Summer 5-2016

Changing Public Opinion Towards LGB Rights: An Analysis of Data from the American National Election Studies, 1992-2012

Jacob Paul Absalon

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, jacob.absalon@huskers.unl.edu

CHANGING PUBLIC OPINION TOWARDS LGB RIGHTS: AN ANALYSIS OF

DATA FROM THE AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES, 1992-2012

By

Jacob P. Absalon

A THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts

Major: Sociology

Under the Supervision of Professor Regina Werum

Lincoln, Nebraska

May, 2016

CHANGING PUBLIC OPINION TOWARDS LGB RIGHTS: AN ANALYSIS OF

DATA FROM THE AMERICAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDIES, 1992-2012

Jacob Absalon, M.A.

University of Nebraska, 2016

Advisor: Regina Werum

This study uses data from several waves of the American National Election Studies (ANES, 1992-2012) to examine changing attitudes regarding civil rights for Lesbian Gay Bisexual (LGB) individuals. Analyses focus on differences in attitudes toward gays and lesbians generally, attitudes regarding non-discrimination protections, and views about integration into military service during this time frame. Generally, this thesis builds on previous research in Sociology and Political Science regarding the role of status attainment characteristics, demographic markers, and ideological preferences to explain long-term trends in public opinion. Specifically, this study extends prior research by analyzing how membership in particular occupational groups has shaped respondents' views of LGB. Findings suggest across all outcome variables examined, white-collar professionals express more positive views towards gays and lesbians than do respondents in unskilled blue-collar and farming occupations, whose negative attitudes are most pronounced regarding inclusion in military service. As expected, ethnic and religious minorities, as well as women, are generally more supportive; married and politically conservative respondents are less supportive; whereas income and education are positively associated with support for LGB rights. These empirical results are discussed in light of central sociological concepts (hegemonic masculinity, heteronormativity) and are used to indicate potential directions for future research.

Introduction

In the years from 1973 through 1991, data from the General Social Survey (GSS) shows that there was little change in public attitudes towards Lesbian Gay Bisexual (LGB) relations.[1] During that time, approximately two-thirds to three-quarters of respondents consistently said "sexual relations between two adults of the same sex" was *always wrong,* while only 10-15% considered it *not wrong at all* a part from occasional widespread media reported events, public discourse was fairly muted. However, public opinion started to shift in the early 1990s. As the federal government implemented Don't Ask, Don't Tell (DADT) in 1993, general attitudes towards LGB persons began to change in the 1990s (Yang 1997; Estrada, Dirosa, and Decostanza 2013). Similarly, Pew Research Center found growing support for gay marriage as well (Dimock, Doherty, and Kiley 2013). There continues discussion on the causal relationship between the passage of DADT and public attitudes in general. As DADT may have spurred the public discourse (on service in the military) as part of the larger context of federal and local laws addressing non-discrimination protections, the growing politicization of sexuality may have set the foundations of attitudinal shifts. By the early 2000s, attitudes had gradually improved to where 64% of respondents viewed relations as "*always wrong"* and 36% viewed it as "*not wrong at all".* As Graph 1 below demonstrates, this trend further accelerated through 2012, by which point respondents were almost equally divided, 51% to 49% with only a slight majority still viewing those relations as *"always wrong."* How do we explain this dramatic shift?

<insert figure 1 about here>

Building on the historical context, this research explores two key decades (1992-2012) in the continuing changes in public acceptance of gay rights (Werum and Winders 2001; Brewer and Wilcox 2005). Werum and Winders (2001) explore how state fragmentation and historical context shaped tactical changes and choices of gay rights adversaries between 1974 and 1999. Using a wealth of polling data, Brewer and Wilcox find that a substantial proportion of the public has followed the issue in more recent years, with the level of attention increasing with key events. Their research outlines previous battle fronts of de-medicalization and de-criminalization including legal status of homosexual relations, employment nondiscrimination, and military service. These efforts set the conditions for the 20-year period of attitudinal shift that corresponds with the public debate implementation in 1993, and eventual repeal in 2011 of the restrictive DADT personnel policy in the military. The latter decade (2002-2012) also includes changes in federal, state, and local policies ranging from anti-discrimination ordinances to same-sex marriage setting conditions for the United States Supreme Court decision in Obergefell v. Hodges in 2015 (Rimmer 1996; Frank and McEneaney 1999; Riggle and Tadlock 1999; Rimmerman, Wald, and Wilcox 2000; Werum and Winders 2001; Hajjar 2010).

This study seeks to examine attitudinal differences in support regarding civil rights for LGB individuals from 1992-2012 using data from the American National Election Studies (ANES). As opposed to the GSS, the ANES data provides more specific questions over time regarding LGB rights. In addition, these differences in attitude are further examined across a 20-year time period across demographic and ideological indicators. This paper examines the differences in attitudes towards LGB civil rights

across several variables including status attainment (occupation, income, and education); demographics (gender, marital status, and race); and ideology (religious and political affiliations and behaviors).

Analyses focus on what predicts public attitudes towards LGB groups in general as well as more specific issues related to gay rights: protections against employment discrimination and inclusion in military service. Findings suggest that key status, demographic, and ideological differences shape attitudes towards specific aspects of job discrimination and military service although the trends were not observed uniformly across occupations. In particular, white-collar professionals had more positive general feelings towards gays and lesbians than unskilled blue-collar and farming occupations; however, negative attitudes toward inclusion in military service were consistent across all occupations and economic classes.

Literature Review

This study is grounded in an analysis of individual-level data. However, while I focus on individual-level determinants of differences in attitudes, I also acknowledge that contextual and historical factors within theoretical frameworks can shape attitudes and public opinion trends.

Previous research explores various theoretical explanations for changes in public attitudes. Grounded in both political science and political sociology literature, one perspective focuses on how changes in public policy, especially federal, can lead to changes in public attitudes. Historical examples that impacted organizations and workplace environments include the effects of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and of the 1972 Title IX legislation on public attitudes towards women and gender equality in

employment (Aiken, Salmon, and Hanges 2013). Additional examples include President Franklin Roosevelt's Executive Order 8802 and President Harry Truman's Executive Order 9981 issued in the 1940's expanding equal opportunity and targeting racial discrimination in the defense industry and United States Armed Forces, which led to a relatively fast change in public attitude trends regarding equal employment openings for African Americans in the military (Mitchell 1954; Moskos 1966; Moskos 1993). Potentially similar to other occupational fields, these military reforms can serve a precursor to changes in the general public's attitudes are issues of equality.

An alternative perspective focuses on the social-psychological mechanism to which we attribute people's changing attitudes at the individual (and implicitly at the aggregate) level. In terms of cognitive dissonance, social psychological research indicates that people will try to resolve incongruences between their personal perspectives and evidence that contradicts their personal views. Cognitive dissonance refers to psychological mechanisms giving rise to biased beliefs and attitudes (Elinder 2012). In this case, when it becomes illegal to discriminate against people based on a particular social status characteristic (e.g., gender, race, sexual orientation), people with attitudes that favor discriminatory practices will typically adjust their views.

However, the ANES does not contain explicit measures that gauge these macro-level and social-psychological dimensions of changes in public opinion. For the purpose of this paper, I will focus on the explanations for how people's individual characteristics affect their attitudes. I synthesized research which shows social class, gender, race, and even religious and political identity have been known to shape attitudes on an array of social policy issues (Wood and Bartkowski 2004; Baunach 2012; Becker 2014). Baunach

(2012) found broad support for older respondents, and opposition to gay rights, specifically same-sex marriage, become more localized to specific subgroups: "older Americans, Southerners, African Americans, evangelical Protestants, and Republicans" (ibid: 364), patterns also observed by other researchers (Kurdek 1988; Anderson and Fetner 2008; Becker and Scheufele 2011; Becker 2012). Wood and Bartkowski (2004) found similar results including political conservatives and persons with little or no favorable contact with gays among others. Building upon contact hypothesis, Brewer's (2008) research supports that familiarly and increasing personal contact is directly related to greater tolerance and support across various gay rights policies.

Status Attainment

Social class and status markers, specifically those associated with occupation, income and education, create a complex picture. The working class, especially blue-collar, ethnically white workers, in the US have had a long history of socially conservative views towards a variety of issues (Wood and Bartkowski 2004; Baunach 2012). Those occupations are associated with masculine norms and roles with traditional gender attitudes. While hegemonic masculinity relates to power within society, traditional masculine roles in lower class occupations retain less power, but still exhibit traditional masculine roles and expectations. What makes it that much more complicated is that some blue-collar workers have high incomes even in the face of comparatively low education levels and occupational status. In other words, these various markers of social status categories can conflict with each other. This raises the question how competing social status characteristics within an occupational context influence people's LGB attitudes in a multivariate analysis.

Extensive literature explores the relationship between occupations, status, and political attitudes. This literature provides the foundation for various groupings such as the six registrar-general's social classes: (1) professional occupations, (2) managerial and technical occupations, (3) skilled non-manual occupations, (4) skilled manual occupations, (5) partly-skilled occupations, and (6) unskilled occupations (Schoon et al. 2009), as well as divisions clustered by human and financial capital theory based groups (Balestrini 2012). In addition, Bureau of Labor Statistics offers another variation of standard occupational classification. The five groups in this study are derived from generally accepted occupational status and social class associations.

We know that policies are related to norms and work place culture in particular occupational contexts. In addition, these policies can create (or remove) barriers support for specific civil rights or can be associated with hostile environments and work climates. Some organizational contexts and personal exposure to an outgroup may be more conducive to lessening barriers than are others (Pettigrew and Troop 2006; Smith, et al. 2009). Conversely, failure to understand prejudicial attitudes occupational differences in of the populations constitutes a hostile workplace environment to outgroups (Estrada and Weiss 1999; Moradi and Miller 2010).

