

Why do People Support Civil Unions but Not Same-Sex Marriage?

By Peter K. Brinson, University of Wisconsin-Madison

pbrinson@ssc.wisc.edu

Abstract

While a great deal of research has been conducted concerning public opinion about same-sex marriage, less attention has been given to public opinion about civil unions. A focus on civil unions is necessary, not only because of the practical, political implications of civil unions, but also because the inclusion of this “alternative” in the same-sex marriage debate provides a lens through which the “structural” and “pragmatic” theories of culture can be evaluated. The analysis shows that attitudes and cognitive beliefs about homosexuality and same-sex couples are highly correlated and powerful predictors of attitudes about both same-sex marriage and civil unions. While this is interpreted as strong evidence for a structural theory of culture, a separate analysis of people who simultaneously oppose same-sex marriage but support civil unions suggests that the debate about legal recognition of same-sex relationships is more complex than either theory alone would predict.

Keywords—marriage, civil unions, homosexuality, culture, public opinion

Introduction

As studies of American public opinion about same-sex marriage proliferate, fewer scholarly efforts have applied the same methodological and analytical rigor in assessing the cultural foundations of attitudes towards other social institutions that provide legal recognition to same-sex relationships, such as civil unions and domestic partnerships. This discrepancy is understandable because political discourse about same-sex relationships in the United States has reflected the actions and rhetoric of the two opposing ideological social movements on each side of the issue: the liberal wing of the GLBTQ rights movement that has utilized legal challenges in the judicial arena to challenge the prohibition against same-sex marriage and the conservative religious right that opposes all legal and social efforts to legitimize of homosexuality (Bernstein 2002; Gallagher and Bull 2001; Rimmerman, Wald, and Wilcox 2000; Stein 2001). Both the structure of the two-party political system in the United States and the norms and practices of journalists and mainstream news media organizations appear to reify and privilege this either/or conception of controversial political issues (Evans 2003; Gans 1979; Tuchman 1978).

However, there are important practical and theoretical reasons for scholarly research to move beyond this simple dichotomy between proponents and opponents of same-sex marriage. As a practical matter, the history of *legislative* conflicts (as opposed to judicial conflicts) over same-sex marriage in states in the European Union and the United States has shown that other forms of legal recognition of same-sex relationships, such as civil unions and domestic partnerships, represent a viable compromise position between two polarized ideological extremes (Eskridge and Spedale 2006). Furthermore, existing polls show that there is more support for civil unions and domestic partnerships than for same-sex marriage (Brewer and Wilcox 2005; Pew Research Center for the People and the Press 2003). In short, these observations suggest that

there are consequential differences between these two forms of legal recognition; failure to study attitudes towards civil unions and domestic partnerships would lead scholars to seriously misunderstand and misrepresent the debate about this issue.

Theoretically, scholarly research should address attitudes towards both civil unions and same-sex marriage, not only because the above observations show that there are politically significant differences between the two forms of legal recognition, but also because this issue provides insight into an important theoretical dilemma in cultural sociology. Two influential theories in cultural sociology offer competing explanations for how people develop attitudes towards any given issue. These two theories echo Sartori's (1969) observation that belief systems can be either "ideological" or "pragmatic." The first theory, which I will here call the "structural" theory, emphasizes the internal ideological structure and coherence of belief systems (Alexander and Smith 1993; Geertz 1973; Lakoff 2002; Levi-Strauss 1966; Sewell 1985). In this view, people's understanding of an issue like same-sex marriage is related to the structure of people's larger belief systems, and these structures act as constraints upon how individuals form attitudes and beliefs. This theory would predict that people's attitudes towards same-sex marriage would be based in large part on their attitudes and beliefs about homosexuality: it would be illogical for someone who has negative attitudes towards gays and lesbians to support same-sex marriage. One's prior beliefs therefore constrain individuals' freedom to form attitudes about particular issues.

The second theory, which I will here call the "pragmatic" theory, argues that belief systems are not as coherent and ideological as structural theorists propose. Rather, belief systems are composed of a variety of contradictory ideas and beliefs and that people draw from this collection of beliefs as you would pick a tool out of a tool kit: to solve a particular problem or in

response to a particular situation (Battani, Hall, and Powers 1997; Swidler 1986; Swidler 2001). This theory would explain attitudes about an issue like same-sex marriage as arising from people's social contexts in which they live and act. So rather than attitudes towards same-sex marriage arising from their beliefs about homosexuality or the meaning of marriage, the pragmatic theory might predict that attitudes towards same-sex marriage would be due to differences in people's social environments, such as the number of gay and lesbian couples they know, or differences in situation, such as how one asks for their opinion. Individuals do not hold just a single attitude or opinion, but rather construct an opinion from the ideas that are most immediately salient in their minds when prompted by an interviewer (Zaller 1992).

