

## Abstract

BLOCH, KATRINA R. Get Away from the Altar: Attitudes Towards Same Sex and Multi Racial Relationships. (Under the direction of Barbara Risman.)

This paper explores the social processes that influence attitudes that legitimate the cultural discrimination toward same sex unions and multi racial marriage. Both types of relationships remain marginalized in today's society. Utilizing the 2000 and 2002 General Social Survey datasets, I assess if race, sex, religion and gender ideology affect attitudes toward same sex and multi racial couples in a similar manner. Parallel logistic regression models are run to explore the role of race, sex, religion and gender ideology in explaining attitudes towards both same sex marriage and multiracial marriage. The results suggest that the processes that influence white attitudes are similar for both types of relationships. However, the attitudes of the black sample are not so easily predicted. While the lack of statistical significance within the black population may partially be explained by a small sample size, the results do suggest that the processes leading to negative attitudes towards both types of relationships may be different for blacks and whites. Possible explanations are provided and suggestions for future research addressed.

**Get Away from the Altar:  
Attitudes Towards Same Sex and Multi Racial Relationships**

by

**Katrina Bloch**

**Master's Thesis submitted to the Department of Anthropology and Sociology  
North Carolina State University**

August 2004

Approved By:

---

Barbara Risman, Chair

---

Donald Tomaskovic-Devey

---

Melvin Thomas

## Biography

In the late 1970's, before Katrina Bloch was born, her parents were happily married with two children, Angela and Christopher. At this point in their lives, they decided that they didn't want to have any more children. So, being a nice guy and all, Mr. Bloch went to the doctor and had his tubes tied. A couple years later, Mrs. Bloch learned that his operation was a complete failure. Thus, in the wee hours of the night on February 1, 1980, a little bundle of joy came into their lives whose name became Katrina.

Katrina lived a beautifully sheltered childhood in a very warm and supportive family environment. She also has many fond memories of the small town, Schuylkill Haven, Pennsylvania, where she lived the first eighteen years of her life. One of her fondest memories is of "The Farmer," who was an awfully nice old man who would come around in his beat up van and sell produce door to door. In general, Katrina spent a lot of her time trying to convince her older brother that she was cool enough to hang out with him and his friends. Somehow, her JJ Joe figures always ended up in the Pit of Death.

Anyway, when she graduated from High School her father forced her to continue her education. While the other two siblings went eagerly, Mr. and Mrs. Bloch found that this one wasn't going so easily. Vowing to stay in rural Pennsylvania until her death, Katrina finished her bachelors at Lycoming College and head to North Carolina State University to do graduate work. She thought that the cobble streets downtown reminded her of Europe, but later learned that these streets were really only *a* block. However, here she stays in North Carolina in a small house in Cary, with two dogs, two cats, and a very supportive partner. One day she'll move back to PA. Well, maybe.

## Acknowledgements

I want to thank everyone and anyone who offered me encouragement or insight during the thesis process. I am especially grateful for the guidance of Barbara Risman, who served as the Chair of my Committee. Her insight and direction during the research process was invaluable. Barbara was an excellent mentor, and I could not have asked for more.

I'd also like to thank Don Tomaskovic-Devey for his help as well. He went above and beyond the call of duty for a committee member, reading multiple versions of my draft and offering advice on both theory and statistics. Dr. Melvin Thomas also deserves a sincere thank you for serving on the thesis committee and offering his insights. I am truly thankful.

To those who went to my defense, Carissa, Seung Hee, Lizzy, Kristine, and Tiffany, thank you so much for your support. Of course, a special thanks to Tiffany Taylor is in order. Her love, support, and encouragement held me together draft after draft after draft. Thank you to my office mate, Patricia, who helped me with SPSS when I was beyond frustrated, and Jennifer Gerteisen Marks for helping me to create the gender ideology scale in SAS. I'd also like to thank Dr. Susan Ross. Without her mentorship during my undergraduate years, I would not be where I am today. Finally, I want to send some love out to my family. Thanks to my Mom, Dad, Brother, and Sister whose love I cherish. Also, I have to thank the doctor who didn't tie my Dad's tubes right before I was born. Thanks!

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| LIST OF TABLES.....                             | v    |
| 1. INTRODUCTION.....                            | 1    |
| 2. THE MEANING OF MARRIAGE.....                 | 3    |
| 3. DIFFERENCES BY RACE AND SEX.....             | 6    |
| a. Attitudes Towards Same Sex Marriage.....     | 6    |
| b. Attitudes Towards Multi Racial Marriage..... | 7    |
| 4. RELIGION.....                                | 8    |
| a. Attitudes Towards Same Sex Marriage.....     | 8    |
| b. Attitudes Towards Multi Racial Marriage..... | 9    |
| 5. GENDER IDEOLOGY.....                         | 10   |
| a. Attitudes Towards Same Sex Marriage.....     | 10   |
| b. Attitudes Towards Multi Racial Marriage..... | 11   |
| 6. RESEARCH DESIGN.....                         | 13   |
| 7. METHODS.....                                 | 15   |
| a. Data.....                                    | 15   |
| b. Dependent Variables.....                     | 16   |
| c. Explanatory Variables.....                   | 18   |
| d. Control Variables.....                       | 19   |
| e. Analyses.....                                | 20   |
| 8. RESULTS.....                                 | 22   |
| 9. DISCUSSION.....                              | 28   |
| 10. CONCLUSION.....                             | 31   |
| 11. REFERENCES.....                             | 33   |
| 12. TABLES.....                                 | 40   |

## TABLES

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Table 1. Descriptive Statistics.....   | 40   |
| Table 2. Binary Logistic Regression Odds Ratio Estimates for Attitudes Towards<br>Same Sex Relationships.....        | 41   |
| Table 3: Ordinal Logistic Regression Odds Ratio Estimates for Attitudes Towards<br>Relative Marrying Other Race..... | 42   |

The marginalization of both multi racial couples and same sex couples remains a problem in the United States today (Ross 2002). Scholars such as Eskridge (1996), who compare the marginalization of these couples, tend to focus on legal discussions revolving around the past prohibition of multi racial marriage and the current prohibition of same sex marriage. Ross (2002) adds an interesting comparison suggesting that the discrimination against same sex marriage and multi racial marriage both derive from a “sexualization” of those marriages. Instead of associating same sex or multi racial relationships with love, they are viewed primarily as sexual relationships. For example, the stereotype still persists that those individuals who enter into multi racial relationships do so entirely out of the curiosity and desire to have sex with someone of another race (Yancey 2003). Similarly, individuals who partner with someone of the same sex are often seen as hyper-sexed, promiscuous and incapable of a monogamous relationship (Ross 2002). These stereotypes lead to negative attitudes towards both types of marriage. However, attitudes are not static and are constantly being challenged.

The success of any social movement, including civil rights for gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and racial and ethnic minorities requires both legal and cultural transformations (Bernstein 2002). Any movement that focuses solely on legal change will run the risk of “mistaking new laws and policies for lasting cultural change.” (Bernstein 2002:532). It is clear that while marriage across color lines is legal, multi racial couples still face discrimination on a wide scale (Rosenblatt, Karis, and Powell 1995). Currently, we are in a social climate in which the laws backing the boundaries between those who partner with someone of the same sex and heterosexuals are being openly contested, with Massachusetts

now allowing same sex marriage. Just as boundary formation may operate out of racial threat and competition (Blalock 1967), heterosexism may work similarly. However, a multiracial couple or same sex couple that holds hands in public does not have to be married to draw disapproving stares from strangers. In this sense, marriage is more of a reward given to “acceptable” couples. For example, Duncan (1996) writes, “even if we are unconvinced that homosexual conduct is intrinsically wrong, we might nevertheless conclude that it lacks sufficient goodness to qualify for access to a governmentally-endorsed and specially-preferred status such as marriage” (594).

In this paper, my goal is to explore the social processes that influence attitudes that legitimate the cultural discrimination toward same sex unions and multi racial marriage. Underlying attitudes towards marriage laws are beliefs about what “marriage” means for individuals and the level of societal acceptance they have for different types of couples. Research indicates that religion plays a role in influencing attitudes towards both homosexuality (Cotton-Huston and Waite 2000; Fisher et al 1994; Herek 1988; Lewis 2000) and multi racial marriage (Wilson and Jacobson 1994; St. Jean and Parker 1995). Gender ideology has also been determined to explain differences in attitudes towards homosexuality (Whitley 2002), but has remained unexplored in regards to attitudes towards multi racial marriage. I will add to the literature by exploring the role of religion and gender ideology in explaining attitudes towards both same sex relations and multi racial marriage.

In this paper, I first discuss what “marriage” has traditionally symbolized in the United States. Second, I move away from discussion of marriage to explore underlying attitudes toward these types of couples and what shapes prejudice towards same sex and multi racial couples. I formulate my hypotheses based on the literature to explain the role of



race, sex, religion and gender ideology in explaining prejudice against same sex and multi racial couples. I then discuss the methods and analysis used to test my hypotheses. I utilize multiple years, 2000 and 2002, of the General Social Survey to explore attitudes towards same sex marriage and multiracial marriage. I use parallel logistic regression models to explore the role of race, sex, religion and gender ideology in explaining attitudes towards both same sex marriage and multiracial marriage. I assess if race, sex, religion and gender ideology affect attitudes toward same sex and multi racial couples in a similar manner. The results are generally supportive of past research that has predicted white attitudes towards same sex and multi racial marriage. However, the attitudes of the black sample, which remains a marginalized group in the United States, are not so easily predicted. Possible explanations are provided and suggestions for future research addressed.