For instance, previous research about issues related to "inclusion" in the military demonstrates periods of progressive equal opportunity reforms leading to a military known for being among the best employment and promotion and non-discriminatory practices of any employment sector in the US (Mitchell 1954; Segal, Bachman, and Dowdell 1978; Knouse 1991; Lundquist 2008; Truhon 2008). To date, research on the LGB community in the military has focused largely on acceptance, compatibility,

integration of gay service personnel, and a potential attitude gap with the civilian

population (Belkin et al. 2012; Ender et al. 2012). Estrada's work outlines almost twenty

of years of data collected in various public opinion polls on GLBT issues of equality,

revealing that "large percentages of military respondents expressed disapproval or

opposition toward removing the ban on homosexuals in the armed forces" in the 1990s

(2013: 334). However, in response to conservative criticism following the DADT repeal,

Belkin et al. (2013) sought to assess the accuracy of detrimental predictions about the

impact of DADT repeal on military readiness. According to their analysis, the repeal had

no significant impact on overall military readiness. This fact was known to the general

military population before the repeal of DADT.

Beyond sectoral similarities between military and civilian occupational groups,

those with higher level of educations tend to support gay rights policies (Beran et al.

1992; Brewer 2008). Brewer finds that similar to their support of gender equality and

racial minority civil rights, those with higher levels of education are more likely to favor

LBGT rights. Specifically, using ANES 2004 data, he finds a strong statistically

significance and positive association for respondents with higher levels of education to

support employment nondiscrimination, adoption rights, and military service (31).

Demographics

The ANES data contains different respondents in each wave. Due to data limitations, this

study cannot explore any shift or change in population-level attitudes as an attribution of

cohort replacement, individual-level change, or a combination of both (Ryder 1965;

Firebaugh and Davis 1988; Firebaugh 1992). However, controls for year and age are

included, as age has been shown to be inversely related to support for LGB civil rights

and marriage equality (Kurdek 1988; Anderson and Fetner 2008; Becker and Scheufele 2011; Becker 2012). Previous literature suggests that there is a complex relationship between a person's demographic characteristics (sex, marital status, and race) and their social attitudes, including those on LGB inclusion.

Findings suggest that variables such as gender, race, and marital status effect strength of attitudes. For instance, gender focused research has consistently shown that women tend to be more supportive of gay rights policies (Kite and Whitley 1996; Herek 2002; Brewer 2008; Becker and Scheufele 2009). In terms of marital status, we would expect to see a selection effect. Married respondents are more invested in their institution and tend to align themselves with more conservative attitudes (i.e. abortion, gay rights) whether due to selection effect into marriage or whether being married respondents develop more conservative views during marriage (Waite and Lehrer 2003; Keister 2011; Sherkat et al. 2011; Fitzgerald and Glass 2012; Powell, Bolzendahl, Geist, and Steelman 2012; Kimport 2012; Hopkins, Sorensen, and Taylor 2013; Dillon 2014). Generally, disenfranchised gender and racial/ethnic groups who typically face discriminatory practices in inclusion and employment are associated with more socially liberal attitudes, specifically towards LGB persons (Lewis 2003; Brown and Henriquez 2008).

Religious and Political Ideology

People's ideological preferences play a significant role in shaping their views and attitudes across various social issues, including same-sex marriage (Schwadel 2005; Sherkat et al. 2010). We know that religious conservatism, especially among Protestants, is associated with opposition to liberal positions of sexuality, reproductive rights, and the gendered division of labor (Davis and Robinson 1996), higher proclivity of homophobia

(Finlay and Walther 2003) and less support of gay rights overall (Clarke, Brown, and Hochstein 1989; Sherkat et al. 2010). Thus we would expect individuals who identify as Protestant to be more hesitant to support LGB rights. We also know that political conservatism (which goes well beyond binary party identifications) is associated with socially conservative attitudes (Johnson, Tamney, and Halebsky 1986; Johnson and Tamney 2010). Thus we would expect individuals who identify as more conservative on a scale to be more hesitant to support LGB inclusion in the military and beyond.

Brewer (2003a; 2003b) examined two explanations for the shift from 1992-2000 focusing on egalitarianism and moral traditionalism as predispositions to opinion forming. Using a multivariate analysis including survey year, ideology, partisanship (and controlling for religious preference), he finds higher egalitarianism produced support for gay rights policies, while moral traditionalism produced opposition. Partisanship and ideology had small effects. Other studies found that political values have a significant effect on attitudes towards gay rights policies (Baunach, Burgess, and Muse 2010; Becker and Scheufele 2009) and similarly religious preference (Hayes 1995). For example, using data from the using the 2003 Cornell Media Attitudes Survey and 2006 Civic and Political Health Survey, Becker and Scheufele (2009) find that older populations rely more heavily on their religious and political predispositions when determining their acceptance of homosexuality.

In addition, Dillon (2014) finds that, while religious affiliation is a strong predictor of attitudes toward abortion and gay rights, opposition to liberal stances to each of these specific issues may vary by demographics within and across groups (e.g., Latino Catholics, black protestants).

Control Variables

My analyses also control for the election year the ANES data were collected, as well as for the age of respondents. Analyzing attitudinal trends during presidential election years is an effective approach to understanding public attitudes. Political sociology and political science research demonstrates that people will tend to take positions on various issues depending on what they think their political party of group in general supports. These political and ideological effects are most prevalent during the public discourse during election years, specifically presidential election years. In these cycles public discourse across a variety of social and political issues increases as they generate more coverage. Piven and Cloward (1997) find that "defiance is first expressed in the voting booth simply because, whether defiant or not, people have been socialized within a political culture that defines voting as the mechanism through which political change can and should properly occur" (15). In short, people care more as they prepare to cast a ballot and more specifically during increased coverage in a presidential election cycle.

Hypotheses

Based on the theoretical and empirical evidence to date, this project tests the following hypotheses regarding the effects of status attainment (occupation, income, and education), demographic (gender, marital status, and race), and ideological (religious, political affiliation and behavior) characteristics on attitudes towards LGB rights. These hypotheses relate to differences in attitudes related to respondent characteristics, not to individual respondent's changes in attitude over time.

Status Attainment

H1: I expect to find attitudinal differences between occupational groups.

H1a: I expect that, compared to the highest-ranking occupational group, respondents in all other groups express less support for LGB rights.

H1b: Specifically, attitudes of those in the protective services and Armed Forces occupational group are negatively associated across dependent variables, but most strongly so with support for LGB inclusion in the military.

H1c: Occupations with more traditional and conservative gender ideologies, such as unskilled blue-collar and farm jobs, are associated with less support for LGB rights.

H1d: Attitudes of non-employed respondents are negatively associated with support for LGB rights across all dependent variables.

H2: Respondents with higher family income, and higher levels of education, are more supportive of LGB groups and rights.

Demographics

H3: I expect women are more supportive than men across all dependent variables.

H4a: I expect single respondents are most supportive of LGB rights, across all dependent variables.

H4b: I also expect to find that attitudes of respondents in partnered relationships will be more supportive of LGB rights than married respondents.

H5a: I expect to see that the relationship between being a member of a minority group (African American or Latino) and views on LGB rights will vary by group and by dependent variable.

H5b: I expect the relationship between being African-American or Latino to vary by dependent variable. Specifically, I expect African-American or Latinos to be more supportive than whites with respect to non-discrimination laws because of their known

support for classic civil right goals. I expect general feelings towards LGB persons to vary by group, possibly related to differences in cultural and social conservativism norms. It is unclear whether and if so how both groups view LGB inclusion in military service.

Religious and Political Ideology

H6a: Compared to Protestants, I expect Catholics are more supportive both generally and specifically in terms of LGB non-discrimination laws and inclusion in military service.

H6b: Compared to Protestants and Catholics, I expect people who define their religious affiliation as Jewish are more supportive of gays and lesbians across all dependent variables.

H6c: Compared to all three main religious affiliations, I expect respondents who identify as religiously unaffiliated ("none") to be the most supportive across all dependent variables.

H7: I expect respondents who attend church regularly to express less support for LGB rights, across all dependent variables.

H8: I expect a respondents identifying as strongly Republican to express less support for LGB rights, across all dependent variables.

H9: I expect politically active respondents, particularly those who vote, to express more support for LGB rights, across all dependent variables.

Data

American National Election Study

The American National Election Studies (ANES) data are widely used in political science, sociology, and in research regarding survey methodology (McDonald 2003;

Malhotra and Krosnick 2006; Olson and Witt 2011). ANES data have been collected

during each election cycle since 1948. For the purpose of this study, I restrict the data set

to waves between 1992 and 2012. Consequently, this data set consists of six pooled

cross-sectional surveys during presidential election years (1992 – 2012).[2] The samples

are independently drawn. The ANES target population is U.S. citizens age 18 or older.

Specifically, the ANES Time Series studies are part of a biennial election study

containing questions on participant's choices, attitudes, and contemporary matters in the

context of federal elections. During presidential elections years, respondents conduct a

pre-election interview (*pre IW*) two months prior to the election, and then respondents

complete a post-election interview (*post IW)* during the two months following the

election.[3] Access to these data is publically available from the election studies online

resources.[4]

In each of the ANES surveys, respondents answer four questions measuring

support of equality towards the LGB community including a feeling thermometer, job

discrimination, and military service: "Gay men and lesbians (that is), homosexuals –

thermometer", "Do you favor or oppose laws to protect homosexuals against job

discrimination?", and "Do you think homosexuals should be allowed to serve in the

United States Armed Forces, or don't you think so?"[5] In addition, there is a question on

adoption for gay couples; however, it was not asked during 1996 and is omitted from this

analysis.[6]

Consistent with previous research using the same LGB attitudinal measures in the

ANES (Brewer 2003), I use listwise deletion to identify the analytical sample for

respondents answering all variables and measures of interest, resulting in 5,006 cases

(1992-2004) and 9,326 cases (1992-2012), respectively.[7]

Dependent Variables

I use three dependent variables for this analysis. I analyze each dependent variable separately using ordinary least squares (OLS) or logistic regression[8]. The ANES contains a question calibrated as a "feeling thermometer" that gauges respondent attitudes towards gays and lesbians along a 100-point scale, where lower values indicate less support and higher values indicate more supportive attitudes with a mean of 42.52 degrees. Responses from *97-100 degrees* (3.05%) are collapsed in the ANES. All *don't know* or *no post IW* responses coded as 98 or 99 are not included in analysis.

