Individualism and Attitudes toward Homosexual, Premarital, Adolescent, and Extramarital Sexual Behaviors

Heidi F. Browne

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Sociology

Carol A. Bailey, Chair
James E. Hawdon
Anthony Kwame Harrison
Edward H. Sewell Jr.

May 1, 2009
Blacksburg, VA

Keywords: Individualism, Attitudes, Perceived Deviance, Sexual Behaviors

Copyright 2009, Heidi F. Browne

Individualism and Attitudes toward Homosexual, Premarital, Adolescent, and Extramarital Sexual Behaviors

Heidi F. Browne

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between individualism and attitudes toward four types of sexual behavior, specifically adolescent sex, premarital sex, extramarital sex, and homosexual sexual behavior. A secondary purpose was to add to the conceptual and methodological discussions of individualism.

In the United States these behaviors are becoming more common and attitudes generally more accepting. What remains unclear and under theorized is why? I address this question from the frame of the intersection of sexuality studies with the study of deviance as these behaviors have been considered to fit normative, absolutists, statistical and/or reactive definitions of deviance. This research was informed by Hawdon's recent general model of deviant behavior. In brief, one of Hawdon's contributions to the study of deviance is his addition of the cultural value of individualism as an explanatory variable related to cross-cultural rates of drug use.

The primary research question that guided this research was: Is individualism related to attitudes toward adolescent sex, premarital sex, extramarital sex, and homosexual sexual behavior? Utilizing data from the General Social Survey, this question was examined using a variety of conceptualizations of individualism to test the relationship between individualism and attitudes toward the various sexual behaviors for five time periods--1998, 2000, 2002, 2004, and 2006. Three major hypotheses were posed regarding the relationship between individualism and attitudes toward perceived sexual deviance. The analysis did not support the hypotheses. Reasons for this lack of support for the theoretical perspective were discussed.

Table of Contents

Abstract……..…….i

Chapter One...…….……1

Statement of the Problem……1

Chapter Two…….5

Theory and Review of Literature…….5

Adolescent Behavior……5

Premarital Sex……..7

Extramarital Sex……...8

Homosexual Sex……11

Modernization and Rationalization……16

Individualism…….19

Hypotheses…….27

Chapter Three…….28

Methods……..28

Data……28

Dependent Variables……..28

Independent Variables……...29

Control Variables……...31

Analytic Strategy……...32

Chapter Four……..34

Results……34

Sample Population…….34

Recoding Tolerance Variables……...35

Bivariate Correlations……36

Logistic Regressions for 1998……...37

Tolerance for Homosexual Sex……..37

Tolerance for Premarital Sex…….39

Tolerance for Adolescent Sex……41

Tolerance for Extramarital Sex……..42

Logistic Regressions for 2000……...43

Tolerance for Homosexual Sex……..44

Tolerance for Premarital Sex…….45

Tolerance for Adolescent Sex……47

Tolerance for Extramarital Sex……..48

Logistic Regressions for 2002……...50

Tolerance for Homosexual Sex……..50

Tolerance for Premarital Sex…….52

Tolerance for Adolescent Sex……53

Tolerance for Extramarital Sex……..55

Logistic Regressions for 2004……...56

Tolerance for Homosexual Sex……..56

Tolerance for Premarital Sex…….58

Tolerance for Adolescent Sex……59

Tolerance for Extramarital Sex……..61

Logistic Regressions for 2006……...62

Tolerance for Homosexual Sex……..63

Tolerance for Premarital Sex…….64

Tolerance for Adolescent Sex……66

Tolerance for Extramarital Sex……..67

Summary of Results……...68

Chapter Five……...71

Discussion……..71

Qualitative Assessment……..71

Thinking Individualism……..72

Responsibility for Helping the Sick and the Poor……..73

Frequent Church Attendance…….74

Methodological Limitations……...75

Individualism ……77

Sexual Behavior…….78

References Cited……80

Appendix A…….....89

Appendix B…….....132

List of Tables

Table 1: Models and Variables……..……...33

Table 2: Homosexual Behaviors on Individualism Variables 1998……..……...38

Table 3: Premarital Behaviors on Individualism Variables 1998……..……...40

Table 4: Adolescent Behaviors on Individualism Variables 1998…….……...42

Table 5: Extramarital Behaviors on Individualism Variables 1998……...……...43

Table 6: Homosexual Behaviors on Individualism Variables 2000……..……...45

Table 7: Premarital Behaviors on Individualism Variables 2000……..……...46

Table 8: Adolescent Behaviors on Individualism Variables 2000.....……...47

Table 9: Extramarital Behaviors on Individualism Variables 2000……...……...49

Table 10: Homosexual Behaviors on Individualism Variables 2002……...51

Table 11: Premarital Behaviors on Individualism Variables 2002……...53

Table 12: Adolescent Behaviors on Individualism Variables 2002…...……...54

Table 13: Extramarital Behaviors on Individualism Variables 2002…….……...55

Table 14: Homosexual Behaviors on Individualism Variables 2004...……...57

Table 15: Premarital Behaviors on Individualism Variables 2004…...……...59

Table 16: Adolescent Behaviors on Individualism Variables 2004……...……...60

Table 17: Extramarital Behaviors on Individualism Variables 2004….……...62

Table 18: Homosexual Behaviors on Individualism Variables 2006……...64

Table 19: Premarital Behaviors on Individualism Variables 2006……..65

Table 20: Adolescent Behaviors on Individualism Variables 2006……...……...66

Table 21: Extramarital Behaviors on Individualism Variables 2006…….……...68

Table 22: Odds of Tolerance 1998-2000……..…….69

Table 23: Odds of Tolerance 2002-2004……...70

Table 24: Odds of Tolerance 2006……..……..….70

Chapter One

Statement of the Problem

The primary purpose of this research is to examine the relationship between individualism and attitudes toward four types of sexual behavior, specifically adolescent sex, premarital sex, extramarital sex, and homosexual sexual behavior. A secondary purpose is to add to the conceptual and methodological discussions of individualism.

The prevalence of adolescent sex, premarital sex, extramarital sex, and homosexual sexual behavior are becoming more common, except for adolescent sexual behavior, which has declined in the last decades. Still, the incidence of adolescent sexual behavior is considerable with approximately 47% of 9th through 12th graders admitting to having had sexual intercourse (Kaiser Family Foundation 2005). Estimates of premarital sexual behavior are high, ranging between 95% and 99% of American adults having had sex prior to marriage. Women are just as likely to engage in premarital sexual activity as men (Finer 2007). Incidences of extramarital sexual behavior of American adults are reported as high as 34% for men and 19% for women (Allen and Baucom 2004:467).

Estimating the rates of homosexual behavior is more problematic than for the other sexual behaviors. Holding an exclusive sexual identity of homosexual (gay, lesbian, bisexual) is quite different from homosexual or bisexual sexual behavior; sexual behavior does not imply that individuals have to hold a corresponding sexual identity. Thus, research that asks about homosexual identity may underestimate same-sex sexual behavior. A recent study that asked about same-sex behavior found that 6.5% of males, ages 25-44 have had oral or anal sex with another man, while 11% of women, aged 25-44 have reported engaging in sexual behavior with another woman (Mosher, Chandra, and Jones 2005).

Attitudes toward adolescent sex are primarily negative. Thornton and Young-DeMarco (2001) found that attitudes toward acceptance of non-marital sexual behavior have liberalized, but that this liberalizing effect is only toward adults---attitudes toward sex among teenagers is overwhelmingly negative. They do note that unmarried childbearing has lost some of its stigma along with the liberalizing of attitudes toward unmarried sex, but that unmarried teen childbearing is still very negatively viewed (Thornton and Young-DeMarco 2001). When looking at premarital sex more generally, Treas (2002) found that attitudes toward premarital sex have declined in disapproval in the years between 1972 and 1998. Marriage is the approved venue for sexual expression in the dominant culture of the United States (Christopher and Sprecher 2000). Therefore, all other forms of sexual expression are implicitly compared to normative marital sexual expression. Extramarital sex, or extradyadic involvement, is antithetical to marriage and disapproval is nearly universal (Christopher and Sprecher 2000; Thornton and Young-DeMarco 2001). Generally, there is agreement that attitudes toward homosexuality have liberalized since the GSS started to report attitudinal tolerance toward this sexual behavior.

In the United States these behaviors are becoming more common and attitudes generally more accepting. What remains unclear and under theorized is why? Although there is a significant body of research on attitudes toward a variety of forms of behavior that are perceived as deviant, many questions remain unanswered about factors that are related to approval and disapproval of these forms of sexual behaviors. Thus I ask might there be other factors related to tolerance of adolescent sex, premarital sex, extramarital sex, and homosexual behavior that have yet to be adequately explored?

I address this question from the frame of the intersection of sexuality studies with the

study of deviance as these behaviors have been considered to fit normative, absolutists, statistical and/or reactive definitions of deviance (Clinard and Meier 2004). The sexual behaviors examined in this research are in opposition to the invisible and *de facto* normative category of heterosexual and married monogamy. Thus, I draw upon theories of deviance to examine factors that might affect attitudes toward different forms of sexual behavior. In particular, my research is informed by Hawdon's (2005) recent model of deviant behavior. In brief, one of Hawdon's contributions to the study of deviance is his addition of the cultural value of individualism as an explanatory variable related to cross-cultural rates of drug use, which can be applied to deviant behavior in general.

Individualism has long been of interest to sociologists, as early as the interest by Comte and Durkheim's articulation of moral individualism. Individualism remains important to sociologist as witnessed by recent interest in individualism examined in the context of romantic relationships (Santore 2008), homicide rates (Messner 1982), direct and indirect aggression (Forbes, Zhang, Doroszewicz, and Haas 2009), New Age religious groups (Farias and Lalljee 2008), and so on. Recently, Rothwell (in progress) extended Hawdon's theoretical model by examining individualism, secularism, and belief in science and their relationship to adolescents' involvement in and attitudes toward minor forms of delinquent behavior. I build upon the research by Rothwell and Hawdon (2008), Hawdon (2005), and others by specifically focusing on individualism as a possible predictor of attitudes toward the four forms of sexual behavior.

The primary research question that guides this research is: Is individualism related to attitudes toward adolescent sex, premarital sex, extramarital sex, and homosexual behavior? Given there is considerable conceptual confusion surrounding individualism and no agreed upon definition, I examine this research question using a variety of conceptions of individualism. I

utilize data from the General Social Survey (GSS) to test the relationship between individualism and attitudes toward various sexual behaviors for five time periods--1998, 2000, 2002, 2004, and 2006.

In the following chapter, I review the literature on the four forms of sexual behavior. Then, I set the context for the development of individualism as an important value in modern societies, and summarize different conceptions of individualism. I present research that has used individualism in an explanatory context. Finally I end the chapter with the hypothesis to be tested.