### **The Meaning of Marriage**

Marriage has come to hold special significance in the United States. Calhoun (2000) suggests that marriage is seen as the very foundation of a stable society, and Waite and Lehrer (2003) claim it is an “almost universal goal for young adults.” Marriage brings with it a higher social status (Barclay and Fisher 2003) and the reputation of being a more reliable citizen (Card 1996). Individuals who are married experience better physical health and a longer life (Waite and Lehrer 2003). Their children are considered legitimate, and the couple enjoys the substantial benefits that the state grants to legally married couples. These benefits include, but are not limited to, the rights to alimony following a divorce, the rights to spousal benefits such as health and life insurance, various inheritance rights, and the right for one’s non-American spouse to be granted citizenship (Eskridge 1996).

Therefore, it is not surprising that marriage is often accompanied by such adjectives

as “sacred” and warranting “protection.” At the same time, it is not surprising that couples who are denied the right to a legal marriage would seek to change the legislation that prohibits them from doing so. There are those who are critical of the institution (e.s. Card 1996). However, legal marriage has undeniable benefits that are withheld from couples who are denied the right to marry.

Thus, the question becomes, why have some types of couples throughout history been considered undeserving of legal marriage? Ross (2002) suggests that one reason is that both multi racial relationships and same sex relationships have been sexualized. Black men have been stereotyped as rapists and black women as the hyper sexual “Jezebel” (Collins 2000). White individuals who enter into relationships with blacks are stereotyped as sexual thrill seekers or displaying sexual rebellion (Foeman and Nance 1999). Similarly, individuals who partner with someone of the same sex are often seen as hyper-sexed, promiscuous and incapable of a monogamous relationship (Calhoun 2002; Ross 2002). Some have even argued that AIDS was a disease created by God to punish the sinful homosexuals (Lewis 2000). *Heterosexual* marriages are considered the “foundation” of society, while these other types of marriages are defined by their sexual activity.

At the same time that the morality of these types of relationships are questioned, so is the occurrence of non “traditional” families raising children. While Stacey (1996) asserts that the face of family has changed and we must reinvent the meaning of family to include more diverse forms, Popenoe (1993) counters, “What type of child wants to live in a non-traditional family?” (554). Just as the myth of psychological shortcomings of multiracial children surfaced when miscegenation laws were being challenged (Foeman and Nance 1999), those who oppose same sex marriage often argue that living in this type of family will

be psychologically, if not physically, detrimental to the well being of the child (Ross 2002). While Stacey and Biblarz (2002) found that children raised by same-sex couples had no more psychological or cognitive handicaps than children raised by heterosexual couples, they also found that children raised by same sex couples were more likely to question traditional gender ideology and reject heterosexism. If opponents to same sex parenting fear children who value equality, then they have reason to worry.

Even if we were to assume that same sex and multi racial couples made unfit parents, it remains unclear why their marriages have been questioned while felons and “deadbeat” dads legally obtain marriages (Eskridge 1996). Furthermore, those who specifically question same sex relationships because of the perception of a lack of opportunity or motivation for procreation do not fight to deny marriage to heterosexual couples who choose not to have or biologically cannot have children (Bolte 1998). While these popular arguments do not hold up on examination, same sex couples still do not qualify for the societal “encouragement” or “special approval” that marriage implies (Duncan 1996).

Limiting marriage by Duncan’s (1996) criteria of “preferred” couples, it is a wonder that anyone but white, wealthy, and highly educated heterosexuals can marry. However, his argument sheds light on both the past prohibition of multi racial marriage and the current prohibition of same sex marriage. Marriage is the added bonus given to those who meet society’s approval. The next part of my paper is intended to further shed light on how different types of people view same sex and multi racial couples and what shapes their perceived “appropriateness” or “unworthiness” for marriage. First I will discuss attitudinal differences by race and sex that have been found in prior research. Second, I will discuss how religion influences individual’s perceptions of same sex and multi racial marriage.

Then, I will discuss the role that adherence to traditional gender ideology plays in shaping attitudes towards both types of marriage.

### **Differences by Race and Sex**

#### Attitudes Towards Same-Sex Couples

An individual's attitudes towards multi racial and same sex marriage may vary by race and sex based on different historical and cultural factors. Looking first at same sex marriage, research has suggested that blacks are more likely to have negative attitudes towards same sex relations than are whites (Battle and Lemelle 2002). However, Lewis (2003) found that while religion and education were important in explaining both black and white individual's attitudes towards same sex relations, that they explained more variation within the white sample. He concludes that the roots of homophobia may be different for whites and blacks.

Schulte (2002) suggests that the difference between white and black attitudes may be linked to differential perceived gender deviance of gays and lesbians by race. She found that black respondents perceived greater gender differences between heterosexuals and gays than did white respondents. This inflation of gender deviance within the black community may explain why blacks tend to have more negative attitudes towards same sex relations than whites.

Research also indicates that men are more likely to have negative attitudes towards homosexuality than women (Battle and Lemelle 2002; Herek 2002; Kite and Whitley 1998; Wills and Crawford 2000). It has been theorized that men have more negative attitudes towards same sex relations, because gay men are perceived as feminine. Since femininity is devalued in our society, crossing the gender boundary has a much greater negative

consequence for men than women (Bem 1993). By expressing negative attitudes towards homosexuality, men may be reinforcing their identity as masculine in order to retain heterosexual male privilege. This sex effect coupled with the negativity in the black community results in black males having the most negative attitudes towards same sex relationships than any other race/sex category (Schulte 2002).

### Attitudes Towards Multi Racial Marriage

Research has suggested that blacks may be more likely to have positive attitudes than whites (Spickard 1989). However, black women have reported more negative attitudes than black men (Paset and Taylor 1991). Several explanations have been given. Romano (2003) suggests that the legacy of slavery may directly influence a black woman's attitude towards multi racial marriage. While rape was an institutionalized practice during slavery, it continued to be a way for white men to subordinate black women into the twentieth century (Collins 2004). Because of this, black women may view marriage to a white man as a retreat into a power domination of white over black.

It has also been suggested that black women may have negative attitudes towards multi racial marriage, because they resent that black men who marry white women are buying into the standards of beauty created by the white majority (Yanick and Parker 1995). Rosenblatt and his colleagues' (1995) study also suggests that black women may have negative attitudes towards multiracial dating, because there is a double standard placed on black women to pass on the familial heritage that is not placed on black men. Echoing this statement, Patricia Hill Collins (2004) writes, "African American women in interracial love relationships face the stigma of being accused of being race traitors and whores, whereas African American men engaged in similar relationships can find their status as men raised."

(262). Since black women are expected to marry black men, and high expectations are placed on them to fulfill this obligation, this may translate into open negativity towards multi racial marriage in general (Rosenblatt et al. 1995).

In summary, the literature indicates that men as opposed to women and blacks in comparison to whites are more likely to have negative attitudes towards same sex relations. However, in regards to multi racial marriage, blacks are more likely to have positive attitudes than whites, while some research suggests that black females may have more negative attitudes than black males. This suggests that black males may be the most likely of any race/sex group to approve of multi racial marriage. I now review will turn to exploring how religion and gender ideology may help explain attitudes towards these two types of relationships. First, I review the literature on religion.

## **Religion**

### Attitudes Towards Same Sex Relationships

For most Christian religions, the stance they take on same sex relations tends to depend upon their interpretation of certain passages from the Christian Bible. Cygnar, Noel, and Jacobson (1977) assert that “different dimensions of religiosity exhibit different relations to prejudice” (188). Therefore, it is necessary to take into consideration the beliefs of different denominations, the role of religious intensity and what it is about religion that may influence a person’s attitude toward multiracial marriage or same-sex marriage when exploring the influence of religion on these types of relationships.

Studies conducted by Cotton-Huston and Waite (2000) and Herek (1988) found that the more religious individuals reported themselves, the more likely they were to report negative attitudes towards homosexuality. Kirkpatrick (1993) suggests that the most

important factor in predicting negative attitudes towards same sex couples is the individual's level of fundamentalism. He found that individuals with a fundamentalist religious orientation were more likely to report negative attitudes towards same sex relations than individuals with other Christian backgrounds. Marsiglio's (1993) study of men between the ages of 15 and 19 also found that fundamentalism played a role in forming negative attitudes towards homosexuality.

Other studies have focused specifically on religious denominational affiliation on attitudes towards same-sex relations, finding that Jewish respondents are more likely than Protestant respondents to have positive attitudes towards same-sex relations (Fisher et al 1994, Lottes and Kuriloff 1992). Lewis (2000) finds that weekly church attendance and fundamentalism play an important role in shaping both black and white respondents' attitudes towards same sex marriage, with fundamentalist Protestants being the least likely to have positive attitudes towards same sex marriage.