Support for protecting lesbians and gays against job discrimination is measured by a single categorical question, "Do you favor or oppose laws to protect homosexuals against job discrimination?" with four response categories. The categories are *favor*, *oppose*, *don't know*, and *not applicable*. The categories of interest are recoded as 1 (*oppose*) and 1 (*favor*). Overall, all *don't know* or *no post IW* responses coded as 8 or 9 are recoded as missing data and dropped from the analysis.

Finally, support for integrating gays and lesbians into the military service is measured by a single categorical question, "Do you think homosexuals should be allowed to serve in the United States Armed Forces, or don't you think so?" with three response categories. The categories were *yes think so*, *don't know so,* and *don't know*. The categories of interest are recoded 0 (*don't know so*) and 1 (*yes think so*). Again, all *don't know* or *no post IW* responses coded as 8 or 9 are recoded as missing data and dropped from the analysis. All three dependent variables are highly correlated.

Independent Variables

I use nine sets of independent variables. They are separated into three theoretically based groups and are added sequentially to the multivariate models: status attainment characteristics (occupation, income, education); demographic characteristics (gender, marital status, and race), and ideological preferences (religious affiliation and religiosity, political affiliation and voting behavior). Cases with missing information on key independent variables are dropped from the analysis.

The first set of independent variables gauge status attainment characteristics and includes occupation, income, and education of the respondents. Originally, the ANES coded status attainment variables of interests as 14-category occupational groups, quintile of family income, and 4-category educational attainment.

Originally, occupation is measured using a single categorical question, "What is/was your main occupation?" with 14-response categories.[9] For the purpose of this analysis, I recode an original 14 categories into five broad occupational groups including those non-employed: (1) white-collar professionals (including executive, administrative, managerial, professional specialty occupations, technicians, and related support occupations); (2) blue- and white-collar unskilled occupations (including sales, administrative support, clerical, domestic services, "handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers"); (3) security-related occupations (including protective services and armed forces); (4) blue-collar skilled occupations (including precision production, craft and repair, machine operators, assemblers and inspectors, transportation and material moving); (5) farm occupations (including farming, forestry, and fishing both owners and employees); and (6) non-employed (including nonworking homeworker, has never worked for pay, retired, and student (10.30% of sample). Each occupational

category is turned into a dichotomous variable. An analysis of another work status 5-category variable shows that 72% of the non-employed identified specifically as *homemaker*.[10]

Due to limitations of occupational data in the study for the 2008 and 2012 waves, I use a work status variable as a proxy in Model 5. Work status in measured with five response categories: *employed, not employed, retired, homemaker,* and *student.* For the final model of analysis, I recode work status into a dichotomous variable with *employed* and *retired* (1) and *not employed*, *homemaker*, and *student* (0). In analysis not shown, respondents employed or retired as measured by the work status measure is identical to those respondents reporting an occupational category other than *not employed* group.

Family income is measured by the total income of all the members of family living together/total income in previous year, before taxes. Quintiles are 0-16%, 17-33%, 34-67%, 68-95%, and 96-100%.[11] Respondent education attainment is measured using two similar variations of the question, "What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?" with four response categories: *Grade school or less*, *High school*, *Some college*, and *College or advanced degree*.

The second set of independent variables gauges the impact of demographic characteristics, specifically the respondents' gender, race, and marital status. Gender is coded by interviewer *male* and *female*, 0, 1, respectively, with no missing data. From 1992-2012 respondents are asked three variations of race/ethnicity questions including, "In addition to being American, what do you reconsider your main ethnic group or national group?" (1992, 1996), "what racial or ethnic group or groups best describes you?" (2000-2008), and in 2012 respondents chose from a list of six race categories. I

recode respondents race into four categories from an initial six race-ethnicity options: *White non-Hispanic*, *Black non-Hispanic*, *Hispanic*, and *Other* (Asian or Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaska Native, and Other or multiple races). As result of size and initial correlations of four *Other* categories, they are collapsed for my analysis.

Marital status is measured by the question, "Are you married, divorced, separated, widowed, or have you never been married?", with six response categories including *married*, *never married*, *divorced*, *separated*, *widowed,* or *partnered.* In my analysis, *divorced*, *separated*, *widowed are collapsed, resulting in four dummy variables.* Cases with missing data for any of the demographics are excluded from this analysis/[12]

Ideological characteristics are measured using four questions for religious affiliation, religiosity, political affiliation, and voting behavior. Religious affiliation is determined by a series of questions and follow-ups to determine specific denomination. I recode responses into *Protestant*, *Catholic*, *Jewish*, *Other*, and *None* with the last category of religiously unaffiliated representing 14.6% of the sample. Religiosity is measured by asking, "Would you say you/do you go to (church/synagogue) every week, almost every week, once or twice a month, a few times a year, or never?" along a 0-5 scale from with *every week – more than once* to *never*. I reverse code church attendance behavior from *never* (1) to *every week* (6).

The ANES provides numerous measures for political ideology. Political affiliation is measured on a 1-7 scale (*strong Democrat*, *weak Democrat, Independent-Democrat* through *strong Republican*). Political behavior is measured by asking, "Did Respondent Vote in the National Elections?" with response categories of *no, did not vote* and *yes, voted* coded 0, 1, respectively.

Control variables include age and year of the survey. Age is measure on a

continuous scale from 18 – 97. Mean age is 44.92. Survey year is 1992, 1996, 2000, and

2004 with 2008 and 2012 included in extended models. Overall, the sample is fairly

equally representative of demographics and measured independent variable opinions.

Table 1 provides variable distributions and sample characteristics.

<insert table 1 about here>

Methods

Overall, this study seeks to explain differences across occupation groups in attitudes

towards gays and lesbians generally, and attitudes regarding employment protections and

integration into military service. This study uses both ordinary least squares (OLS) and

logistic regressions. The OLS regression is used for the continuous feeling thermometer

scale. Logistic regression is used for both employment protections from job

discrimination and service in the military.

All four models use three separate dependent variables measuring LGB attitudes

including feeling thermometer, service in the military, and protection from job

discrimination. Initially, my analysis focused on 1992-2004 for each of the three

dependent variables, I estimate and report four separate, sequentially expand models

totally twelve models. Furthermore, I run the full model for the time period through 2012,

even though without a key independent variable of occupation, for the most recent waves

(2008-2012). Consequentially, Table 3-5, which contain the results of multivariate

regressions, show five models in all, including two full models for different time periods: 1992-2004 and 1992-2012.

Model 1 (baseline) includes the effect of year, age, and with 1992 as a reference year. Model 2 explores the effects of occupation and status attainment adding the occupation, income and education variables. Model 3 adds gender, marital status, and race and effects. Model 4 measures all previous effects and includes the effects of religious and political ideology. All models report model fit statistics; R2 for OLS and Wald Chi for logistic regressions. Complete logistic regression odds are ratios are available on request for employment protection and integration of military service dependent variables. Model 5 expands the time period through 2012, but omits unavailable occupation variables. This makes it possible to speculate about the effects of a known omitted variable (occupation) on the overall model fit and coefficients of variables included.

<insert table 2 about here>

Results

Table 3 presents OLS results regressing the "feeling thermometer" variable on a series of predictors. Tables 4-5 present logistic regressions using the remaining two dependent variables that gauge respondents' attitudes towards extending protection against job discrimination to LGB individuals, and their attitudes towards LGB inclusion in military service. Models 1-4 sequentially expand to include occupation (status attainment), demographic, and ideological predictors of attitudes from the period 1992 – 2004. As

expected, Model 4 has the best optimal model fit ($R^2 = 0.2178$). Again, occupation data is not available for the full 20-year period (Model 5 for each table). Instead, I use a proxy dichotomous variable for work status which does not leave a substantive influence on the sign or magnitude of other direct effects and coefficients while expanding the size and period of interest of the study. Results are robust.

Model 1 across all dependent variables show the effect of survey year and respondent age control variables. The growing magnitude and significance of survey year varies by feelings towards gays and lesbians, support for laws against job discrimination, and support for military service. Overall feelings towards gay and lesbians started to become more positive in 2000 ($p < .0001$). Support for protections against job discrimination accelerated rapidly starting in 2004. However, it appears that public attitudes towards LGB inclusion in the military started becoming more favorable as early as 1996 – right after implementation of the 1992 DADT policy and related policy measures that were included in a larger push to implement non-discrimination laws that included LGB. Moreover, as expected respondent age is negatively associated with all dependent variables.

<insert table 3 about here>

How have attitudes changed regarding LGB individuals in general?

Model 2 contains status attainment variables. I find respondents with higher occupational status, higher family income, and higher education levels are more supportive of positive feelings towards gays and lesbians.

Overall, I did find attitudinal differences between occupational groups, which confirms H1. White collar professionals are positively associated with support compared to all other categories (H1a). Compared to white-collar professionals, respondents in security-related, skilled blue-collar, and farm jobs expressed significantly more negative feelings towards gays and lesbians. This confirms H1c, suggesting that perhaps norms associated with hegemonic masculinity are implicated in public sentiment towards sexual minorities. How can this pattern be explained? Note that several of the occupational categories in the ANES samples used here are predominantly male: security-related (88%), skilled blue-collar (81%), and farm workers (81%). Conversely, respondents identifying as not employed are 89% women. Non-employed respondents approach, but fail to reach statistical significant (H1d).