The existence of civil unions and domestic partnerships as an alternative to same-sex marriage poses a significant challenge to structural theorists. While two ideologically consistent positions exist in this debate—support or opposition to both forms of legal recognition—there is also an apparently ideologically inconsistent position in the debate: opposition to same-sex marriage but support for same-sex civil unions. Initially, it would seem difficult for structural theorists to account for this ideologically inconsistent position. If one has negative views towards homosexuality or is a conservative evangelical or born-again Christian, for example, one would expect that he or she would oppose all forms of legal recognition of same-sex relationships. Without resorting to an explanation that people who hold the ideologically inconsistent position are simply confused, an explanation would have to emerge from the structure of people's attitudes and beliefs. Properly nuanced and specified, opposing same-sex marriage but supporting civil unions may in fact be an ideologically consistent position; but it is not obvious that this would be the case.

A more convincing explanation for why someone would oppose same-sex marriage but favor civil unions might be offered by pragmatic theorists, who begin with the assumption that people hold ideologically contradictory beliefs. From this theoretical point of view, people's attitudes may be weakly held; or they may be concerned about totally rejecting gay and lesbian couples altogether; or they simply might not want to sound like an "intolerant bigot" talking to a pollster on the telephone. It is also possible that people's feelings about same-sex marriage might be emotionally driven rather than logically thought through: they may be "grossed out" by homosexuality or intuitively "know" that marriage is between one man and one woman. For example, someone might oppose same-sex marriage because they are emotionally disturbed by homosexuality and unreflexively or habitually think of marriage as a sacred institution between one man and one woman; but they simultaneously might choose to support civil unions because they happen to know someone personally who is gay or lesbian and in a long-term relationship and feel sympathy towards them.

Despite the contradictory explanations of these two theories, as a number of scholars have pointed out, it would be a mistake to view these two theories as irreconcilable. [SEWELL 1999]. Schudson (1989) argues that the task of cultural sociologists should be to determine the *conditions* under which the structural and the pragmatic theories of culture apply. Schudson argues that the "potency" of cultural objects can be analyzed in order to determine the degree of freedom that individuals have to do what they want with the cultural objects (or conversely, the degree of constraint that the cultural object exercises over the individual's ability to interpret or use the cultural object). Other scholars have begun to analyze differences in the social structures of groups and institutions that are associated with the degree of ideological coherence of beliefs (Martin 2000; Martin 2002). In her study of same-sex marriage, Hull (2006) has shown how the

practices and attitudes of same-sex couples about public commitment ceremonies are constrained by dominant cultural meanings about “marriage;” but at the same time, same-sex couples use such ceremonies to create new cultural meanings of “marriage.”

In this paper, I begin an examination of the how these two theories of culture apply to the same-sex marriage debate by analyzing survey data about same-sex marriage and civil unions. Analysis of survey data, such as the data presented here, that include measures of attitudes and beliefs offers one simple measure of the internal coherence of people’s belief systems. To the extent the people’s beliefs are highly correlated with each other, we would have strong evidence that people’s attitudes towards this issue are constrained by their larger belief systems. Even though analysis of survey data cannot address the pragmatic theory of culture directly, we may see patterns in the data that point towards the non-ideological mechanisms at work in shaping people’s opinions: such as emotions, a pragmatic orientation towards politics, the presence of weakly held or contradictory beliefs, or social contexts that cause people to produce certain opinions when they are asked to do so.

In this paper, first, I test the extent to which attitudes towards same-sex marriage appear to be due to demographic factors, whether or not someone knows a gay and lesbian person, and beliefs and attitudes about homosexuality and same-sex couples. Second, I use the same models to explain attitudes towards same-sex civil unions. Finally, I focus specifically upon people who are opposed to same-sex marriage but in favor of same-sex civil unions in order to examine who holds these apparently contradictory views and why. Taken together, the three analyses will offer evidence about the ideological coherence of people’s policy attitudes and their belief systems.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

In this paper, I address three research questions regarding patterns of support and opposition to same-sex marriage and civil unions.

RQ1: How important are various demographic characteristics, beliefs, and attitudes in predicting support for same-sex marriage?

Previous studies of American public opinion specifically regarding same-sex marriage have emphasized the importance of religion in shaping attitudes and have also noted the existence of significant differences due to political beliefs, gender, age, and education (Brewer and Wilcox 2005; Olson, Cadge, and Harrison 2006). Beyond demographic characteristics, there are a number of attitudes and beliefs about homosexuality that are closely related to attitudes about same-sex marriage. Wilcox and Wolpert (2000) argue that people's attitudes towards homosexuality are strong predictors of attitudes towards all GLBTQ issues, such as gays in the military and gay rights. Thus, predictors of attitudes towards homosexuality are also likely to be predictors of attitudes towards same-sex marriage.

In addition to the demographic and religious influences cited above, there are a number of important cultural values and beliefs that powerfully shape people's attitudes towards homosexuality. These include: beliefs about the nature of homosexuality (Pew Research Center for the People and the Press 2003; Wilcox and Wolpert 2000; Wood and Bartkowski 2004), belief in negative stereotypes about gays (Wood and Bartkowski 2004), measures of homophobia (Wood and Bartkowski 2004), implicit and explicit motivations regarding prejudice (Lemm 2006), belief in traditional moral values (Wilcox and Wolpert 2000), and emotional reactions towards homosexuality (Wilcox and Wolpert 2000). Research has also shown that sustained personal contact with gays and lesbians is associated with positive attitudes towards

homosexuality (Herek and Glunt 1993; Lemm 2006; Pew Research Center for the People and the Press 2003; Schiappa, Gregg, and Hewes 2006).