#### Attitudes Towards Multi Racial Marriage

Wilson and Jacobson (1995) explored whether or not religious affiliation influenced white respondents' attitudes towards black/white multi racial marriage. In general, respondents who identified as Jewish were the least likely to approve of laws banning multi racial marriage in comparison to Protestants and Catholics. St. Jean and Parker (1995) looked at attitudes among black women towards multi racial marriage utilizing a measure of religiosity. They found that black females who reported being highly religious were more likely to agree with a law banning multiracial marriage than black females who were less religious.

While these two studies suggest a similar relationship for religion and attitudes

towards multi racial marriage, it must be noted that both St. Jean and Parker (1995) and Wilson and Jacobson's (1995) studies were limited in their explanatory power. Respondents were merely asked whether or not they agreed or disagreed with a law banning multiracial marriage. Disagreeing with a law banning a certain behavior doesn't necessarily mean that one supports such couples. In regards to Wilson and Jacobson's (1995) study of a white sample, this question may have been more a measure of racism in general than a measure of attitudes towards multi racial marriage. St. Jean and Parker's (1995) study also was limited by only exploring religiosity and not religious affiliation.

In conclusion, religion may operate similarly in shaping attitudes towards same sex marriage and multi racial marriage. This research suggests that individuals who are more religious or report being fundamentalist Protestants are less likely to be accepting of both same sex and multi racial marriage than their counterparts. This statement is made with some reservation due to the small number of studies on multi racial marriage and the limitations in the research designs of those that have been conducted. My research will add to this literature by exploring multiple dimensions of religious ideology when exploring attitudes towards multi racial marriage.

## **Gender Ideology**

### Attitudes Towards Same Sex Relationships

Research has suggested that an individual's gender ideology may influence attitudes towards both same sex (Whitley 2002) and multi racial attitudes. However, the role of gender ideology in shaping attitudes has been explored more thoroughly in regards to same sex marriage than multi racial marriage. Bem (1993) suggests that heterosexism results from the polarization of gender in society and the stress placed on men and women to live within



the confines of what society views as appropriate gender norms. Research that has explored the role of gender ideology finds that individuals with more traditional gender ideologies have more negative attitudes towards homosexuality than those with nontraditional gender ideologies (Henley and Pincus 1978; Herek 1988; Hinrichs and Rosenberg 2002; Kerns and Fine 1994; Kurdek 1988; Liebach and Friedman 1985; and Whitley 1987 and 2002). One study reports a stronger correlation between traditional gender ideologies and negative attitudes towards homosexuality for men than for women (Hinrichs and Rosenberg 2002). Kerns and Fine (1994) found that when gender ideology was included in their model any sex differences disappeared. Thus, they propose that prior findings of men having more negative attitudes towards same sex relations than women may be due to men having more traditional gender ideologies than women.

Whitley (2002) further examines the role of an individual's gender ideology, suggesting that attitudes towards appropriate masculinity may not necessarily have the same influence on attitudes towards homosexuality as attitudes towards appropriate femininity. He hypothesized that the endorsement of traditional male gender norms would be more closely correlated with negative attitudes towards same sex relations than traditional female femininity, but found that both were similarly correlated. In general, research finds that traditional gender ideologies are associated with negative attitudes towards same sex relations.

#### Attitudes Towards Multi Racial Marriage

Unlike the research on attitudes towards homosexuality, no research that I am aware of has specifically explored the relationship between traditional gender ideology and attitudes towards multi racial marriage. However, Henley and Pincus (1978) did find a correlation

between attitudes towards racism and attitudes towards “sexism”. While racism is not the only factor in explaining attitudes towards multi racial marriage, it has been suggested that the rate of interracial marriage in a society reflects the racial climate (Spickard 1989). White partners involved in interracial couples noted warnings from relatives that they might have “little black kids”, signifying negativity towards “black skin” and the couples’ disregard for the existing racial order (St. Jean 1998). This suggests that individuals, or at least white individuals, who have more traditional gender ideologies might have negative attitudes towards multi racial marriage, because they are more likely to be racist.

This would be especially true if people still view individuals involved in multi racial marriage as hypersexual (Ross 2003). The stereotype that individuals who enter into multi racial relationships do so purely out of the desire to have sex with someone of another race has been used as ammunition by white supremacists and has even been used as a plotline in the film “Jungle Fever” (Yancey 2003). The legacy of this racist stereotype may influence attitudes towards multi racial marriage. Since gender norms in our society do not endorse highly sexual women, in this sense, multi racial marriage could be viewed as gender deviance. Thus, one might expect that traditional gender ideology would be highly correlated with negative attitudes towards multi racial marriage.

However, another argument may be more appropriate for black men. Black men out-marry at a higher rate than black women. Cazenave (1983) suggests this is because black men may have a preference for women who conform to traditional gender expectations of femininity, which are white standards in our society. Judging from this research, it may be that black men who adhere to traditional gender norms are more likely to hold positive attitudes towards multi racial marriage. However, it is unclear how gender ideology would

influence black women. Black women as a group may resent black men who buy into the white standard of beauty, and thus, have negative attitudes towards multi racial marriage regardless of gender ideology.

In summary, the research suggests that individuals with more traditional gender ideology are more likely to have negative attitudes towards both same sex marriage and multi racial marriage. However, the correlation between traditional gender ideology and multi racial marriage may be weaker for black men than individuals of any other race/sex group. In general, individuals who are very religious, Protestant, and have a traditional gender ideology are most likely to have negative attitudes towards both same sex relationships and multi racial marriage. Next, I lay out detailed hypotheses about the relationship between religion and gender ideology and attitudes towards same sex and multi racial marriage.

### **Research Design**

Attitudes towards same sex relationships and multi racial relationships remain an important subject matter, because both types of relationships are marginalized (Ross 2002). In a society where marriage is one of the greatest rewards, multi racial marriage remained illegal until 1967 and same sex marriage is still illegal in most states. This paper adds to the literature exploring how religion and gender ideology influence attitudes towards both same sex relationships and multi racial relationships. Based on prior literature, several predictions can be made.

#### **Same Sex Relations**

The literature suggests that the more religious individuals report themselves to be, the more likely they are to have negative attitudes toward same sex relations (Cotton-Huston and Waite 2000; Herek 1998). Research has also suggested that individuals who report being

fundamentalists are more likely to have negative attitudes towards same sex relations (Kirkpatrick 1993). Thus, I expect to find that report having strong religion and being fundamentalist will be statistically significant predictors for the likelihood of a respondent having negative attitudes towards same sex relations. My specific hypothesis surrounding religion and attitudes towards same sex relations are:

*H1: Individuals who report being more religious will be more likely to have negative attitudes towards same sex relations.*

*H2: Respondents who report being fundamentalists will be more likely to have negative attitudes towards same sex relations.*

Prior research also indicates that an individual's gender ideology is an important predictor of attitudes towards same sex relations. Based on Whitley's (2002) meta-analysis, having a more conservative gender ideology is expected to be highly correlated with negative attitudes towards same sex relations. However, this relationship is expected to be stronger for men than for women (Hinrichs and Rosenberg 2002).

*H3-1: Individuals who report having a more traditional gender ideology are expected to have negative attitudes towards same sex relations.*

*H3-2: The relationship between traditional gender ideology and negative attitudes towards same sex relations will be stronger for men than for women.*

### Multi Racial Marriage

Research has suggested that individuals who report being more religious are more likely to have negative attitudes towards multi racial marriage (St. Jean and Parker 1995). Therefore, I predict that:

*H1: Individuals who are more religious are more likely to have negative attitudes*

*towards multi racial relationships.*

Gender ideology may also play an important role in explaining attitudes towards multi racial marriage. If Ross's (2002) theory that multi racial relationships are sexualized, then having a more conservative gender ideology should be correlated with negative attitudes towards multi racial marriage. However, if black men may have a preference for women who conform to traditional gender expectations of femininity, (Cazenave 1983), then the correlation between traditional gender ideology and negative attitudes towards multi racial marriage may be reversed for them. Drawing from this literature my hypothesis are:

*H2-1: For all respondents except black men, having more traditional gender ideologies will be correlated with negative attitudes towards multi racial marriage.*

*H2-2: For black men, there will be a positive relationship between conservative gender ideology and attitudes towards multi racial marriage..*

In the next section, I discuss the data and type of analyses utilized for this paper.

## **Methods**

### *Data*

This paper utilizes two years of the General Social Survey (GSS 2000 and 2002), which is a probability sample of households in the United States. This is a biennial survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center. The GSS is obtained through face to face interviews with non-institutionalized, English speaking individuals over the age of 18. The descriptive statistics for the sample are located in Table 1.

*Insert Table 1 About Here*

The sample is split almost in half by sex, with men making up 50.2 percent of the respondents. The majority of those included in the analysis are white (84.1%) with black respondents comprising 15.9 percent of the sample. In general, the majority of respondents indicated having some sort of religious influence in their lives. More specifically, only 13.5 percent of the respondents reported that they were not religious at all. For gender ideology, 60.8 percent of the sample reported having a more liberal gender ideology. A larger percentage of the white respondents (41.1%) than blacks (22.9%) responded favorably to same sex relationships.