In Model 2, the effect of family income is non-significant, but the effect of income gains strength and significance across later models. Higher levels of education are positively associated with supportive attitudes across all models ($p < .0001$). Model 3 adds demographic variables whose directionality is consistently positive across all models. As Table 3 shows, even with the addition of demographic measures, blue-collar unskilled workers and farm workers express consistently less support for LGB groups in terms of general feelings towards LGB persons. Interestingly, the coefficient for the security-related occupations fails to reach statistical significance in this model, which means that I did not find complete support for the hegemonic masculinity argument overall (H1c). Confirming H1d, non-employed respondents are negatively associated while income and education are significantly positively associated with general feelings towards LGB.

Women are more supportive than men regarding general feelings towards gays and lesbians, which confirms H3. When compared to married respondents, being single or partnered is strongly positively associated with general feelings towards LGB. This confirms H4a. Latinos and African-Americans are more supportive than other racial groups, which does not support H5b.

The effects of status attainment and demographics variables remain virtually unchanged when taking into account religious and political affiliation, church attendance, and voting behavior (Model 4). Notably, the size of the coefficient for farm workers support decreases with including ideological predictors (-14.01 to -10.93, $p < .0001$) suggesting that their less pronounced negative feelings towards LGB individuals in general in the full model are partly attributable to religious and political ideologies held by respondents in this occupational group (rather than just the occupation per se). Non-employed respondents support slightly increase as well. Also, the effects of African-Americans and partnered respondents lose statistical significance.

With the exception of *Other* religious affiliation, results show that religious and political predictors were all statistically significant. Specifically, compared to Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and respondents with no religious affiliation are more supportive of LGB groups, which confirms H6a. However, judging by the size of the coefficients, respondents who identify as Jewish express greater support than Catholics and those without a religious affiliation, which confirms H6b but does not support H6c. Higher church attendance is negatively associated with general feelings towards LGB persons (H7). As expected, respondents identified as more Republican have more negative feelings (H8). Voting is positively associated with more positive feelings (H9). Finally,

when omitting detailed occupational variables, but including the dichotomous work status variable in Model 5, results are stable for all other included variables of interest. This is consistent across all Models 5 and dependent variables.

<insert table 4 about here>

How have attitudes changed regarding the inclusion of LGB groups in non-discrimination laws?

Table 4, Model 2, includes status attainment variables. Respondents in security-related, blue-collar skilled, and farming occupations are negatively associated with support for inclusion of LGB groups in non-discrimination laws, which further confirms H1c. Again, the coefficients for non-employed respondents and income fail to reach statistical significance in Model 2. Higher education is positively associated with support for anti-discrimination laws for LGB groups.

When including demographic variables in Model 3, respondents in blue-collar skilled and farming jobs remain less likely to support for LGB anti-discrimination laws (H1c). The coefficient for respondents in security-related jobs is no longer statistically significant, but being non-employed is now negatively associated with support for LGB-inclusive antidiscrimination laws (H1b & H1d). Income and education are positively associated with support for inclusion of LGB groups in non-discrimination laws (H2).

Women are once again more supportive than men consistently across all models (H3). As with general feelings towards gays and lesbian, single and partnered respondents when compared to married respondents are more supportive for job

protections (H4a-b). African-Americans are the only statistically significance race category and positively associated with inclusion of LGB groups in non-discrimination laws. However, all race categories are non-significant for the remaining models for LGB inclusion in anti-discrimination laws.

The findings regarding the effects of ideological indicators (Model 4) on support for antidiscrimination laws are similar to findings in Table 3, regarding general feelings towards gays and lesbians. Again, blue-collar and farm workers are less likely to support LGB anti-discrimination laws. The effects of income and education gain strength and statistical significance. Women and single respondents remain positively associated and more supportive than men and married respondents, respectively.

Catholics are significantly more supportive than Protestants (H6a) and those of Jewish belief are consistently even more supportive than Catholics (H6b) when compared to Protestants as a reference group. In terms of employment protections, respondents with no religious affiliation are less likely to support than Catholic or Jewish respondents which does not support H6c. Higher church attendance and most staunchly self-identified Republicans are negatively associated with support for inclusion of LGB groups in non-discrimination laws. Unlike in Table 3, actual voting behavior is not a statistically significant predictor of support for antidiscrimination laws

<insert table 5 about here>

How have attitudes changed regarding the inclusion of LGB in the military?

When compared to white-collar professionals in Models 2 through 4,, being employed in security-related, blue-collar skilled, and farm jobs is strongly statistically negatively associated with support for *inclusion of LGB in the military* (H1a-c), as is being non-employed, though that effect is less stable (H1d).

Compared to white-collar professionals, coefficients for all other occupational groups are highly statistically significant and negatively associated with support for inclusion of LGB in the military (H1a-c), even when including demographic predictors (Model 3). Particularly, the strongly negative association for security-related occupations confirms H1b. Effects of income are nonsignificant, whereas education is significant and positively associated with support for LGB inclusion in the military.

As expected, women are more supportive than men for inclusion in the military (H3). When comparing odds ratios, woman are 2.40 times more likely to support LGB inclusion in the military. Comparatively, women are only 1.55 times more likely to support LBG inclusion in anti-discrimination laws demonstrating that the gender gap is even more pronounced for inclusion in military service. Compared to married respondents, all other respondents express more support for LGB inclusion in the military, at marginally statistically significant levels ($p < .05$), with single and partnered respondents most likely to support inclusion of LGB in the armed forces. Race variables across all models are statistically non-significant for inclusion in the military ($p < .05$).

The effects of occupational group remain stable in Model 4. The effects of income and education are both positively associated and statistically significant. However, marital status variables lose significance. Race variables remain non-significant. Ideological indicators included in Model 4 show a similar pattern for religious and

political affiliation and behavior, which supports H6a-b, H7, and H8. Like support for inclusion of LGB groups in non-discrimination laws, respondents with no religious affiliation are most likely to support and voting respondents being positively associated were not supported (H6c and H9).

Discussion

Results show that status attainment characteristics have a strong and consistent influence on people's attitudes towards LGB rights. At the same time, it is clear that education and occupation are better predictors of such attitudes than is income per se.

Across all dependent variables, white-collar professionals express more positive and supportive attitudes towards gays and lesbians. Notably, findings indicate strong, consistently negative attitudes among blue-collar and farm workers for general feelings towards gays and lesbians and support for inclusion of in non-discrimination laws. Compared to white-collar professionals, all occupational groups appear less supportive of military inclusion – including security-related workers, who are negatively associated with support in some models (i.e., Models 2). Respondents in security-related occupations express less support for LGB inclusion in the military, even though they were overall supportive of LGB-inclusive antidiscrimination laws and expressed supportive attitudes generally. Taken together, these findings suggest that respondents in occupations frequently associated with traditional gender and masculinity norms are less supportive of gay rights.

The effects of income and education are strongly positively associated with support for gays and lesbians in general, support for job protections, and support for inclusion the military. This empirical relationship is strongest yet in Model 5, where the

magnitude of education coefficients increases reliably when I omit detailed occupational status characteristics from the model.

As expected, the effects of gender and marital status are consistent with previous research. I find that women generally expressed more favorable attitudes towards LGB inclusion on all fronts than do men in line with previous research (Herek 2002; Brewer 2008; Becker and Scheufele 2011). However, I find that the gender gap is smallest with employment protections and largest with military service. When comparing the logistic regression models, male resistance to inclusion in the military is much more pronounced than inclusion in legal protections. These gendered effects are in line with previous research. Thus, findings complement Kite and Whitley (1995), whose work shows that men that are less supportive of gay rights than women, even as gender differences are minimal regarding marriage equality specifically. Recall that initially I hypothesized strong race specific effects due to the fact that Hispanics and African Americans are known to by socially conservative in matters of sexuality. While, some of my analyses confirm this hypotheses, overall the effects of race are much weaker than expected. Respondents from minority groups are generally more supportive of LGB groups. However, they are typically no different from whites in their resistance to military inclusion (unless occupational characteristics are omitted from the full model). In so far as minorities do express more supportive views in general and regarding civil rights protections, the effects are group specific. I find that insofar as minorities are more sympathetic in their general feelings towards gays and lesbians, this effect is limited to Latinos. In Table 3, Latinos are consistently identified as more supportive towards LGB, but less willing to extend civil rights protections or integrate the military.

Similar to previous research examining the direct relationship between religious and political ideological identification and behavior, and opposition to gay rights (Brewer 2003a; Brewer 2003b; Becker and Scheufele 2011), this study shows religious and political ideology consistently predicts attitudes toward LGB individuals. Interestingly, religiously unaffiliated respondents were not more supportive across all dependents variables as expected. Yet as a measure of religiosity, respondents who attend church more regularly are strongly negatively associated with LGB support.

Respondents who self-identified as more Republican express less support for LGB rights than do self-identified Democrats. These findings are robust in the face of changing model specification. In other words, when we omit detailed occupational status from the model, the coefficients for the ideological variables remain substantially the same. In terms of political behavior, politically active respondents who vote are only statistically significant and positively associated with general feelings towards LGB groups. Ironically, the dependent variable outcomes that are potentially influenced at the ballot box are non-significant. These findings confirm prior research indicating that religiously and politically conservative individuals tend to be less willing support gay rights, as well as other ideas challenging opposition to their belief system (Becker and Scheufele 2011).

