

**Author(s):** Strand, Douglas Alan

**Title:** Homosexuality, Gay Rights, and the Clinton Coalition: Report to the National Election Studies on Results from the 1993 NES Pilot Study

**Date:** March 16, 1994

**Dataset(s):** 1992 National Election Study, 1993 Pilot Study

---

## **Abstract**

This paper examines the 1993 Pilot Study items relating to gay rights. Strand finds that all the Pilot Study items show good criterion validity and, at least under certain circumstances, have substantive power in predicting more general attitudes regarding gay rights, morality, Aids, and gender issues. Strand also finds that the items seem to measure across a broad spectrum of bases of support and opposition to gay rights, as was intended in their design. Because the measures are so divergent, scaling of the Pilot Study items into a general "gay rights" support measure is unjustified. Scaling should, instead, be limited to one or two items. Strand then discusses the political importance of the gay rights measures. Specifically, he finds that a respondent's position on the "gays in the military" issue plays an important role in the developments of views of President Clinton. Finally, Strand examines the determinants of positions on the gay rights issues and finds that the important factors are: perceptions of what is natural or unnatural sexually, judgements whether "deviancy" is avoidable, and "gut reaction." Surprisingly, however, Strand finds little direct effect of theological beliefs -- independent of the other determinants examined -- in determining positions on gay rights issues.

Homosexuality, Gay Rights,  
and the Clinton Coalition:  
Report to the National Election Studies  
on Results from the  
1993 NES Pilot Study

Douglas Alan Strand

Dept. of Political Science  
210 Barrows Hall  
University of California, Berkeley  
Berkeley, CA 94720

March 16, 1994

## I. Background

The issue of gay rights rose to unprecedented national in 1993 with the rise of the "gays in the military" controversy. Conflict on this issue had appeared before that during the 1992 presidential campaign. Clinton courted the gay vote possibly more than any Democratic presidential candidate had theretofore. For its part, the Republican party highlighted Clinton's attention to this constituency and for a time attempted to use gay rights and "family values" as a wedge issue to break off culturally conservative Democrats. Although the Bush campaign subsequently reigned in its rhetoric on "family values", analysis of 1992 vote choice suggested that gay rights issues played a noteworthy role. (Shanks and Miller, 1993; Strand and Sherrill, 1993)

These analyses were possible because of the inclusion of a broader array of gay rights variables in the 1992 ANES instrument: questions on gay employment rights laws, legalizing gay adoption, and, most fortunately, a question as to whether gays should be allowed to serve in the US military. When the gays in the military issue became the leading hot button issue of the early months of the Clinton administration, it appeared that it would be wise for the National Election Study to build on the data derived from the gay rights questions in the 1992 Post-election interviewing and try to track the issue in the context of one of the 1993 Pilot Study's goals: to trace the development in the electorate of the "Clinton Coalition" after the inauguration. At the same time, it appeared that NES could take advantage of the unprecedented national salience of gay rights in general and learn something about the bases for public attitudes on gays and gay rights.

I suggested some question themes and subsequently engaged in what I feel was a very productive and careful discussion on how to pick the right questions in this topic area. A number of NES Board members and those serving on the Pilot Study Committee were most helpful in developing the right themes and particular question wordings. Ultimately, when repeats of the gay feeling thermometer and the 1992 policy questions are counted, 13 gay-related items appeared on the 1993 Pilot Study, the majority of which had never been asked in a survey before. I hope to show below that the inclusion of these items clearly paid off for the National Election Study and the social science community.

## II. Overview of Main Points

1. All of the items seemed to "work". All show good criterion validity. Moreover, even when the items are in the same analyses with each other, none really wash out as a general rule. Indeed, each seems to have its moment or moments of substantial power in predicting more general attitudes regarding gay rights, morality, AIDS, and gender.

2. One of my main goals in suggesting questions for the study was to broadly cover the various leading bases for support or opposition to gay rights: theological principle, perceptions

of what is "natural" versus "unnatural", perceptions of concrete social and personal threat, and just plain gut reaction to homosexuality. The results suggest that the questions did measure across a broad spectrum. Indeed, unidimensional scaling might for the most part be precluded because of the success in reaching this goal. But I think the analysis of comparative strength of these potential underpinnings for gay rights attitudes will be worth the diminution of scaling possibilities.

3. The goal of tracking the development of the Clinton Coalition was helped along considerably by the inclusion of gay rights questions. The analysis that follows will focus on the lagged, 1992 versions of these questions in attempting to understand how much of the change in measures of Clinton support were due to post-election attitudes on gay rights subsequently encountering or being activated by the surge in the real policy relevance of these attitudes with the gays in the military clash between the President, the Congress, and the military establishment. Future analysis might be able to develop satisfactory dynamic models of change in Clinton support that would not suffer from worries about causal direction. For now, I set aside use of the 1993 policy items in the analysis of change in Clinton support for that reason. Using the lagged, 1992 policy measures, I end up much more comfortable with what seems to be a demonstration of the leading causal importance of the gays in the military controversy and the attendant public opinions that predated the inauguration in shaping the development of the Clinton Coalition in the electorate.

4. The measurement of what were expected to be divergent yet overlapping bases for political opinions about gays and gay rights seems to have been quite successful. It seems to permit the apportionment of responsibility for directly affecting these political opinions among the possible alternative bases. Surprising to me is the result that divine authority -- given a one particular perception of divine will -- seems to have quite limited, though greatly varying potency in directly affecting gay rights and broad gay-related attitudes. Much more commonly influential are such things as perceptions of what is natural or unnatural, judgments about whether deviancy is avoidable or is instead something largely immutable, and just plain old gut reaction.

5. I close with recommendations for the 1994 NES and/or future biennial studies.

### III. A Look at the Question Responses

Table I are the marginal distributions on the 13 gay-related items in the 1993 Pilot Study. Certain things were expected: majority disapproval of Clinton's handling of the gays in the military affair. On two items only a small minority went for the

"homonegative"<sup>1</sup> response: only 13% indicated some worry that they would be running a special disease risk working with a gay person. Just 17% thought that many gays will try to seduce a heterosexual if an opportunity presents itself. Yet about a quarter of the population will accept at least one of these minority positions. Moreover, there seems to be some influential variation between the high and low levels of confidence that gays pose no problems in these areas.

A 54% majority managed to admit at least some discomfort at the idea of other people engaging in homosexual activity. Fully a third of the public will tell a survey researcher that they "strongly" feel that "the very idea of homosexuality is disgusting". Forty-three percent report strongly believing that homosexuality is "against the will of God". The country is split on whether homosexuality is a choice or an unavoidable fact of life for a gay person. Only a small minority judges that gays don't have enough influence in American "life and politics".

Table IIA-D are interitem correlations, both overtime where panel comparisons of identical items in 1992 and 1993 are possible, and among the broad array of gay and gay-related items in the 1993 instrument. Given all the controversy during the period between the panel waves, it is surprising how stable the gay feeling thermometer is. This suggests that people's general reaction to gays and homosexuality tends to be deeply rooted. To a lesser degree, I am also surprised by the stability of the gays in the military opinion. There is however potentially enough change here to try to explain in future analyses that I plan to do. That is not a focus in this particular report.

None of the gay-related items appears to be out of place with the rest of the items addressing the same general topic. The interitem correlations seem fairly respectable. Based on correlations of the homosexuality attitudes with gay rights attitudes, it appears that all of the new items show good criterion validity in this regard. The gender socialization item (here pooling responses to the different half-sample followups) was intended in part to aid in establishing criterion validity, and almost all of the new homosexuality items have virtually the same correlations with judgements about the importance of traditional masculinity and femininity. In examining correlations between the homosexuality attitudes and less automatically yet theoretically related items, such as the role of women scale, it appears that these items also demonstrate some construct validity.

Are there then good reasons to expect good scaling potential? As I indicated above, the items were designed to measure different dimensions and bases of attitude toward homosexuals and homosexuality so that they could be compared when they are together in a predictive equation. (The equations in

---

<sup>1</sup>Scientifically this is a more accurate term than "homophobia.

the second half of this paper are not intended to be full causal models.) I believe that when I present such equations below, there will be sufficient reason to believe that the goal of broad coverage of different dimensions was achieved and then scaling will appear to be limited to maybe one or two pairs of items. However, multidimensional scaling or multiple unidimensional scaling might appear feasible with further investigation.

I did not see any "weird" crosstabulation results casting doubt on the measurement validities of any of the gay items. I worried some that the God's will item might have suffered from misunderstanding of the "homosexuality should have nothing to do with God" alternative -- the strongly religious might pick this as the most condemning view of homosexuality (they are too sinful to relate to God). But only 2 out of 25 people who read the Bible more than once a day and hold it to be true "literally word for word" picked this option, while 22 said they strongly believed that homosexuality was against the will of God. Some people (14% of this nonreligious group) for whom religion was not important, who believed the Bible was not at all the word of God, and who also had no religious affiliation said that homosexuality was against the will of God, but so there might well be a degree of mismeasurement here.<sup>2</sup> How much is unclear. (Unfortunately the NES no longer keeps track of professing atheists.)

There appears to be room for separating perceptions of what is unnatural from theological beliefs, for there are more than a few respondents who will say "unnatural" but not say "against the will of God", and vice versa; and who will say "natural" but also say homosexuality is a "choice", or "unnatural" yet "can't be changed". Some of this divergence is probably measurement error; some is just a lack of tremendous attitudinal constraint.