### Dependent Variables

Three dependent variables are utilized in the analysis. Looking first at same sex relationships, the question in the GSS specifically asks, “What about sexual relations between two adults of the same sex—do you think it is always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all?” This is a perfect example of Ross’s (2002) theory of the sexualization of attitudes towards same sex couples. The wording of this question illustrates the validity problem suggested by Ross (2002). Respondents may have read the question to mean either that same-sex relationships are wrong or that the sexual act between same-sex persons is wrong.

I have two justifications for using this measure. First, Connell (1987) suggest that laws that have banned sexual activity such as sodomy have really been enacted to eradicate the relationships. This, along with Ross’s (2002) suggestion that the same sex relationships are “sexualized” indicates that attitudes towards same sex relationships and same sex *sex* are likely to be related. Second, if these relationships are marginalized because of being sexualized, then the measure is actually more conservative in measuring positive attitudes

towards same sex relationships than a measure would be that does not directly address sexual intimacy. It is surely an incomplete victory for the “gay” movement if the general consensus is, ‘They can be a couple as long as they do not have sex.’ Therefore, while this measure is problematic, it is still worth using since no alternative exists. There is clearly much room for future research to craft better measures.

For the purpose of this research, the four response categories are collapsed into two categories. In this analysis, the categories became (1) always wrong and almost always wrong and (2) sometimes wrong and not wrong at all. This was done, because simple bivarates demonstrated that the vast majority of respondents answered either extreme. Especially for the black sample, there were too few respondents falling into the two middle categories ( $N = 9$ ), to run ordinal logistic models without significant error terms. It also theoretically makes sense to combine these categories, as it is likely that those who always think and those who almost always think that same sex relationships are wrong will vote against any positive queer legislation. However, those who respond that same sex relations are only sometimes wrong (conversely meaning almost always right) and not wrong at all are most likely to vote for any positive queer legislation, or at least not vote against it.

In the measurement for attitudes towards multi racial relationships, two separate questions are utilized. White respondents were asked, “How would you feel if a close relative marries someone who is black?” Black respondents were asked, “How would you feel if a close relative marries someone who is white?” Possible answers included strongly favor, favor, neither favor nor oppose, oppose, strongly oppose and don’t know. While these measures are not perfect as they may partially measure an individual’s comfortableness with close contact with someone of another race in addition to attitudes towards the relationships

themselves (St. Jean 1998), the questions are better than those used in previous studies. Most prior research has utilized respondents' attitudes toward a law banning multi racial marriage to assess attitudes towards multi racial marriage, measuring only extreme racism and separatism. Since multi racial marriage is legal, and "bigotry" has become socially inappropriate, it is unlikely that anyone other than a true extremist would want to ban such marriages. Furthermore, individuals may be willing to agree that people they don't know can inter marry, but they may feel more strongly about their children, siblings, and parents.

For the purpose of this analysis, the 36 respondents who responded that they "didn't know" were excluded from the analysis. The response categories were then collapsed into (1) strongly favor, (2) favor, (3) neither favor nor oppose, and (4) oppose or strongly oppose. The categories oppose and strongly oppose were combined, because too few black respondents answered negatively to the question.

### Explanatory Variables

The main exploratory variables for the analysis include measures about religion and a gender ideology scale. Following previous research (Cygner, Noel, and Jacobson 1977), I include two measures in my analyses. The first religious measure, intensity, measures how strong the respondents consider their religious affiliation, and the second measure explores fundamentalism, with possible answers including fundamentalists, moderates, liberals, or no religious affiliation. No religious affiliation serves as the baseline.<sup>1</sup>

For the gender ideology scale, I include three questions that measure traditional and nontraditional attitudes towards gender ideology. These include questions that measure whether or not respondents thought working women could form warm relationships with

---

<sup>1</sup> Religious Affiliation was excluded from the analysis, because a Pearson Coefficient indicated that it was highly correlated with religious fundamentalism. Running the analysis with religious affiliation instead of



their children, if preschool children are hurt by their mother working, and if it is better for men than women to work outside the home. The Cronbach's alpha score for the scale is .69.

### Control Variables

My analysis also includes several control variables. These include a person's age, education, region in which they live, income, marital status, and political views. Age is included, because research suggests that those who are older tend to be less accepting of same sex marriage (Lewis 2003) and multi racial marriage (St. Jean and Parker 1995). Research has also suggested that those who are more educated are more likely to have more positive attitudes towards same sex marriage (Lewis 2003) and multi racial marriage (St. Jean and Parker 1995; Wilson and Jacobson 1995). Region may also play a role in attitudes towards same sex marriage and warrants inclusion in the analysis, with individuals from the South and Midwest having more negative attitudes towards same sex relations than individuals from the Pacific Coast (Herek 1988; Irwin and Thompson 1977). Research has also indicated that black women from the south central United States are the least likely to have positive attitudes towards multi racial marriage than black women from other regions (St. Jean and Parker 1995).

Income is included as a measure for social class, because economic disadvantage may result in identity work that is not conducive to positive attitudes toward same sex or multi racial relationships. Schwalbe and his colleagues (2000) note that "oppressive othering occurs when one group seeks advantage by defining another group as morally and/or intellectually inferior" (423). Adding an economic component, Collins (2000) argues that heterosexual privilege is the only privilege that marginalized groups are granted, and therefore, they seek to protect it.

---

religious fundamentalism did not improve the models' -2 Log likelihoods.

Martial status is used as a control variable, because it is a measure of individual's who have or have not experienced the desired "reward" for being good citizens. Finally, political ideology is included, because research suggests that conservatism is associated with prejudice in general (Lottes and Kuriloff 1992).

### Analysis

The analyses are separated into two main parts. The first section includes an analysis of attitudes towards same sex relationships. Parallel models are then run exploring multi racial relationships. The findings from the models predicting attitudes towards same sex marriage are then compared with the findings for attitudes towards multi racial relationships. For the model exploring attitudes towards same sex relationships, binary logistic regression is utilized, because the dependent variable is dichotomous. A dichotomous dependent variable violates basic assumptions of ordinary least squares regression (OLS), and therefore, logistic regression is best suited for this analysis. The variable measuring multi racial relationships is comprised of four response categories. Since, the dependent variable has more than two ranked categories, but is not continuous, ordinal logistic regression is most appropriate (Menard 2002).

### Same Sex Analysis

I run a series of binary logistic regression models first for black respondents and separately for white respondents, because Lewis (2000) suggests that the root of attitudes towards same sex relations is different for Blacks than it is for Whites. Also, running distinct models for black and white respondents keeps the same sex analyses parallel to those run for multi racial relationships, allowing for comparison across relationship types. The first of a series of nested model includes only the control variables. The second model includes

religious variables and control variables. By comparing the  $\chi^2$  between the first model and the second model, it can be determined whether or not adding the religious variables adds to the predictive power.

The third model includes the measures of religion, the gender ideology scale and the control variables. The  $\chi^2$  from this model can then be compared to Model 2. The fourth and final model consists of all of the variables in model three plus an interaction exploring sex and gender ideology to determine if the explanatory power of gender ideology is larger for men than women. The  $\chi^2$  for this model will then be compared to the  $\chi^2$  for model three to determine if the interaction term significantly improves the model's fit.

#### Analysis for Multi Racial Relationships

For multi racial couples, I utilize two different questions in the GSS as discussed previously. The first question asks white respondents how they would feel if a close relative marries a black person, while the second question asks black respondents how they would feel if a close relative marries a white person. Just as with the same sex marriage analysis, separate but parallel, ordinal logistic nested models are run for white and then black respondents. The ordering of the models was designed utilizing the same logic regarding the comparison of  $\chi^2$  scores as discussed above.

After parallel models for attitudes towards same sex relations and attitudes towards multi racial relationships are reported separately, the findings are compared. Within each type of relationships, a test for significant slope differences will be run comparing black and white slope coefficients. Any significant differences between black and white respondents for one type of relationship will then be compared with slope differences for the other type of relationship.

## Results

### Results for Same Sex Relationships

While all of the models were statistically significant for the white sample, none of the models were statistically significant for the black sample. Because the models failed to be statistically significant for the black sample, only the white models will be discussed. The results for this analysis are located in Table 2.

(Insert Second Table About Here)

The Model  $\chi^2$  for Model 1, which included only the control variables, was statistically significant for white respondents (152.606). Variables that were statistically significant were family income, liberal politics, moderate politics, being from the Midwest, from the south, having less than a high school education, and age. More specifically, white respondents with liberal political ideologies (4.568) and moderate political ideologies (1.704) were more likely to approve of same sex relations than conservatives. Having a higher income (.999) and being older (.972) were less likely to approve of same sex relationships. Being from the Midwest (.54) and the South (.27) in comparison to the Pacific, and having less than a high school education (.432) in comparison to more than a high school education were less likely to approve of same sex relations.