In this paper, I use weighted least squares (WLS) regression models to measure the influence of a number of demographic characteristics, the amount of personal contact with gays and lesbians, and a number of attitudes and beliefs about homosexuality and same-sex couples on people's attitudes towards same-sex marriage. Because previous research has emphasized the relationship between attitudes about homosexuality and attitudes about other GLBTQ issues, I hypothesize that:

H1a: Positive attitudes and liberal beliefs about homosexuality will be the strongest predictors of attitudes towards same-sex marriage.

It is logical that attitudes and beliefs that predict attitudes towards same-sex marriage are related to various demographic factors as well. I expect that these attitudes and beliefs are best understood as intervening variables between demographic predictors and attitudes towards same-sex marriage. Therefore, I further hypothesize that:

H1b: Measured demographic characteristics of survey respondents will not be significant predictors of attitudes towards same-sex marriage after attitudes and beliefs are added to the model.

To the extent that these hypotheses are confirmed, this would constitute strong evidence that people's belief systems are ideologically coherent about this issue. That is, people's freedom to form a concrete policy opinion about same-sex marriage is constrained by their associated beliefs and attitudes about homosexuality.

After using these models to predict attitudes towards same-sex marriage, I will apply the same models to attitudes about civil unions.

RQ2: How important are various demographic characteristics, beliefs, and attitudes in predicting support for civil unions?

Existing research has shown that religious variables are less important in predicting attitudes towards civil unions and also that there is, in general, less opposition towards civil unions than towards same-sex marriage (Brewer and Wilcox 2005; Olson, Cadge, and Harrison 2006; Pew Research Center for the People and the Press 2003). Attitudes towards civil unions have also been shown to be context-dependent: people are more likely to express support for civil unions *after* they have been asked for their opinion about same-sex marriage (Brewer and Wilcox 2005; Pew Research Center for the People and the Press 2003). Loftus (2001) shows that there is an important difference between Americans' beliefs about the *morality* of homosexuality and Americans' beliefs about whether or not gays and lesbians deserve to have *civil liberties* protected. For all of these reasons, we should expect that attitudes and beliefs about homosexuality will not be as strongly related to people's attitudes about civil unions. Therefore, I hypothesize that:

H2a: The models used to predict attitudes towards same-sex marriage will not perform as well in predicting attitudes towards civil unions.

Because opposition to same-sex marriage is greater than opposition to same-sex civil unions, I further hypothesize that:

H2b: Political ideology will be a stronger predictor of attitudes towards civil unions, and attitudes and beliefs about homosexuality will be weaker predictors of attitudes towards civil unions when compared with the models regarding same-sex marriage.

To the extent that these hypotheses are confirmed, this would be evidence that people's belief systems are not as ideologically coherent as structural theorists would predict. If measured

attitudes and beliefs about homosexuality do not perform as strongly in predicting attitudes towards same-sex civil unions, this would suggest that non-ideological factors would play a large role in shaping people's policy attitudes about this issue.

Finally, I will apply these same models to only a subset of respondents: those who oppose same-sex marriage but support civil unions. In these models, I will be measuring the extent to which various demographic characteristics, levels of contact with gays and lesbians, and attitudes and beliefs about homosexuality and same-sex couples are associated with simultaneously opposing same-sex marriage and supporting civil unions. Doing so will allow me to address the final research question:

RQ3: What kinds of people oppose same-sex marriage but support civil unions, and why?

To my knowledge, no scholarly research has asked this question. However, it seems plausible that people who both oppose same-sex marriage and support civil unions will be politically moderate. I hypothesize that:

H3a: Compared to respondents who hold ideologically consistent beliefs about same-sex marriage and civil unions, people who oppose same-sex marriage but support civil unions will be more likely to hold moderate political beliefs and will be more likely to hold a mixture of liberal and conservative beliefs about homosexuality and same-sex couples.

How someone would justify being simultaneously against same-sex marriage but opposed to civil unions is not readily apparent. It would not appear to stem, for example, from particular attitudes and beliefs about homosexuality, since the only difference between the two questions is in the form of legal recognition of same-sex couples that is in question. Thus, I hypothesize that:

H3b: People who oppose same-sex marriage but support civil unions will offer different reasons for their opposition to same-sex marriage than those who oppose both forms of legal recognition. Specifically, they will be more likely to rely on the culturally traditional definition of marriage as between one man and one woman as the justification for their attitudes.

To the extent that these hypotheses are confirmed, this will provide some evidence in favor of the pragmatic theory of culture. Not only would people's belief systems appear to be contradictory in that they hold a variety of liberal and conservative beliefs and attitudes, but people's explanations for their positions would be based on their "gut feeling" about what marriage "is," rather than a principled, logically coherent reason.