Chapter Two

Theory and Review of the Literature

In this chapter, I review the prevalence of four forms of sexual behaviors-- adolescent sex, premarital sex, extramarital sex, and homosexual sex and related attitudes toward these behaviors. Next I present a detailed discussion of the extant literature on individualism and research that has used this concept. I end with the hypotheses to be tested.

Adolescent Behavior

Although adolescent sexual behavior has declined in the last decades, the incidence of adolescent sexual behavior is considerable with approximately 47% of 9th through 12th graders admitting to having had sexual intercourse (Kaiser Family Foundation 2005). Attitudes toward teen sexual behavior are generally negative. The behavior is considered a social problem, in part, because of the social costs engendered by teen pregnancy and rates of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) and abortion among adolescents (Klein and Adelman 2008; Risman and Schwartz 2007; Teitler 2002). For example, in 2000 there were an estimated 9 million cases of STDs among adolescents in the US, costing US taxpayers between 9-15.5 billion dollars (Klein and Adelman 2008:658).

Though teen pregnancy is down from highs in the 1990s, between 750,000 and 900,000 15-19 year olds experience pregnancies every year in the United States, and nearly 90% of these pregnancies are unplanned (Klein and Adelman 2008; Alan Guttmacher Institute (AGI) 2006). Costs associated with adolescent pregnancy cost taxpayers billions per year (Klein and Adelman 2008; Klein 2005; AGI 2006). Adolescent mothers have lower rates of educational achievement compared to other female adolescents that do not have children. Also, adolescent mothers have

higher rates of health complications due to pregnancy, higher rates of STDs, higher rates of single-parenthood, and higher rates of poverty. Further, off-spring of adolescent mothers have poor health, educational, and social outcomes, including higher rates of incarceration, poor educational performance, high drop-out rates, chronic health problems, and higher rates of poverty. [1]

Negative attitudes toward adolescent sex are not confined to the United States; across 24 countries only 7% of respondents indicated there was nothing wrong with under 16-year olds having sex (Widmer, Treas, and Newcomb 1998). The United States along with Bulgaria, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, the Philippines and Poland were grouped together by their very low acceptance of adolescent sex (Widmer et al. 1998). According to Inglehart and Baker (2001), the United States and New Zealand fall within the self-expression/traditional cultural zone.

Since 1972, when the GSS began asking about attitudes toward sexual behaviors, negative attitudes toward teen sex have liberalized slightly, remaining, however, as negative as the attitudes toward extramarital sex (Treas 2002). Treas (2002) found, as of 1998, 71.7% of GSS respondents indicated that teen sex was always wrong. She goes on to say that cohort succession has had a liberalizing effect on sexual attitudes in general, but that "intracohort change overwhelmed cohort turnover on the attitudes toward extramarital sex and teen sex" (Treas 2002:279).

Thornton and Young-DeMarco (2001) concur that attitudes toward acceptance of nonmarital sexual behavior have liberalized but that this liberalizing effect is only toward adults; attitudes toward sex among teenagers is overwhelmingly negative. Thornton and Young-DeMarco (2001) do note that unmarried childbearing has lost some of its stigma along with the

[1] It can be argued that in viewing adolescent sex from a perspective of social costs carries the connotation of the social control of women's, sexuality, albeit young women's. The social control of women's sexuality in the teenage years is cloaked within the discourse of health concerns and social costs of sexual behavior.

liberalizing of attitudes toward unmarried sex, but that unmarried teen childbearing is still very negatively viewed. Nevertheless, they found that the majority of adolescent males believe that unmarried parenthood is preferable to marriage or abortion (Thornton and Young-DeMarco 2001). Widmer et al. (1998), in their study of attitudes toward nonmarital sex in 24 countries, lump the United States into the category of sexual conservatives. These 'sexual conservatives', including Ireland, Northern Ireland, Poland and the U.S., chose always wrong 78% of the time in regard to teen sex versus that of 'sexual permissives' cluster of countries (Germany, Austria, Sweden, and Slovenia) which only regarded teen sex always wrong at 58% (Widmer et al. 1998).

Teitler (2002) merges the categories of premarital sex and teen sex when he notes that nonmarital sex is accepted as normative in all developed nations, and, further, that for large numbers of young women in Anglo nations, having children outside of marriage is no longer a frightening prospect. He found this in the context of his analysis of the convergence of age of first sexual initiation in developed industrial nations (Teitler 2002). Nevertheless, he notes that the age of sexual initiation in a number of industrial/developed nations has converged to the age of 16-18 years of age (Teitler 2002). Schalet (2000) notes that European, particularly Dutch, parents approach adolescent sexuality differently than do parents of American adolescents. This cultural difference can account for Teitler's merging of premarital and teen sex.

Premarital Sex

As suggested by the above study, "approval of premarital sex is limited to adults" (Widmer et al. 1998:352). Though some of the literature referring to the prevalence of teen sex tends to alternate between the moniker of teen sex and premarital sex (Teitler 2002), for my purposes, this discussion revolves around the prevalence of sexual activity of adults. As such, premarital sex, typically defined as sexual activity prior to marriage, is generally normalized.

That is, sexual activity between unmarried heterosexual adults has come to be accepted as normal behavior in western industrial nations (Scott 1998; Thornton and Young-DeMarco 2001; Teitler 2002. Moreover, Treas (2002) says that attitudes toward premarital sex have declined in disapproval, according to the General Social Survey, from 1972 to 1998.

The literature suggests that a majority of Americans continue to value marriage and children, and other aspects of family life (Cherlin 2004). However, marriage has become voluntary, as has childbearing within wedlock. Additionally, cohabitation prior to marriage and cohabitation without marriage are choices available, thus contributing to the normalization of premarital sex, particularly among young adults (Thornton and Young-DeMarco 2001).

The literature regarding premarital sex extends from the marriage and family literature to the literature on attitudinal tolerance. Further, there is little contestation to the notion that premarital sex, albeit outside the normative conception and approval level of marital sexual behavior, is all but normative for adults. The general trend in attitudes toward premarital sex is that from the late 1960s onward there has been a sharp liberalization in attitudes toward this sexual behavior. In 1969 more than 75% of American adults disapproved of premarital sex, by the 1980s only about 35% of American adults thought premarital sex was always or almost always wrong (Harding and Jencks 2003). Recent work by Finer (2007) corroborates these findings; he concludes that almost all Americans have sex before marriage.

Extramarital Sex

Many studies have attempted to estimate the number of people who have engaged in infidelity (Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, and Michael 1994; Forste and Tanfer 1996; Wiederman 1997; Atkins, Baucom, and Jacobson 2001). Forste and Tanfer (1996) found that only 10% of the overall sample had a secondary sexual partner when they used the National Survey of

Women. Further, they found that women were least likely to have a secondary sexual partner, followed by dating women and then cohabitating women (4%, 18%, and 20% respectively). Forste and Tanfer (1996), among others, included other sorts of 'committed' relationships in addition to marriage, in calculating their measures of extradyadic involvement. Wiederman (1997) found that 22% of men and 12% of women respondents admitted to engaging in extramarital sex, and that 78% of men and 88% of women denied ever having engaged in extramarital sex in the 1994 GSS. Using the 1991-1996 GSS, Atkins et al. (2001) found that 13% of respondents admitted to having had extramarital sex. More recently, Blow and Hartnett (2005) conclude that over the course of heterosexual married relationships in the US, extramarital sex occurs less than 25% of the time in committed relationships, with men engaging in infidelity more than women.

Number of sexual partners prior to primary relationship is positively associated with the likelihood of women engaging in extradyadic involvement. Persons that cohabitate have a higher rate of non-monogamy than married persons (Christopher and Sprecher 2000; Forste and Tanfer 1998). Over the life course males, African Americans, remarried persons, highly educated and very low educated individuals, those with very low religiosity, and persons living in urban areas are found to have higher rates of infidelity (Christopher and Sprecher 2000).

Defining infidelity complicates estimating prevalence of the phenomenon. As sexual behavior has increasingly decoupled from marriage, the literature that covers extramarital sex includes extradyadic involvement. Additionally, this extradyadic involvement includes one-night stands, emotional involvement, long-term relationships and serial philandering. Most of this literature does not distinguish between these types of infidelity, and it is consequently under researched. Most empirical studies on infidelity are focused on sexual intercourse and do not

take into consideration the range of behaviors and intensity of the phenomenon (Brown 2001; Blow and Hartnett 2005). Equally limited is the research on same-sex couples and infidelity. Most empirical work in the area of same-sex sex has focused on risky sexual behaviors and not on long-term committed same-sex relationships (Christopher and Sprecher 2000). Not since Blumstein and Schwartz (1983) has any systematic research been undertaken for this population (Blow and Hartnett 2005).

Blumstein and Schwartz (1983) found that in male relationships sexual experiences outside of the primary relationship was not uncommon but that it negatively influenced sexual satisfaction between partners of the primary relationship. Further, non-monogamous lesbians were also less satisfied sexually as well as less committed to the future of the relationship (Blumstein and Schwartz 1983; Blow and Hartnett 2005). However, Blow and Hartnett (2005) suggest that these findings should be treated with caution given the datedness of these findings. Nevertheless, these findings are consistent with the findings regarding heterosexual couplings (Liu 2000). Some research points out that sexual experiences, outside of the primary relationship, in gay male pairings does not occur without the emotional fallout of jealousy and pain (Worth, Reid, and McMillan 2002; Blow and Hartnett 2005).

Marriage is the approved venue for sexual expression in the dominant culture of the United States (Christopher and Sprecher 2000). The vast majority of married couples expect monogamy in their relationships (Treas and Giesen 2000). Therefore, all other forms of sexual expression are implicitly compared to normative marital sexual expression. Extramarital sex, or extradyadic involvement, is antithetical to marriage and disapproval is nearly universal (Christopher and Sprecher 2000; Thornton and Young-DeMarco 2001). Thus, extramarital sex has "enormous disruptive potential for marriages" (Liu 2000:363). Exactly what constitutes

extramarital sexual behavior, and thus the attitudes toward it, is secondary to the normative assumption that this behavior is assumed to include or involve sexual intercourse (Thompson 1983). It should be noted that marital infidelity can, and does, include a wide range of behaviors that include everything from coitus to emotional infidelity (Christopher and Sprecher 2000; Thornton and Young-DeMarco 2001).

The important point here is that with the assumption of sexual misconduct is in opposition to normative, heterosexual monogamy within the context of the bonds of matrimony as opposed to infidelity in dating, cohabitating, or same-sex relational contexts. Within the literature on extramarital sex, very little deals substantively with the nature of attitudes toward this sexual behavior. What literature does exist, deals with prevalence, empirical studies that examine variables likely to lead to such behavior and clinical resolutions (Christopher and Sprecher 2000; Thornton and Young-DeMarco 2001; Thompson 1983).