#### IV. Gay Rights and the Clinton Coalition in 1993

The importance of the gays in the military controversy in affecting change in measures of Clinton support becomes clear in Tables IIIA through IIID. Here 1993 measures of 1992 "revote" preference (if the election were repeated, who would you vote for now, Clinton, Bush, or Perot?), the Clinton feeling thermometer, Clinton's rating on "provides strong leadership", and the sum of respondent reports of whether Clinton has ever made them feel angry, afraid, proud or hopeful (with a report of a positive emotion scored +1 and a negative emotion -1) are each modeled as a function of the respondent's value on the identical measure taken just before or just after the 1992 presidential election plus an array of issue and ideological preferences -- all also measured in the 1992 Pre/Post-election interviewing -- that potentially would explain how respondents would rate Clinton on

---

<sup>2</sup>On the other hand, religiously apathetic theists might construct the divine by projection just as easily as anyone else can do it.

each identical measure when it was asked in October and November of 1993.

This is a model of change in each of these four indicators of Clinton support or opposition. If one were to use dependent variables that were differences between each particular measure in 1993 and what it was for the same panel respondent in the fall of 1992, the coefficients for the predictors would be identical. This approach with the measure at time " $t_2$ " regressed on the same measure at time " $t_1$ " is used because it gives the more appropriate R-squared statistic. In sum, the analysis presented in Tables IIIA-B will address the question, given a respondents' levels on each particular measure of Clinton support in the fall of 1992, what issue preferences and ideological predispositions among those respondents predicted more or less up or down movement in the same measure when it was taken again after candidate Clinton had been inaugurated and had served his first 9-10 months as President Clinton.

But note that one of the measures of 1993 Clinton support lacks a 1992 predecessor: the general approval rating for how well he is handling his job as President. Here I cannot truly model change. Instead the coefficients essentially will represent how much each variable predicted Clinton's fall 1993 general approval given respondents' feeling thermometer rating for him during the NES Post-election survey period (approximately November through early January). In other words, what beyond a person's "starting gate" level of like or dislike for the just-elected President accounts for her or his approval level ten months later?

I say a "person's" starting gate level when in actuality my analysis is somewhat narrower than that: Tables IIIA-D focus only on voters (defined by self-report). Since the central question motivating these tables is how much did the gays in the military flap affect change in the Clinton Coalition--looking at changes in various measures of support level -- it seemed most appropriate to present the answer for those individuals who voted before and who will likely vote again in 1996. Including nonvoters would only blur the picture for the people most likely to decide the next election. But I have done some comparisons of the results in the analysis presented here with those which include all respondents. Between the two there is not a great deal of difference in the picture of the importance of conflict over gay rights in affecting public support for Clinton. Nonvoters seem to introduce less predictive power for gays in the military opinion, but more on the issue of whether the government should ban job discrimination against gays.

Note that Tables IIIA-D present two different coefficients in each cell: the unstandardized OLS regression coefficient and, in parentheses, the standardized coefficients or "beta weights" for the same variable in the same equation. I believe that both types of coefficients address the question of which variables were more "important", but in two different ways, both of which I

see as appropriate. The unstandardized coefficient will tell us how change in the dependent variable is predicted by movement from one extreme to the other on each variable --- like the dependent variable they are all scored 0-1, with 1 being the liberal extreme or, on the dependent variables, the pro-Clinton extreme. But on many of these variables there are not a lot of people at either extreme in our country at this time. That is why I find the beta weight the best comparative measure of importance<sup>3</sup>. It addresses the question of how much the change in the various measures of Clinton support is predicted by similar degrees of unitless variation on each variable in the American public of 1992-1993. In other words, it permits us to get a fix on which divergences of opinion in late 1992 were associated with the most subsequent fluctuation in evaluation of the new president.

One additional note is in order concerning the "revote" measure analyses. There simply is very little change here to explain. Voters overwhelmingly stuck with their 1992 election vote choices. Of the 601 people in the sample who cast a vote for either of the three major candidates in November 1992, only 39 of these switched their hypothetical revote to Clinton from either Bush or Perot. Unfortunately for the Clinton Coalition, he lost exactly 39 1992 voters to Bush, Perot, "none of the above" and "don't know". In explaining this tiny degree of change, gay rights opinion -- in any of its manifestations in the 1992 survey instrument -- fails to reach statistical significance and is almost always substantively trivial in its coefficients (see Table III E). But then so is pretty much every other explanatory variable save one (besides party identification): the national defense index (a sum of 2 items-- how willing the US should be to use force, and how important is it for the US to stay the world's leading military power regardless of cost). Clinton dependent variables other than the vote exhibit much greater variance, permitting better understanding of the bases for change in the degree of support for Clinton -- even if such change had not yet resulted in a hypothetical vote switch. I have included all such possible change measures of change in Clinton support.

Something else in the tables that might first appear odd, but then should make sense is the curvilinear negative association of the gay feeling thermometer ratings with change in the Clinton dependent variables. The equations in the table with each of the gay rights variables included by itself without any other gay rights variable in simultaneously all did include, however, a pair of gay feeling thermometer dummy variables to

---

<sup>3</sup>For comparisons of different ways of assessing the importance of independent variables, see Merrill Shanks, "The Importance of Importance...\*\*", Shanks/Miller..., and Chris Achen, Understanding and Interpreting Regression...\*\*fn



capture some of this curvilinearity.<sup>4</sup> When omitted, the feeling thermometer appeared to slightly suppress the association of gay rights opinion with the Clinton dependent variables. In the cases of the Clinton approval rating, the Clinton feeling thermometer and the summed feeling reactions, the negative association for those rating gays higher than 60 on the 0-100 feeling thermometer is fairly sizeable. Much rarer is the appearance of a similarly large negative association, which would be expected, for those clearly disliking gays (below 50) instead of being in the base category, 50-60. Given the lack of any measurement of gay or lesbian identity in the 1992 or 1993 instruments -- which I tend to think is as it should be given the likelihood of substantial underreporting of such a stigmatized category -- it is probably impossible to determine how much of the greater dislike for Clinton among the more "gay-friendly" as opposed to those with a more middling or neutral rating is due to the doubtless presence of some gay or lesbian or bisexual respondents in this part of the scale. It could also be just family and friends of gay people, or just strong liberals, who were disappointed with the outcome of Clinton's handling of the gays in the military issue. In the same category of probable disgruntlement is the 26% of strong supporters of gays in the military who then in 1993 reported strong disapproval of Clinton's handling of the gays in the military issue. This must account for much of the fact that the gays in the military approval variable fades into statistical insignificance when it is in the same equation with the other specific approval ratings in predicting overall 1993 Clinton job approval. The 1992 policy issue opinion itself is a better, more robust predictor of 1993 Clinton evaluations.

The beta weights bolster the case that gays in the military was an important explanation for the development of people's view of President Clinton over his first 10 months. In the case of 2 of the 5 replications of the change analysis -- the feeling thermometer and the sum of the four "feeling reactions" -- the beta for gays in the military when it is the only gay rights item in the equation -- the first column of each of Tables IIIA-D -- is either the largest for any variable in the equation, including party identification, or is essentially tied for this (possibly unfavorable) distinction. In the results for Clinton approval the gays in the military beta surpasses all but the one for party identification. Only on the change in the rating of the Clinton

---

<sup>4</sup>Experience with the gay feeling thermometer in modeling the 1992 presidential vote gave me the expectation that the feeling thermometer would work better as a pair of dummies for those below 50 and those above 61. In 1992 the feeling thermometer did not predict the vote when it was a continuous variable, but did when it was it was modeled as a single indicator variable for those having values below 50.

trait "provides strong leadership" does the beta fade into a tie for second place with the feeling thermometer for "feminists". But here it is "losing" to a variable with a considerable measurement advantage, a sum of the four measures of moral traditionalism. Even in this equation the beta for gays in the military surpasses that for party identification in predicting improvement or decline in voter rating of Clinton leadership strength.

When one examines the unstandardized regression coefficients above the beta weights in each cell, gays in the military becomes less outstanding as a predictor of change on the various Clinton evaluations. By this account, it still clearly leads in predicting change on Clinton's feeling thermometer, but for the other dependent variables gays in the military falls somewhat back in the pack in the degree to which a difference between people at the opposite extremes on the measure translates into a difference in their change in various Clinton evaluations. But gays in the military has far more people at either extreme than any of these other measures that surpass its unstandardized regression coefficient. Gays in the military is a relatively highly polarized opinion, with 72% all told at either end of the original 5 point scale on that single question<sup>5</sup>. That is why I think the beta weight is more appropriate for seeing gays in the military as possibly the single leading conflict in the electorate explaining individual-level change in the measures of the strength or weakness of the Clinton coalition. That leading role is not seen (given the 1992 measures we have), at least not so consistently across the "replications", for support for a government health insurance plan, for views on national defense, for feelings toward feminists, and for general moral traditionalism. And this omits listing (here and in the tables) other potential competitors for explaining change in Clinton support, such as views on taxation, abortion, and aid to the poor, which were in general not showing up as statistically significant.<sup>6</sup>

But there is a good deal more worth noting about the findings in Tables IIIA through D. Gays in the military is where most of the "action" is in the gay rights realm. Differences on

---

<sup>5</sup>Note that wherever it makes sense, I score Don't Knows =0, or the neutral or midpoint. This is intended to avoid case loss where I think more will be lost without the case than I would pay in any additional "noise" from the DK measurement error.

<sup>6</sup>The initial pool of "competitors" for explaining change in Clinton support was selected either because of expectations that they would explain 1993 change, e.g., health care, or because they had been found in the 1993 Shanks and Miller or Strand and Sherrill analyses to have predicted 1992 vote choice between Clinton and Bush. (Shanks and Miller 1993, Strand and Sherrill, 1993)

the question of whether gays should be legally permitted to adopt children is never statistically significant when it is the sole gay rights variable in the equations (last column in Tables IIIA-D) and almost always substantively trivial in the size of its coefficient. Position on laws against employment discrimination vis a vis gays (second column from the left) is sizeable, but clearly less potent than gays in the military in predicting change on the Clinton feeling thermometer. In the case of Clinton approval, it is second to defense, but again gays in the military does better when it is replaces discrimination laws as the single gay rights variable in the equation. But for the other dependent variables, discrimination law preference is not significant.