Even though this analysis cannot adjudicate questions about changes in attitudes over time, the inclusion of survey year as a control variable enables me to pinpoint *when* attitudes began changing. Future analyses will need to examine this issue more closely, for example by introducing interaction terms. In the meantime, in the results as described above, the magnitude and significance of the survey year accelerates over time, but the

pace varies by dependent variable. For example, feelings towards gays and lesbians in general (feeling thermometer) begin in 2000, whereas support for anti-discrimination laws does not begin to change until 2004. Most interesting, the general public started becoming more supportive of LGB inclusion in military service as early as 1996. This suggests that, despite the introduction of several federal and state-level antidiscrimination laws (including but not limited to DADT in 1993), public attitude towards LGB inclusion begin shifting swiftly. Thus, public attitudes on this matter apparently were changing well ahead of public policy, as DADT was not repealed until 2011. It appears also that changes in attitudes regarding inclusion in military service may have propelled subsequent public attitude changes including general and federal protected civil rights laws. Baseline models examine the effects of various demographics models.

It is important to be mindful that despite consistency of results across models keep in mind the tenacious of results due to data limitations and limitations in the scope of project. Findings may change with different sample and model specifications. Entirely likely that omitted variables may alter conclusions draw here.

Moreover, the causal models employed have several limitations related to the structure of the ANES. Future research might focus on key interaction dynamics unexplored in this particular analysis. For instance, the effects demographic characteristic such as age, gender and race may have vacillated over time. For example, the gender and age gap may be decreasing over time. Similarly, the effects of status attainment characteristics may have changed over time, as may the effect of religious and political ideologies. In addition, future analysis may seek to employ more refined measures of occupational, religious, and political predictors. In particular, the white-collar

professional reference categories include a host of occupations regarding post collegiate training. Choice of occupation into these groups may conflate with other ideological indicators. The precise mechanism that drives these occupational difference should be explored in future analyses. Similarly, I used a relative crude dummy for religious and political ideologies.

Pending data availability, future research may examine people attitudes are not just contextual, but related to aspects capture in the contact hypothesis. That is, personal familiarity with members of a marginalized group may make people more support of said group. Social network analysis is usually the focus of contact hypothesis research with regards to LGB persons. Future analysis also may seek to disaggregate Evangelical and mainline Protestants (Schwadel 2005; Schwadel 2011). This would help identify whether religious affiliation per se or religious ideology is the mechanism driving the effects explored in this study. This is a particularly relevant question given the continually rising membership in self-identified Evangelical Protestants in the United States. In addition, given the changing meaning of political ideologies in this time period (especially the increasing trend towards bimodal partisan attitudes), it is entirely possible that current (2012) attitudes are more strongly affects by individual political views than they were back 1992.

REFERENCES

Abramowitz, Alan I. 1995. "It's Abortion, Stupid: Policy Voting in the 1992 Presidential Election." *The Journal of Politics* 57(1):176–86.

Aiken, Juliet R., Elizabeth D. Salmon, and Paul J. Hanges. 2013. "The Origins and Legacy of the Civil Rights Act of 1964." *Journal of Business and Psychology* 28(4):383–99.

Andersen, Robert and Tina Fetner. 2008. "Cohort Differences in Tolerance of Homosexuality: Attitudinal Change in Canada and the United States, 1981-2000." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72(2):311–30.

Balestrini, Pierre P. 2012. "How Citizens' Education, Occupation, Personal Economic Expectations and National Identity Interact with One Another to Sway Public Opinion on the EU: Interactions and EU Support." *Swiss Political Science Review* 18(3):371–84.

Balestrini, Pierre P. 2014. "How Do the Levels of Education and Occupations of Citizens Interact with the National Socio-Economic Context to Influence Public Opinion on Globalisation: Interactions and Opinion on Globalisation." *Politics* 34(1):6–22.

Baunach, Dawn M. 2012. "Changing Same-Sex Marriage Attitudes in America from 1988 Through 2010." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 76(2):364–78.

Baunach, Dawn M., Elisabeth O. Burgess, and Courtney S. Muse. 2010. "Southern (dis) Comfort: Sexual Prejudice and Contact with Gay Men and Lesbians in the South." *Sociological Spectrum* 30(1):30–64.

Becker, Amy B. 2014. "Employment Discrimination, Local School Boards, and LGBT Civil Rights: Reviewing 25 Years of Public Opinion Data." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 26(3):342–54.

Becker, Amy B. and Dietram A. Scheufele. 2011. "New Voters, New Outlook? Predispositions, Social Networks, and the Changing Politics of Gay Civil Rights: New Voters, New Outlook?" *Social Science Quarterly* 92(2):324–45.

Belcher, John R., Donald Fandetti, and Danny Cole. 2004. "Is Christian Religious Conservatism Compatible with the Liberal Social Welfare State?" *Social Work* 49(2):269–7

Belkin, Aaron, Morten G. Ender, Nathaniel Frank, Stacie R. Furia, George Lucas, Gary Packard, Steven M. Samuels, Tammy Schultz, and David R. Segal. 2013. "Readiness and DADT Repeal: Has the New Policy of Open Service Undermined the Military?" *Armed Forces & Society* 39(4):587–601.

Beran, Nancy J., Connie Claybaker, Cory Dillon, and Robert J. Haverkamp. 1992. "Attitudes toward Minorities: A Comparison of Homosexuals and the General Population." *Journal of Homosexuality* 23(3):65–84.

Bowers, Jake and Michael J. Ensley. 2003. "Issues in Analyzing Data from the Dual-Mode 2000 American National Election Study."

Brewer, Paul R. 2003a. "The Shifting Foundations of Public Opinion about Gay Rights." *Journal of Politics* 65(4):1208–20.

Brewer, Paul R. 2003b. "Values, Political Knowledge, and Public Opinion about Gay Rights: A Framing-Based Account." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 67(2):173–201.

Brewer, Paul R. 2007. *Value War: Public Opinion and the Politics of Gay Rights*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Brewer, Paul R. and Clyde Wilcox. 2005. "Same-Sex Marriage and Civil Unions." *Public*

Opinion Quarterly 69(4):599–616.

Brint, Steven. 1985. "The Political Attitudes of Professionals." *Annual Review of Sociology* 11:389–414.

Brown, Michael J. and Ernesto Henriquez. 2008. "Socio-Demographic Predictors of Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians." *Individual Differences Research* 6(3):193–202.

Burden, Barry C. 2000. "Voter Turnout and the National Election Studies." *Political Analysis* 8(4):389–98.

Cahill, Sean. 2004. "The Importance of GLBT Think Tanks to Our Agenda of Equality and Liberation." *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services* 16(3-4):129–46.

Clarke, J. Michael, Joanne Carlson Brown, and Lorna M. Hochstein. 1989. "Institutional Religion and Gay/lesbian Oppression." *Marriage & Family Review* 14(3-4):265–84.

Davis, Nancy J. and Robert V. Robinson. 1996. "Are the Rumors of War Exaggerated? Religious Orthodoxy and Moral Progressivism in America." *American Journal of Sociology* 102(3):756–87.

Dillon, Michele. 2014. "Asynchrony in Attitudes toward Abortion and Gay Rights: The Challenge to Values Alignment." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 53(1):1–16.

Dimock, Michael, Carroll Doherty, and Jocelyn Kiley. 2013. "Growing Support for Gay Marriage: Changed Minds and Changing Demographics." *Gen* 10:1965–80.

Elinder, Mikael. 2012. "Correcting Mistakes: Cognitive Dissonance and Political Attitudes in Sweden and the United States." *Public Choice* 153(1-2):235–49.

Ender, Morten G., David E. Rohall, Andrew J. Brennan, Michael D. Matthews, and Irving Smith III. 2012. "Civilian, ROTC, and Military Academy Undergraduate Attitudes toward Homosexuals in the U.S. Military: A Research Note." *Armed Forces & Society* 38(1):164–72.

Estrada, Armando X. 2002. "A Preliminary Scale for Assessing Attitudes toward Homosexuals in the Military." *Psychological reports* 90(2):583–92.

Estrada, Armando X., Gia A. Dirosa, and Arwen H. Decostanza. 2013. "Gays in the U.S. Military: Reviewing the Research and Conceptualizing a Way Forward." *Journal of Homosexuality* 60(2-3):327–55.

Estrada, Armando X. and David J. Weiss. 1999. "Attitudes of Military Personnel Toward Homosexuals." *Journal of Homosexuality* 37(4):83–97.

Finlay, Barbara and Carol S. Walther. 2003. "The Relation of Religious Affiliation, Service Attendance, and Other Factors to Homophobic Attitudes among University Students." *Review of Religious Research* 44(4):370.

Firebaugh, Glenn. 1992. "Where Does Social Change Come from? Estimating the Relative Contributions of Individual Change and Population Turnover." *Population Research and Policy Review* 11(1):1–20.

Firebaugh, Glenn and Kenneth E. Davis. 1988. "Trends in Antiblack Prejudice, 1972-1984: Region and Cohort Effects." *The American Journal of Sociology* 94(2):251–72.

Fitzgerald, Scott T. and J. Glass. 2012. "Conservative Protestants, Early Transitions to Adulthood, and the Intergenerational Transmission of Class." *Religion, Work and Inequality. Bingley, United Kingdom: Emerald* 49–74.

Frank, David J. and Elizabeth McEneaney. 1999. "The Individualization of Society and the Liberalization of State Policies on Same-Sex Sexual Relations, 1984-1999." Social Forces 77:3:911-944.

Hajjar, Remi M. 2010. "A New Angle on U.S. Military's Emphasis on Developing Cross-Cultural Competence: Connecting In-Ranks' Cultural Diversity to Cross Cultural Competence" *Armed Forces & Society* 36(2):247-263

Hayes, Bernadette C. 1995. "Religious Identification and Moral Attitudes: The British Case." *The British Journal of Sociology* 46(3):457.

Herek, Gregory M. 2002. "Gender Gaps in Public Opinion about Lesbians and Gay Men." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 66(1):40–66.