Data and Methods

To test these hypotheses, I conducted a secondary analysis of data collected by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. Telephone interviews were conducted with a national sample of 1,515 adults on October 15-19, 2003. The results of the survey were weighted in order to reflect known population parameters, so the total (N) presented in some of these analyses are larger than the actual number of individuals interviewed. The survey questions focused primarily on current events, religiosity, and homosexuality. Because the survey included a wide variety of items intended to measure various attitudes and beliefs about homosexuality and the issue of same-sex marriage, the data collected from this survey provides a significant degree of insight into public opinion about the political controversy surrounding same-sex marriage and civil unions. This dataset enables the researcher to examine the relationship

between demographic characteristics, cultural attitudes and beliefs, and concrete policy positions in a way that sheds light on the two theories of culture described above.

The two main dependent variables in this analysis are support for same-sex marriage and support for civil unions. Respondents were first asked, “Do you strongly favor, favor, oppose, or strongly oppose allowing gays and lesbians to marry legally,” and the next question asked, “Do you strongly favor, favor, oppose, or strongly oppose allowing gay and lesbian couples to enter into legal agreements with each other that would give them many of the same rights as married couples?” The four answer choices were assigned values 1 (strongly oppose) through 4 (strongly favor). The order of the questions was reversed on one version of the survey. Because question order was found to affect people’s stated positions towards civil unions, this analysis uses only data collected from “Form 1,” in which the question about same-sex marriage was asked first.

The first two research questions were addressed by estimating a series of five weighted least squares (WLS) regression equations for each of the dependent variables. The first model included only demographic characteristics of the respondents. Demographic variables include: sex, age, education, race (a dummy variable coded as white or not white), marital status (a dummy variable indicating whether or not the respondent is currently married), parental status (a dummy variable indicating whether or not the respondent is currently a parent or guardian of a child under age 18), income, political ideology, size of the city or town in which they live, and religiosity (measured in two ways: frequency of church attendance and whether or not the respondent identifies as a born-again or evangelical Christian). The second model added a measure of personal contact with gays and lesbians in the respondent’s daily lives: a dummy variable indicating whether or not “you have a friend, colleague, or family member who is gay.”

The third, fourth, and fifth models added a variety of measures of attitudes and beliefs to the regression equations. The third model added three measures of cognitive beliefs about the nature of homosexuality. Respondents were first asked, “In your opinion, when a person is homosexual is it something that people are born with, or is it something that develops because of the way people are brought up, or is it just the way that some people prefer to live?” I coded responses as a dummy variable, indicating whether or not the respondent believes homosexuality is something people are born with. Secondly, respondents were asked, “Do you think a gay or lesbian person’s sexual orientation can be changed or cannot be changed?” Thirdly, respondents were asked, “Do you think it is a sin, or not, to engage in homosexual behavior?”

The fourth model added two measures of attitudes and beliefs about same-sex couples. Respondents were asked to “completely agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or completely disagree” with the following statements (read in random order): “Gay and lesbian couples can be as good parents as heterosexual couples,” and “Allowing gay and lesbian couples to legally marry would undermine the traditional American family.” The responses were coded from 1 (completely disagree) to 4 (completely agree).

The fifth model added three measures of attitudes towards gay and lesbian individuals. The first measure is an index of two questions, whether the respondent has a “very favorable, mostly favorable, mostly unfavorable, or very unfavorable” opinion of gay men and lesbian women. While there were differences between opinions of gay men and opinions of lesbian women, the two items were highly correlated ($r = .88$). Whether the item about gay men or lesbian women was asked first was alternated; responses were coded from 1 (very unfavorable) to 4 (very favorable). The second measure is in response to the question, “Do you think more acceptance of gays and lesbians would be a good thing or a bad thing for the country—or that it

would not make much difference either way?” Responses were coded from 1 (bad for country) to 3 (good for country). Lastly, respondents were asked whether “it doesn’t bother you to be around homosexuals” or “it makes you uncomfortable to be around homosexuals.” Responses were coded as a dummy variable indicating whether or not the respondent is uncomfortable around homosexuals.

To test the third research question, as the dependent variable, I created a dummy variable representing those respondents who oppose same-sex marriage and are in favor of civil unions. I used the same five models above in binary logistic regression in order to estimate what demographic variables, attitudes, and beliefs make it more likely for someone to hold this combination of policy attitudes. Separately, I also analyzed responses to an open-ended question that was asked only to people who said they either oppose or strongly oppose same-sex marriage: “What would you say is the MAIN reason you object to allowing gays and lesbians to marry?” By comparing the responses of people who said they also oppose civil unions with the responses of people who said that they favor civil unions, I can analyze whether or not people have different reasons for holding this “ideologically inconsistent” set of attitudes.

Results

The results of the analysis predicting support for same-sex marriage are presented in Table 1. Model 1, which includes only demographic characteristics of respondents, shows that women, young people, unmarried people, liberals, and people who are less religious are more likely to support same-sex marriage. The addition (Model 2) of a measure of whether or not the individual knows someone who is gay or lesbian does not change the model.