In Model 2, the two religious measures were added to the control variables. The Model  $\chi^2$  was statistically significant for white respondents (189.203). For white respondents, this model was a better fitting model than Model 1. With the inclusion of the religious variables, having a liberal political ideology remained positively correlated with favorable attitudes towards same sex relationships, but having a moderate political ideology lost significance. Similarly to Model 1, the control variables being from the Midwest (.586),

being from the South (.323), having less than a high school degree (.389), and age (.975) remained statistically significant and associated with negative attitudes towards same sex relations. Only one of the religious measures, religious intensity, was a statistically significant predictor. Respondents who reported being very religious (.301) were less likely to have positive attitude towards same sex relationships.

The next Model, Model 3, included all the variables in Model 2 and the gender ideology scale. The Model  $\chi^2$  for Model 3 was statistically significant for whites (230.135). The same control variables that were statistically significant in model 2 remained significant. These include: liberal political ideology (2.974), being from the Midwest (.464), from the South (.267), having less than a high school education (.482), and age (.982). Having a strong religious identity (.317) also remained statistically significant and negatively associated with having negative attitudes towards same sex relationships. The added gender ideology scale was statistically significant. Scoring more liberal on the gender ideology scale (1.413) was associated with having more positive attitudes towards same sex relationships.

In Model four, a sex (male) by gender ideology scale interaction term was added to the prior model. Model  $\chi^2$  for model four was statistically significant for whites (230.137). While the model itself was statistically significant for whites, comparisons of the -2 Log likelihoods did not show a statistically significant improvement in Model 4 in comparison to model three. The interaction was not statistically significant, and the same variables that were significant in Model 3 remained so. More specifically, political ideology (2.974), being from the Midwest (.464), from the South (.266), having less than a high school education (.481), having a strong religious affiliation (.317) and gender ideology (1.409) were statistically significant.

In order to determine if there were statistically significant differences in slope values for each variable depending on race, I then calculated t-tests<sup>2</sup> comparing the slope coefficients. Since none of the black models were statistically significant, these calculations should be taken with some level of caution.<sup>3</sup> For Model 1, the test for slope differences found statistically significant differences for liberal politics, moderate politics, having a high school education, and age. For Model 2, the slope comparison showed statistically significant differences for liberal politics, moderate politics, and age. For Model 3, the only variable that showed statistically significant different slopes was age. Finally, the variables with statistically significant different slopes in Model 4 were having a liberal political ideology, being married, and the sex by gender ideology interaction term.

#### Results for Multi Racial Relationships.

Similarly to the results for attitudes towards same sex relationships, all of the black models failed to reach statistical significance. Because of this, only results for the white sample will be discussed in this section. The results for these models are located in Table 3. Looking first at the model comprised of the control variables, the model  $\chi^2$  is statistically significant for whites (115.473). The control variables that are statistically significant

---


$$^2 \quad T_{\text{calc}} = \frac{b_{1(\text{Blacks})} - b_{1(\text{Whites})}}{\sqrt{[se(b_{1(\text{Blacks})})^2 + se(b_{1(\text{Whites})})^2]}}$$

From: "Multiple Comparison Tests" by *The Odium Institute for Research in Social Science*

<sup>3</sup> Since none of the black models were statistically significant, I reran the models with a larger sample (N=883) which included missing data lost on the other dependent variable. While this sample is not directly comparable to the sample asked about multi racial marriage, it supports the findings noted above. For Model 3, the model chi-square (29.417) was significant. All findings on the variables went in the same direction, with the gender ideology scale becoming significant at the .05 level for a two-tailed test. The only variable that became significant that had not been with the smaller sample was south. The direction remained the same, with the model predicting that people from the south are less likely to approve of same sex relationships than individuals from the Pacific West.

predictors of positive attitudes towards same multi racial relationships are having a liberal political ideology (1.577), moderate political ideology (1.359), and being from the north (1.62). The control variables that are statistically significant and predict negative attitudes towards multi racial relationships are being from the south (.553) and age (.966).

(Insert Table 3 About Here)

The Model  $\chi^2$  for the second model, which included the control variables and the two religious measures, was also statistically significant for whites (121.501). However, while the model was significant for white respondents, adding the religious variables in Model 2 did not result in a statistically significant improvement on Model 1. Both religious variables failed to be statistically significant. However, when the religious variables were included in the model moderate politics was no longer statistically significant and having a high school education became statistically significant (.734). Having liberal political ideology (1.501), being from the North (1.654), being from the South (.606) and age (.967) all remained statistically significant in Model 2.

In Model 3 the gender ideology scale was added to the control variables and the religious measures. The Model  $\chi^2$  was statistically significant for the white sample (134.69). For the white sample, Model 3 is the best fitting model. Adding the gender ideology scale into the model results in a statistically significant improvement on both Model 1 and Model 2. Gender Ideology was statistically significant (1.162), with respondents with more liberal gender ideologies having positive attitudes towards multiracial marriage. Having Liberal ideology and having a high school education were no longer statistically significant. Being from the North (1.559), being from the South (.572), and age (.971) remained statistically significant.

The fourth model included all of the variables in model 3 and the sex (male) by gender ideology interaction term. The Model  $\chi^2$  for the final model was also statistically significant for whites (134.755). However, adding the interaction between sex and gender ideology did not improve the models predictive power and therefore, Model 3 was a better fit to the data. The interaction term failed to reach statistical significance. The exact same variables that were statistically significant in Model 3 remained so in Model Four.

Slope comparisons between black respondents and white respondents were also calculated for all the models predicting attitudes towards close relatives marrying someone of the other race.<sup>4</sup> For Model 1, the slopes which were statistically significantly different at the .05 level were having a liberal political ideology, having a high school degree, and age. The variables in Model 2 with statistically significant different slopes were having a liberal political ideology, less than high school degree, and age. For Model 3, the variables with statistically significant different slopes were age and gender ideology. Finally, for Model 4, the two variables that had statistically significant different slopes were having a liberal political ideology and age.

#### Hypotheses for Same Sex Relationships

Hypotheses 1 predicted that individuals who report being more religious will be more likely to have negative attitudes towards same sex relations. This was supported in the white sample. In the best fitting model, Model 3, white respondents who reported having a strong religious affiliation were less likely to approve of same sex relations as respondents who did not consider themselves religious at all. However, this hypothesis failed to be supported by the black sample. Religious strength was not statistically significant in any of the models.

---

<sup>4</sup> The analysis was also run using the larger black sample (N=833). For model 3, moderate politics was statistically significant similarly to the smaller sample. However, marital status was no longer statistically



The second hypothesis predicted that respondents who report being fundamentalists will be more likely to have negative attitudes towards same sex relations. This hypothesis was not supported in any of the models, regardless of race. Fundamentalism was not statistically significant in any of the models.

Hypothesis 3-1 predicted that individuals who report having a more traditional gender ideology are more likely to have negative attitudes towards same sex relations. This hypothesis was supported for both whites and blacks. The more liberal respondents scored on the gender ideology the greater the likelihood that they approved of same sex relationships. However, hypothesis 3-2, which predicted that the relationships between traditional gender ideology and negative attitudes towards same sex relations will be stronger for men than women, was not supported in the white or black models. The interaction term between sex and gender ideology was not significant for either sample.

#### Hypothesis for Multi Racial Marriage

The first hypothesis predicted that individuals who are more religious are more likely to have negative attitudes towards multi racial relationships. This hypothesis was not supported by either the black or the white sample. Religious strength was not statistically significant in any of the models.

Hypothesis 2-1 predicted that for all respondents except black men, having more traditional gender ideologies would be correlated with negative attitudes towards multi racial marriage. This hypothesis was partially supported. Having more conservative gender ideologies was associated with negative attitudes towards multi racial marriage for the white population. However, the models do not suggest that black women with more traditional gender ideologies have more negative attitudes towards multi racial marriage. Neither

---

significant. Being from the South and Religious Strength became statistically significant predictors.

gender ideology nor the sex by gender ideology interaction are statistically significant for the black sample. Therefore, hypothesis H2-2 is also only partially supported. H2-2 predicted that there would be a positive relationship between conservative gender ideology and positive attitudes towards multi racial marriage for black men. However, the results do not indicate any significant difference in the role of gender ideology for black men and women.

## **Discussion**

### Religion and White Attitudes

This research was designed to explore what shapes attitudes towards same sex and multi racial relationships. The results suggest that the predictors of attitudes towards marginalized relationships vary across race, and that attitudes towards each relationship are influenced by different factors. For white respondents, the analysis suggests that strength of religious belief is important for predicting attitudes toward same sex relationships, but not for multi racial relationships. This suggests that same sex relationships may pose a bigger threat to religious groups than multi racial relationships. Schwalbe and his colleagues (2000) note that “oppressive othering occurs when one group seeks advantage by defining another group as morally and/or intellectually inferior” (423). Herek (1990) suggests that outward acts of anti-gay prejudice may be an individual’s way of proclaiming personal values in order to affirm his or her religious identity.

While these results suggest that religion is not playing as important role in explaining white attitudes towards multi racial relationships as it is towards same sex relationships, it should not be entirely discounted. Recent research does suggest that religion is still correlated with racism. Jacobson (1998) survey of undergraduate students found both linear and curvilinear relationships between religion and prejudice.