Homosexual Sex

Unlike premarital sex, homosexual or same-sex sexual relations are still stigmatized in the US and elsewhere and thus accurate estimates of prevalence are more difficult to obtain (Scott 1998). Nevertheless, a good deal of research has explored prevalence of same-sex behavior since Kinsey's ground breaking work in the late 1940s (Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin 1948). Alfred Kinsey (Kinsey et. al 1948 as cited in Weeks, Holland, and Waites 2003) challenged the taken for granted assumptions purveyed to the American public that homosexuality was perverse. His research on human sexual behavior in the 1940s had enormous political and cultural impact. He effectively demonstrated that despite social stigma, laws, and consequences, people tended to follow their sexual desires. He and his associates documented a large variety of sexual behaviors during the course of their studies on human sexuality.

Kinsey suggested that homosexuality was only one type of human sexual behavior and that it existed on a continuum with heterosexuality (Weeks et al. 2003). He approached the study of human sexuality from a sociological perspective and opened a dialogue about sexual variability in humans and challenged the prevailing morals of the day (Weeks et al. 2003; Moore 2001). Kinsey and his colleagues (1948; 1953) suggested that perhaps as much as 10% of the population, particularly males, had engaged in some form of same-sex sexual contact exclusively over the course of several years between the ages of 16 and 53 (Kinsey et al 1948; Butler 2005). Others, primarily Humphreys (1975), have estimated prevalence of same-sex sexual behavior at higher rates. Humphreys (1975) estimated that prevalence of same-sex behavior, and thus implying a sexual identity, was closer to 15%. Both of these researchers have been criticized, among other reasons, for their unscientific sampling strategies, thus rendering their estimates as suspect.

More recent research puts the prevalence of same-sex erotic activity at much lower rates, and that there are differences, particularly along the lines of gender, in that prevalence. Butler (2000) found, using the GSS data, that the prevalence of same-sex erotic activity to be around 1.7% from the period of 1988 to 1990, and 3.9% from the period of 1996 to 1998. She suggests that changes in the normative, economic, and legal realms have facilitated an increase in the self-reporting of same sex erotic activity (Butler 2000; 2005). Johnson, Mercer, Erens, Copas, McManus, Wellings, Fenton, Korovessis, Macdowell, Nanchahal, Purdon, and Field (2001a) have reported similar changes in prevalence of same-sex erotic activity in Great Britain. Johnson et al. (2001a; Johnson, Copas, Erens, Mandalia, Fenton, Korovessis, Wellings, and Field 2001b), using the British National Survey of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles data, reported that rates of same-sex erotic activity increased for males from 1.5% in 1990 to 2.6% in 2000. For British

women, the rate of reporting such activity increased from 0.8% to 2.6% over the same period (Butler 2005; Johnson et al. 2001a; Johnson et al. 2001b). Butler (2005) notes, that unlike her study utilizing the GSS, Johnson et al. (2001a; 2001b) used different data collection methodology, which may account for the magnitude of change in reporting of both men and women, thus treating these data with some caution.

Generally, there is agreement that attitudes toward homosexuality have liberalized since the GSS started to report attitudinal tolerance toward this sexual behavior. Smith (1990) studied a variety of attitudes from post World War II to the late 1980s; he reported that attitudes toward sexual morality have liberalized, along with attitudinal tolerance toward women's rights, race relations, abortion, among others (Smith 1990; Loftus 2001). Loftus (2001) has convincingly established that Americans make a distinction between the morality of homosexuality and their willingness to restrict the civil liberties of homosexuals. She posits that there are two possibilities that provide a rationale for this distinction.

The first concerns the morality question in the GSS regarding homosexuality. This question focuses on the sexual behavior of homosexuals whereas the civil liberties question focuses on homosexuals as a minority group. Loftus speculates that the morality question taps into puritanical beliefs on sexuality that Americans hold (Loftus 2001). Activisms that taps into strategies that either evoke or avoid images of the sexual behaviors of homosexuals, has been employed by both sides of the homosexual debate and have had a profound effect on the public. (Loftus 2001; Bernstein 1997; Nelson and Kinder 1996). The second rationale regarding the distinction between morality and civil liberties regards homosexuals as a minority group. Comparing the situation of homosexuals to other marginalized groups, such as African Americans, emphasizes tolerance of the group even if attitudes are still unfavorable (Loftus

2001). It is also possible that Americans are generally accepting of the right to free speech and civil liberties.

Perceptions of gays and lesbians have important implications for attitudes towards this social groups (Herek 2000a; 2000b; 2002). The study of attitudes toward gays and lesbians is well established in the social-psychological literature (Ellis, Kitzinger, and Wilkinson 2002). Results from multiple studies, utilizing both nationally representative samples and convenience samples, suggest that heterosexuals' attitudes towards lesbians differ from their attitudes toward gay men, particularly if homosexual behavior is emphasized over homosexuals as a minority group. The intensity of attitudes differs by gender, but not as it happens, by race, though it should be noted that there are differences by race, but not in terms of intensity (Herek and Capitanio 1995; Herek 2000a; 2002; Kite and Whitley 1996).

Overall, heterosexual men have more negative attitudes toward gays and lesbians than heterosexual women. The intensity of these negative attitudes varies by how gays and lesbians are perceived. If the perception of gays and lesbians is one that centers on homoerotic behavior, then the intensity of those negative attitudes is higher, particularly if the focus is on gay men and behavior, than if the perception was one that focuses on gays and lesbians as a minority group (Herek 2000a; 2002; Ellis et al. 2002). Herek wrote "At least for heterosexual males, answering questions about gay men appears to stimulate retrieval of negative thoughts and feelings from memory, which carry over to subsequent responses to items about lesbians" (Herek 2000a:262). Heterosexual male's consistent hostility toward gay men can plausibly be interpreted as an extension of the linkages between heterosexual masculinity and sexual identity (Herek 2000b; Kimmel 2000; 2005; Connell 1992). Moreover, heterosexual men make a distinction between the genders of homosexuals, with questions regarding gay males perhaps tapping into

heterosexual males' gender and sexual identity. In research that first posed questions regarding lesbians, male heterosexuals expressed attitudes that were less negative, than if they were first questioned about gay males (Herek 2000a).

Heterosexual women, in contrast to heterosexual men, have more tolerant attitudes toward gays and lesbians overall. For the most part, heterosexual women do not display hostility to the extent that heterosexual men do toward gay men and lesbians. Even when questioned first about gay males, heterosexual women's expressed attitudes toward gays and lesbians displayed similar levels of warmth, though their attitudes toward bisexuals displayed less warmth. This situation is not comparable to the intensity and variance of heterosexual males. Heterosexual women's attitudes are not generally as affected by contextual variables (Herek 2002). However, it does indicate that in some cases, gender and sexuality identity issues may have relevance for some heterosexual women (Herek 2000a).

Research on Black heterosexual's attitudes toward gays and lesbians is, at best, sparse (Herek and Capitanio 1995). Research of this type is valuable for a couple of reasons. First, black heterosexual's attitudes towards gays and lesbians represent attitudes from one out-group to another. Second, Black gays and lesbians often experience prejudice at the intersection of both race and sexuality simultaneously, thus making the understanding of the cultural milieu of Black gays, lesbians, and bisexuals an imperative (Herek and Capitanio 1995; hooks 2000).

Research on Black heterosexual attitudes toward gays and lesbians indicates that negative attitudes are widespread, though no more so than the attitudes expressed by White heterosexuals (Herek and Capitanio 1995). Moreover, gender differences in Black heterosexuals' attitudes toward gays and lesbians are similar to White heterosexuals' attitudes, in that Black males generally display more hostility toward gay men than do Black women. Black

heterosexuals were more likely to express more positive attitudes towards gays and lesbians if they were single, well educated and attended religious services infrequently (Herek and Capitanio 1995). These findings were not inconsistent with those for White respondents. The key differences between Black and White respondents seems to be centered on whether or not homosexuality was perceived as a choice or as an essentialized characteristic and thereby beyond the individual's control. When Black respondents believed that homosexuality was something one was born with, their attitudes were more tolerant (Herek and Capitanio 1995).

Modernization and Rationalization

This research is contextualized by macro-level modernization studies. Specifically, this research finds its impetus within the theoretical formulations posited by Hawdon (2005). Additionally, this research employs elements of the work conducted by Inglehart (1990; 2000), Inglehart and Baker (2001) and Inglehart and Norris (2003) and Norris and Inglehart (2006), as it is complementary to Hawdon's work and assists with the transition from macro-level to micro-level. Both Hawdon's and Inglehart's work are macro-level theories of modernization with attendant rationalization, twin processes that work together to create profound social change in societies (Hawdon 2005; Welzel, Inglehart, and Klingermann 2003; Inglehart and Baker 2001). The following is an abbreviated description of these theoretical perspectives.

Hawdon's discussion centers on drugs and drug use as it relates to the processes of modernization and rationalization. Though properly considered a modernization theory, Hawdon's theory is also a general theory of deviance, in the form of drugs and drug use, which synthesizes the sociological theories of Durkheim, Weber, Parsons, Habermas, and Black, among others (Hawdon 2005). My research, of course, centers on attitudes toward perceived deviant sexual behaviors. Implicit to my research is the assumption that drugs and drug use are deviant

objects and behavior and thus analogous to perceived deviant sexual behaviors at the center of this research. Further, also implicit to this research is the notion that there is a strong connection between the characteristics of societies and the beliefs of individuals. Thus, I employ macro-level theoretical perspectives to contextualize this micro-level research.

According to Hawdon (2005), the process of modernization creates structural changes over time. In this formulation, premodern societies are characterized as undifferentiated in terms of stratification, with little or no division of labor as conceptualized by Durkheim. As societies modernize the division of labor advances as does the level of stratification within a given society. This circumstance alters the structure and culture of societies. With increased stratification and differentiation, social institutions such as the state and religion emerge, furthering the process of stratification and advancement of the division of labor. Concomitant to increasing stratification and the division of labor is the rise of science and increasing rationalization. In premodern societies the church dominated explanation and heavily influenced world views.

Once societies achieve a level of modernization, a scientific world-view begins to dominate. Science challenges religiously derived traditions and customs and the process of rationalization leads to normative ambiguity. In modern states, the authority of the church is replaced by the authority of achieved consensus (Hawdon 2005; Habermas 1979; 1970). The normative consensus that once held groups together breaks down and decreases the individual's constraint within the group by lowering the exit costs of group membership. Together these processes lead to increased secularism and greater individuation, as well as more freedom to engage in deviant behaviors. The deviance structure expands causing a concomitant expansion of a society's moral boundaries (Hawdon 2005).