Table 1: Support for Same-Sex Marriage

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
Male	-.211***	-.208***	-.127***	-.108***	-.077**
Age	-.153***	-.152***	-.135***	-.093**	-.042
Education	.056	.052	-.027	-.063*	-.091***
White	.063	.066	.057	.046	.025
Married	-.147***	-.148***	-.186***	-.106***	-.085**
Parent	-.063	-.062	-.030	-.008	.014
Income	.034	.035	.041	.043	.032
Political Liberalism	.129***	.130***	-.001	-.032	-.027
City Size	.079*	.078*	.047	.033	.024
Church Attendance	-.191***	-.189***	-.095**	-.062	-.052
Born-again or Evangelical	-.254***	-.251***	-.051	-.007	.028
Gay Friend Colleague Family		.021	-.051	-.075**	-.111***
Born Gay			.196***	.110***	.079*
Can't be changed			.034	-.015	-.016
Homosexuality a Sin			-.454***	-.361***	-.272
Good Parents				.343***	.204***
Undermine Traditional Family				-.167***	-.119***
Opinion of Gays and Lesbians					.243***
Acceptance of Gays Good for Country					.133***
Uncomfortable					.159***
Constant	2.631***	2.591***	3.339***	2.958***	2.097***
df	11/596	12/596	15/596	17/596	20/596
Adjusted R-squared	.273	.272	.473	.591	.643

Regression coefficients are standardized.

* p<=.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001

In Model 3, the addition of cognitive beliefs about homosexuality significantly mediates the influence of demographic predictors; this model shows that the largest predictors of support for same-sex marriage are disagreement that homosexuality is a sin and the belief that homosexuality is something you are born with. In Model 4, the addition of cognitive beliefs about same-sex couples further improves the predictive power and reduces the influence of demographic predictors. People who believe that same-sex couples can be just as good parents as

heterosexual couples and who disagree that same-sex marriage will undermine the traditional family are more likely to support same-sex marriage. In Model 5, the addition of feelings about gays and lesbians continues to improve the predictive power and reduces the influence of demographic predictors.

Overall, liberal beliefs and attitudes about homosexuality are indeed the strongest predictors of support for same-sex marriage, thus confirming Hypothesis 1a. On the other hand, Hypothesis 1b only receives partial support. Some demographic measures do retain statistical significance after attitudes and beliefs are added to the model; however, many of the signs are in the opposite directions from what is expected. After attitudes and beliefs are added, the effects of a number of demographic variables (education, political liberalism, being a born-again or evangelical Christian, and knowing someone who is gay) reverse direction. This is due to the high correlations among all of the attitudes and beliefs and many of the demographic predictors in the models. In fact, a factor analysis (not shown) of all attitudes and beliefs in Models 3-5 suggested a one-factor solution, which indicates that all of the cognitive beliefs and attitudes share a common, underlying belief.

This pattern of results provides strong evidence in favor of the structural theory of culture. Policy attitudes towards same-sex marriage appear to be strongly related to a number of highly correlated cognitive beliefs and attitudes about homosexuality. In addition, the models appear to leave relatively little room for factors related to one's social context to directly influence attitudes towards same-sex marriage.

How do the above results compare with attitudes towards civil unions? Table 2 shows both a striking similarity to the models used to measure attitudes towards same-sex marriage and thus represents strong evidence against Hypotheses 2a and 2b. In fact, all five models perform

better in predicting support for civil unions than they did in predicting support for same-sex marriage! Unlike the models predicting support for same-sex marriage, these models provide no unexpected changes in the direction of effects as cognitive beliefs and attitudes are added to the model (the effect of being a born-again or evangelical Christian changes, but it fails to reach statistical significance when the sign changes). All coefficients are in the expected direction for all models.

Table 2: Support for Civil Unions

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
Male	-.197***	-.180***	-.107***	-.099***	-.070**
Age	-.197***	-.189***	-.192***	-.149***	-.086***
Education	.170***	.151***	.070*	.063*	.032
White	.100**	.114***	.106***	.080**	.043
Married	-.086*	-.096**	-.125***	-.051	-.041
Parent	-.074	-.068	-.055	-.061*	-.042
Income	.022	.034	.041	.059*	.046
Political Liberalism	.119***	.126***	.017	.000	.001
City Size	.126***	.120***	.106***	.096***	.078***
Church Attendance	-.248***	-.232***	-.161***	-.121***	-.093***
Born-again or Evangelical	-.213***	-.195***	-.022	.017	.044
Gay Friend Colleague Family		.140***	.077*	.048	.005
Born Gay			.211***	.087**	.048
Can't be changed			.063	.029	.026
Homosexuality a Sin			-.326***	-.227***	-.135***
Good Parents				.395***	.241***
Undermine Traditional Family				-.124***	-.051
Opinion of Gays and Lesbians					.237***
Acceptance of Gays Good for Country					.192***
Uncomfortable					-.080**
Constant	2.533***	2.252***	2.838***	2.131***	1.097***
df	11/611	12/611	15/611	17/611	20/611
Adjusted R-squared	.321	.338	.475	.609	.678

Regression coefficients are standardized.