### Gender Ideology and White Attitudes

For white respondents having a traditional gender ideology is a statistically significant predictor of negative attitudes towards both types of relationships. For same sex relationships, this association has been supported by prior research (Henley and Pincus 1978; Herek 1988; Hinrichs and Rosenberg 2002; Kerns and Fine 1994; Kurdek 1988; Liebach and Friedman 1985; and Whitley 1987 and 2002). Traditional gender norms stress attraction to the other sex, and gender deviance is often equated with homosexuality (Bem 1993). Further illustrating this point, Connell (1987:222) writes, “Gender relations involve the structuring of social practice around sex and sexuality.”

When explaining the relationship between gender ideology and multi racial relationships, the theoretical link has not been thoroughly flushed out. This finding does not contradict Ross’s (2003) suggestion that negative attitudes stem from a sexualization of multi racial relationships. In so much as hypersexuality is seen as gender deviance for women in our society, multi racial relationships may be viewed as violating gender norms. However, this analysis does not directly test whether or not multi racial relationships are seen as relationships based on sex and this interpretation is purely speculative. It is just as likely that the connection is directly related to racism. Henley and Pincus (1978) found that racism and sexism are correlated. It is not surprising that individuals who seek to protect the privileges that result from following traditional gender norms, would also seek to maintain race privilege as well.

### Religion *or* Gender Ideology and Black Attitudes??

The most glaring finding is that there weren’t any for black respondents. While all of the white models were statistically significant, none of the black models were. This may

partially be the result of a smaller black sample size, but even when the analysis was re-run with the larger black sample, the Model  $\chi^2$  values still remained *much* lower than those with the white sample. This supports Lewis's (2000) suggestion that the roots of attitudes towards same sex relationships differ for whites and blacks. I'd also suggest that the roots of attitudes towards multi racial relationships also differ by race.

An explanation for why the black models weren't statistically significant for same sex relationships is because the vast majority responded that the relationships are wrong. While 41.1% of white respondents reported favorable attitudes towards same sex relationships, only 22.2% of blacks did so. It could be that the variables chosen were not statistically significant, because there was little variation within the groups. In other words, regardless of religion and the control variables, the majority thought it was wrong. If gays, lesbians and bisexuals do face harsher stigmatization within the black community (Collins 2004, Schulte 2002), then this only illustrates the need for further research.

Although none of the models predicting attitudes towards same sex relationships were statistically significant, it may be important to note that gender ideology was statistically significant in Model 3 and 4. This supports Schulte's (2002) suggestion that negativity towards same sex relationships is greater for blacks, because they perceive greater gender deviance by gays. If marginalized groups seek to protect their heterosexual privilege because it is the only privilege they are granted (Collins 2000) and blacks equate homosexuality with gender deviance (Schulte 2002), it logically follows that having a conservative gender ideology would be associated with negative attitudes towards same sex relationships.

## **Conclusion**

### Future Research

Gay rights activists often piggy back on the civil rights movements, arguing that the prohibition of same sex marriage is alike to the past prohibition of multi racial marriage. However, no research has actually empirically tested whether or not the same social processes that legitimate the cultural discrimination toward same sex unions are similar to those of multi racial relationships. The goal of this paper was to compare these processes across relationships types, while avoiding the assumption that the processes would be the same for different racial groups. If the sample size had been larger, the models would have been even further divided by sex and race.

While some variables were similar in explaining white attitudes towards both types of relationships, in general, there was not one over arching pattern. However, the most striking finding was how different the social processes were in explaining black attitudes in comparison to whites. While every model, in every analysis, was statistically significant for white respondents, not one model was statistically significant within the black sample. Clearly, there is a need for future research.

There were several limitations to this research that scholars should address in the future. The first limitation of this research was the phrasing of the same sex relationship question. Research that utilizes a clearer phrased question has more validity in their measure. Furthermore, if future research seeks to further compare attitudes towards same sex relationships with attitudes towards multi racial relationships, questions that are completely parallel should be utilized. Secondly, this research was limited by the small black sample size. Datasets with a larger black sample will produce more reliable results. Third, the

gender ideology scale in the GSS is very traditional, does not measure behavior, and does not address whether or not the individuals actually perceive the members of the couple as gender deviants. Also, questions that would actually test the sexualization hypothesis put forth by Ross (2002) were not available in the GSS. Finally, the GSS categorization of race reinforces the black/white racial dichotomy, with no room for bi-racial individuals (St. Jean 1998). Having biological or non biological parents of different races may particularly influence attitudes towards multi racial relationships.

A theoretical approach that is absent from this paper is the inclusion of Contact Theory. Very briefly, Contact Theory suggests that favorable interactions with members of an out-group will increase positive attitudes towards them. With the exception of southerners, research does indicate that individuals who come into contact with people who partner with someone of the same sex tend to have more positive attitudes towards same sex relationships (Barth and Marvin 2003). In regards to race relations, contact theory may depend on the types of contacts. For example, some research suggests that whether or not a black contact positively influences a white individual's attitudes is dependent on the socioeconomic status of the black contact (Jackman and Crane 1986). Future research comparing attitudes towards same sex and multi racial relationships may want to include this approach in their analysis.

There is much room for future research on this topic, especially in understanding what processes continue to legitimate blacks' negative attitudes towards same sex and multi racial relationships. The marginalization of same sex relationships and multi racial relationships persist today, and understanding what shapes attitudes towards these relationships remains an important goal for social scientists.

## References

- Barclay, Scott and Shauna Fisher. 2003. "The States and the Differing Impetus for Divergent Paths on Same-Sex Marriage, 1990-2001" *The Policy Studies Journal* 31(3):2003.
- Barth, Jay and Marvin Overby L. 2003 "Are Gay Men and Lesbians in the South the New "Threat"?: Regional Comparisons of Contact Theory" *Politics and Polity* 31(3):452-470.
- Battle, Juan and Anthony J. Lemelle, Jr. 2002. "Gender Differences in African American Attitudes Toward Gay Males." *The Western Journal of Black Studies* 26(3):134-139.
- Bem, Sandra Lipsitz .1993. *The Lenses of Gender*. Yale University Press. New Haven.
- Bernstein, Mary. 2002. "Identities and Politics: Toward a Historical Understanding of the Lesbian and Gay Movement" *Social Science History* 26(3):531-581.
- Blalock, Hubert M. 1967. *Toward a Theory of Minority-group Relations*. Wiley:New York.
- Bolte, Angela. 1998. "Do Wedding Dresses Come in Lavender? The Prospects and Implications of Same-Sex Marriage." *Social Theory and Practice* 24(1):111-131.
- Calhoun, Cheshire. 2002. *Feminism, The Family, and the Politics of the Closet: Lesbian and Gay Displacement*. Oxford University Press.
- Card, Claudia. 2001. "Against Marriage and Motherhood" *Hypatia* 11(3):1996.
- Cazenave, Noel A. 1983 "A Woman's Place": The Attitudes of Middle-Class Black Men" *Phylon* XLIV (1):12-31.

- Collins, Patricia Hill (1998) *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice*  
University of Minnesota Press; Minneapolis.
- Collins, Patricia Hill (2000) *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment* Routledge: New York.
- Collins, Patricia Hill (2004) *Black Sexual Politics: African Americans, Gender, and the New Racism*. Routeledge. New York
- Cotten-Huston Annie L., and Bradley M. Waite. 2000. "Anti-Homosexual Attitudes in College Students: Predictors and Classroom Interventions" *Journal of Homosexuality* 38(3):117-133.
- Crowder, Kyle D. and Stewart E. Tolnay. 2000. "A New Marriage Squeeze for Black Women: The Role of Racial Intermarriage by Black Men." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62:792-807.
- Cygner, Thomas E, Donald L Noel and Cardell K. Jacobson. 1977. "Religiousity and Prejudice: An Interdimensional Analysis" *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 16(2):183-191.
- Duncan, Richard F. 1996 "Homosexual Marriage and the Myth of Tolerance: Is Cardinal O'Conner a "Homophobe"?" *Notre Dame Journal of Law, Ethics and Public Policy* X(2):1996.
- Fassin, Eric. 2001. "Same Sex, Different Politics: "Gay Marriage" Debates in France and the United States" *Public Culture* 13(2):215-232.
- Foeman, Anita Kathy and Teresa Nance. 1999. "From Miscegenation to Multiculturalism: Perceptions and Stages of Interracial Relationship Development" *The Journal of Black Studies* 29(4):540-557.