The third column in the tables ("Mil+Discrim") presents the coefficients from simply adding together gays in the military and gay discrimination law items. This indexing of the two items produces some boost in the appearance of the importance of gay rights "discriminatory/exclusion" attitude in general. But in the case of the "feeling reaction" sum, it depresses the relationship that appears for gays in the military by itself. In general it appears from their divergent predictive potencies that there is a substantial difference in what these items mean politically, so combining them tends to add emphasis to the picture of the importance of gay rights in predicting Clinton support change, but it seems to come at the cost of concealing more that it reveals.

I hope in future analyses to go much deeper in exploring the dynamics of support for Clinton and its relation to gay rights.<sup>7</sup> But I think Tables IIIA through D provide a sufficient initial demonstration of the probability that the gays in the military conflict resulted in change in the inclination of voters to support or oppose Clinton, or at least to like him more or less. Indeed, gays in the military might very well have been the single issue where differences of opinion among voters mattered the most in the development of their support for the new President. This becomes an even more likely conclusion when one notes the "double-edged sword" nature of the issue in producing change contrary to the usual ideological alignments, in the case of the gay feeling thermometer, as well as in accord with it, in the case of two of the gay rights variables. 1993 apparently was an excellent time to measure the divisiveness of gay rights.

---

<sup>7</sup>I also intend to pursue the possibility of an instrumental variables approach to reducing measurement error in the lagged 1992 Clinton support measures. But for the time being, I do not believe that measurement error there would result in a larger boost in the coefficient for gays in the military over the boost lent to the coefficients for competing explanatory variables.

## V. Comparing the Strength of the Underpinnings of Gay Rights and Gay-Related Political Attitudes

As I see it, the most interesting part of the 1993 Pilot Study data on gays and gay rights comes with the new measures of bases for evaluations of homosexuality and homosexuals. These I believe allow us to learn some new things both about the grounds for these gay rights opinions that appear to have been so divisive in 1993 and about the comparative bases for public reaction to deviant or unpopular groups. In particular, we can begin to gauge the independent role of theology and religion in producing reactions to such groups where morality is commonly perceived to be at issue.

Tables IVAs through IVD -- now including all respondents -- I find so rich that it is difficult to know where to start or how to best organize presentation of the interesting findings. But I will start with the finding that strikes me most: the limited and varying direct impact of the perception that homosexuality is against the will of God compared with the regularly strong direct impact of differing views about whether homosexuality is unnatural or, for at least some people, natural sexuality. Since the time I helped design the questions here, I expected that beliefs about God, as presumably the Ultimate Arbiter, would be a potent independent, additive predictor of a wide variety of gay rights opinions, even when the overlapping nonreligiously-motivated opposition to homosexuality was controlled for. What basis could be more absolute and august in authority, at least for many believers? Yale law professor Stephen L. Carter has recently drawn much attention arguing that "[f]or vast numbers of Americans, another agency of settlement for moral dilemmas [besides courts] -- another authority -- is available: divine command," and that this source of authority deserves more respect in political discourse. (Carter, 1993) James Davison Hunter has argued that perceptions of the absolute and unchanging authority of scripture and church authority provide the main underpinnings for conservative positioning in this country's alleged "Culture Wars". (Hunter, 1991) After reviewing the research on religion and prejudice, including their own, Batson and Burris have concluded that most religiosity (both "extrinsic", means-oriented religiosity and well as "intrinsic", religion-as-end-in-itself religiosity) fosters prejudice when it is not proscribed by the religious community, such as has been the case historically in many religious communities with regard to homosexuals. (Batson and Burris, 1994) I expected that perceptions of God's will would affect not just views of gay rights in terms of such more traditional family issues like adoption, but also even in the case of gays in the military and anti-discrimination laws for gays. I thought that a considerable number of people would clearly be much more likely to oppose **banning** a particular form of discrimination or ending a military exclusion -- above and beyond whatever other motivations for opposing homosexuality they might have -- if they viewed homosexuality as condemned by God in

the same way they would oppose a nondiscrimination law for thieves and alcoholics or want to keep such individuals out of the military.

But it seems that there is much less direct divine impetus on gay rights issues-- again controlling for other bases for judgement of homosexuality that are not explicitly religious, and which are easily held by nonreligious people. Of course, some of the indirect routes to anti-gay rights attitudes probably stem from theology but are entirely mediated by, for example, views of what is "natural". And, I would expect that people's theology -- including opting out of or into a conservative religious faith -- is influenced by childhood nonreligious socialization in the area of gender and sexuality norms. Indeed, I expect most people's antipathy to homosexuality to predate their exposure to claims about the lessons of Sodom and Gomorrah. Nevertheless, I fully expected someone who believes that homosexuality is unnatural and against the will of God to be more strongly and consistently opposed to gay rights than someone who just believed in what I expected to be a weaker underpinning, i.e., a perception of what is or is not natural. I really did not expect it to be much of a contest between divine will and the "natural" in terms of influencing gay rights attitude.

Religious conservatism has been found to be most consistently associated with political and social conservatism in the areas of gender, abortion and sexuality.<sup>8</sup> But as far as I can tell this research has rarely tried to separate out the nonreligious, traditionalistic attitudes which could be potential confounds in any attempt to analyze the impact of religious views on social and political attitudes. That was one of the main goals in the design of these Pilot questions on attitudes towards homosexuality. It turns out that in analysis of key areas of debate over gay rights in our society, views about divine will (for at least the population in general) seem to have little direct impact over and above variables tapping opposition to homosexuality that are not explicitly religious and are for many people probably not based on religion. Views about what is "natural", phobias about catching diseases from gays, and perceptions that gays are sexually "pushy" are cognitive evaluations that clearly predict gay rights attitudes across a broad front when theology does not.

Tables IVA1a-c show the results of regressions of various attitudes regarding homosexuals, gay-related public policies, gender issues, and general morality on what I posit as the four fundamental cognitive evaluations of homosexuality measured in the Pilot Study. In this series of tables they are all scored to differentiate different degrees of negativity from either neutrality or positive viewpoints, which are both at this point lumped together at a score of 1. The negative end, e.g.,

---

<sup>8</sup>Wald, Owen, and Hill

strongly believing that homosexuality is against the will of God, strongly believing that homosexuality is unnatural, strongly believing that gays are special disease risks in a work environment, and strongly believing that gays try to seduce people who aren't gay are all scored 0. For this first series of tables, variance is only permitted on the negative side because I wanted to compare the God's will item with the nonreligious items on essentially equivalent terms. Otherwise the God's will item is set up such that the extreme positive end is not really as strongly supportive as the analogous endpoint is with the "natural" item, and to a lesser degree, it seems to me, with the disease and seduction cognitive evaluations. As I have set it up in this first set of comparisons, the items are all being compared when the others are simultaneously controlled for in a way that compares movement of varying degrees into and out of the negative zone in a way that shouldn't handicap one measure over another. I generally found that the God's will item shows a greater direct association in this format than when the items are compared across the full range in their question format.

Tables IVA1a-c control for no other variables beyond these competing cognitive evaluations. Tables IVA2a-c add demographic controls, e.g, gender, age, education, social class, rural background. Then Tables IVA3a-c add to these a set of religion dummies that separate out evangelical identifiers (fundamentalist, evangelicals, and charismatic) from those claiming a "moderate to liberal" Christianity. Separate dummies are included for Jews, nonevangelical Catholics, and those having no religious affiliation (as well as some other religion dummies described in the appendix).

One main point of the display of incremental controls is to show how little actually changes in the original coefficients for the cognitive evaluations of homosexuality. The other point is to show the incremental additive effect of the gender and religion dummies, particularly those for evangelical religious identification. This latter group is further subdivided into those who claim that religion provides "a great deal of guidance" in their daily life versus those who indicate a lesser degree of daily importance for religion in their lives. (Religion and demographic coefficients are selectively featured to emphasize those showing a general predictive importance.)

Views of the will of God are strongly related to the report of disgust in reaction to homosexuality. Here theology provides about as potent a direct effect as the "natural" judgement. God's will also adds substantial prediction of the feeling thermometer for gays, the view that the country should put more emphasis on traditional family ties, and, consonant with this traditional "family values" perspective, divine will seems associated importantly with opposition to permitting gays to adopt children. The latter one would expect from the emphasis on the family in much Christian tradition.

But the additive impact of theology -- at least to the

extent measured here -- does not seem to extend much beyond the prediction of attitude in the cases just mentioned. Very little additional impetus for opposition to antidiscrimination laws seems to stem from perceptions of God's will. There is no association with preferences for levels of spending for AIDS research, as there is to some extent for the natural, disease, and seduction opinions. There is likewise no theological association with the view that "we have gone too far in pushing equal rights"; there is some association between this general rights perspective and disease and seduction perceptions.

The theological association with gays in the military opinion is about half that of the association of this policy preference with the view on what is natural sexuality. Moreover, much of the God's will direct association disappears when religious group and importance variables are put in the equation. These evangelical identification cum religious importance associations are apparently not much mediated by theology. In general across this array of dependent variables, the evangelicalism/fundamentalism variables often equal or exceed the predictive strength of theology, such as in the case of AIDS spending. Further analysis might shed light on how much of the margin in these variables for the group that says that their evangelicalism provides a "great deal" of guidance in their life is due to greater group participation and thus group contextual effects, and how much is due instead to greater individual devotion to the religion (such as might be measured through level of bible reading and prayer). Unfortunately, I expect that the number of cases might be too small to avoid the multicollinearity involved in unteasing these interaction effects.