* p<=.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001

The reason that the models predicting attitudes towards civil unions perform so much better than the models predicting attitudes towards same-sex marriage is not immediately clear. It may be due to differences in overall level of support in the dependent variable, or it may be due to some unmeasured difference in the factors that predict support for the dependent variables. Whatever the case may be, the models predicting support for civil unions also provide strong evidence in favor of the structural theory of culture: cognitive beliefs and attitudes about homosexuality appear to be ideologically related to people’s concrete policy attitudes towards civil unions as well as towards same-sex marriage.

Finally, I examined the reasons why some people simultaneously oppose same-sex marriage and support civil unions. As Table 3 demonstrates, a non-trivial portion of all respondents either favor or strongly favor civil unions while opposing or strongly opposing same-sex marriage. Of the overall sample, 13.4% of respondents hold this apparently ideologically inconsistent position (approximately 1/5 of all people who express some level of opposition to same-sex marriage). This is a large enough group of people that it is implausible that these respondents are simply confused; there must be some reason that they hold these views.

Table 3: Support for Same-Sex Marriage and Civil Unions

		Support for Civil Unions				Total
		Strongly Oppose	Oppose	Favor	Strongly Favor	
Support for Same-Sex Marriage	Strongly Oppose	72.6% (305)	17.9% (75)	8.6% (36)	1.0% (4)	100.0% (420)
	Oppose	12.7% (40)	52.2% (165)	32.0% (101)	3.2% (10)	100.0% (316)
	Favor	0.0% (0)	1.5% (4)	79.9% (215)	18.6% (50)	100.0% (269)
	Strongly Favor	0.0% (0)	2.4% (3)	8.1% (10)	89.4% (110)	100.0% (123)
Total		30.6% (345)	21.9% (247)	32.1% (362)	15.4% (174)	100.0% (1128)

Table 4 presents the reasons that respondents gave for why they oppose same-sex marriage. Overall, the main reasons that people oppose same-sex marriage appear to be religious: almost 50% said that same-sex marriage is morally wrong, a sin, or against their religious beliefs. A comparison of the reasons given by people who support civil unions with the reasons given by people who oppose both marriage and civil unions, however, shows important differences among these groups of people. It is much more common for people who favor civil unions to rely on the heterosexual or procreative definition of marriage as their reason for opposing same-sex marriage, compared with people who also oppose civil unions. Similarly, people who support civil unions are less likely to say that same-sex marriage is morally wrong, compared with those who oppose civil unions.

Table 4: Reasons People Oppose Gay Marriage, by Level of Support for Civil Unions

		Support for Civil Unions				Total
		Strongly Oppose	Oppose	Favor	Strongly Favor	
Why Oppose Gay Marriage	Definition of marriage is only for a man and a woman	17.1%	14.2%	24.8%	42.9%	18.0% (129)
	Purpose of marriage is to have children	2.4%	6.0%	6.2%	21.4%	4.6% (33)
	Not natural / Not normal	9.7%	7.7%	8.5%	.0%	8.7% (62)
	Morally wrong / A sin / The Bible says	38.5%	26.2%	18.6%	7.1%	30.3% (217)
	Against my religious beliefs	15.0%	19.7%	20.9%	14.3%	17.6% (126)
	They don't have stable, long-term relationships	.0%	.9%	3.1%	.0%	0.8% (6)
	Opens the door to other immoral behavior	.9%	3.9%	3.1%	.0%	2.2% (16)
	It's just wrong / I just don't agree with it	11.5%	13.7%	8.5%	.0%	11.5% (82)
	Other	2.6%	4.3%	3.9%	7.1%	3.5% (25)
	Economic/legal problems	.0%	.0%	.8%	.0%	0.1% (1)
	Bad for children	2.1%	3.4%	1.6%	7.1%	2.5% (18)
	Undermines traditional family	.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	0.1% (1)
	Total	100.0% (340)	100.0% (233)	100.0% (129)	100.0% (14)	100.0% (716)

What demographic factors, attitudes, and beliefs are correlated with holding this combination of policy attitudes? Table 5 shows the results of binary logistic regressions using the five models above to predict likelihood of simultaneously opposing same-sex marriage but supporting civil unions. The table shows that the most important predictors of holding this combination of attitudes stems from a mix of liberal and conservative beliefs about homosexuality. On one hand, this group of people believes that legalizing same-sex marriage would undermine the “traditional American family;” on the other hand, this group of people believes that more acceptance of gays and lesbians would be good for the country and that gay and lesbian couples can be as good parents as heterosexual couples. In addition, this group of people are likely to know a friend, colleague, or family member who is gay and to live in a metropolitan area. These results provide evidence in favor of Hypotheses 3a and 3b.