Hopkins, Jason J., Anna Sorensen, and Verta Taylor. 2013. "Same-sex Couples, Families, and Marriage: Embracing and Resisting Heteronormativity." *Sociology Compass* 7(2):97–110.

Johnson, Stephen D. and Joseph B. Tamney. 2001. "Social Traditionalism and Economic Conservatism: Two Conservative Political Ideologies in the United States." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 141(2):233–43.

Johnson, Stephen D., Joseph B. Tamney, and Sandy Halebsky. 1986. "Christianity, Social Traditionalism and Economic Conservatism." *Sociological Focus* 19(3):299–314.

Keister, Lisa A. 2011. *Faith and Money: How Religion Contributes to Wealth and Poverty*. Cambridge University Press.

Kelly, K. Dennis and William J. Chambliss. 1966. "Status Consistency and Political Attitudes." *American Sociological Review* 31(3):375.

Kimport, Katrina. 2012. "Remaking the White Wedding? Same-Sex Wedding Photographs' Challenge to Symbolic Heteronormativity." *Gender & Society* 26(6):874–99.

Kite, Mary E. and Bernard E. Whitley, Jr. 1996. "Sex Differences in Attitudes Toward Homosexual Persons, Behaviors, and Civil Rights: A Meta-Analysis." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 22(4):336–53.

Knouse, Stephen B. 1991. "Introduction to Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Issues in the Military: The Decade of the 1990s and beyond." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 15(4):385–88.

Kurdek, Lawrence A. 1988. "Correlates of Negative Attitudes toward Homosexuals in Heterosexual College Students." *Sex Roles* 18(11):727–38.

Lundquist, Jennifer H. 2008. "Ethnic and Gender Satisfaction in the Military: The Effect of a Meritocratic Institution." *American Sociological Review* 73(3):477–96.

Malhotra, N. and J. A. Krosnick. 2006. "The Effect of Survey Mode and Sampling on Inferences about Political Attitudes and Behavior: Comparing the 2000 and 2004 ANES to Internet Surveys with Nonprobability Samples." *Political Analysis* 15(3):286–323.

McDonald, Michael P. 2003. "On the Overreport Bias of the National Election Study Turnout Rate." *Political Analysis* 11(2):180–86.

Mitchell, Clarence. 1954. "The Status of Racial Integration in the Armed Services." *The Journal of Negro Education* 23(3):203.

Moradi, B. and L. Miller. 2010. "Attitudes of Iraq and Afghanistan War Veterans toward

Gay and Lesbian Service Members." *Armed Forces & Society* 36(3):397–419.

Moskos, Charles. 1993. "From Citizens' Army to Social Laboratory." *The Wilson Quarterly (1976-)* 17(1):83–94.

Moskos Jr, Charles C. 1966. "Racial Integration in the Armed Forces." *American Journal of Sociology* 72(2):132–48.

Ohlander, Julianne, Jeanne Batalova, and Judith Treas. 2005. "Explaining Educational Influences on Attitudes toward Homosexual Relations." *Social Science Research* 34(4):781–99.

Olson, Kristen and Lindsey Witt. 2011. "Are We Keeping the People Who Used to Stay? Changes in Correlates of Panel Survey Attrition over Time." *Social Science Research* 40(4):1037–50.

Otjen, John P., William B. Davitte, Gerald L. Miller, John S. Redd, and James M. Loy. 1993. "Summary Report of the Military Working Group on Recommended Department of Defense Homosexual Policy." *Office of the Secretary of Defense July*.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. and Linda R. Tropp. 2008. "How Does Intergroup Contact Reduce Prejudice? Meta-Analytic Tests of Three Mediators." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 38(6):922–34.

Piven, Frances F. and Richard A. Cloward. 1997. *The Breaking of the American Social Compact*. New Press.

Powell, Brian, Catherine Blozendahl, Claudia Geist, and Lala Carr Steelman. 2010. *Counted Out: Same-Sex Relations and Americans' Definitions of Family: Same-Sex Relations and Americans' Definitions of Family*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Riggle, Ellen D. B. and Barry L. Tadlock. 1999. *Gays and Lesbians in the Democratic Process: Public Policy, Public Opinion, and Political Representation*. Columbia University Press.

Rimmerman, Craig. A. 1996. *Gay Rights, Military Wrongs: Political Perspectives on Lesbians and Gays in the Military*. Garland Pub.

Rimmerman, Craig. A., Kenneth D. Wald, and Clyde Wilcox. 2000. *The Politics of Gay Rights*. University of Chicago Press.

Ryder, Norman B. 1965. "The Cohort as a Concept in the Study of Social Change." *American Sociological Review* 30(6):843–61.

Schoon, Ingrid, Helen Cheng, Catharine R. Gale, G. David Batty, and Ian J. Deary. 2010. "Social Status, Cognitive Ability, and Educational Attainment as Predictors of Liberal Social Attitudes and Political Trust." *Intelligence* 38(1):144–50.

Schwadel, Philip. 2005. "Education and Churchgoing Protestants' Views of Highly Politicized Christianity." *Review of Religious Research* 47(2):150.

Schwadel, Philip. 2011. "The Effects of Education on Americans' Religious Practices, Beliefs, and Affiliations." *Review of Religious Research* 53(2):161–82.

Segal, David R., Jerald G. Bachman, and Faye Dowdell. 1978. "Military Service for Female and Black Youth:' A Perceived Mobility Opportunity.'" *Youth and society* 10(2):127.

Sherkat, Darren E., Melissa Powell-Williams, Gregory Maddox, and Kylan Mattias de Vries. 2011. "Religion, Politics, and Support for Same-Sex Marriage in the United States, 1988–2008." *Social Science Research* 40(1):167–80.

Smith, Sara J., Amber M. Axelton, and Donald A. Saucier. 2009. "The Effects of Contact

on Sexual Prejudice: A Meta-Analysis." *Sex Roles* 61(3-4):178–91.

Torres-Reyna, Oscar and Robert Y. Shapiro. 2002. "Trends: Defense and the Military." *Public opinion quarterly* 66:279–303.

Truhon, Stephen A. 2008. "Equal Opportunity Climate in the United States Military: Are Differences in the Eye of the Beholder?" *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 17(1):153–69.

Waite, Linda J. and Evelyn L. Lehrer. 2003. "The Benefits from Marriage and Religion in the United States: A Comparative Analysis." *Population and Development Review* 29(2):255–75.

Werum, Regina and Bill Winders. 2001. "Who's 'In' and Who's 'Out': State Fragmentation and the Struggle over Gay Rights, 1974–1999." *Social Problems* 48(3):386–410.

Wood, Peter and John Bartkowski. 2004. "Attribution Style and Public Policy Attitudes Toward Gay Rights." *Social Science Quarterly* 85(1):58–74.

Yancey, George. 1999. "An Examination of the Effects of Residential and Church Integration on Racial Attitudes of Whites." *Sociological Perspectives* 42(2):279–304.

Yang, Alan. 2001. "The 2000 National Elections Study and Gay and Lesbian Rights: Support for Equality Grows." Retrieved May 13, 2016 (http://fvkrnqa.thetaskforce.org/downloads/reports/reports/2000NationalElections Study.pdf).

Yang, Alan S. 1997. "Attitudes Toward Homosexuality." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 61(3):477–507.

Appendix

Endnotes

---

[1] While the ANES questions only frame respondent views towards this particular social issue as either "homosexuals" or "gays and lesbians", findings reported here are assumed to be generally applicable for attitudinal relationships toward the greater gay, lesbian, and bisexual (LGB) community.

[2] The ANES Times Series Study is conducted every two years (except 2006 and 2010). However, questions regarding LGB job discrimination and military service are only asked every four years. In addition, respondent income quintile data is unavailable for 2002. With these limitations in mind and citing previous literature on public discourse and attitudes during presidential election years, I only conduct analysis for every four years. In analyses not reported here, I did conduct an OLS regression analysis for the Feeling Thermometer (Gays/Lesbians) using data for every two years between 1992-2012 with nine waves total. Results were consistent with the analysis of four and six waves reported here. Analysis available upon request.

[3] Questions regarding LGB attitudes questions are asked during post-election survey. Only cases with both a pre- and post-interview were included in this analysis.

[4] The American National Election Studies (www.electionstudies.org) TIME SERIES CUMULATIVE DATA FILE. Stanford University and the University of Michigan. 2010. These materials are based on work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant Numbers: SBR-9707741, SBR-9317631, SES-9209410, SES-9009379, SES-8808361, SES-8341310, SES-8207580, and SOC77-08885. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in these materials are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the funding organizations.

[5] Exact Feeling Thermometer Phrasing: "We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm toward the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group, you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one. And still using the thermometer, how would you rate [the following]:"

[6] A question on adoption was asked during period of study, but excluded 1996: "Do you think gay or lesbian couples, in other words, homosexual couples, should be legally permitted to adopt children?" (VCF0878) Given the limitations of occupational data for 2008 and 2012, VCF0878 is not included as a dependent variable, as this would limit the current analysis to only 3 survey waves. Analysis available upon request.

[7] The ANES cumulative data file consists of variables derived from the 1948 – 2012 series of biennial Time Series. To produce this dataset, cross section cases have been pooled; the total unweighted cross section N is 7,218 for 1992-2004. This study uses the combined post-stratified sampling weight (VCF0009z) with the svy estimation commands as a design-consistent approach to obtain correct standard errors and significance tests. However, this study did not specify the stratum and primary sampling unit in svy estimation.

[8] The ANES does assess strength of opinion for both questions regarding employment discrimination and military service along a four-point scale making an OLS regression possible. However, for this analysis I only focus on support for/against gay rights, because the bimodal distribution among respondents suggested the need to dichotomize the variables.