In contrast to the limited direct predictive potency of theology, the Pilot measurement of opinion about what is natural sexuality produces a typically much more consistently substantial prediction of views across the array of dependent variables here. As I suggested above, this is quite contrary to my expectations for the strength of such a seemingly subjective, mysterious construct. It might just be showing us the strength of childhood and adolescent socialization on sexual norms.

Concerns about disease contagion and expectations of sexual harassment, or the lack of either of these, are regularly and substantially present in lending additive prediction. However, I expected these fears of concrete threat from gays to produce even stronger negative reactions on rights and influence. Maybe that just suggests that I expected too much rational weight from these perceptions. Nonetheless, the disease fear appears to be strongly associated with opinion on job discrimination laws, but this might be inflated by the fact that both items refer to the workplace.

The view that homosexuality is disgusting or makes the respondent uncomfortable is added into the equations in Tables IVB1 and B2. Also added is the opinion on whether homosexuality is a choice or something that gays can't change. At the same time, all of the variables are now allowed to vary across their

full positive and negative codings.

The choice variable provided another surprise for me. I expected the choice/no choice evaluation to be too esoteric for the average respondent to be anything other than just a product of his or her other more basic views about homosexuality. Yet choice is substantial in its direct additive association with variables where one would expect it to be particularly relevant, namely, on job discrimination and military exclusion. If a person can't change a feature, there is a stronger argument, *ceteris paribus*, against excluding that person from a job or career, although this might depend on perceiving the characteristic as nonthreatening. On the other hand, choice seems to make little difference in the case of gay adoption rights and it there is no evidence that a "no choice" view greatly effects how much the person holding that opinion likes or dislikes homosexuals. It is of course possible that some of the robust correlation of choice with the gay discrimination or military items is a result of question order: the choice item follow these almost immediately. The policy questions might produce pressure for cognitive consistency.

The reported negative affective reaction to homosexuality shows considerable independent predictive strength. This is what I expected, although some recent literature has suggested that in the case of unpopular and salient social groups, symbolic attitudes dominate over affective reactions. (Esses, Haddock and Zanna, 1993) In any event, the strength of disgust suggests that this kind of measurement of strong distaste for important actions of some other people can work in survey research. Given doubts about complete candor on the part of respondents, one is left wondering whether this coefficient is even much larger in reality.

Again, demographic and religious controls produce little diminution of the coefficients for these cognitive and affective variables. But this time the additive religious group effects no longer differentiate according to the importance of religion to the individual. Obviously the next step is to evaluate how much of these differences were apparently due to disgust differences as opposed to differences in the choice view. Now, however, theology is completely gone from any direct association with a gays in the military view. Gender, on the other hand, persists in showing an additive association for both gays in the military and job discrimination.

Table IVC is an examination of the possible conditioning effects of the choice viewpoint on the associations of the three gay rights variables with the other homosexuality judgements. The results in part follow what one would expect logically. It is harder for theological condemnation to play a role when the human being whose behavior is in question can't change the way they are. A role for views of what is natural is seemingly impeded a great deal by definition, and that is what we see. Nevertheless, disgust continues to have a strong association with these rights variables. If a respondent does not like the



activity, the fact that the actor can't change the inclination to that activity does not seem to make much of a difference in rights policy for that same respondent. In general, the "no choice" belief seems to correspond with a shift away from the association of rights judgements with moral judgments (involving God and naturalness), but still leaves plenty of room for perceptions of social and health threats in addition to just emotional reaction.

Finally, Table IVD adds in the sum of the 1992 and 1993 feeling thermometers in order to show the continuing additional strength of the cognitive evaluations. Natural and choice still hold up surprisingly well under all these controls for affect and other cognitions. Disease and, to a lesser extent, seduction threat perceptions also persist in predicting opinion on gays in the military and job discrimination. God's will, on the other hand, only shows the suggestion of effect in the case of adoption by gays. Religious group variables, again undifferentiated by level of religiosity, continue to show an association with gays in the military. I think such an association is noteworthy for variables not directly about homosexuality and present in an equation with many measures that are specifically related to the dependent variables.

After examining all these different associations of the different homosexuality attitudes with criterion variables, do any of these variables, despite my best efforts, seem to be measuring the same thing, and thus allow some limited scaling? I think it is clear that natural and God are conceptually different. There does seem a distinct possibility that natural and choice can be combined, but the differences above in the direct relation of each with adoption policy and opinion on the gay influence question, as well as the substantial greater bivariate correlation of natural with God all confirm my suspicion that the "natural" measure captures a moral viewpoint in addition to a more factual/scientific judgement. Thus these may indeed be too different for scaling. Disease and seduction seem to show fairly similar relationships with criterion variables except in the case of the role of women attitude where seduction is quite a robust predictor, even when feminist attitudes are included. In any event, it seems likely the study achieved the goal of maximizing coverage the array of major dimensions underlying attitudes towards gays and gays rights. Factor analysis and other further investigations might present multidimensional scaling possibilities, or suggest multiple unidimensional scales.

#### VI. Conclusions and Recommendations:

1. The gays in the military controversy seems to have been important in affecting the development of the Clinton Coalition by producing change in a broad array of measurements of Clinton support. Therefore I recommend:

A. Continue to ask at least the gays in the military and the job

discrimination items in the 1994 and 1996 ANES. The adoption item could be useful as a stable comparison measure.

B. Include as many repeats of 1992 or 1993 Clinton evaluations as possible in order to permit analysis of change in this regard. I strongly suggest that the "moral" trait be included in the next battery so that the 1992 version can be used on the right-hand side of a change analysis in this area possibly catching some of the fallout from the gays in the military affair. I also urge a Clinton reelection vote intention question in 1994 (such was asked, I believe, concerning Bush in 1990 or 1991).

C. Repeat the battery of religion questions full-sample in 1994. This will not only provide additional measurement leverage for analysis of religiosity interaction effects vis a vis gay rights, but I saw evidence at least suggesting that the impact of gays in the military might well have been conditioned to a noteworthy extent by a literalist view of the Bible. (Unfortunately time and space limitations are preventing me from adding another table to show this.) It is quite plausible that Clinton will be quickly forgiven (or already has been) on gays in the military by those holding nonreligious motivations for opposing the policy. But fundamentalists and evangelicals might continue to hold it against him.

2. Theology seemed to more often than not play a minor role in directly predicting opinion on the most salient gay rights issues, discrimination and the military. Overall, other factors, such as perceptions of what is natural, what is chosen and what is just plain distasteful seemed to more regularly directly affect gay rights attitudes and such things as spending on the fight against AIDS.

I did see evidence suggesting that the will of God was more strongly associated with these policy attitudes for those who were Biblical literalists and those who read the bible more frequently (yet not much interaction with the subjective report of the importance of religion, with the frequency of prayer, and with church attendance). Such inferences are preliminary and tentative so far.

In any event, I believe that NES should build on its investment in the 1993 homosexuality attitude questions. The best-targeted approach I see is to expand the array of theological measurements, either specifically focused on homosexuality or addressed more broadly. We could use more variance on the theological measure. A large chunk of the population might too easily fall into stating that homosexuality is against the will of God. Present an option that is harder to assent to. For example, Gallup has found 60% of evangelicals and 35% of nonevangelicals agreeing that "I sometimes think that AIDS is a punishment from God". Maybe the will of God effect is highly conditioned by the expectation that God will bring about

concrete harmful events for the society.

Another approach I favor would be to try to see how much a measure of a personality trait, such as dogmatism or authoritarianism conditions theological **and religious group** reaction to homosexuality. There is one perspective on fundamentalism that argues that its association with higher levels of prejudice and discriminatory treatment of women and gays stems from these kinds of psychological traits allegedly more likely to be found among fundamentalists. As McFarland suggests, "Perhaps as Glock and Stark and many others have argued, fundamentalism cloaks a general closed-minded, ethnocentric mindset, which is shown here as a general tendency to discriminate." (McFarland, 1989) So it would be nice to compare theology with personality in explaining, for example, the association of God's will with gay adoption opinion. I suggest consideration of a small dogmatism battery for the 1994 instrument.

On the other hand, pure theology might explain a lot. There is also the possibility of seeking out more information on religious group exposure, thinking that might condition a great deal. The GSS in 1988 asked about the religious affiliation of good friends. This could allow the exploration of religious group conditioning effects.

In general, we already have a good array of information on nonreligious opposition to homosexuality. We should expand the theological side for better comparison and conditioning effect exploration, and in addition add a measurement of a personality trait that could be a confound in an analysis of the impact of theological convictions.

3. I found little evidence that we could improve on the vote predictive potency of the gay rights attitudes. The gay influence item was not clearly providing much incremental explanatory potential. The thermometer will show less than routine behavior, but it seemed to capture a broad array of homosexuality attitudes.

4. It might be wise to include a question inquiring whether R knows a gay or lesbian in the 1994 NES. Although the contact hypothesis vis a vis prejudice has only conditional support, knowing a gay person might buffer the translation of a given level of homonegativism into policy opposition, since R might be more likely to see unfair, harmful consequences resulting for someone than if R doesn't know any gay people. In this kind of specification, I would not have any strong causal direction worries.

5. The natural, God, choice, and disgusting items might be profitable inclusions in a 4 year panel with a couple of rights items for purposes of untangling causal relationships among the foundational attitudes and the rights views. There might be enough fluctuation on some of these measures over a 4 year

period.

6. The strong role seen for choice and natural as opposed to God suggests more potential for liberal change on gay rights. On the other hand, as the choice conditioning analysis suggested, pure gut reaction can be powerful despite a presumably stronger logical or philosophical foundation for gay rights support. In any event, NES might want to ask these questions every 8-12 years and derive a time series on these basic predispositions.