Discussion

This analysis of attitudes towards same-sex marriage and civil unions has shown strong evidence in favor of a structural theory of culture. While this type of analysis of this type of data is not a useful test of the pragmatic theory of culture, it can at least provide a simple measure of the coherence of particular attitudes and beliefs. Specifically, this analysis showed that individuals’ specific policy attitudes towards same-sex marriage are strongly related to their cognitive beliefs and attitudes about homosexuality and same-sex couples, and the influence of demographic variables once these beliefs and attitudes are taken into account is minimal. This suggests that people’s attitudes and beliefs act, to a greater or lesser degree, as ideological constraints on their formation of other attitudes. Surprisingly, these findings were confirmed even more strongly when analyzing attitudes about same-sex civil unions. While I expected the

models to perform more poorly when predicting attitudes towards civil unions, they actually performed better than towards same-sex marriage, the dependent variable for which they were intended. Indeed, the overwhelming majority of respondents held ideologically consistent attitudes towards both forms of legal recognition of same-sex relationships.

Table 5: Opposition to Same-Sex Marriage but Support for Civil Unions

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
Male	-.368	-.260	-.277	-.087	.062
Age	-.017	-.016	-.017	-.022*	-.015
Education	-.024	-.059	-.038	.150	.101
White	.640	.741*	.704	.238	.145
Married	-.074	-.111	-.077	-.272	-.309
Parent	.253	.281	.227	-.041	-.218
Income	-.009	-.008	-.008	-.006	-.007
Political Liberalism	-.006	.009	.060	.503**	.339
City Size	.332**	.316*	.330**	.417**	.302*
Church Attendance	-.267**	-.249*	-.259*	-.196	-.155
Born-again or Evangelical	.174	.280	.226	.122	.358
Gay Friend Colleague Family		.728*	.832*	1.015**	.952**
Born Gay			-.271	-.107	-.107
Can't be changed			.365	.647	.748*
Homosexuality a Sin			.426	.372	.468
Good Parents				.505***	.319*
Undermine Traditional Family				1.229***	1.351***
Opinion of Gays and Lesbians					-.025
Acceptance of Gays Good for Country					.908***
Uncomfortable					-.890
Constant	-1.535	-2.157*	-2.753**	-9.928***	-10.83***
Chi-square	30.107**	35.746***	39.110***	98.752***	116.306***
Nagelkerke R-square	.091	.108	.117	.282	.327

Regression coefficients are unstandardized.

* p<=.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001

Altogether, these results might be interpreted to show that the debates about same-sex marriage are occurring between two polarized camps of people, each with coherent, incompatible belief systems. On one hand, people who oppose same-sex marriage believe that homosexuality, and any legal and social legitimation of homosexuality, is wrong; on the other hand, people who support same-sex marriage believe that there is nothing wrong with homosexuality and that equal access to legal and social recognition of same-sex relationships would be a good thing for the country. These findings appear to bolster an outlook on American politics that explains a number of current political controversies as the result of a conflict between two incompatible and irreconcilable worldviews. Most commonly known as the “culture wars” thesis, this view has received some empirical support (particularly around issues of gender, sexuality, and abortion), and a number of causal mechanisms have been identified that would cause a polarization in attitudes towards certain political issues (Davis and Robinson 1996; DiMaggio, Evans, and Bryson 1996; Evans 2003; Hunter 1991). The culture wars thesis is particularly plausible when backed by a structural view of culture.

Nevertheless, the empirical evidence in favor of this culture wars thesis is highly qualified. These same studies find that Americans’ political attitudes are *not* becoming more polarized over time for *most* issues. Indeed, the patterns of political discourse encouraged by the two-party political system and the news media, which I discussed at the beginning of the paper, are probably leading observers to believe that political disagreements are more ideologically irreconcilable than they are in reality. As Evans (1996) convincingly argues, because individuals have a large variety of status group memberships of any number of combinations, it is unlikely that any individual will always find themselves on the same “side” of every issue as someone

else. Thus, people's cognitive beliefs and attitudes may not be as systematically and ideologically coherent as they might seem.

The analysis of the group of people who simultaneously oppose same-sex marriage and support civil unions supports this contrary point of view. This sizeable minority of respondents holds a combination of liberal and conservative attitudes and beliefs about homosexuality and same-sex couples. Their opposition to same-sex marriage seems to be based more on a traditional heterosexual definition of marriage and less on religious or moral opposition to homosexuality, *per se*. Indeed, this analysis shows that the belief that legalizing same-sex marriage would undermine the "traditional American family" does not prevent someone from also simultaneously believing that legal recognition of same-sex relationships would be good for the country.

Thus, both the structural theory and the tool-kit theory of culture receive some support in this analysis. But because of the limited insight into each theory of culture that can be gained from public opinion analysis, this analysis leaves much to be desired. Future research should go beyond the analysis of public opinion data in order to provide a more definitive and convincing analysis of how these two theories of culture can help explain policy attitudes. In particular, a study of the *processes* by which people form policy attitudes in their everyday lives is required. People's attitudes and beliefs, after all, are not property of isolated individual brains but are constructed in particular social contexts. Only an analysis of this process of attitude formation can capture the extent to which structural and pragmatic theories of culture each contribute to a scholarly account of how policy attitudes are formed. A methodology that is sensitive to both the ideological and non-ideological mechanisms of opinion formation is required in order to evaluate how variations in cultural objects, social structures, and group contexts affect opinion formation.