[9] Master codes were under revision for the 2008 Time Series Study and are not available at the time of this release (for the ANES Time Series Cumulative Data File). It is currently unclear how the new codes will integrate with this file. As of summer 2016, occupation has not yet been coded for the 2012 Time Series Study.

[10] Additional analyses not reported here used a recoded work status variable (VCF0118), transformed into dummy variables including homemaker, student, and non-employed. When combined with occupation (VCF0154b) dummy variables, results demonstrated that homemaker drove the direction and significance of the collapsed non-employed category. Also, the ANES provides for a rural geographic indicator. When included in the analysis with farm and blue collar groups, the results remain the same indicating that geographic norms are not the reason. Analysis available upon request.

[11] Income (VCF0114) ranges corresponding to percentiles varied by year. For example, *96-100%* was 90,000+ in 1992 and 120,000+ in 2004. *0-16%* ranged from none-$9999 to none-$16,999 in 2004. I conducted additional analysis on income quintiles dummy variables, finding only 96-100% marginally significant for Feeling Thermometer (Gays/Lesbians) across all models and dependent variables. Analysis available upon request.

Table 1: Variable Overview

Variable Name	Variable Metric and Range	1992-2004 (N = 5,004)				1992-2012 (N = 9,322)			
		Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Feeling Thermometer: LGB	continuous, range 0-97	42.51	0.41	0	97	46.55	0.34	0	97
LGB Anit-Discrimination Laws	(1 = Favor)	0.65	-			0.70	-		
LGB in the Military	(1 = Favor)	0.69	-			0.75	-		
Age	continuous, range 17-97	44.70	0.26	18	93	45.70	0.21	18	93
White-Collar Profession	(1 = Executive, administrative, managerial…)	0.30	-						
Blue- and White-Collar Unskilled	(1 = Sales occupation, administrative support…)	0.35	-						
Protective Services & Armed Forces	(1 = Protective service, member of armed forces)	0.02	-						
Blue-Collar Skilled	(1 = Precision production, machine operators…)	0.20	-						
Farm	(1 = Farming, forestry and fishing...)	0.02	-						
Non-Employed	(1 = nonworking homeworker, retired, student...)								
Work Status	dichotomous; 1=employed or retired					0.78	-		
Income	(0-16%, 17-33%, 34-67%, 68-95%, 96-100%)	2.92	0.02	1	5	2.92	0.01	1	5
Education	(1 grade school or less - 4 college or adv degree)	2.72	0.01	1	4	2.80	0.01	1	4
Sex	dichotomous; 1=female	0.53	-			0.52	-		
Married (∞ = 1)	dichotomous; 1=married	0.58	-			0.56	-		
Single	dichotomous; 1=single	0.19	-			0.19	-		
Other	dichotomous; 1=divorced, separated, or widowed	0.20	-			0.21	-		
Partnered	dichotomous; 1=partnered	0.03	-			0.04	-		
White (1=yes)	dichotomous; 1=white	0.77	-			0.75	-		
Black	dichotomous; 1=African-American	0.12	-			0.12	-		
Hispanic	dichotomous; 1=Latino	0.08	-			0.09	-		
Other Race/Am. Indian/Asian PI	dichotomous; 1=other	0.03	-			0.04	-		
Protestant	dichotomous; 1=Protestant	0.57	-			0.55	-		
Catholic	dichotomous; 1=Catholic	0.25	-			0.23	-		
Jewish	dichotomous; 1=Jewish	0.02	-			0.02	-		
Other Religion	dichotomous; 1=other	0.01	-			0.02	-		
None	dichotomous; 1=none	0.15	-			0.18	-		
Church Attendance	dichotomous; 1=liberal	2.90	0.03	1	6	2.80	0.02	1	6
Political Party Affiliation	dichotomous; 1=moderate	3.74	0.03	1	7	3.75	0.03	1	7
Voting	dichotomous; 1=conservative	0.75	-			0.76	-		

Source: American National Election Study, Times Series, 1992-2012

Table 2: Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
1) Feeling Thermometer: LGB	1.00																													
2) LGB Anit-Discrimination Laws	0.41*	1.00																												
3) LGB in the Military	0.49*	0.40*	1.00																											
4) Age	-0.14*	-0.06*	-0.09*	1.00																										
5) White-Collar Profession	0.14*	0.07*	0.10*	0.01	1.00																									
6) Blue- and White-Collar Unskilled	0.05*	0.05*	0.04*	-0.02	-0.48*	1.00																								
7) Protective Services & Armed Forces	-0.01	-0.02	-0.05*	0.00	-0.10*	-0.11*	1.00																							
8) Blue-Collar Skilled	-0.17*	-0.09*	-0.12*	0.05*	-0.32*	-0.36*	-0.07*	1.00																						
9) Farm	-0.10*	-0.07*	-0.11*	0.03	-0.10*	-0.11*	-0.02	-0.07*	1.00																					
10) Non-Employed	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-0.06*	-0.22*	-0.24*	-0.05*	-0.16*	-0.05*	1.00																				
11) Work Status	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.10*	0.22*	0.10*	0.04*	0.10*	0.00	-0.66*	1.00																			
12) Income	0.07*	0.03*	0.04*	-0.06*	0.31*	-0.13*	0.03	-0.08*	-0.05*	-0.13*	0.25*	1.00																		
13) Education	0.21*	0.10*	0.11*	-0.14*	0.50*	-0.16*	0.00	-0.28*	-0.09*	-0.09*	0.16*	0.40*	1.00																	
14) Sex	0.15*	0.10*	0.18*	0.00	-0.05*	0.24*	-0.12*	-0.33*	-0.10*	0.24*	-0.22*	-0.12*	-0.05*	1.00																
15) Married (∞ = 1)	-0.07*	-0.06*	-0.05*	0.13*	0.07*	-0.08*	0.03*	0.03	0.01	-0.03	0.08*	0.38*	0.08*	-0.09*	1.00															
16) Single	0.11*	0.07*	0.06*	-0.40*	-0.03*	0.06*	-0.03	-0.04*	-0.01	0.04*	-0.07*	-0.19*	0.03*	-0.03*	-0.57*	1.00														
17) Other	-0.04*	-0.01	0.00	0.27*	-0.05*	0.05*	-0.02	0.01	-0.02	0.00	-0.03	-0.28*	-0.14*	0.15*	-0.58*	-0.24*	1.00													
18) Partnered	0.04*	0.02*	0.02	-0.10*	0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.03*	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	-0.19*	-0.08*	-0.08*	1.00												
19) White	-0.07*	-0.04*	0.00	0.14*	0.09*	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01	-0.02	-0.07*	0.10*	0.18*	0.10*	-0.03	0.11*	-0.13*	0.00	-0.02	1.00											
20) Black	0.02	0.04*	0.00	-0.05*	-0.09*	0.03*	0.03*	0.01	0.02	0.04*	-0.08*	-0.18*	-0.10*	0.03*	-0.15*	0.11*	0.06*	0.02*	-0.65*	1.00										
21) Hispanic	0.06*	0.00	0.00	-0.12*	-0.05*	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.06*	-0.06*	-0.09*	-0.07*	0.01	0.00	0.05*	-0.04*	-0.01	-0.55*	-0.10*	1.00									
22) Other Race/Am. Indian/Asian PI	0.03*	0.03*	0.00	-0.04*	0.03*	-0.02	-0.02	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.03*	0.04*	-0.02	0.00	0.02	-0.02*	0.02	-0.33*	-0.06*	-0.05*	1.00								
23) Protestant	-0.17*	-0.14*	-0.14*	0.05*	-0.06*	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03*	0.03*	-0.04*	-0.05*	-0.06*	0.06*	0.03	-0.08*	0.06*	-0.03*	-0.06*	0.22*	-0.13*	-0.03*	1.00							
24) Catholic	0.09*	0.08*	0.08*	0.02	0.05*	-0.01	0.00	-0.02	-0.02*	-0.02*	0.05*	0.08*	0.03*	-0.01	0.05*	0.01	-0.06*	-0.03*	0.02	-0.17*	0.18*	-0.02*	-0.66*	1.00						
25) Jewish	0.08*	0.04*	0.06*	0.04*	0.09*	-0.03*	-0.01	-0.04*	-0.02	-0.02	0.06*	0.10*	0.00	0.01	-0.02	0.01	0.00	0.05*	-0.04*	-0.01	-0.01	-0.15*	-0.08*	1.00						
26) Other Religion	0.03	0.03*	0.02	-0.01	0.05*	-0.01	-0.02	-0.03*	-0.02	-0.01	-0.02	0.02*	0.06*	0.00	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.09*	-0.13*	-0.07*	-0.02	1.00				
27) None	0.09*	0.06*	0.07*	-0.11*	-0.03*	0.01	0.00	0.03*	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	-0.06*	-0.01	-0.06*	-0.10*	0.11*	-0.02	0.07*	0.05*	-0.07*	-0.02*	0.05*	-0.47*	-0.24*	-0.05*	-0.04*	1.00			
28) Church Attendance	-0.17*	-0.13*	-0.16*	0.17*	0.05*	-0.02	-0.02	-0.04*	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.03*	0.05*	0.07*	0.14*	-0.13*	0.00	-0.10*	-0.05*	0.06*	0.01	-0.01	0.23*	0.10*	-0.04	-0.01	-0.43*	1.00		
29) Political Party Affiliation	-0.21*	-0.21*	-0.21*	-0.03*	0.04*	-0.03*	0.05*	-0.04*	0.04*	0.00	0.03	0.16*	0.11*	-0.09*	0.10*	-0.04*	-0.07*	-0.03	0.22*	-0.25*	-0.05*	0.01	0.09*	-0.04*	-0.08*	-0.03*	-0.03*	0.08*	1.00	
30) Voting	0.05*	0.00	0.02	0.18*	0.17*	-0.03*	0.02	-0.09*	-0.03	-0.08*	0.14*	0.26*	0.27*	-0.01	0.16*	-0.12*	-0.06*	-0.04*	0.12*	-0.06*	-0.08*	-0.03*	0.00	0.04*	0.06*	0.02*	-0.0978*	0.15*	0.03	1.00