- Henley, N. M. and F Pincus. 1978. "Interrelationship of Sexist, Racist, and Antihomosexual Attitudes." *Psychological Reports* 42:83-90.
- Herek, Gregory M. 1988. "Homosexuals' Attitudes toward lesbians and Gay Men: Correlates and Gender Differences." *The Journal of Sex Research* 25(4):451-477.
- Herek, Gregory M. 1990. "The Context of Anti-Gay Violence: Notes on cultural and Psychological Heterosexism." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 5(3):316-333.
- Herek, Gregory M. 2002. "Gender Gaps in Public Opinion About Lesbian and Gay Men" *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 66(1):40-66.
- Himmelstein, Jerome L. 1986. "The Social Basis of Antifeminism: Religious Networks And Culture." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 25(1):1-15.
- Hinrichs, Donald W. and Pamela J. Rosenberg. 2002. "Attitudes toward Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Persons among Heterosexual Liberal Arts College Students" *Journal of Homosexuality* 43(1):61-84.
- Irwin, Patrick and Norman L. Thompson. 1977. "Acceptance of the Rights of Homosexuals: A Social Profile" *Journal of Homosexuality* 3(2):107-121.
- Jackman, Mary R. and Marie Crane. 1986. "Some of My Best Friends Are Black...": Interracial Friendship and Whites' Racial Attitudes" *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 50(4):459-486.
- Kerns John G. and Mark A. Fine (1994). "The Relation Between Gender and Negative Attitudes Toward Gay men and Lesbians: Do Gender Role Attitudes Mediate This Relation?" *Sex Roles* 31:297-307.
- Kirkpatrick, Lee A. 1993. "Fundamentalism, Christian Orthodoxy, and Intrinsic Religious Orientation as Predictors of Discriminatory Attitudes." *Journal for the*

*Scientific Study of Religion* 1993, 32(3):256-268.

- Kite, Mary E. and Bernard E. Whitley, Jr. 1998. "Do heterosexual Women and men Differ in their Attitudes Toward Homosexuality? A Conceptual and Methodological Analysis." In *Stigma and sexual Orientation: Understanding Prejudice Against Lesbians, Gay Men, and Bisexuals*, edited by G.M. Herek. Thousand Oaks, CA:Sage. Pp. 38-61.
- Kurdek, Lawrence A. 1988. "Correlates of negative Attitudes Toward Homosexuals in Heterosexual College Students" *Sex Roles* 18:727-738.
- LaMar, L. and Mary E. Kite. 1998. "Sex differences in Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men: A Multidimensional Perspective." *Journal of Sex Research* 35:189-196.
- Lewis, Gregory B. 2003. "Black-White Differences in Attitudes Toward Homosexuality and Gay Rights" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 67:59-78.
- Lieblich, Amia and Gitza Friedman. 1985. "Attitudes Toward Male and Female Homosexuality and Sex-Role Stereotypes in Israeli and American Students. *Sex Roles* 12:561-570.
- Lottes, Lisa L. and Peter J. Kuriloff. 1992. "The Effects of Gender, Race, Religion, and Political Orientation on the Sex Role 1 Attitudes of College Freshmen." *Adolescence* 17(107):675-189.
- Marsiglio, William. 1993. "Attitudes Toward Homosexual Activity and Gays as Friends: A National Survey of Heterosexual 15- To 19- Year-Old Males." *Journal of Sex Research* 30(1):12-20.
- Menard, Scott. 2002. *Applied Logistic Regression Analysis: Second Edition*. Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks.

- Namaste, Ki. 1996. "The Politics of Inside/Out: Queer Theory, Poststructuralism, and a Sociological Approach to Sexuality" in Seidman, Stevens *Queer Theory/Sociology* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 168-193.
- Poole, Oliver. March 13, 2004. "Californian Court Bands Gay Marriage in San Francisco" *Daily telegraph (London, England)*.
- Popenoe, David. 1993. "The National Family Wars" *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 55(3):553-555.
- Porterfield, Ernest. 1982. "Black-American Intermarriage in the United States" *Marriage and Family Review* 5(1):17-32.
- Rey, Amy M. and Pamela Reed Gibson. 1997. "Beyond High School: Heterosexuals' Self-Reported Anti-Gay/Lesbian Behaviors and Attitudes." *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services* 7(4):65-84.
- Romano, Renee C. 2003. *Race Mixing: Black-White Marriage in Postwar America*. Harvard University Press Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Rosenblatt, Paul C., Terri A. Karis, and Richard D. Powell. 1995. *Multiracial Couples: Black and White voices*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Ross, Josephine. 2002. "The Sexualization of Difference: A Comparison of Mixed-Race and Same-Gender Marriage." *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review* 37(2):256-288.
- Schneider, William and I. A. Lewis. 1984. "The Straight Story on Homosexuality and Gay Rights." *Public Opinion* 7:16-20.
- Sherkat, Darren E. 2002. "Sexuality and Religious Commitment in the United States: An Empirical Examination." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 41(2):313-323.

- Schulte, Lisa J. 2002. "Similarities and Differences in Homophobia Among African Americans versus Caucasians" *Race, Gender, and Class* 9(4):71-93.
- Schwalbe, Michael, Sandra Godwin, Daphne Holden, Douglas Schrock, Shealy Thompson and Michele Wolkomir. 2000. "Generic Processes in the Reproduction of Inequality: An Interactionist Analysis." *Social Forces* 79(2):419-452.
- Smith, Anne Marie. 2001 "The Politicization of Marriage in Contemporary American Public Policy: The Defense of Marriage Act and the Personal Responsibility Act." *Citizenship Studies* 5(3):303-320.
- Spickard, Paul R. 1989. *Mixed Blood: Intermarriage and Ethnic Identity in Twentieth-Century America*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Stacey, Judith. 1996. *In the Name of the Family: Rethinking Family Values in the Postmodern Age*, Beacon Press: Boston.
- Stacey, Judith and Timothy J. Biblarz. 2001. "(How) Does the Sexual Orientation of Parents Matter?" *American Sociological Review* 66(April):159-183.
- St. Jean, Yanick. 1998. "Let People Speak for Themselves: Interracial Unions and the General Social Survey" *Journal of Black Studies* 28(3):398-414.
- St. Jean, Yanick and Robert E. Parker. 1995. "Disapproval of Interracial Unions: The Case of Black Females" in *American Families: Issues in Race and Ethnicity* ed. Cardell K. Jacobson Garland publishing Inc. New York.
- Waite, Linda J. and Evelyn L. Lehrer. 2003. "The Benefits of Marriage and Religion in the United States; A Comparative Analysis." *Population and Development Review* 29(2):255-275.
- Wills, Georgia and Ryan Crawford. 2000. "Attitudes toward Homosexuality in

- Shreveport-Bossier City, Louisiana” *Journal of Homosexuality* 38(3):97-116.
- Whitley, Bernard. 1987. “The Relationships of Sex-Role Orientation to heterosexuals’ Attitudes Toward Homosexuals” *Sex Roles* 17:103-113.
- Whitley, Bernard. 2001. “Gender Role Variables and Attitudes Towards Homosexuality” *Sex Roles* 45(11-12):691-721.
- Wilson, Deborah S, and Cardell K. Jacobson. 1995. “White Attitudes Towards Black and White Interracial Marriage” in *American Families: Issues in Race and Ethnicity* ed. Cardell K. Jacobson Garland Publishing Inc. New York.
- Wong, Frank Y., Donald R. McCreary, Kenneth M. Carpenter, Amy Engle, and Roksana Korchynsky. 1999. “Gender Related Factors Influencing Perceptions of Homosexuality.” *Journal of Homosexuality* 37(3):19-31.
- Yancey, George. 2003. “A Preliminary Examination of Differential Sexual Attitudes Among Individuals Involved in Interracial Relationships: Testing "Jungle Fever" *The Social Science Journal* 40(1):153-157.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

| Independent Variables    |                | Descriptive Statistics |   |   |   |   |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|
|                          |                | Univariate             | Favor Same Sex Relationships (White Sample) | Favor Same Sex Relationships (Black Sample) | Attitudes favor Marrying Black (White Sample) | Attitudes favor Marrying White (Black Sample) |
| Sex                      |                |                        |   |   |   |   |
|                          | Male           | 50.2%                  | 41.9%                                       | 22.9%                                       | 25.9%   | 45.8%   |
|                          | Female         | 49.8%                  | 40.4%                                       | 21.9%                                       | 26.6%   | 52.8%   |
| Race                     |                |                        |   |   |   |   |
|                          | White          | 84.1%                  | 41.1%                                       | *****                                       | 26.4%   | *****   |
|                          | Black          | 15.9%                  | *****                                       | 22.2% *                                     | *****   | 48.7%   |
| Religious Intensity      |                |                        |   |   |   |   |
|                          | Strong         | 34.5%                  | 25.8%                                       | 16.4%                                       | 23.6%   | 56.5%   |
|                          | Weak           | 52%                    | 42.4%                                       | 29.8%                                       | 26.6%   | 44.9%   |
|                          | Not Religious  | 13.5%                  | 69.6%                                       | 22.2%                                       | 30.1%   | 33.3%   |
| Religious Fundamentalism |                |                        |   |   |   |   |
|                          | Fundamentalist | 31.8%                  | 15.8%                                       | 22.2%                                       | 20.4%   | 52.7%   |
|                          | Moderate       | 33.8%                  | 45.4%                                       | 12%   | 32.2%   | 53.8%   |
|                          | Liberal        | 28.9%                  | 55.4%                                       | 33.3%                                       | 24%   | 40%   |
|                          | None           | 5.4%                   | 50%   | 40%   | 27.8%   | 20%   |
| Gender Ideology          |                |                        |   |   |   |   |
|                          | Conservative   | 39.2%                  | 20%   | 19.23%                                      | 17.4%   | 54.1%   |
|                          | Liberal        | 60.8%                  | 80%   | 80.77%                                      | 77.8%   | 45.9%   |

Note: N=757. 2000 and 2002 General Social Survey. Descriptive Statistics for control variables available upon request.

