that prejudices and opposition to change have a negative effect on the opinion towards homosexuals. On the other hand, the research by Fichera (2016) argues that both left-wing and right-wing politicians advocate for same-sex marriage legislation so perhaps the political landscape regarding this debate is changing.

Moreover, Heywood (2003) claims in his chapter that for conservatism, the importance is evolution instead of revolution and perhaps LGBTQI-rights have been on the agenda for the time it takes for Conservative supporters to gradually change their opinion. In addition, an interpretation of the result is that the Conservative has just recently shifted their opinion in a more positive direction as it is still a weak positive effect. Maybe the future will lead to a stronger positive position for Conservatives, even though the result also presented that any religious denomination have a negative effect on the phenomenon.
5.6 Hypothesis 6:

- If the country has a strong influence of Liberal parties, it will be more likely to have legislated the right to same-sex marriage in the constitution. Social democratic influence will have the most positive influence of legislating same-sex marriage.

According to the results, this hypothesis is rejected. The effect of the variable share of votes: Liberal is positive but very weak and almost non-existent. The other variable share of votes: Social democratic, is according to the result also positive and weak, but a bit stronger than the former variable. Thus, this hypothesis can most likely be rejected.

There can be various explanations for why both variables are positive but weak. It can for example be that the measurement about “share of votes” is not accurate for measuring the influence of parties in the parliament, due to that the electoral system differs in the EU. Knight-Finley’s (2017) research measures, for example, regime types in terms of Conservative, Liberal and Social democratic, that can be more accurate. It can also be a definition problem, as the parties and their ideologies vary across Europe and it is just as important which parties are collaborating as how they identify themselves. Another possibility is that within the EU, it does not matter which party gets the most share of votes as the result also showed that share of votes: Conservative has a positive effect of same-sex marriage legislation. Perhaps, an assumption can be that this is not a politically polarised question but rather a polarised question in other terms. Moreover, maybe the political parties influence when the legislation occurs rather than if.

5.7 General discussion

It can be argued that the foundation in the opinion about same-sex marriage legislation is the answer to the following question, ‘do you believe that homosexual people are just like us and worthy of equal treatment?’ If you will answer yes to this question, you are most likely an advocate for same-sex marriage and it will seem odd for you that half of the member states of the EU member states will answer no to the question. Furthermore, the other fundamental question to answer is, what is marriage?
A Conservative religious person would argue, as article 12 in the EU charter, that marriage is an institution for heterosexual couples, exclusively. A Christian Anglican, Catholic, Eastern-Orthodox and Protestant would argue that homosexuality is, according to the holy book, unnatural and that marriage is understood in terms of procreation and thus not for same-sex couples. Marriage is seen as a holy institution and to redefine such a sacred thing would be quite difficult.

Therefore, as noted in table 3.5, some member states of the EU have offered a different option for same-sex couples, called registered partnership. This option have the legal status of marriage and is seen as an alternative for same-sex couples. However, by doing this, the society does not recognise homosexual couples as equal to heterosexual couples, and this can be interpreted as discriminating on the grounds of sexual orientation.

The idea of equal treatment disregarding sexual orientation is a rather new phenomenon, and the development of LGBTQI-rights is proof of that our society is constantly changing. Interestingly, 70 years ago, when the European Convention of Human Rights were written, the founders excluded homosexual couples from the idea of a family compared to today in 2018 where 50% of the member states of the EU have legislated marriage equality. This suggests that a lot can change in 70 years and no one knows what the future will hold. Perhaps there will be a new phenomenon that is unthinkable today, but concerning same-sex marriage, the hazard rate for non-existence of same-sex marriage legislation is increasing ever since 2001.

As the trend is increasing, as graph 4.5 showed, the future, if the trend continues, can possibly lead to a consensus among the member states. This will lead to a redefinition of the family concept and a gender neutral marriage legislation even within the parliament of the EU. When or if all member states of the EU will legislate same-sex marriage can not be fully answered in this thesis. However, my interpretation of graph 4.5, and this is only my personal hypothesis, suggests that if the trend continues as it has, there will possibly be a same-sex marriage legislation among all member states by 2030, possibly earlier.
6. Conclusion

The aim for this thesis was to investigate three possible reasons for same-sex marriage legislation among the member states of the EU, namely, political influence, religious denomination, and level of equality. The method was a quantitative, comparative analysis using the dataset from Quality of Government and World Religion Dataset and an analysis by using Cox Regression. This was used to measure to what extent a causal relation between the independent variable and the dependent variable predicted the survival of no same-sex legislation. The conclusion will be divided in four sections. The first three sections will answer the research questions from 1.2 and finally, a general conclusion will be drawn. Moving on to answer the research questions, the first one was the following:

6.1 Research question 1

- **What are the possible reasons for that some EU member states have legislated same sex-marriage, and some have not?**

Prior research on the subject have presented a variation of possible reasons for why some EU member states have legislated same-sex marriage and some have not. However, this thesis shows that one possible cause for why some member states have legislated same-sex marriage is due to the level of equality in the society. In other words, that the state value and work towards social cohesion and non-discrimination of a specific group. In addition, it also shows that a high religious influence, disregarding which religious denomination has a negative effect on the legislation. Thus, the answer to this question is that two possible reasons for the occurring of same-sex marriage legislation among the member states of the EU is a high level of equality and a low level of religious influence in the society. This chapter will now move on to answering the second research question.

6.2 Research question 2

- **To what extent do Conservative, Liberal and Social democratic influence, religious denomination, and the level of equality have any effect whether the member state have legislated same-sex marriage or not?**
Overall, the result shows that the variables included in the analysis have a significant effect on the legislation of same-sex marriage. The variable measuring the level of Social Cohesion and Equality has to a large extent a positive effect on the legislation of same-sex marriage. Something that contradicted the hypotheses, is that share of votes: Conservative also has to a large extent a positive effect on the legislation. In addition, the effect that share of votes: Liberal and Social democratic have on the dependent variable is positive but weak or almost non-existent and thus, as noted in chapter 5, both hypotheses 5 and 6 can be rejected.

Religious denomination turned out to a large extent have a negative effect on same-sex marriage legislation, disregarding what denomination. Furthermore, Eastern Orthodox has the most negative effect followed by Anglican, Muslim, non-religious, Protestants and Catholics. Interestingly, all religious denominations including “non-religious” people have a negative effect on same-sex marriage legislation. As explained in the previous chapter, this could be explained by the dataset used or the fact that there are other reasons for the legislation not included in the analysis.

6.3 Research question 3

- **How likely is it that the trend will continue in the sense that more states among the EU members will legislate same-sex marriage in the future?**

The graph that showed hazard rate for covariates of mean proved that same-sex marriage legislation has ever since the beginning of the 21st century increased among the member states of EU. The legislation has occurred among 14 of the 28 member states by 2018 and as the analysis has shown, a high level of equality have a positive effect on the legislation whereas religion had a negative effect. Thus, it all depends on which of the variables that will continue to have a high effect in either a positive or negative direction whether the trend will continue.

Nevertheless, as the 4.5 graph showed, the hazard rate of no legislation is increasing, and it is to a large extent likely that the trend will continue as it has done since 2001, a personal and subjective prediction was that the trend will continue and there will be a same-sex marriage legislation among all member states by 2030.
6.4 General conclusion

To conclude, this thesis shows that the level of equality and religious influence have a causal effect on the legislation of same-sex marriage for member states of the EU. Whereas a high level of equality has a positive effect on the phenomenon and a high religious influence, disregarding the denomination, has a negative effect. The share of votes for Conservative, Liberal, and Social democratic proofed to not be significant, suggesting that within the EU this phenomenon is not politically polarised. This means that the proliferation of same-sex marriage legislation in the European Union is a matter of equality and religion, but not politics according to the result of this thesis. Some limitations with this thesis are that the analysis showed that there are possibly an additional number of reasons affecting the legislation that is not part of the analysis.

The Cox Regression presented that the trend of legislating same-sex marriage is increasing among the member states and especially since 2015. Only the future can tell if a consensus regarding this phenomenon will be reached even on a transnational level. Hopefully, the different issues related to abuse against LBTQI-people, as was described by the Human Rights Watch in the introduction, will decrease as same-sex couples are included in the institution of marriage and recognised as equal citizens in the society.
7. Further research
Some limitations with this thesis was that I only investigated the impact of three different variables and the effect that they had on same-sex marriage. My result presented that there most likely are other reasons with a greater influence on the legislation that are not included in the analysis. Supposedly another approach for further research could be to make a case study of some of the EU member states to really find the root reasons for legislation of same-sex marriage or the absence of it and then to test the variables statistically on all member states.

A way to replicate my research would be to use more number of cases, possibly worldwide or another continent of the world. As the phenomenon is interesting in a transitional landscape, the member states of for example the United Nations can be made to investigate the effect. Furthermore, another limitation was the use of the variables “share of votes” as the result showed that the matter of legislation is not politically polarised. Hence the analysis can be repeated but with another operationalisation of influence of Conservative, Liberal and Social democratic parties.
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9. Appendix A

Graph of survival function at mean of covariates
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