Note: *p<.05

Source: American National Election Study, Times Series, 1992-2012, N = 5,004

Table 3: Ordinary Least Squares Regression of LGB Feeling Thermometer

| | 1992-2004 | | | | | | | | 1992-2012 | |
| | Model 1 | | Model 2 | | Model 3 | | Model 4 | | Model 5 | |
Variables	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Controls										
1992 (Reference)										
1996	1.21	1.05	0.73	1.03	0.69	1.01	0.67	0.96	0.86	0.96
2000	9.18****	1.07	8.11****	1.04	7.98****	1.02	7.79****	0.98	8.23****	0.98
2004	10.27****	1.18	8.70****	1.15	8.47****	1.14	8.57****	1.07	9.25****	1.07
2008									9.94****	0.93
2012									11.62****	0.94
Age	-0.23****	0.02	-0.18****	0.02	-0.11****	0.03	-0.11****	0.03	-0.15****	0.02
Status Attainment										
White-Collar Profession (Ref)										
Blue- & White- Collar Unskilled			-0.44	1.03	-1.57	1.02	-1.18	0.97		
Protective & Armed Forces			-5.05*	2.50	-1.4	2.50	-0.04	2.49		
Blue-Collar Skilled			-9.95****	1.31	-6.52****	1.33	-6.57****	1.26		
Farm			-17.18****	2.59	-14.01****	2.49	-10.93****	2.47		
Non-Employed			-2.68	1.53	-5.43*	1.54	-3.70**	1.45		
Work Status (1=Employed/Retired)									1.1	0.83
Income (%/Quintiles)			-0.24	0.39	1.01***	0.43	1.09***	0.42	0.90**	0.35
Level of Education			4.15****	0.54	4.54****	0.54	4.86****	0.52	5.55****	0.40
Demographics										
Female					8.30***	0.86	8.17****	0.83	9.79****	0.63
Married (Ref, ∞ = 1)										
Single					6.05***	1.16	3.67***	1.14	3.45****	0.95
Divorced, Separated, Widowed					1.61	1.07	0.69	1.03	1.93*	0.83
Partnered					8.39**	2.70	4.28	2.74	5.94	1.63
White (Ref)										
African-American (1=yes)					2.89*	1.32	1.91	1.36	0.09	1.13
Latinos (1=yes)					7.76****	1.43	5.52****	1.42	3.74***	1.09
Other Race (1=yes)					2.86	2.24	2.92	2.24	0.16	1.76
Ideology										
Protestant (Reference)										
Catholic							6.14****	0.89	6.86****	0.73
Jewish							9.74****	2.32	9.91****	2.18
Other Religion							3.35	2.83	7.02***	2.19
None							4.31****	1.22	4.62****	0.99
Church Attendance (1-6)							-2.21****	0.24	-2.15****	0.20
Political Party Affiliation (1-7)							-2.63***	0.19	-2.62****	0.16
Voting (1=yes)							2.56****	0.96	3.30****	0.82
_cons	48.75	1.23	39.65	2.47	24.42	2.81	35.94	2.85	31.33	2.08
N	5,004		5,004		5,004		5,004		9,322	
F	53.60****		50.15****		41.71****		56.52****		84.58****	
R2	0.0474		0.1043		0.1344		0.2178		0.2176	

Note: *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001, ****p<.0001

Source: American National Election Study, 1992-2012.

Table 4: Logistic Regression of Inclusion of LBG in Anti-Discrimination Laws

		1992-2004								1992-2012	
		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
Variables		β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Controls											
1992 (Reference)											
1996		0.18	0.08	0.16	0.08	0.16	0.08	0.16	0.09	0.17*	0.09
2000		0.25***	0.09	0.20**	0.09	0.20*	0.09	0.19*	0.09	0.22**	0.09
2004		0.67****	0.10	0.61****	0.10	0.61****	0.10	0.68****	0.11	0.71****	0.11
	2008									0.70****	0.09
	2012									0.85****	0.09
Age		-0.01****	0.00	-0.01***	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.01***	0.00
Status Attainment											
White-Collar Profession (Ref)											
Blue- & White- Collar Unskilled				0.02	0.09	-0.05	0.09	-0.02	0.09		
Protective & Armed Forces				-0.50**	0.21	-0.32	0.21	-0.2	0.22		
Blue-Collar Skilled				-0.44****	0.11	-0.27**	0.11	-0.30***	0.11		
Farm				-0.96****	0.22	-0.80****	0.23	-0.61**	0.25		
Non-Employed				-0.21	0.13	-0.35***	0.13	-0.25	0.14		
Work Status (1=Employed/Retired)								0.23***	0.07		
Income (%/Quintiles)				-0.01	0.03	0.08*	0.04	0.11**	0.04	0.08**	0.03
Level of Education				0.14****	0.05	0.15***	0.05	0.22****	0.05	0.28****	0.04
Demographics											
Female						0.44****	0.08	0.46****	0.08	0.50****	0.06
Married (Ref, ∞ = 1)											
Single						0.45****	0.10	0.31***	0.11	0.18*	0.09
Divorced, Separated, Widowed						0.12	0.09	0.06	0.09	0.16*	0.07
Partnered						0.52*	0.23	0.27	0.24	0.16	0.17
White (Ref)											
African-American (1=yes)						0.32**	0.11	0.18	0.12	-0.09	0.10
Latinos (1=yes)						0.11	0.13	-0.13	0.14	-0.1	0.10
Other Race (1=yes)						0.38	0.20	0.37	0.21	0.06	0.16
Ideology											
Protestant (Reference)											
Catholic								0.54****	0.09	0.45****	0.07
Jewish								0.58*	0.28	0.59*	0.24
Other Religion								0.56	0.31	0.43	0.26
None								0.26*	0.12	0.19*	0.09
Church Attendance (1-6)								-0.14****	0.02	-0.14****	0.02
Political Party Affiliation (1-7)								-0.22****	0.02	-0.23****	0.02
Voting (1=yes)								-0.05	0.09	0.11	0.07
_cons		0.78	0.10	0.52	0.21	-0.36	0.24	0.5	0.26	0.32	0.18
N		5,004		5,004		5,004		5,004		9,322	
F		15.49****		13.34****		11.65****		18.57****		31.79****	
Wald Chi		62.00****		146.99****		210.45****		466.59****		732.80****	

Note: *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001, ****p<.0001

Source: American National Election Study, 1992-2012.

Table 5: Logistic Regression of LGB Inclusions in Military Service

	1992-2004								1992-2012	
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
Variables	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Controls										
1992 (Reference)										
1996	0.47****	0.08	0.45****	0.09	0.47****	0.09	0.51****	0.09	0.50****	0.09
2000	0.85****	0.09	0.81****	0.09	0.85****	0.10	0.91****	0.10	0.91****	0.10
2004	1.18****	0.11	1.14****	0.11	1.22****	0.12	1.37****	0.12	1.33****	0.12
2008									1.12****	0.12
2012									1.64****	0.10
Age	-0.01****	0.00	-0.01****	0.00	-0.01****	0.00	-0.01****	0.00	-0.01****	0.00
Status Attainment										
White-Collar Profession (Ref)										
Blue- & White- Collar Unskilled			-0.17	0.09	-0.32***	0.10	-0.34***	0.10		
Protective & Armed Forces			-1.06****	0.21	-0.73***	0.21	-0.69**	0.22		
Blue-Collar Skilled			-0.74****	0.11	-0.43****	0.12	-0.49****	0.12		
Farm			-1.54****	0.22	-1.25****	0.23	-1.10****	0.25		
Non-Employed			-0.30*	0.13	-0.62****	0.14	-0.55****	0.15		
Work Status (1=Employed/Retired)									0.21**	0.08
Income (%/Quintiles)			0.00	0.03	0.07	0.04	0.09*	0.04	0.11***	0.04
Level of Education			0.09	0.05	0.13**	0.05	0.20****	0.05	0.33****	0.04
Demographics										
Female					0.88****	0.08	0.97****	0.09	0.85****	0.07
Married (Ref, ∞ = 1)										
Single					0.25*	0.11	0.06	0.12	0.24**	0.10
Divorced, Separated, Widowed					0.21*	0.10	0.14	0.10	0.15	0.08
Partnered					0.41	0.22	0.08	0.25	0.26****	0.19
White (Ref)										
African-American (1=yes)					-0.03	0.12	-0.21	0.13	-0.34***	0.11
Latinos (1=yes)					-0.03	0.14	-0.26	0.15	-0.27**	0.11
Other Race (1=yes)					-0.18	0.19	-0.2	0.22	-0.31	0.17
Ideology										
Protestant (Reference)										
Catholic							0.54****	0.09	0.45****	0.08
Jewish							1.01***	0.34	0.54	0.38
Other Religion							0.36	0.30	0.68***	0.26
None							0.25*	0.13	0.08	0.11
Church Attendance (1-6)							-0.20****	0.02	-0.21****	0.02
Political Party Affiliation (1-7)							-0.26****	0.02	-0.24****	0.02
Voting (1=yes)							0.12	0.09	0.11	0.08
_cons	0.93	0.10	0.98	0.22	0.11	0.25	1.25	0.28	0.27	0.20
N	5,004		5,004		5,004		5,004		9,322	
F	49.66****		30.60****		23.77****		27.53****		40.72****	
Wald Chi	198.75****		337.30****		429.28****		691.45****		938.79****	

Note: *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001, ****p<.0001

Source: American National Election Study, 1992-2012.

Figure 1: What about sexual relations between two adults of the same sex?