Let me conclude by deeply thanking the Board and the staff of the National Election Studies for the privilege of participating in the Pilot Study process. I have found it most gratifying.

Works Cited

- Batson, C. Daniel and Christopher T. Burris. 1994. Personal Religion: Depressant or Stimulant of Prejudice and Discrimination? In The Psychology Of Prejudice: The Ontario Symposium, ed., Mark P. Zanna and James M. Olson, 7: 149-169. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Carter, Stephen L. 1993. The Culture of Disbelief: How American Law and Politics Trivializes Religious Devotion. New York: Basic Books.
- Esses, Victoria, Geoffrey Haddock, and Mark P. Zanna. 1993. Values, Stereotypes, and Emotions as Determinants of Intergroup Attitudes. In Affect, Cognition and Stereotyping: Interactive Processes in Group Perception, ed., Diane M. Mackie and David L. Hamilton, 137-166. New York: Academic Press.
- Hunter, James Davison. 1991. Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America. New York: Basic Books.
- McFarland, Sam G. 1989. Religious Orientations and the Targets of Discrimination. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 28 (3): 324-336.
- Shanks, J. Merrill and Warren E. Miller. 1993. Performance, Policy, Partisanship -- and Perot: Alternative Interpretations of the 1992 Elections. Paper prepared for delivery at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC, September 2- September 5, 1993.
- Strand, Douglas Alan and Kenneth S. Sherrill. 1993. Electoral Bugaboos? The Impact of Attitudes Towards Gay Rights and Feminism on the 1992 Presidential Vote. Paper prepared for delivery at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC, September 2- September 5, 1993.

Table I  
Gay-Related 1993 NES Pilot Study Items  
and Frequency Distributions

\* Do you approve or disapprove of the way Bill Clinton has handled the question of homosexuals in the military?

Approve/Strongly	133	17.8%
Approve/Not Strongly	139	18.6
Disapprove/Not Strongly	127	17.0
Disapprove/Strongly	311	41.7
DK	36	4.8

\* Feeling Thermometer: Gay Men and Lesbians, that is homosexuals?

Mean:	38.9
Median:	50
% Zero:	16.2

\* (Forms 1,2)

Which comes closer to your view:

In raising their children parents should encourage boys to be masculine and girls to be feminine,

or

Parents should pay little attention to traditional notions of masculinity and femininity.

Encourage/Strongly	160	40.3%
Encourage/Not Strongly	52	13.1
Little Attention/Not Strongly	49	12.3
Little Attention/Strongly	124	31.2
DK	12	3.0

(Forms 3,4; alternate followup)

"Do you think parents should give a lot of attention to this matter or only some?"/"Do you think parents should pay any attention at all to this?"

A Lot of Attention	85	24.6%
Some Attention	96	27.7
Little Attention	94	27.2
No Attention At All	56	16.2
DK	15	4.3

\* Do you favor or oppose laws to protect homosexuals against job discrimination?

Favor/Strongly	275	37.1%
Favor/Not Strongly	172	23.2
Oppose/Not Strongly	97	13.1
Oppose/Strongly	163	22.0
DK	34	4.6

\* Do you think homosexuals should be allowed to serve in the United States Armed Forces or don't you think so?

Allow/Strongly	318	42.9%
Allow/Not Strongly	125	16.8
Not Allow/Not Strongly	57	7.7
Not Allow/Strongly	216	29.1
DK	26	3.5

\* Do you think gay or lesbian couples, in other words, homosexual couples, should be legally permitted to adopt children?

Permit/Strongly	109	14.6%
Permit/Not Strongly	99	13.3
Don't Permit/Not Strongly	68	9.1
Don't Permit/Strongly	445	59.7
DK	24	3.2

\* Do you think being homosexual is something people choose to be, or do you think it is something they cannot change?

People Choose/Strongly	238	32.1%
People Choose/Not Strongly	76	10.3
People Cannot Change/Not Strongly	97	13.1
People Cannot Change/Strongly	249	33.6
DK	81	10.9

\* Which comes closer to your view:

One: If they get the chance, many homosexuals will try to seduce people who are not homosexual.

Or,

Two: Like the majority of people, homosexuals don't make sexual advances on people who are not interested.

Will Try to Seduce/Strongly	87	11.7%
Will Try to Seduce/Not Strongly	34	4.6
Don't Make Advances/Not Strongly	138	18.6
Don't Make Advances/Strongly	440	59.2
DK	44	5.9

\* Some people find the very idea of homosexuality disgusting, while others don't have that particular emotional reaction. What about you?

-->Followup on Not Disgusted:

Would you say that the idea of other people practicing homosexuality makes you feel personally uncomfortable, or that you don't have that reaction either?

Feel Disgusted/Strongly	255	33.2%
Feel Disgusted/Not Strongly	43	5.6
Feel Uncomfortable/But Not Disgusted	118	15.3
Not Uncomfortable or Disgusted	326	42.5
DK	25	3.3

\* Which comes closer to how you feel:

"If I had a job working with a gay or lesbian, I would be worried about getting AIDS or some other disease."

or,

"I don't worry that working with a homosexual would pose any special danger of disease."

Very Worried	57	7.7%
A Little Worried	42	5.6
No Danger/Somewhat Confident	235	31.5
No Danger/Very Confident	395	53.0
DK	16	2.1



\* Which of these statements comes closer to your view:

One, homosexuality is unnatural.

Or,

Two, for some people, homosexuality is their natural sexuality.

Homosexuality Unnatural/Strongly	277	37.2%
Homosexuality Unnatural/Not Strongly	42	5.6
Natural Sexuality/Not Strongly	109	14.7
Natural Sexuality/Strongly	285	38.3
DK	31	4.2

\* Some people think that homosexuals have too much influence in American life and politics, others think they have just about the right amount of influence, while other people feel they don't have enough influence. What is your opinion?

--> Do you feel that homosexuals have much too much influence or only a little too much influence?

--> Do you feel that homosexuals have far too little influence or only slightly too little influence?

--> Are you closer to feeling that homosexuals have a little too much influence or only slightly too little influence?

Much Too Much Influence	165	22.5%
Little Too Much Influence	120	16.4
Closer to A Little Too Much	133	18.1
Just the Right Amount	39	5.3
Closer to Slightly Too Little	151	20.6
Slightly Too Little	62	8.5
Far Too Little Influence	26	3.5
DK	37	5.0

\* Do you feel that:

Homosexuality is against the will of God;

That homosexuality can be acceptable to God;

or

That homosexuality should have nothing to do with God?

Against God's Will/Strongly	320	43.1%
Against God's Will/Not Strongly	28	3.8
Should Have Nothing To Do With God	237	31.9
Homosexuality Acceptable to God/Not Strongly	33	4.4
Homosexuality Acceptable to God/Strongly	75	10.1
None of These Are Right	11	14.8
DK	39	5.2

Table IIA Overtime Correlations

92-93 gaythermometer	.71
92-93 gaymilitary	.59
92-93 gaydiscrim. laws	.54
92-93 gayadopt	.72

Table IIB Correlations among 93 Policy/Thermometer/Influence

	93 gaymil	93gay discrim	93gay adopt	93gay therm	93gay influ ence	clint aprv gays
93gaymil	1.00					
93gaydisc	.44	1.00				
93gayadopt	.47	.32	1.00			
93gaytherm	.55	.45	.55	1.00		
93gayinfluence	.52	.47	.49	.54	1.00	
clint aprv gays	.47	.32	.26	.36	.32	1.00

Table IIC Correlations Among '93 Homosexuality/Gender Views

	gender soclztn	gaygod	gaynatural	gaychoice
gender soclztn	1.0			
gaygod	.33	1.0		
gaynatural	.37	.57	1.0	
gaychoice	.33	.48	.59	1.0
gayseduce	.30	.33	.35	.31
gaydisease	.23	.23	.57	.45
gaydisgust	.36	.49	.57	.45
gayinflunc	.32	.45	.55	.45

	gayseduce	gaydisease	gaydisgust	gayinflunc
gender soclztn				
gaygod				
gaynatural				
gaychoice				
gayseduce	1.0			
gaydisease	.34	1.0		
gaydisgust	.40	.34	1.0	
gayinflunc	.33	.31	.51	1.0

Table IID Correlations Between Homosexuality Views and  
Gay Policy /Thermometer

	93gay military	93gay discrim	93gayadopt	93gaytherm
gaygod	.37	.28	.43	.47
gaynatural	.46	.37	.48	.52
gaychoice	.43	.40	.37	.46
gayseduc	.35	.29	.35	.41
gaydisease	.30	.33	.28	.35
gaydisgust	.48	.33	.50	.59
gayinflunc	.53	.47	.49	.54

Table IIIA  
Accounting for Change  
in Clinton Feeling Thermometer, '92-'93  
Dependent Variable= '93 Clinton FT  
(Dep. Var and Indep. Vars All Scored 0-1)  
(Cell Entries are Unstandardized OLS Regression Coefficients  
with Standardized Coefficients in Parentheses)  
n=426 '92 voters      Varying Specifications

Independent Variables	Military (1)	Discrim. (2)	Mil+Discrim (3)	Adoption (4)
GayMilitary	.116 (.178)	om	om	om
GayDiscrim	om	.060* (.089)	om	om
Mil+Discrim	om	om	.138# (.183)	om
GayAdoption	om	om	om	-.017ns (-.024)
GayTherm 0-49	ns	ns	ns	ns
GayTherm61-100	-.071** (-.100)	-.063 (-.087)	-.068** (-.095)	-.059* (-.083)
PartyID	.068** (.099)	.076** (.111)	.073** (.107)	.071** (.104)
ThermFeminsts	ns	ns	ns	.091 (.075)
MoralIndex	ns	ns	ns	ns
Defense	.089 (.069)	.096* (.075)	.092 (.072)	.096* (.075)
Taxes	ns	ns	ns	ns
HealthInsur	ns	ns	ns	ns
R-Squared	.582	.570	.580	.565
S.E.E.	.182	.184	.182	.185