Rationality and modernization go hand and hand, once set into motion they mutually reinforce each other (Hawdon 2005). Modernization theorists such as Weber and Durkheim made predictions about the future of the industrialized world. A key prediction was the decline of religion in influence in modern industrial societies (McClay 2007; Norris and Inglehart 2006; Inglehart and Baker 2001). Though predictions of the end of organized religion did not come to fruition, modernization studies have not lost their explanatory power. They do, however, require some retooling to accommodate the globalized world of the 21st century (Inglehart and Baker 2001). Hawdon posits that a social correlate of modernization is decreased levels of religiosity, not the disappearance of religiosity (Hawdon 2005). Norris and Inglehart (2006:225) also note that secularism is a tendency of modernization, not an iron-clad law.

The notion that religion plays a significant role in culture, though carrying a good deal of weight, is only half the story. Moreover, whereas religiosity versus a secular worldview is important in modernization and rationality theories, individualism has a significant role but has received much less attention in this context. According to Inglehart and Norris (2003), central to discussions of modernization and cultural gaps are attitudes toward sexual liberalization and gender equality. Attitudes toward sexual liberalization and gender equality are part of a broader pattern of tolerance and emphasis on individual autonomy that constitutes "self-expression values" (Inglehart and Norris 2003:67). The self-expression value that is central to this research is individualism.

The keystone of Hawdon's theory is social mobilization. The twin processes of modernization and rationalization work in concert, the consequences of which are decreased religiosity, increased secularism and an emphasis on rampant individualism, or individualism taken to an extreme (Hawdon 2005:327). Another element of Hawdon's theory incorporates

economic movements. In times of a robust economy, in the modern society, rates of social mobility increase. As social mobility increases, rates of inter-group contacts increase, increasing the numbers of groups and associations an individual can make. With increased inter-group contacts comes an increase in tolerance towards deviance and greater normative ambiguity coupled with less restraint on individual behaviors (Hawdon 2005; 1996).

Individualism

As noted in the previous section, numerous factors have been related to attitudes toward different forms of sexual behavior. A factor that has received little attention in relation to sexual behaviors is individualism, even though individualism has been shown to be related to other forms of behaviors.

Individualism has long been important to sociologists. Durkheim included this concept in his theories of modernity. Durkheim argued that premodern societies were held together by mechanical solidarity that had a collective focus, with individuals participating in similar tasks, leading to a strong collective conscience. In contrast, modernization led to an emphasis on individualism, individual freedoms, and the value of the individual. In modern societies, individuals are bound together by an organic solidarity, where differences among individuals are emphasized because of the division of labor, which in turn, results in a weaker collective conscience (Durkheim [1887] 1933).

Although Durkheim asserted that individualism is a major facet of organic solidarity, paradoxically, individuals are bound together by norms of individual behavior, rights, and actions. For example, the Bill of Rights connects individuals to the collective by protecting individual rights. Thus, modern societies contain a complex set of rules and regulations that are

shared, in part, to accommodate individual differences Durkheim referred to this as moral individualism, making clear that moral individualism is different from egoism and selfishness.

de Tocqueville shared Durkheim's differentiation between individualism with selfishness or égoïsme. "Selfishness is a passionate and exaggerated love of self, which leads a man to connect everything with himself and to prefer himself to everything in the world" (de Tocqueville 1945:104). Individualism, however, "disposes each member of the community to sever himself from the mass of his fellows and to draw apart with his family and his friends, so that after he has thus formed a little circle of his own, he willingly leaves society at large to itself" (de Tocqueville 1945:104). de Tocqueville "linked individualism with individual rights and freedom, equal opportunity, and limited government" (Oyserman, Coon, and Kemmelmeier 2002:4).

Inglehart and Baker (2001) assert that the rise of industrialization in modern societies, or rather post-industrialization, has had "pervasive social and cultural consequences" (Inglehart and Baker 2001:17). These consequences include, but are not limited to, changing gender roles, greater political participation and activism, rising educational attainment, declining fertility rates, and shifting attitudes toward authority. And most important for this research, he includes the consequence of so-called deviance and an emphasis on individual autonomy; all of which constitutes self-expression values (Inglehart and Norris 2006; Norris and Inglehart 2003; Inglehart and Baker 2001). Indeed, Inglehart, emphasizing the economic underpinnings of individualism, suggests that the greater affluence of post-industrialized nation states has shifted concerns from subsistence and survival to that of self-expression and self-actualization (Treas 2002; Inglehart and Baker 2001; Inglehart et al. 1990). Chief among these self-expression values is individualism.

Weber, another classical sociological theorist, addressed individualism in his theorizing. Weber's contribution to individualism was his contrasting of western and eastern cultures, the west promoting individual self-reliance and pursuit of happiness over the east's focus on more collective practices (Oyserman et al. 2002; Durkheim [1887] 1933; Weber 1930). In contemporary social sciences, individualism continues to be contrasted with collectivism, from western to eastern cultures. A key assumption of contemporary studies is that individualism is much more prevalent in industrialized (or post-industrial) societies versus more traditional societies (Inglehart and Norris 2003; Oyserman et al. 2002).

Contrasting individualism and collectivism as simple opposites in this manner, though common, obscure the conception that these perspectives influence worldviews by what issues they make salient (Oyserman et al. 2002). No nation state or culture is exclusively individualistic or collectivist, each is multivalent with the intensity of one or the other that differentiates different countries (Fischer 2008). The United State, for example, can be thought to be more individualistic than other western nations because of such things as Americans being more likely to attribute poverty to individual characteristics, such as laziness (Fischer 2008). Thus, they then are less likely to advocate governmental intervention for the poor. In this conception, the individual is responsible for himself or herself and should not be dependent on others for well-being. Still, American individualism, or American exceptionalism as Lipset (1996) would call it, is much more complex than is generally thought. Indeed, the American cultural toolkit, though containing the discourse for an autonomous self and as a strategy of action, holds other tools as well (Fischer 2008; Swidler 2001; 1986).

As de Tocqueville (1945:104) noted, American individualism focuses on each person's own circle of associations, and less so to the larger society. Fischer (2008) augments this

characterization of individualism by noting that Americans do indeed voluntarily commit themselves to associations in order to attain their individual goals, and in so doing freely commit themselves to the collective constraints of those associations. He writes "they are morally free to leave but not morally free to trespass the implicit contract. One can chose to divorce, but not to cheat; to change congregations, but not to be indifferent; to quit a job, but not to be insubordinate; to leave the nation, but not to betray it" (Fischer 2008:370). Thus, he argues that the American variety of individualism displays characteristics that are both individualistic and collectivist (Fischer 2008).

Current conceptualizations of individualisms share some common characteristics and differences. Hofstede has defined individualism as an emphasis on rights over duties, which entails a focus on personal autonomy and self-fulfillment, as well as a concern for self and immediate family (Hofstede 1980 as cited in Oyserman et al. 2002). Waterman (1984 as cited in Oyserman et al. 2002) defined normative individualism as an emphasis on freedom of choice and personal responsibility in addition to "living up to one's potential, and respecting the integrity of others" (Oyserman et al. 2002:4). Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, and Tipton (1985) suggest that individualism is the very core of our American culture, and that it is at the base of an American identity. As Americans, "we believe in the dignity, indeed the sacredness, of the individual" (Bellah et al. 1985:142). They define individualism as "anything that would violate our rights to think for ourselves, judge for ourselves, make our own decisions, live our lives as we see fit, is not only morally wrong, it is sacrilegious" (Bellah et al. 1985:142).

Gelfand, Triandis, and Chan (1996) are critical of over-simplified conceptualizations that assume that individualism and collectivism are a dichotomy. They posit more complex formulations of individualism and collectiveness. One possibility they put forward, and

supported by their research, is that rather than the opposite end of the continuum of individualism and collectivism is authoritarianism (Gelfand et al. 1996; Triandis and Gelfand 1998). They built upon the work Altemeyer (1981) conducted on authoritarianism (1996:399). Gelfand et al. (1996) note, in this work, that individual-level expressions that characterize authoritarian societies are obedience to authority, submissiveness, and punishment for deviance. Using Gelfand, Triandis, and Chan's (1996) conceptualization of individualism, then it follows that those who do not rate individualism highly (i.e. belief in authoritarianism) would be less tolerant of what they perceive as deviant behavior, and those who are high on individualism would have more tolerant attitudes. However, they note that elements of authoritarianism overlap with collectivism that includes adherence to social conventions and customs (Gelfand et al. 1996:407).

Building upon their earlier work, Triandis and Gelfand (1998) discuss the multidimensional character of individualism and collectivism. They list four defining attributes of individualism and collectivism; they are 1) definition of self, which can emphasize collective or personal aspects; 2) personal goals that can have priority over in-group goals or vice versa; 3) emphasis on exchange rather than communal relationships; and 4) the importance of attitudes and norms as determinants of social behavior—individualistic cultures emphasize attitudes and in collective cultures, norms are more emphasized than attitudes (Triandis and Gelfand 1998:118). They argue that individualism and collectivism may be horizontal (emphasis is on equality—based on heterogeneity) or vertical (emphasis is on hierarchies—based on status differences). These attributes can be distributed either horizontally or vertically. In this manner, dimensions of individualism/collectivism can be sorted into horizontal individualism (HI), vertical individualism (VI), horizontal collectivism (HC), and vertical collectivism (VC); they

note that all four constructs can be found in the United States (Triandis and Gelfand 1998:118-119). Thus, conceptualizing individualism and collectivism as only bipolar opposites is misleading. An individual can possess elements of both constructs in degrees of high and low; the selection of which construct to utilize being situational and the attitude under consideration (Gelfand et al. 1996:407; Triandis and Gelfand 1998).

In more recent studies, Oyserman et al. (2002) suggested seven major domains related to individualism. They called them independence, goals, competition, uniqueness, private, self-knowing, and direct communication (Shulruf, Hattie, and Dixon 2007; Oyserman et al. 2002). However, Oyserman et al. (2002) noted that there was no measurement tool to assess the different types of individualism at the time of their research (Shulruf et al. 2007).

Shulruf et al. (2007) created a measurement tool utilizing the seven domains of individualism proposed by Oyserman et al. (2002) and building upon the work of Singelis (1994), Hui (1988), and Schwarz and Oyserman (2001). Their goal was to refine the dimensions of individualism and collectivism. They labeled their instrument the Auckland Individualism and Collectivism Scale (AICS).