References

- Alexander, Jeffrey C. and Philip Smith. 1993. "The Discourse of American Civil Society: A New Proposal for Cultural Studies." *Theory and Society* 22:151-207.
- Battani, Marshall, David R. Hall, and Rosemary Powers. 1997. "Cultures' Structures: Making Meaning in the Public Sphere." *Theory and Society* 26:781-812.
- Bernstein, Mary. 2002. "Identities and Politics: Toward a Historical Understanding of the Lesbian and Gay Movement." *Social Science History* 26:531-581.
- Brewer, Paul R. and Clyde Wilcox. 2005. "The Polls--Trends: Same Sex Marriage and Civil Unions." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 69:599-616.
- Davis, Nancy J. and Robert V. Robinson. 1996. "Are the Rumors of War Exaggerated? Religious Orthodoxy and Moral Progressivism in America." *American Journal of Sociology* 102:756-787.
- DiMaggio, Paul, John Evans, and Bethany Bryson. 1996. "Have American's Social Attitudes Become More Polarized?" *American Journal of Sociology* 102:690-755.
- Eskridge, Jr., William N. and Darren R. Spedale. 2006. *Gay Marriage: For Better or for Worse?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, John H. 1996. "'Culture Wars' or Status Group Ideology as the Basis of US Moral Politics." *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 16:15-34.
- . 2003. "Have Americans' Attitudes Become More Polarized? An Update." *Social Science Quarterly* 84:71-90.
- Gallagher, John and Chris Bull. 2001. *Perfect Enemies: The Battle Between the Religious Right and the Gay Movement*. Lanham, MD: Madison Books.
- Gans, Herbert J. 1979. *Deciding What's News: A Study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek, and Time*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures; Selected Essays*. New York,: Basic Books.
- Herek, Gregory M. and Eric K. Glunt. 1993. "Interpersonal Contact and Heterosexuals' Attitudes Toward Gay Men: Results From a National Survey." *Journal of Sex Research* 30:239-244.
- Hull, Kathleen E. 2006. *Same-Sex Marriage: The Cultural Politics of Love and Law*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunter, James Davison. 1991. *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lakoff, George. 2002. *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lemm, Kristi M. 2006. "Positive Associations Among Interpersonal Contact, Motivation, and Implicit and Explicit Attitudes Toward Gay Men." *Journal of Homosexuality* 51:79-99.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude. 1966. *The Savage Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Loftus, Jeni. 2001. "America's Liberalization in Attitudes Toward Homosexuality, 1973-1998." *American Sociological Review* 66:762-782.
- Martin, John Levi. 2000. "The Relation of Aggregate Statistics on Beliefs to Culture and Cognition." *Poetics* 28:5-20.
- . 2002. "Power, Authority, and the Constraint of Belief Systems." *American Journal of Sociology* 107:861-904.

- Olson, Laura R., Wendy Cadge, and James T. Harrison. 2006. "Religion and Public Opinion about Same-Sex Marriage." *Social Science Quarterly* 87:340-360.
- Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. 2003. "Republicans Unified, Democrats Split on Gay Marriage; Religious Beliefs Underpin Opposition to Homosexuality." Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, Washington, D.C.
- Rimmerman, Craig A., Kenneth D. Wald, and Clyde Wilcox. 2000. *The Politics of Gay Rights*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sartori, Giovanni. 1969. "Politics, Ideology, and Belief Systems." *American Political Science Review* 63:398-411.
- Schiappa, Edward, Peter B. Gregg, and Dean E. Hewes. 2006. "Can One TV Show Make a Difference? *Will & Grace* and the Parasocial Contact Hypothesis." *Journal of Homosexuality* 51:15-37.
- Schudson, Michael. 1989. "How Culture Works: Perspectives from Media Studies on the Efficacy of Symbols." *Theory and Society* 18:153-180.
- Sewell, William H. Jr. 1985. "Ideologies and Social Revolutions: Reflections on the French Case." *Journal of Modern History* 57:56-85.
- Stein, Arlene. 2001. *The Stranger Next Door: The Story of a Small Community's Battle Over Sex, Faith, and Civil Rights*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Swidler, Ann. 1986. "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies." *American Sociological Review* 51:273-286.
- . 2001. *Talk of Love: How Culture Matters*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tuchman, Gaye. 1978. *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality*. New York: Free Press.
- Wilcox, Clyde and Robin Wolpert. 2000. "Gay Rights in the Public Sphere: Public Opinion on Gay and Lesbian Equality." Pp. 409-432 in *The Politics of Gay Rights*, edited by C. A. Rimmerman, K. D. Wald, and C. Wilcox. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wood, Peter B. and John P. Bartkowski. 2004. "Attribution Style and Public Policy Attitudes Toward Gay Rights." *Social Science Quarterly* 85:58-74.
- Zaller, John R. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.