Note: (1) is an equation with '92 gays in military policy opinion + gay feeling thermometer dummies + 92 Post-Election Clinton feeling thermometer; (2) contains 92 gay job discrimination policy opinion + same; (3) contains '92 gay military+discrim policy opinion + same; (4) contains gay adoption policy +same. Except in (3), no two policy opinions are in the same specification. See Appendix for Independent/Control Vars. om=omitted from specification; \*=p-value<=.05; \*\*=p-value<=.02;#=p<=.005; ns=not significant=p<.1 (two-tailed test)

Table IIIB  
Accounting for Change  
in Clinton "4 Feelings Sum"  
1992-1993

Dep. Variable= sum of 4 '93 feelings re Clinton  
(See Explanatory Notes Atop Table IIIA)

n=426 '92 voters      Varying Specifications

Independent Variables	Military (1)	Discrim. (2)	Mil+Discrim (3)	Adoption (4)
GayMilitary	.107** (.127)	om	om	om
GayDiscrim	om	.025ns (.029)	om	om
Mil+Discrim	om	om	.101* (.105)	om
GayAdoption	om	om	om	.033ns (.036)
GayTherm 0-49	ns	-.078* (-.112)	ns	-.077* (-.110)
GayTherm61-100	-.095** (-.104)	-.087* (-.095)	-.091* (-.100)	-.093* (-.101)
PartyID	.095 (.108)	.099** (.112)	.099** (.113)	.100** (.114)
ThermFeminsts	.202** (.130)	.206** (.133)	.193** (.124)	.209# (.135)
MoralIndex	ns	ns	ns	ns
Defense	.144* (.088)	.149 (.091)	.147* (.090)	.146* (.089)
HealthInsur	ns	ns	ns	ns
R-Squared	.495	.487	.492	.488
S.E.E.	.256	.258	.256	.257

Note: (1) is an equation with '92 gays in military policy opinion + gay feeling thermometer dummies + sum of 4 '92 (Pre-election) Clinton feeling reactions; (2) contains '92 gay job discrimination policy opinion + same; (3) contains '92 gay military+discrim policy opinion + same; (4) contains gay adoption policy +same. Except in (3), no two policy opinions are in the same specification. See Appendix for Independent Control Vars. om=omitted from specification; \*=p-value<=.05; \*\*=p-value<=.02; #=p<=.005; ns=not significant=p<.1 (two-tailed test)

Table IIIC  
Accounting for Change  
in Clinton Leadership Trait Rating  
1992-1993

Dep. Variable= '93 Rating of Clinton Leadership Trait  
(See Explanatory Notes Atop Table IIIA)

n=426 '92 voters                      Varying Specifications

Independent Variables	Military (1)	Discrim. (2)	Mil+Discrim (3)	Adoption (4)
GayMilitary	.090** (.137)	om	om	om
GayDiscrim	om	.058ns (.085)	om	om
Mil+Discrim	om	om	.116** (.152)	om
GayAdoption	om	om	om	-.010ns (-.014)
GayTherm 0-49	ns	ns	ns	ns
GayTherm61-100	ns	ns	ns	ns
PartyID	.078* (.113)	.084** (.122)	.082* (.118)	.081* (.117)
ThermFeminsts	.165** (.135)	.159** (.130)	.152* (.124)	.177** (.145)
MoralIndex	.196# (.168)	.193# (.166)	.191# (.164)	.201# (.172)
Defense	ns	ns	ns	ns
HealthInsur	.117** (.127)	.114** (.124)	.114** (.125)	.115** (.126)
R-Squared	.355	.350	.356	.346
S.E.E.	.227	.228	.227	.229

Note: (1) is an equation with '92 gays in military policy opinion + gay feeling thermometer dummies + 92 (Pre-election) leadership trait rating; (2) contains '92 gay job discrimination policy opinion + same; (3) contains '92 gay military+discrim policy opinion + same; (4) contains gay adoption policy +same. Except in (3), no two policy opinions are in the same specification. See Appendix for Independent/Control Vars.  
om=omitted from specification; \*=p-value<=.05; \*\*=p-value<=.02; #=p<=.005; ns=not significant=p<.1 (two-tailed test)



Table IIID  
 Dependent Variable='93 Clinton Job Approval Rating  
 (See Explanatory Notes Atop Table IIIA)

n=426 '92 voters      Varying Specifications

Independent Variables	Military (1)	Discrim. (2)	Mil+Discrim (3)	Adoption (4)
GayMilitary	.097* (.105)	om	om	om
GayDiscrim	om	.072 (.074)	om	om
Mil+Discrim	om	om	.133** (.124)	om
GayAdoption	om	om	om	-.000ns (-.000)
GayTherm 0-49	ns	ns	ns	-.066 (-.085)
GayTherm61-100	-.097* (-.095)	-.090* (-.088)	-.095* (-.093)	-.089* (-.088)
PartyID	.119** (.122)	.127# (.130)	.123** (.127)	.123# (.126)
ThermFeminsts	ns	ns	ns	.142 (.082)
MoralIndex	ns	ns	ns	ns
Defense	.183** (.101)	.189** (.104)	.186** (.102)	.189** (.104)
HealthInsur	.088 (.068)	ns	ns	ns
R-Squared	.544	.542	.545	.538
S.E.E.	.269	.270	.269	.271

Note: (1) is an equation with '92 gays in military policy opinion + gay feeling thermometer dummies + 92 Post-Election Clinton feeling thermometer; (2) contains '92 gay job discrimination policy opinion + same; (3) contains '92 gay military+discrim policy opinion + same; (4) is an equation with gay adoption policy +same. Except in (3), no two policy opinions are in the same specification. See Appendix for Independent/Control Vars. om=omitted from specification; \*=p-value<=.05; \*\*=p-value<=.02; #=p<=.005; ns=notsignificant=p<.1 (two-tailed test)

Table IIIE  
Accounting for Change  
in Clinton "Vote" Choice  
1992-1993

Dep. Variable= '93 "Revote" (Clinton vs Other/DK)  
(See Explanatory Notes Atop Table IIIA)

n=425 '92 voters      Varying Specifications

Independent Variables	Military (1)	Discrim. (2)	Mil+Discrim (3)	Adoption (4)
GayMilitary	.004ns (.003)	om	om	om
GayDiscrim	om	.035ns (.028)	om	om
Mil+Discrim	om	om	.031ns (.023)	om
GayAdoption	om	om	om	-.083ns (-.063)
GayTherm 0-49	ns	ns	ns	-.080 (-.080)
GayTherm61-100	ns	ns	ns	ns
PartyID	.143# (.114)	.144# (.115)	.143** (.114)	.133** (.106)
ThermFeminsts	ns	ns	ns	ns
MoralIndex	ns	ns	ns	ns
Defense	.252# (.107)	.252#	.251# (.107)	.257# (.109)
Taxes	ns	ns	ns	ns
HealthInsur	ns	ns	ns	ns
R-Squared	.658	.659	.659	.661
S.E.E.	.301	.301	.301	.300

Note: (1) is an equation with '92 gays in military policy opinion + gay feeling thermometer dummies + 92 Vote Choice (Yes/No Clinton); (2) contains '92 gay job discrimination policy opinion + same; (3) contains '92 gay military+discrim policy opinion + same; (4) contains gay adoption policy +same. Except in (3), no two policy opinions are in the same specification. See Appendix for Independent and Control Vars.

om=omitted from specification; \*=p-value<=.05; \*\*=p-value<=.02; #=p<=.005; ns=notsignificant=p<.1 (two-tailed test)

Table IVA1a  
 Association of \*Negative\* Cognitive Evaluations  
 of Homosexuality  
 with Broader Gay-Related Attitudes  
 \*No Controls\*

(Cell entries are unstandardized OLS regression coefficients,  
 with t-statistic in parentheses)

n=573 respondents

Dependent Variables

Independent Variables	GayDisgust	GayThermometer	GayInfluence
Will of God Neg	.268 (7.56)	.129 (5.84)	.117 (4.40)
Natural Neg	.348 (9.57)	.169 (7.42)	.230 (8.43)
Disease Neg	.173 (3.22)	.135 (4.02)	.118 (2.94)
Seduce Neg	.159 (3.56)	.136 (4.58)	.077 (2.17)
R-Squared	.445	.369	.315
S.E.E.	.332	.208	.248

Note: All variables scored 0-1, where <1 are degrees of conservatism/negativity and 1 combines those positive/liberal with those neutral.

Will of God Neg= Homosexuality is against the will of God?

Natural Neg= Homosexuality unnatural?

Disease Neg= R worry that homosexuals pose special disease threat in workplace?

Seduce Neg= Homosexuals try to seduce heterosexuals?

TableIVA1b  
 Association of \*Negative\* Cognitive Evaluations  
 of Homosexuality  
 with Broader Gay-Related Attitudes  
 \*No Controls\*  
 (continued)

(Cell entries are unstandardized OLS regression coefficients,  
 with t-statistic in parentheses)

n=573 respondents

Dependent Variables

Independent Variables	Gay Adoption	Gays in Military	Gay Discrim	AIDS Spend	Equal Rights
Will of God Neg	.244 (6.81)	.152 (3.80)	.048 (1.25)	-.030 (-.922)	.050 (1.41)
Natural Neg	.199 (5.41)	.292 (7.10)	.213 (5.37)	.102 (3.02)	.089 (2.44)
Disease Neg	.112 (2.07)	.166 (2.74)	.301 (5.15)	.112 (2.25)	.152 (2.82)
Seduce Neg	.134 (2.80)	.145 (2.71)	.154 (3.01)	.104 (2.39)	.084 (1.78)
R-Squared	.293	.263	.192	.050	.070
S.E.E.	.336	.375	.361	.307	.333

Note: All variables scored 0-1, where <1 are degrees of conservatism/negativity and 1 combines those positive/liberal with those neutral.