The AICS outlined three dimensions for individualism and two dimensions for collectivism. Most important for this research, the three dimensions for individualism were competition, uniqueness, and responsibility. Each dimension was further delineated. *Competition* is the first dimension of individualism. The items used to measure competition are: 1. “I define myself as a competitive person.” 2. “I enjoy working in situations involving competition with others.” and, 3. “Without competition it is not possible to have a good society.” For the *unique* dimension there are four items; 1. “I see myself as “my own person.”” 2. “It is important for me to be able to act as an independent person.” 3. “I enjoy being unique and

different from others." 4. "I consider myself as a unique person separate from others." For the dimension of *responsibility* there are also four items; 1. "Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me." 2. "I prefer to be self-reliant than dependent on others." 3. "I take responsibility for my own action." and, 4. "I consult with my superior on work related matters" (Shulruf et al. 2007:392-393). The items on this scale were reliable, based on one sample of 199 participants ranging from secondary school to young adults (Shulruf et al. 2007). Although the AICS was intended to measure multiple dimensions of individualism, Inglehart (2000) argues that it is not refined enough to capture the nuances of cultural variations in individualism in other modern nation states.

Individualism continues to garner research attention in a wide array of topics. For example, in their study of New Age religion, Farias and Lalljee (2008) compared the practitioners of New Age religion, Catholics and Atheist/Agnostic groups using a variety of variables associated with individualism and collectivism. They created the concept of holistic individualism that they define as a blend of "…individualistic value orientation with highly abstract holistic perceptions of the self." (Farias and Lalljee 2008:277). Forbes, Zhang, Doroszewicz, and Haas (2009) examined the relationship between individualism and collectivism and direct and indirect aggression in the U.S., China, and Poland. Their results indicated that direct and indirect aggression is more prevalent in societies where individualism is more common. They found that the United States had higher rates of aggression than China, with Poland having moderate levels of both aggression and individualism. Santore (2008), using classical Durkheimian theory, found that individualism does not negate social ties and social cohesion in contemporary romantic relationships and intimacy.

A recent study of minor forms of delinquent behavior was conducted by Rothwell and Hawdon (2008) extending Hawdon's theory of drug use. This research is particularly important for this study because it established the importance of individualism for explaining attitudes toward deviance. I extend the work of Rothwell and Hawdon (2008) by examining attitudes toward adolescent sex, premarital sex, extramarital sex, and homosexual behavior. The inclusion of adolescent sex provides an important contrast to the other behaviors. As it relates to sexual behavior, individualism in the United States is for adults only. This is another example of the multivalent nature of American individualism. American adults do not consider that their offspring are autonomous individuals capable of making the decisions of a fully autonomous adult individual, particularly in the realm of sexual matters (Schalet 2000). Thus, even the most individualistic American adult may have a negative view toward adolescent sexual behavior but think nothing untoward of an adult engaging in premarital sex.

In keeping with the different forms of individualism articulated in the literature, I began with two types of individualism that I label *thinking individualism* and *responsibility individualism*. Thinking individualism is the belief that the most important characteristic of an individual is thinking for herself or himself. Responsibility individualism is the belief that an individual should be responsible for his or her own well being. Two types of being responsible for one's self (and not for others) were to be used—helping the sick and helping the poor. However, during the exploratory phase of the analysis, it was found that help sick and help poor that were first deemed to be both indicators of responsibility individualism did not have sufficiently high Cronbach's alpha levels to be included in the same scale. Consequently, *responsibility individualism* was reconceptualized as *being responsible for poor individualism* and *being responsible for sick individualism.* Each type of individualism highlights a different

facet of the phenomenon. These forms of individualism and their relationship to the work of others are explained in the following chapter.

In addition to the focus on individualism, this research includes a series of theoretically derived control variables that have considerable empirical support in the study of deviance.

Hypotheses

The interrelationships between the control variables and the independent and dependent variables are not specified in the hypotheses but will be included in the tests of the models. What follows are the hypotheses that this research will address.

> H_1: Thinking individualism is related to attitudinal tolerance toward perceived sexual deviance, with respondents who agree that thinking for themselves is the most important quality to teach children will have more tolerant attitudes toward perceived sexual deviance than those who disagree.
>
> H_2: Being responsible for poor individualism is positively related to attitudinal tolerance toward perceived sexual deviance; thus, I expect that respondents that have a strong belief in responsible for poor individualism would have greater attitudinal tolerance toward perceived sexual deviance than those who do not hold this belief.
>
> H_3: Being responsible for sick individualism is positively related to attitudinal tolerance toward perceived sexual deviance; thus, I expect that respondents that a strong belief in responsible for sick individualism would have greater attitudinal tolerance toward perceived sexual deviance than those who do not hold this belief.

Chapter Three

Methods

In this chapter, I discuss my proposed methodology. I begin with a brief discussion of the data. Next, I will outline my dependent, independent, and control variables. Finally, I will summarize my analytic strategy for the data, providing a brief review of the analytic strategy that is appropriate for use in the testing of the hypotheses forwarded in this study. A secondary purpose of the dissertation is to add to the theoretical and methodological discussions of individualism.

Data

I will be using data from the General Social Survey (GSS) to examine attitudes toward deviations from normative sexual behavior in the United States. The GSS has been administered from 1972 to 1998 every year; however, since 1998 the GSS has been administered every two years. The GSS is a national area probability sample of non-institutionalized adults over the age of 18 years, conducted by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) (Davis, Smith and Marsden 2007).

I test 5 models using these data. The first model uses data from 1998, the second 2000, the third 2002, the fourth 2004, and the fifth, 2006. Each of these models is tested four times, each with attitudes toward one of the four forms of sexual behavior as the dependent variable.

Dependent Variables

There will be four dependent variables in this analysis. The GSS asked the same questions for these dependent variables for the five years that are used in this research.
The first dependent variable concerns attitudes toward premarital sex. This variable is operationalized by the question ‘‘Do you think it is always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong

only sometimes, or not wrong at all if a man and a woman have sexual relations before marriage?" The second dependent variable is gauging attitudes toward teen sexual behavior and is measured by a sub-question of the question about premarital sex. The variable is operationalized by the question "What if they are in their early teens, say 14 to 16 years old? In that case, do you think sex relations before marriage are always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all?'' The third dependent variable gauges attitudes toward extra-marital sexual behaviors, and is measured with the question; ''What about a married person having sexual relations with someone other than his or her husband or wife, is it always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all?'' The last dependent variable asks about attitudes toward homosexual or same-sex sexual behaviors and is operationalized with the question; ''What about sexual relations between two adults of the same sex, is it always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all?''

The response categories for these four variables are "always wrong," "almost always wrong," "wrong only sometimes," and "not wrong at all." The other response categories of "Don't Know," "No answer," and "Not applicable" are already set to system missing. These response categories will then be recoded, collapsing each into binaries. Collapsing the variables will be in accord with the literature and confirmed with partitioned chi squares.

Independent Variables

The primary independent variable for this research is individualism. Different operational definitions of individualism will be used for the models, for various reasons with benefits. A benefit is that if support for Hawdon's model is found for different measures of individualism, this provides additional "support" for his theory. Further, the definitions of

individualism and relationships among them and the dependent variable may add to the larger discussion on individualism.

The following items were selected from the GSS to measure respondent's attitudes of individualism. The question operationalizing *thinking individualism* is the same utilized by Rothwell and Hawdon (2008) and was not asked before 1983, though it has been asked every year to 2006 that the survey has been administered. This variable is operationalized by the question ''if you had to choose, which thing on this list would you choose as the most important for a child to learn to prepare him or her for life? To think for himself or herself?'' There were 5 items on the list including, "Obey," "To be well liked or popular," "To think for himself or herself," "To work hard," and "To help others when they need help." For each item on the list, the respondent was asked to rank the importance from first, second, third, fourth, and fifth. In this research, the variable will be recoded into a dummy variable with the ranking "think for himself or herself" was "most important" will be coded as 1 and all other rankings coded as zero. This variable has response categories that rank response by first through fifth mention. The additional two categories, "No answer," and "Not applicable" will be recoded as 'system missing.

The second independent variable was supposed to be *responsibility individualism*. Two questions were supposed to operational this variable and combined into an additive scale. However, during the exploratory phase of the analysis, it was found that the two variables that were first deemed to be both indicators of responsibility individualism did not have sufficiently high Cronbach's alpha levels to be included in the same scale. Thus, responsibility individual was divided into two types: *being responsible for sick individualism* and *being responsible for the poor individualism.*

Being responsible for the poor individualism is operationalized by the following question: “Some people think that the government in Washington should do everything possible to improve the standard of living of all poor Americans. Other people think it is not the government's responsibility, and that each person should take care of himself.” Being responsible for the sick individualism is operationalized by the question, “in general, some people think that it is the responsibility of the government in Washington to see to it that people have help in paying for doctors and hospital bills. Others think that these matters are not the responsibility of the federal government and that people should take care of these things themselves.”

Both questions have a total of 6 response categories, they are identical and will be recoded the same. The response categories are a scale of 1-5, with 1 being “I strongly agree it is the responsibility of the government to help,” and 5 being “I strongly agree that people should take care of themselves.” These items will be recoded from the original format, responses 8 (‘don’t know), 9 (‘no answer’), and “not applicable” will be recoded as system missing; response categories 1 and 2 will be collapsed into one category and designated as 1, response category 3 will be recoded as 2, and response categories 4 and 5 will be collapsed into one and designated as 3. Both questions were asked from 1972-2006 for the specific years the survey was administered.

Control Variables

Control variables were chosen to ensure the best analysis of the potential relationship between attitudes towards deviant sexual behaviors and individualism. The expected controls of race, gender, age, education, and income are included. In addition, I also control for political views, and frequency of religious service attendance due to the potential relationship between these variables and the dependent variables.

Gender, race, and population size will be recoded into dummy variables. Male gender, white race, and southern region of residence will all be reference categories (coded 0). Female gender, non-white race, will all be coded 1. Age, education, political views, and religious attendance will all be used as continuous variables with higher scores indicating higher age, more years of education, increased conservatism, and more frequent religious service attendance. The models to be tested are presented in Table 1.

Analytic Strategy

To determine the effects of a belief in individualism on tolerance of deviance, I will conduct my analysis in a series of steps and repeat them as needed for each type of sexual behavior under consideration in this study. I will begin with the frequencies and measures of central tendency. Bivariate correlations will be calculated for all variables in each year. Finally, binomial logistic regressions with the control variables will be run for each dependent variable in each survey year chosen.