Table 2: Binary Logistic Regression Odds Ratio Estimates for Attitudes Towards Same Sex Relationships

|                     | Model 1   |                    | Model 2   |                    | Model 3   |                    | Model 4   |                    |
|---------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|
|                     | Whites    | Blacks             | Whites    | Blacks             | Whites    | Blacks             | Whites    | Blacks             |
| Model $\chi^2$      | 152.606** | 10.764             | 189.203** | 15.517             | 230.135** | 18.503             | 230.137** | 20.221             |
| Nagelkerke R Square | .291      | .135               | .350      | .19                | .413      | .224               | .413      | .243               |
| Sex                 |           |                    |           |                    |           |                    |           |                    |
| Male                | 0.86      | 1.081              | 0.731     | 1.206              | 0.961     | 1.627              | 1.008     | 0.037              |
| Family Income       | .999**    | .999               | .999      | .999               | .999      | .999               | .999      | .999               |
| Politics            |           |                    |           |                    |           |                    |           |                    |
| Liberal Politics    | 4.568**   | 0.7 <sup>1</sup>   | 3.486**   | 0.691 <sup>1</sup> | 2.974**   | 0.722              | 2.974**   | 0.707 <sup>1</sup> |
| Moderate Politics   | 1.704**   | 0.775 <sup>1</sup> | 1.373     | 0.664 <sup>1</sup> | 1.2       | 0.62               | 1.2       | 0.605              |
| Married             |           |                    |           |                    |           |                    |           |                    |
| Married             | 0.982     | 0.726              | 0.997     | 0.918              | 0.963     | 1.137              | 0.963     | 1.002 <sup>1</sup> |
| Divorced etc.       | 0.961     | 0.263*             | 0.88      | 0.323              | 0.876     | 0.318              | 0.876     | 0.284              |
| Region              |           |                    |           |                    |           |                    |           |                    |
| North               | 1.142     | 2.163              | 1.042     | 1.952              | 0.871     | 1.921              | 0.871     | 1.538              |
| Midwest             | 0.54**    | 0.512              | 0.586**   | 0.46               | 0.464**   | 0.542              | .464**    | 0.463              |
| South               | 0.27**    | 0.987              | 0.323**   | 0.877              | 0.267**   | 0.92               | .266**    | 0.805              |
| Education           |           |                    |           |                    |           |                    |           |                    |
| Less than HS        | 0.432**   | 0.569              | 0.389**   | 0.5                | 0.482*    | 0.698              | .481*     | 0.658              |
| High School         | 0.735     | 1.368 <sup>1</sup> | 0.721     | 1.537              | 0.802     | 1.461              | 0.802     | 1.396              |
| Age                 | 0.972**   | 0.997 <sup>1</sup> | 0.975**   | 1.001 <sup>1</sup> | 0.982**   | 1.007 <sup>1</sup> | .982**    | 1.01 <sup>1</sup>  |
| Religious Strength  |           |                    |           |                    |           |                    |           |                    |
| Strong              |           |                    | 0.301**   | 1.44               | 0.317**   | 1.115              | .317**    | 1.153              |
| Medium              |           |                    | 0.578     | 3.534              | 0.577     | 2.649              | 0.577     | 2.745              |
| Religious Fund      |           |                    |           |                    |           |                    |           |                    |
| Fundamentalist      |           |                    | 0.495     | 0.882              | 0.611     | 0.773              | 0.611     | 0.869              |
| Moderate            |           |                    | 1.141     | 0.606              | 1.085     | 0.488              | 1.086     | 0.486              |
| Liberal             |           |                    | 1.297     | 2.31               | 1.363     | 1.639              | 1.363     | 1.747              |
| Gender Ideology     |           |                    |           |                    | 1.413**   | 1.309*             | 1.409**   | 1.79*              |
| sex*Genderid        |           |                    |           |                    |           |                    | 1.006     | 0.798              |

Note: N= 632 whites and 117 blacks. 2000 and 2002 General Social Survey. All coefficients are non-standardized. \* indicates  $p < .1$  and \*\* indicates  $p < .05$  for a two tailed test. <sup>1</sup>Maximum likelihood est. were so low odds ratios for household income were reported as 1.00.

Table 3: Ordinal Logistic Regression Odds Ratio Estimates for Attitudes Towards Marrying Other Race

| Variable            | Model 1   |                    | Model 2   |                    | Model 3  |                    | Model 4   |                    |
|---------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|
|                     | Whites    | Blacks             | Whites    | Blacks             | Whites   | Blacks             | Whites    | Blacks             |
| Model $\chi^2$      | 115.473** | 12.212             | 121.501** | 15.283             | 134.69** | 15.654             | 134.755** | 15.704             |
| Nagelkerke R Square | 0.182     | 0.108              | 0.191     | 0.133              | 0.21     | 0.136              | 0.21      | 0.137              |
| Intercept 1         | -2.662    | -1.799             | -2.870    | -.906              | -1.256   | -.362              | -1.537    | -.518              |
| Intercept 2         | -.752     | .768               | -.947     | 1.715              | .685     | 2.265              | .414      | 2.108              |
| Intercept 3         | .133      | 1.711              | -.056     | 2.679              | 1.582    | 3.232              | 1.317     | 3.076              |
| Sex                 |           |                    |           |                    |          |                    |           |                    |
| Male                | 0.989     | 1.088              | 0.968     | 1.192              | 1.096    | 1.3                | 0.935     | 0.927              |
| Family Income       | 0.999     | 0.999              | 0.999     | 0.999              | 0.999    | 0.999              | 0.999     | 0.999              |
| Politics            |           |                    |           |                    |          |                    |           |                    |
| Liberal Politics    | 1.577**   | 0.618 <sup>1</sup> | 1.501**   | 0.666 <sup>1</sup> | 1.339    | 0.683              | 1.34      | 0.684 <sup>1</sup> |
| Moderate Politics   | 1.359*    | 0.413**            | 1.284     | 0.453*             | 1.2      | 0.45*              | 1.2       | 0.447*             |
| Married             |           |                    |           |                    |          |                    |           |                    |
| Married             | 0.935     | 0.419*             | 0.916     | 0.359*             | 0.914    | 0.37*              | 0.914     | 0.367*             |
| Divorced etc.       | 0.766     | 0.495              | 0.743     | 0.444              | 0.733    | 0.426              | 0.733     | 0.422              |
| Region              |           |                    |           |                    |          |                    |           |                    |
| North               | 1.62**    | 1.161              | 1.654**   | 1.226              | 1.559*   | 1.185              | 1.555*    | 1.173              |
| Midwest             | 0.811     | 2.28               | 0.869     | 2.603              | 0.803    | 2.733              | 0.802     | 2.772              |
| South               | 0.553**   | 2.285              | 0.606**   | 2.362              | 0.572**  | 2.388              | 0.574**   | 2.387              |
| Education           |           |                    |           |                    |          |                    |           |                    |
| Less than HS        | 0.775     | 1.34               | 0.741     | 1.377 <sup>1</sup> | 0.838    | 1.483              | 0.839     | 1.491              |
| High School         | 0.776     | 2.203 <sup>1</sup> | 0.734*    | 2.103              | 0.775    | 2.58               | 0.776     | 2.05               |
| Age                 | 0.966**   | 1.019 <sup>1</sup> | 0.967**   | 1.017 <sup>1</sup> | 0.971**  | 1.019 <sup>1</sup> | 0.971**   | 1.02 <sup>1</sup>  |
| Religious Strength  |           |                    |           |                    |          |                    |           |                    |
| Strong              |           |                    | 0.665     | 1.853              | 0.693    | 1.741              | 0.696     | 1.743              |
| Medium              |           |                    | 0.859     | 1.333              | 0.881    | 1.247              | 0.886     | 1.244              |
| Religious Fund      |           |                    |           |                    |          |                    |           |                    |
| Fundamentalist      |           |                    | 0.958     | 1.87               | 1.071    | 1.813              | 1.066     | 1.811              |
| Moderate            |           |                    | 1.259     | 1.841              | 1.238    | 1.69               | 1.235     | 1.661              |
| Liberal             |           |                    | 0.847     | 1.201              | 0.873    | 1.098              | 0.872     | 1.078              |
| Gender Ideology     |           |                    |           |                    | 1.162**  | 1.067 <sup>1</sup> | 1.174**   | 1.093              |
| sex*gender id       |           |                    |           |                    |          |                    | 0.981     | 0.959              |

Note: N= 632 whites and 117 blacks. 2000 and 2002 General Social Survey. All coefficients are non-standardized. \* indicates  $p < .1$  and \*\* indicates  $p < .05$  for a two tailed test. <sup>1</sup> indicates statistically significant slope differences between blacks and whites at the .05 level.