Will of God Neg= Homosexuality is against the will of God?

Natural Neg= Homosexuality unnatural?

Disease Neg= R worry that homosexuals pose special disease threat in workplace?

Seduce Neg= Homosexuals try to seduce heterosexuals?

Table IVA1c  
 Association of \*Negative\* Cognitive Evaluations  
 of Homosexuality  
 with Broader Gay-Related Attitudes  
 \*No Controls\*  
 (continued)

(Cell entries are unstandardized OLS regression coefficients,  
 with t-statistic in parentheses)

n=573 respondents

Dependent Variables

Independent Variables	Gender Soclztm	Women's Role	Therm Feminist	Moral Family	Moral Brkdwn
WillofGod Neg	.146 (3.73)	.119 (4.42)	.053 (2.41)	.131 (5.14)	.104 (3.35)
Natural Neg	.176 (4.38)	.044 (1.58)	.097 (4.27)	.065 (2.47)	.121 (3.78)
Disease Neg	.120 (2.02)	.051 (1.25)	.018 (.055)	.048 (1.24)	.095 (2.01)
Seduce Neg	.164 (3.14)	.158 (4.40)	.044 (1.50)	-.030 (-.90)	.070 (1.70)
R-Squared	.180	.143	.106	.117	.133
S.E.E.	.367	.252	.207	.239	.292

Note: All variables scored 0-1, where <1 are degrees of conservatism/negativity and 1 combines those positive/liberal with those neutral.

Will of God Neg= Homosexuality is against the will of God?

Natural Neg= Homosexuality unnatural?

Disease Neg= R worry that homosexuals pose special disease threat in workplace?

Seduce Neg= Homosexuals try to seduce heterosexuals?

Table IVA2a  
 Association of \*Negative\* Cognitive Evaluations  
 of Homosexuality  
 with Broader Gay-Related Attitudes  
 \*With Demographic Controls\*

(see Appendix for list of Controls)

(Cell entries are unstandardized OLS regression coefficients,  
 with t-statistic in parentheses)

n=573 respondents

Dependent Variables

Independent Variables	GayDisgust	GayThermometer	GayInfluence
Will of God Neg	.261 (7.36)	.113 (5.12)	.116 (4.38)
Natural Neg	.339 (9.36)	.167 (7.40)	.214 (7.93)
Disease Neg	.157 (2.93)	.111 (3.31)	.106 (2.66)
Seduce Neg	.142 (2.98)	.116 (3.89)	.086 (2.41)
R-Squared	.471	.404	.356
S.E.E.	.327	.204	.243

Note: All variables scored 0-1, where <1 are degrees of conservatism/negativity and 1 combines those positive/liberal with those neutral.

Will of God Neg= Homosexuality is against the will of God?

Natural Neg= Homosexuality unnatural?

Disease Neg= R worry that homosexuals pose special disease threat in workplace?

Seduce Neg= Homosexuals try to seduce heterosexuals?

Table IVA2b  
 Association of \*Negative\* Cognitive Evaluations  
 of Homosexuality  
 with Broader Gay-Related Attitudes  
 \*With Demographic Controls\*  
 (continued)

(see Appendix for list of Controls)

(Cell entries are unstandardized OLS regression coefficients,  
 with t-statistic in parentheses)

n=573 respondents

Dependent Variables

Independent Variables	Gay Adoption	Gays in Military	Gay Discrim	AIDS Spend	Equal Rights
Will of God Neg	.232 (6.51)	.138 (3.45)	.036 (.92)	-.019 (-.57)	.037 (1.07)
Natural Neg	.204 (5.58)	.279 (6.81)	.199 (5.01)	.098 (2.90)	.079 (2.26)
Disease Neg	.074 (1.38)	.143 (2.36)	.286 (4.87)	.110 (2.22)	.096 (1.84)
Seduce Neg	.106 (2.21)	.123 (2.29)	.153 (2.93)	.121 (2.74)	.082 (1.77)
R-Squared	.334	.301	.222	.090	.180
S.E.E.	.328	.368	.357	.303	.316

Note: All variables scored 0-1, where <1 are degrees of conservatism/negativity and 1 combines those positive/liberal with those neutral.

Will of God Neg= Homosexuality is against the will of God?

Natural Neg= Homosexuality unnatural?

Disease Neg= R worry that homosexuals pose special disease threat in workplace?

Seduce Neg= Homosexuals try to seduce heterosexuals?

TableIVA2c  
 Association of \*Negative\* Cognitive Evaluations  
 of Homosexuality  
 with Broader Gay-Related Attitudes  
 \*With Demographic Controls\*  
 (continued)

(see Appendix for list of Controls)

(Cell entries are unstandardized OLS regression coefficients,  
 with t-statistic in parentheses)

n=573 respondents

Dependent Variables

Independent Variables	Gender Soclztm	Women's Role	Therm Feminist	Moral Family	Moral Brkdwn
Will of God Neg	.117 (3.12)	.104 (3.84)	.060 (2.71)	.125 (4.95)	.095 (3.05)
Natural Neg	.186 (4.82)	.054 (1.97)	.083 (3.68)	.076 (2.94)	.134 (4.20)
Disease Neg	.091 (1.59)	.042 (1.02)	.016 (0.47)	.029 (0.08)	.078 (1.66)
Seduce Neg	.097 (1.92)	.133 (3.65)	.065 (2.19)	-.056 (-1.65)	.052 (1.24)
R-Squared	.278	.178	.151	.185	.176
S.E.E.	.347	.249	.204	.231	.286

Note: All variables scored 0-1, where <1 are degrees of conservatism/negativity and 1 combines those positive/liberal with those neutral.

Will of God Neg= Homosexuality is against the will of God?

Natural Neg= Homosexuality unnatural?

Disease Neg= R worry that homosexuals pose special disease threat in workplace?

Seduce Neg= Homosexuals try to seduce heterosexuals?



TableIVA3a  
 Association of \*Negative\* Cognitive Evaluations  
 of Homosexuality  
 with Broader Gay-Related Attitudes  
 \*With Demographic AND Religious Group Controls\*

(see Appendix for list of Controls)

(Cell entries are unstandardized OLS regression coefficients,  
 with t-statistic in parentheses)

n=573 respondents

Dependent Variables

Independent Variables	GayDisgust	GayThermometer	GayInfluence
Will of God Neg	.246 (6.65)	.105 (4.53)	.095 (3.47)
Natural Neg	.327 (8.89)	.158 (6.88)	.207 (7.56)
Disease Neg	.153 (2.81)	.099 (2.92)	.115 (2.84)
Seduce Neg	.129 (2.67)	.112 (3.73)	.092 (2.60)
Evangel Import Max	-.047 (1.06)	-.053 (-1.91)	-.091 (-2.74)
Evangel Import < Max	.045 (1.00)	-.045 (-1.58)	-.095 (-2.81)
Religion	.101 (2.18)	.014 (0.48)	-.021 (-0.61)
Gender	.117 (4.12)	.045 (2.51)	.067 (3.20)
R-Squared	.485	.417	.375
S.E.E.	.325	.203	.241

Note: All variables scored 0-1, where <1 are degrees of conservatism/negativity and 1 combines those positive/liberal with those neutral.

Will of God Neg= Homosexuality is against the will of God?

Natural Neg= Homosexuality unnatural?

Disease Neg= R worry that homosexuals pose special disease threat in workplace?

Seduce Neg= Homosexuals try to seduce heterosexuals?

TableIVA3b  
 Association of \*Negative\* Cognitive Evaluations  
 of Homosexuality  
 with Broader Gay-Related Attitudes  
 \*With Demographic AND Religious Group Controls\*  
 (continued)

(see Appendix for list of Controls)

(Cell entries are unstandardized OLS regression coefficients,  
 with t-statistic in parentheses)

n=573 respondents

Dependent Variables

Independent Variables	Gay Adoption	Gays in Military	Gay Discrim	AIDS Spend	Equal Rights
Will of God Neg	.206 (5.55)	.094 (2.27)	.004 (0.10)	-.038 (-1.10)	.031 (0.86)
Natural Neg	.192 (5.18)	.254 (6.14)	.171 (4.28)	.083 (2.42)	.072 (2.01)
Disease Neg	.064 (1.17)	.137 (2.24)	.285 (4.81)	.111 (2.19)	.090 (1.70)
Seduce Neg	.111 (2.29)	.117 (2.16)	.152 (2.99)	.130 (2.90)	.078 (1.66)
Evangelical Import Max	-.088 (-1.96)	-.172 (3.44)	-.076 (-1.56)	-.095 (-2.89)	.008 (0.19)
Evangelical Import < Max	-.116 (-2.53)	-.120 (-2.35)	-.020 (-0.41)	-.042 (-1.01)	.002 (.052)
Religion	.037 (.807)	.037 (.071)	.124 (2.48)	-.01 (-.019)	.075 (1.66)
Gender	.034 (1.20)	.145 (4.56)	.110 (3.55)	.003 (0.11)	.036 (1.31)
R-Squared	.351	.326	.254	.111	.191
S.E.E.	.327	.365	.353	.302	.316

Note: All variables scored 0-1, where <1 are degrees of conservatism/negativity and 1 combines those positive/liberal with those neutral.