Table 1: Models and Variables

	Models 1a-1d 1998	Models 1a-1d 2000	Models 1a-1d 2002	Models 1a-1d 2004	Models 1a-1d 2006
Dependent Variables					
Adoles. Prem Extram. Homo	X	X	X	X	X
Independent Variables					
Thinking Individualism	X	X	X	X	X
Responsibility for Help Poor Individualism	X	X	X	X	X
Responsibility for Help Sick Individualism	X	X	X	X	X
Control Variables					
Race—minority	X	X	X	X	X
Gender—female	X	X	X	X	X
Age	X	X	X	X	X
Education	X	X	X	X	X
Income	X	X	X	X	X
Political views--conservativism	X	X	X	X	X
Population size	X	X	X	X	X
Church attendance	X	X	X	X	X

Chapter Four

Results

In this chapter I present the results of my statistical analysis for all variables utilized in this study. A total of 15 variables were employed and recoded from the GSS for this study; they include age, race, gender, income, education, political views (conservatism), population size, and frequency of church attendance as control variables. The dependent variables for this research are attitudes toward homosexual, premarital, adolescent, and extramarital sexual behaviors. The independent variables for this research are thinking for one's self, helping the poor, and helping the sick. Frequencies for all variables were generated for the first phase of analysis. The second phase was generating descriptive statistics for all variables in every year. Frequencies and descriptive statistics for all variables, for all years, can be found in Appendix 1. First, I offer a brief description of the sample population, followed by a discussion of the results of the bivariate correlations. Bivariate correlations tables can be found in Appendix 2. Finally, I discuss the results of the binomial logistic regressions that were performed for the years 1998 to 2006.

Sample Population

The General Social Survey (GSS) is a national survey administered every two years. It is intended to be a representative sample of the non-institutionalized population, ages 18 to 89 or greater (Davis et al. 2007). In this research, it was necessary to work with different sample sizes based on the analysis being done. Frequencies and descriptive statistics were performed with the whole sample. Pairwise deletion (performed with correlations) and listwise deletion (performed with logistic regressions) resulted in different sample sizes for each year and each statistical test. In the total sample population, there is a stable pattern of representation of key characteristics

over time. The average age of respondent for each year fell between 45.6 and 47.1 years of age. Between 54.5% and 56.5% of respondents were female each year. For all years between 1998 and 2004, non-white respondents made up approximately 21% of the sample, but in 2006 this percentage jumped to 27.2%. Between 30% and 31% of respondents were from rural areas with populations of 9,000 or less. The average number of years of education completed by respondents was between 13 and 14 years.

Recoding Tolerance Variables

Recoding the tolerance variables into a dichotomy was based on a review of the literature and the distributions found in the data and confirmed with partitioned chi squares. For tolerance of homosexual behavior and extra-marital sex, a score of 1 indicated a belief that these behaviors were sometimes or never wrong. A score of 0 indicated a belief that the behaviors were almost always or always wrong. For tolerance of pre-marital and adolescent sex, a score of 0 indicated the belief that these behaviors were always wrong, and a score of 1 indicated the belief that these behaviors were almost always, sometimes, and never wrong.

Between 72% and 74% of respondents scored 1 on tolerance of premarital sex in all 5 years. Between 36.3% and 40.2% of respondents scored 1 on tolerance of homosexual sex in all 5 years. Between 27.5% and 30.2% of respondents scored 1 on tolerance of adolescent sex in all 5 years. In stark contrast, the highest percentage of respondents scoring 1 on tolerance of extra-marital sex is 9.7% (in 2000). It is apparent that, of all the types of deviant sexual behavior used in this study, extramarital sex is the least tolerated.

Bivariate Correlations

I now discuss the bivariate correlations, first highlighting those that are statistically significantly related to the four attitudes. This is followed by a brief discussion of statistically significant relationships among the independent and control variables.

Upon examination of correlations, a distinct difference can be noted among tolerance of extra-marital sex and the other three "deviant" sexual behaviors. Tolerance of extra-marital sex has much lower correlations with all indicators than the other three categories of sexual behavior tolerance. This is, in part, because there is much less variance to be explained. Among the individualism variables, thinking for one's self also exhibits one of the strongest overall correlations shown in this analysis ($p < .01$) in all years with the tolerance variables, with the exception of tolerance of adolescent sex in the years 2004 and 2006 ($p < .05$). The other two individualism variables (helping the sick and helping the poor) show sporadic significant correlations with tolerance of the four types of the perceived deviant sexual behavior in various years. However, even in instances in which the correlations were statistically significant, the correlations themselves are weak (the strongest of which was -.18 for tolerance of homosexual behavior in 2000). These two variables were strongly correlated with each other, with correlation coefficients between .36 and .48 (the strongest correlations in these analyses).

The variables most highly correlated with tolerance of extra-marital sex are frequency of religious attendance and level of conservatism. Both have negative relationships and are significant at the .01 level in all years. These two are also two of the most highly correlated variables for all other tolerance measures over all included years. However, years of education shows significant correlations of less than .01 in all years and on all 3 remaining tolerance

variables, with the exception of tolerance of adolescent sex in 2004 ($p < .05$). Other correlations showed expected general relationships to tolerance. Tolerance was statistically significantly and negatively related to age, race, and gender, indicating that increased age, membership in a minority racial group, and being male were all associated with less tolerance. Living in a rural area also indicated lower levels of tolerance.

Logistic Regressions for 1998

Support for the hypothesized relationship between thinking individualism and homosexual and premarital sexual behaviors (hypothesis 1) was supported in this regression analysis, but not for adolescent or extramarital sexual behaviors. Support for the hypothesized relationship between responsibility for helping the poor individualism (hypothesis 2) and perceived sexually deviant behaviors was not found in this regression analysis. Support for the hypothesized relationship between responsibility for helping the sick individualism (hypothesis 3) and perceived sexually deviant behaviors was not found in this regression analysis.

Tolerance for Homosexual Sex

Results of logistic regression on homosexual behaviors in 1998 are shown below (Table 2). This regression explains 35% of the variance in tolerance toward homosexual sexual behaviors. Age is inversely related to tolerance of homosexual behavior ($b = -.043$; $p < .003$); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 4% for every year older. Frequent church attendance is also negatively related to tolerance of homosexual behavior ($b = -.236$; $p < .000$); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 21% for every increase on the attendance scale. Education is positively related to tolerance of homosexual behavior ($b = .157$; $p < .020$); the likelihood of tolerance increases by approximately 14% for every additional year of education. Conservativism is inversely related to tolerance of homosexuality ($b = -.285$; $p < .065$); the likelihood of tolerance

decreases by approximately 25% as one increases by one on the Conservativism scale. Race is negatively related to the tolerance of homosexuality (b = -.923; p< .029); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 60% when respondents are Black or Other race. Population size is positively related to tolerance of homosexuality (b = .880; p< .023); the likelihood of tolerance increases by 141% when respondents live where the population exceeds 9000 people.

Thinking for self is positively related to tolerance of homosexuality (b = .597; p< .070); the likelihood of tolerance increases approximately 81% when respondents hold the belief that thinking for one's self is the most important thing to teach children. All other variables are

Table 2: Logistic Regressions of Homosexual Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 1998

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	-.042**	.014	8.503	.959
Attend	-.236**	.065	13.210	.789
Education	.130*	.067	3.758	1.139
Income	.065	.064	1.024	1.067
Conservativism	-.285*	.125	5.208	.752
Minority	-.923*	.423	4.767	.397
Female	.138	.336	.168	1.148
Population Size	.880*	.386	5.194	2.412
Think for Self	.597†	.329	3.285	1.817
Help Poor	.378	.310	1.481	1.459
Help Sick	-.286	.280	1.045	.751
Constant	-.579	1.229	.638	.561
Cox/Snell	.254			
Nagelkerke	.353			
N	250			

** <=.001,* <= .05, †<.10

insignificant. The variables Help poor and help sick are not significant. Nevertheless as key variables, these variables are important to the analysis and are delineated below. Helping the poor is positively related to tolerance of homosexuality (b = .378; p< .307); likelihood of tolerance increases when respondents hold the belief that the individual is responsible for themselves economically. Helping the sick is negatively related to tolerance of homosexuality (b = -.286; p< .307); the likelihood of tolerance decreases when respondents hold the belief that the government is responsible for the sick.

Tolerance for Premarital Sex

Results of logistic regression on premarital behaviors in 1998 are shown below (Table 3). This regression explains approximately 40% of the variance in tolerance toward premarital sexual behaviors. In this regression, age is inversely related to tolerance of premarital sex (b = -.025; p< .073); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 2% for every year older. Frequent church attendance decreases the likelihood of tolerance (b = -.405; p< .000); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 33% for every increase on the attendance scale. Conservativism is inversely related to tolerance (b = -.425; p< .003); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 35% for every increase on the conservativism scale. Thinking for self is positively related to tolerance of premarital sex (b = 1.088; p< .003); the likelihood of tolerance increases by approximately 197% when the respondent holds the belief that thinking for one's self is the most important thing to teach children.

Table 3: Logistic Regressions of Premarital Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 1998

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	-.025†	.014	3.221	.975
Attend	-.405**	.073	30.925	.667
Education	-.061	.075	.656	.941
Income	-.001	.067	.000	.999
Conservativism	-.425**	.145	8.656	.653
Minority	-.085	.412	.042	.919
Female	.231	.363	.405	1.260
Population Size	-.044	.419	.011	.957
Think for Self	1.088**	.369	8.674	2.968
Help Poor	.310	.317	.959	1.364
Help Sick	-.224	.286	.611	.799
Constant	5.898	1.460	16.312	364.143
Cox/Snell	.263			
Nagelkerke	.396			
N	275			

** <=.001,* <= .05, †<.10

All other variables are insignificant. The variables help poor and help sick are not significant. Nevertheless as key variables, these variables are important to the analysis and are delineated below. Helping the poor is positively related to tolerance of premarital sex (b = .310; p< .328); likelihood of tolerance increases by 136% when respondents believe that individuals are responsible for their own economic well being. Helping the sick is negatively related to tolerance (b = -.224; p< .434); likelihood of tolerance decreases by 20% when respondents believe that the government is responsible for the sick.

Tolerance for Adolescent Sex

Results of logistic regression on adolescent sexual behaviors in 1998 are shown below (Table 4). This regression explains approximately 36% of the variance in tolerance toward adolescent sexual behaviors. In this regression, age is inversely related to tolerance of adolescent sex ($b = -.041$; $p < .005$); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 4% for every increase in age. Frequent church attendance is inversely related to tolerance of adolescent sex ($b = -.341$; $p < .000$); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 29% for every increase on the attendance scale. Education is positively related to tolerance of adolescent sex ($b = .162$; $p < .020$); the likelihood of tolerance increases by 17% for every increase of years in education. Conservativism is inversely related to tolerance of adolescent sex ($b = -.324$; $p < .006$); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 28% as one increases on by one on the conservativism scale. Population size is positively related to tolerance ($b = .748$; $p < .045$); the likelihood of tolerance increases by 111% when one lives in a community that exceeds 9000 in population.

All other variable are not statistically significant. The variables think for self, help poor, and help sick are not significant. Nevertheless as key variables, these variables warrant further discussion. Thinking for one's self is positively related to tolerance of adolescent sex ($b = .055$; $p < .862$); the likelihood of tolerance increases when one believes that thinking for one's self is the most important thing to teach children. Helping the poor is positively related to tolerance ($b = .204$; $p < .437$); likelihood of tolerance increases when one believes that individuals are responsible for themselves economically. Helping the sick is negatively related to tolerance ($b = -.245$; $p < .347$); the likelihood of tolerance decreases when one believes that the government is responsible for the sick.