Will of God Neg= Homosexuality is against the will of God?

Natural Neg= Homosexuality unnatural?

Disease Neg= R worry that homosexuals pose special disease threat in workplace?

Seduce Neg= Homosexuals try to seduce heterosexuals?

TableIVB1  
 Association of \*Full Range\* of Cognitive Evaluations  
 of Homosexuality  
 with Broader Gay-Related Attitudes  
 \*No Controls\*

(Cell entries are unstandardized OLS regression coefficients,  
 with t-statistic in parentheses)

n=570 respondents

Dependent Variables

Independent Variables	Gay Therm.	Gay Influence	Gay Adoption	Gays in Military	Gay Discrim.
God's Will	.093 (3.10)	.081 (2.22)	.153 (3.01)	.026 (0.47)	-.035 (-.064)
Natural	.072 (2.73)	.159 (4.94)	.149 (3.34)	.170 (3.52)	.121 (2.52)
Choice	.074 (3.03)	.082 (2.75)	.043 (1.04)	.178 (3.97)	.182 (4.09)
Disease	.120 (3.97)	.085 (2.31)	.108 (2.10)	.174 (3.14)	.277 (5.02)
Seduce	.095 (3.42)	.056 (1.65)	.120 (2.56)	.145 (2.87)	.145 (2.88)
Disgust	.190 (7.90)	.164 (5.58)	.230 (5.65)	.220 (5.00)	.064 (1.47)
R-Squared	.470	.399	.341	.359	.245
S.E.E.	.191	.234	.325	.351	.349

Note: All variables scored 0-1, where 1=the most liberal/positive side.

Will of God= Homosexuality is against the will of God,  
 Pro/Con/Neutral-DK  
 Natural = Homosexuality unnatural?  
 Choice = Homosexuality a choice?  
 Disease = R worry that homosexuals pose special disease  
 threat in workplace?  
 Seduce = Homosexuals try to seduce heterosexuals?  
 Disgust = R find idea of homosexuality disgusting?

Table IVB2  
 Association of \*Full Range\* of Cognitive Evaluations  
 of Homosexuality  
 with Broader Gay-Related Attitudes  
 \*Demographic and Religious Group Controls\*

(Cell entries are unstandardized OLS regression coefficients,  
 with t-statistic in parentheses)

n=570 respondents

Dependent Variables

Independent Variables	Gay Therm.	Gay Influence	Gay Adoption	Gays in Military	Gay Discrim.
God's Will	.083 (2.72)	.063 (1.72)	.136 (2.65)	-.016 (-0.28)	-.050 (-0.89)
Natural	.067 (2.51)	.148 (4.63)	.140 (3.14)	.162 (3.33)	-.106 (2.19)
Choice	.077 (3.11)	.079 (2.65)	.053 (1.30)	.162 (3.59)	.159 (3.52)
Disease	.090 (2.90)	.099 (2.64)	.068 (1.31)	.174 (3.07)	.277 (4.89)
Seduce	.079 (2.76)	.080 (2.32)	.097 (2.02)	.132 (2.52)	.165 (3.15)
Disgust	.179 (7.31)	.145 (4.89)	.221 (5.40)	.177 (3.95)	0.02 (0.36)
Evangelical Import Max	-.030 (-1.14)	-.070 (-2.23)	-.070 (-1.59)	-.140 (-2.92)	-.045 (-0.93)
Evangelical Import < Max	-.050 (-1.88)	-.100 (-3.14)	-.133 (-3.00)	-.137 (-2.83)	-.026 (-.53)
Relignone	.001 (0.97)	-.04 (-1.07)	.024 (0.53)	.01 (0.12)	.108 (2.19)
Gender	.015 (0.91)	.042 (2.07)	.001 (.028)	.110 (3.57)	.091 (2.98)
R-Squared	.503	.449	.400	.402	.293
S.E.E.	.188	.227	.315	.344	.344

Note: All variables scored 0-1, where 1=the most liberal/positive side.

Will of God= Homosexuality is against the will of God,  
 Pro/Con/Neutral-DK

Natural = Homosexuality unnatural?

Choice = Homosexuality a choice?

Disease = R worry that homosexuals pose special disease  
 threat in workplace?

Seduce = Homosexuals try to seduce heterosexuals?  
Disgust = R find idea of homosexuality disgusting?

Table IVC  
Conditioning By  
Homosexuality is Choice vs Can't Change

(Cell entries are unstandardized OLS regression coefficients,  
with t-statistic in parentheses)

Choice  
n=237 respondents      Dependent Variables

Independent Variables	Gay Adoption	Gays in Military	Gay Discrim. Laws
God's Will	.239 (3.35)	.040 (0.37)	-.221 (-2.12)
Natural	.181 (3.40)	.269 (3.36)	.141 (1.82)
Disease	-.017 (-0.31)	.091 (1.09)	.295 (3.65)
Seduce	.079 (1.61)	.138 (.187)	.164 (2.30)
Disgust	.186 (3.89)	.180 (2.50)	.116 (1.66)
R-Squared	.342	.208	.166
S.E.E.	.257	.389	.376

Can't Change  
n=278      Dependent Variables

Independent Variables	Gay Adoption	Gays in Military	Gay Discrim. Laws
God's Will	.048 (.653)	-.006 (-0.10)	.050 (0.79)
Natural	.104 (1.39)	.060 (0.94)	.105 (1.63)
Disease	.324 (3.36)	.265 (3.24)	.250 (3.01)
Seduce	.219 (2.16)	.228 (2.66)	.228 (2.61)
Disgust	.348 (4.98)	.271 (4.57)	.066 (1.10)
R-Squared	.245	.210	.128
S.E.E.	.368	.312	.317

Table IVD  
 Association of Gay Variables  
 with Gay Policies/Influence  
 with Inclusion of 92-93 Gay Feeling Thermometers  
 and Demographic and Religious Group Variables

(Cell entries are unstandardized OLS regression coefficients,  
 with t-statistic in parentheses)

n=556 respondents

Dependent Variables

Independent Variables	Gay Influence	Gay Adoption	Gays in Military	Gay Discrim.
God's Will	.037 (1.02)	.093 (1.81)	-.062 (-1.14)	-.095 (-1.71)
Natural	.149 (4.66)	.128 (2.84)	.119 (2.50)	.101 (2.10)
Choice	.054 (1.81)	.021 (0.49)	.126 (2.84)	.111 (2.47)
Disease	.080 (2.14)	.040 (.774)	.116 (2.10)	.237 (4.22)
Seduce	.053 (1.53)	.067 (1.40)	.115 (2.24)	.116 (2.25)
Disgust	.088 (2.90)	.154 (3.59)	.095 (2.09)	-.079 (-1.72)
92+93 Gay Therms	.293 (5.15)	.391 (4.89)	.565 (6.65)	.514 (5.98)
Evangelical Import Max	-.044 (-1.39)	-.060 (-1.35)	-.115 (-2.48)	-.019 (-0.40)
Evangelical Import < Max	-.069 (-2.19)	-.105 (-2.37)	-.091 (-1.94)	.015 (0.32)
Relignone	-.031 (-0.97)	.017 (0.38)	.013 (0.27)	.109 (2.64)
Gender	.036 (1.83)	-.011 (-0.39)	.089 (3.00)	.075 (2.49)
Race	.130 (3.68)	.114 (2.30)	.086 (1.64)	.108 (2.03)

Appendix

Descriptions of Independent and Control Variables

Tables IIIA-E:

Featured Independent Variables- (all scored 0-1="liberal"/Democratic side)  
(all '92 Pre/Post-Election NES)

GayMilitary=	5 point allow gays-in-the-military?
GayDiscrim=	5 point laws protect gays against job discrimination?
Mil+Discrim=	Sum of above 2 items
GayAdoption=	5 point permit gay/lesbian couples to legally adopt children?
GayTherm 0-49=	Dummy variable for those giving gay feeling therm. 0-49
GayTherm61-100=	Dummy variable for those giving gay feeling therm. 61-100
PartyID	3 category partisan identification, answer to root question
Thermfeminists	Feeling thermometer rating for "feminists"
MoralIndex	4 Likert Item Moral Traditionalism Scale
Defense	sum of 2 items: US should stay #1 regardless of cost and How willing should US be to use military force
HealthInsur	7Pt Govt Health Plan vs. Private/Employer Plan

Control Variables:

race, gender, 5 category cohorts (W.E. Miller divisions according to definitive periods when R first voted; born 1850-1907; 1908-1923; 1924-1943; 1944-1958; 1959-1975); 6 category education; workingclass subjective social class dummy; religion dummies: no religious affiliation, jewish, evangelical/fundamentalist/charismatic Christian self-identification + guides life "a great deal", other evangelicals, "other" Christian self-identification (neither evangelical nor "moderate-liberal"), nonevangelical Catholics, 3 item individualism/govt role scale, fundamentalist feeling thermometer, "close to unions" mention - "close to business" mention, isolationism, Vietnam draft dodging, willingness to pay more in taxes, spending on "poor" + food stamps, and 4category abortion position. Self-identifying "moderate to liberal" Christians and the few nonJudeo-Christian adherents are the base for category for the religion dummies.

Tables IVA-D:

Demographic Variables: race, gender, cohort, education, working



class subjective social class, a pair of family dummies (low and high); raised in the southern US, raised in a rural area.

Religious Variables: Dummies for no religious affiliation, non-Judeo-Christian religions, jewish, evangelicals/fundamentalist/charismatics self-identifiers whose religion guides their life "a great deal", other evangelicals, "other" Christian self-identification who say they religion provides a "great deal" of guidance, the rest of these "others", nonevangelical catholic "great dealers", and all other nonevangelical catholics. Self-identifying "moderate to liberal" Christians are the base category.