Table 4: Logistic Regressions of Adolescent Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 1998

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	-.041**	.014	7.920	.960
Attend	-.341**	.066	26.987	.711
Education	.162*	.069	5.454	1.176
Income	.000	.072	.000	1.000
Conservativism	-.324**	.118	7.563	.723
Minority	-.300	.377	.634	.741
Female	.151	.329	.211	1.163
Population Size	.748*	.373	4.013	2.113
Think for Self	.055	.315	.030	1.056
Help Poor	.204	.262	.603	1.226
Help Sick	-.245	.261	.884	.782
Constant	.624	1.294	.232	1.866
Cox/Snell	.264			
Nagelkerke	.362			
N	272			

** <=.001,* <= .05, †<.10

Tolerance for Extramarital Sex

None of the individualism variables are statistically related to tolerance (Table 5). However, this regression explains approximately 15% of the variance in tolerance toward extramarital sexual behaviors. Think for self is negatively related to tolerance (b = -.25; p< .61); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 22% when respondents believe that thinking for self is not important to teach children. Helping the poor is negatively related to tolerance (b = -.45; p< .29); the likelihood of tolerance decreases when respondent believes that the government is

Table 5: Logistic Regressions of Extramarital Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 1998

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	-.007	.021	.110	.993
Attend	-.085	.094	.819	.918
Education	-.074	.089	.693	.929
Income	.227	.139	2.678	1.255
Conservativism	-.122	.181	.458	.885
Minority	-1.220	.809	2.277	.295
Female	-.753	.492	2.347	.471
Population Size	.857	.593	2.087	2.357
Think for Self	-.253	.492	.264	.777
Help Poor	-.451	.427	1.119	.637
Help Sick	.230	.385	.357	1.259
Constant	-2.252	2.022	1.241	.105
Cox/Snell	.067			
Nagelkerke	.150			
N	264			

** <=.001,* <= .05, †<.10

responsible for people living in poverty. Helping the sick is positively related to tolerance (b = .23; p< .26); likelihood of tolerance increases when respondents believe that individuals are responsible for themselves when sick.

Logistic Regressions for 2000

Support for the hypothesized relationship between thinking individualism and homosexual behavior (hypothesis 1) was found in this regression analysis, but not for premarital, adolescent, or extramarital sexual behaviors. Support for the hypothesized relationship between

responsibility for helping the poor (hypothesis 2) and perceived sexual deviance was also not found in this regression analysis. However, support for the hypothesized relationship between responsibility for helping the sick (hypothesis 3) and adolescent sexual behavior was found in this regression analysis, but not for homosexual, premarital, or extramarital sexual behaviors..

Tolerance for Homosexual Sex

Results of logistic regression on homosexual sex in 2000 are shown below (Table 6). This regression explains approximately 39% of the variance in tolerance toward homosexual sexual behaviors. In this regression age is inversely related to tolerance of homosexuality (b = -.03; p< .04); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 3% for every year older. Frequent church attendance is inversely related to tolerance (b = -.33; p< .000); likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 29% for each increase on the attendance scale. Education is positively related to tolerance (b = .243; p< .001); the likelihood of tolerance increases by approximately 28% for each additional year of education. Conservativism is inversely related to tolerance (b = .460; p< .000); likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 37% for every increase of one on the conservativism scale.

Thinking for self is positively related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b = .616; p< .061); likelihood of tolerance increases by 85% when one has the belief that thinking for one's self is the most important thing to teach children. Helping the poor is negatively related to tolerance (b = -.062; p< .835); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 6% when respondents believe that the government is responsible for the poor. Helping the sick is negatively related to tolerance (b = -.032; p< .912); likelihood of tolerance decreases by 3% when individuals hold the belief that the government is responsible for the sick.

Table 6: Logistic Regressions of Homosexual Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 2000

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	-.027*	.013	4.122	.974
Attend	-.335**	.068	24.372	.715
Education	.243**	.074	10.821	1.275
Income	.041	.056	.541	1.042
Conservativism	-.460**	.129	12.699	.632
Minority	-.394	.387	1.040	.674
Female	.501	.358	1.963	1.650
Population Size	.015	.345	.002	1.015
Think for Self	.616†	.328	3.521	1.852
Help Poor	-.062	.296	.043	.940
Help Sick	-.032	.288	.012	.969
Constant	-.578	1.253	.213	.561
Cox/Snell	.279			
Nagelkerke	.385			
N	241			

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

Tolerance for Premarital Sex

Results of logistic regression on premarital sex in 2000 are shown below (Table 7). This regression explains approximately 44% of the variance in tolerance toward premarital sexual behaviors. Frequent church attendance is inversely related to tolerance of premarital sex (b = -.573; p< .000); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 44% for every increase on the attendance scale. Education is positively related to tolerance of premarital sex (b = .152; p< .062); the likelihood of tolerance increases by 16% for every additional year of education.

Conservativism is inversely related to tolerance of premarital sex (b = -.372; p< .009); likelihood of tolerance decreases by 31% for each increase on the conservativism scale. Though not statistically significant, thinking for self is negatively related to tolerance (b = -.381; p< .328); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 32% when one believes that thinking for one's self is unimportant. Helping the poor is negatively related to tolerance of premarital sex (b = -.404; p< .204); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 33% when one believes the government is responsible for the poor. Helping the sick is positively related to tolerance of

Table 7: Logistic Regressions of Premarital Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 2000

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	.019	.015	1.596	1.019
Attend	-.573**	.089	41.048	.564
Education	.152†	.081	3.489	1.164
Income	.030	.063	.236	1.031
Conservativism	-.372**	.142	6.858	.689
Minority	.716	.468	2.341	2.047
Female	-.339	.395	.736	.712
Population Size	-.062	.421	.022	.940
Think for Self	-381	.389	.958	.683
Help Poor	-.404	.318	1.612	.668
Help Sick	.243	.337	.520	1.275
Constant	2.707	1.465	3.414	14.991
Cox/Snell	.295			
Nagelkerke	.438			
N	252			

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

premarital sex (b = .243; p< .471); the likelihood of tolerance increases by approximately 28% when one believes that the individual is responsible for themselves when sick. Thinking for self, helping the poor, and helping the sick are not statistically significant in 2000.

Tolerance for Adolescent Sex

Results of logistic regression on adolescent sex in 2000 are shown below (Table 8). This regression explains approximately 34% of the variance in tolerance toward adolescent sexual behaviors. In this regression, age is inversely related to tolerance (b = -.041; p< .004); the

Table 8: Logistic Regressions of Adolescent Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 2000

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	-.041**	.014	8.151	.960
Attend	-.371**	.078	22.606	.690
Education	.074	.072	1.065	1.077
Income	-.026	.057	.215	.974
Conservativism	-.260*	.118	4.858	.771
Minority	.207	.385	.289	1.230
Female	.246	.343	.516	1.279
Population Size	.341	.383	.793	1.407
Think for Self	-.217	.348	.390	.805
Help Poor	-.095	.268	.126	.909
Help Sick	-.839**	.296	8.049	.432
Constant	3.107	1.379	5.077	22.344
Cox/Snell	.233			
Nagelkerke	.339			
N	262			

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

likelihood of tolerance decreases by 4% for every year older. Frequent church attendance is inversely related to tolerance (b = -.371; p< .000); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 31% for every increase of one on the conservativism scale. Thinking for self is not statistically significant, however, it is negatively related to tolerance (b = -.217; p< .532); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 20% when one believes that thinking for one's self is unimportant when instructing children. Helping the poor is negatively related to tolerance of adolescent sex and is also not statistically significant (b = -.095; p< .722); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 9% when one holds the belief that the government is responsible for the poor. Helping the sick is statistically significant and negatively related to tolerance of adolescent sex (b = -.839; p< .005); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 57% when one believes that the government is responsible for the sick.

Tolerance of Extramarital Sex

Results of logistic regression on extramarital sex in 2000 are shown below (Table 9). This regression explains approximately 17% of the variance in tolerance toward extramarital sexual behaviors. In this regression, frequent church attendance is inversely related to tolerance (b =-.272; p< .003); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 24% for every increase on the attendance scale. Conservativism is inversely related to tolerance of extramarital sex (b = -.283; p< .065); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 25% for every one increase on the conservativism scale. Population size is positively related to tolerance of extramarital sex (b = .859; p< .089); the likelihood of tolerance increases by 136% when one resides in a community with a population that exceeds 9000 people. Though not statistically significant, thinking for self is positively related to tolerance of extramarital sex (b = .102; p< .813); the likelihood of tolerance increases by approximately 11% when one holds the belief that

thinking for one's self is the most important thing to teach children. Helping the poor is positively related to tolerance of extramarital sex (b = .449; p< .248); the likelihood of tolerance increases by approximately 57% when one holds the belief that the individual is responsible for poverty. Helping the sick is negatively related to tolerance of extramarital sex (b = -.003); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 3% when one holds the belief that the government is responsible for the sick.

Table 9: Logistic Regressions of Extramarital Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 2000

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	.007	.016	.175	1.007
Attend	-.272**	.092	8.656	.762
Education	.045	.087	.260	1.046
Income	.025	.073	.118	1.025
Conservativism	-.283†	.153	3.397	.754
Minority	.662	.485	1.861	1.939
Female	-.444	.453	.958	.642
Population Size	.859†	.505	2.890	2.360
Think for Self	.102	.429	.056	1.107
Help Poor	.449	.388	1.335	1.566
Help Sick	-.003	.357	.000	.997
Constant	-2.838	1.641	2.993	.059
Cox/Snell	.088			
Nagelkerke	.174			
N	259			

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

Logistic Regressions for 2002

Support for the hypothesized relationship between thinking individualism and perceived sexually deviant behaviors (hypothesis 1) was not found in this regression analysis. Support for the hypothesized relationship between responsibility for helping the poor individualism (hypothesis 2) and perceived sexually deviant behaviors was not found in this regression analysis. Support for the hypothesized relationship between responsibility for helping the sick individualism (hypothesis 3) and perceived sexually deviant behaviors was not found in this regression analysis.

Tolerance for Homosexual Sex

Results of logistic regression on homosexual sex in 2002 are shown below (Table 10). This regression explains approximately 48% of the variance in tolerance toward homosexual sexual behaviors. In this regression, frequent church attendance is inversely related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b= -.377; p< .000); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 31% when there is a corresponding increase on the attendance scale by one. Education is positively related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b = .369; p< .000); likelihood of tolerance increases by approximately 45% with each additional year of education. Conservativism is inversely related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b = -.620; p< .002); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 46% for each increase on the conservativism scale. Gender is positively related to tolerance (b = .775; p< .084); the likelihood of tolerance increases by 117% when one is female.

None of the independent variables for this year are statistically significant. Thinking for self is positively related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b = .037; p< .930); the likelihood of tolerance increases by approximately 4% when one holds the belief that teaching children to think for themselves is unimportant. Helping the poor is negatively related to tolerance of

homosexual sex (b = -.210; p< .583); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 19% when one holds the belief that the government is responsible for those in poverty. Helping the sick is negatively related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b = -.043; p< .986); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 4% when one holds the belief that the government is responsible for those that are sick.

Table 10: Logistic Regressions of Homosexual Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 2002

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	-.001	.017	.003	.999
Attend	-.377	.099	14.566	.686
Education	.369	.093	15.674	1.447
Income	.091	.093	.963	1.095
Conservativism	-.620	.201	9.485	.538
Minority	-.077	.615	.016	.926
Female	.775	.448	2.987	2.171
Population Size	-.226	.478	.224	.798
Think for Self	.037	.419	.008	1.037
Help Poor	-.210	.383	.301	.810
Help Sick	-.043	.330	.017	.958
Constant	-2.453	1.778	1.904	.086
Cox/Snell	.354			
Nagelkerke	.481			
N	170			

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

Tolerance for Premarital Sex

Results of logistic regression on premarital sex in 2002 are shown below (Table 11). This regression explains approximately 51% of the variance in tolerance toward premarital sexual behaviors. In this regression frequent church attendance is inversely related to tolerance of premarital sex (b = -.617; p< .000); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 46% for each increase on the attendance scale. Conservativism is inversely related to tolerance of premarital sex (b = -.328; p< .068); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 28% for every increase of one on the conservativism scale. Race is negatively related to tolerance of premarital sex (b = -1.262; p< .032); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 71% when one's race is Black or Other.

No other variables are statistically significant for this year, nevertheless, below is a description of the independent variables thinking for self, helping the poor, and helping the sick. Thinking for self is positively related to tolerance of premarital sex (b = .619; p< .151); the likelihood of tolerance increases by approximately 99% when one holds the belief that teaching children to think for themselves is the most important thing. Helping the poor is negatively related to tolerance of premarital sex (b = -.404; p< .359); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 33% when one holds the belief that the government is responsible for those that live in poverty. Helping the sick is positively related to tolerance of premarital sex (b = .382); the likelihood of tolerance increases by approximately 46% when one holds the belief that individuals are responsible for themselves when they are sick (as opposed to governmental responsibility).

Table 11: Logistic Regressions of Premarital Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 2002

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	-.018	.021	.725	.982
Attend	-.617**	.119	26.795	.539
Education	.141	.097	2.116	1.151
Income	-.073	.080	.812	.930
Conservativism	-.328†	.180	3.328	.720
Minority	-1.262*	.589	4.588	.283
Female	-.523	.550	.903	.593
Population Size	-.895	.575	2.423	.409
Think for Self	.691	.482	2.058	1.996
Help Poor	-.404	.441	.840	.668
Help Sick	.382	.400	.915	1.466
Constant	6.071	2.309	6.914	433.038
Cox/Snell	.351			
Nagelkerke	.512			
N	165			

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

Tolerance of Adolescent Sex

Results of logistic regression on adolescent sex in 2002 are shown below (Table 12). This regression explains approximately 20% of the variance in tolerance toward adolescent sexual behaviors. In this regression, frequent church attendance is inversely related to tolerance of adolescent sex (b = -.214; p< .011); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 19% for every increase of one on the attendance scale. Conservativism is also inversely related to tolerance of

adolescent sex (b = -.327; p< .020); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 28% for every increase of one on the conservativism scale.

Thinking for self is positively related to tolerance of adolescent sex (b = .458; p< .258); the likelihood of tolerance increases by 58% when one holds the belief that thinking for one's self is the most important thing to teach children. Helping the poor is positively related to tolerance of adolescent sex (b = .061; p< .842); the likelihood of tolerance increases by 6% when

Table 12: Logistic Regressions of Adolescent Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 2002

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	-.021	.018	1.362	.979
Attend	-.214*	.084	6.442	.807
Education	.074	.078	.912	1.077
Income	.026	.072	.134	1.027
Conservativism	-.327*	.141	5.394	.721
Minority	.157	.475	.109	1.170
Female	-.513	.396	1.678	.599
Population Size	-.228	.428	.284	.796
Think for Self	.458	.405	1.281	1.581
Help Poor	.061	.307	.040	1.063
Help Sick	.085	.325	.069	1.089
Constant	.746	1.557	.230	2.108
Cox/Snell	.142			
Nagelkerke	.200			
N	162			

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

one holds the belief that helping the poor is the responsibility of the individual. Helping the sick is positively related to tolerance of adolescent sex (b = .085; p< .794); the likelihood of tolerance increases by approximately 9% when one holds the belief that helping the sick is the responsibility of the individual. Thinking for self, helping the poor, and helping the sick, and all other variables are not statistically significant.

Tolerance of Extramarital Sex

Results of logistic regression on extramarital sex in 2002 are shown below (Table 13). This regression explains approximately 17% of the variance in tolerance toward extramarital

Table 13: Logistic Regressions of Extramarital Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 2002

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	.019	.027	.484	1.019
Attend	-.191	.151	1.612	.826
Education	.174	.141	1.511	1.190
Income	-.113	.104	1.170	.894
Conservativism	.247	.285	.748	1.280
Minority	-.534	1.180	.205	.586
Female	.151	.719	.044	1.163
Population Size	1.406	1.123	1.568	4.081
Think for Self	-.079	.754	.011	.924
Help Poor	-.728	.746	.953	.483
Help Sick	-.476	.648	.538	.622
Constant	-4.397	2.636	2.781	.012
Cox/Snell	.060			
Nagelkerke	.167			
N	174			

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

sexual behaviors. In this regression there are no statistically significant variables. However, thinking for self is negatively related to tolerance of extramarital sex (b = -.079; p< .917); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 8% when one holds the belief that thinking for one's self is unimportant to teach children. Helping the poor is negatively related to tolerance of extramarital sex (b = -.728; p< .329); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 52% when one holds the belief that the government is responsible for poor people. Helping the sick is negatively related to tolerance (b = -.476; p< .463); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 38% when one holds the belief that the government is responsible for the sick.

Logistic Regressions for 2004

Support for the hypothesized relationship between thinking individualism and perceived sexually deviant behaviors (hypothesis 1) was not found in this regression analysis. Support for the hypothesized relationship between responsibility for helping the poor individualism (hypothesis 2) and perceived sexually deviant behaviors was not found in this regression analysis. Support for the hypothesized relationship between responsibility for helping the sick individualism (hypothesis 3) and perceived sexually deviant behaviors was not found in this regression analysis.

Tolerance for Homosexual Sex

Results of logistic regression on homosexual sex in 2004 are shown below (Table 14). This regression explains approximately 47% of the variance in tolerance toward homosexual sexual behaviors. In this regression frequent church attendance is inversely related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b= -.371; p< .001); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 31% with each increase of one on the attendance scale. Education is positively related to tolerance of

homosexual sex (b = .278; p< .008); the likelihood of tolerance increases by 32% with each additional year of education. Income is positively related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b = .193; p< .063); the likelihood of tolerance increases by 21% with each increase on the income scale. Conservativism is inversely related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b = -.462; p< .018); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 37% with each increase on the conservativism scale.

Table 14: Logistic Regressions of Homosexual Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 2004

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	.011	.018	.365	1.011
Attend	-.371**	.109	11.538	.690
Education	.278**	.104	7.122	1.320
Income	.193†	.103	3.468	1.212
Conservativism	-.462*	.195	5.604	.630
Minority	.086	.588	.021	1.090
Female	.935†	.520	3.229	2.546
Population Size	.744	.569	1.711	2.105
Think for Self	.592	.472	1.575	1.808
Help Poor	-.386	.457	.712	.680
Help Sick	1.006*	.459	4.809	2.734
Constant	-5.840	2.056	8.064	.003
Cox/Snell	.346			
Nagelkerke	.468			
N	128			

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

Gender is positively related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b = .935; p< .072); the likelihood of tolerance increases by approximately 155% when one is female.

Thinking for self is statistically insignificant, nevertheless, thinking for self is positively related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b = .592; p< .209); the likelihood increases by approximately 81% when one holds the belief that thinking for one's self is the most important thing to teach children. Helping the poor is negatively related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b= -.386; p< .399); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 32% when one holds the belief that the government is responsible for the poor. Helping the poor is also not statistically significant. Helping the sick is positively related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b = 1.006; p< .028); the likelihood of tolerance increases by 173% when one holds the belief that the individual is responsible for themselves when sick (as opposed to the government being responsible).

Tolerance for Premarital Sex

Results of logistic regression on premarital sex in 2004 are shown below (Table 15). This regression explains approximately 24% of the variance in tolerance toward premarital sexual behaviors. In this regression frequent church attendance is inversely related to tolerance of premarital sex (b = -.294; p< .006); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 26% for each increase on the attendance scale. No other variable are statistically significant for this regression. Nevertheless, thinking for self is positively related to tolerance of premarital sex (b = .695; p< .188); the likelihood of tolerance increases by approximately 101% when one holds the belief that thinking for one's self is the most important thing to teach children. Helping the poor is positively related to tolerance of premarital sex (b = .812; p< 145); the likelihood of tolerance increases by 125% when one holds the belief that the individual is responsible for being poor. Helping the sick is negatively related to tolerance for premarital sex (b = -.579; p< .225); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 44% when one holds the belief that the government is responsible for the sick.

Table 15: Logistic Regressions of Premarital Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 2004

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	-.010	.020	.246	.990
Attend	-.294**	.107	7.612	.745
Education	-.119	.090	1.752	.888
Income	-.063	.084	.566	.939
Conservativism	-.234	.210	1.249	.791
Minority	.176	.599	.087	1.193
Female	-.110	.541	.041	.896
Population Size	.130	.549	.056	1.139
Think for Self	.695	.528	1.736	2.005
Help Poor	.812	.557	2.124	2.252
Help Sick	-.579	.477	1.474	.561
Constant	5.583	1.962	8.094	265.900
Cox/Snell	.152			
Nagelkerke	.243			
N	135			

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

Tolerance for Adolescent Sex

Results of logistic regression on adolescent sex in 2004 are shown below (Table 16). This regression explains approximately 18% of the variance in tolerance toward adolescent sexual behaviors. In this regression, conservativism is inversely related to tolerance of adolescent sex (b = -.478; p< .005); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 38% with each increase on the conservativism scale. Thinking for self is positively related to tolerance of

adolescent sex (b = .747; p< .071); the likelihood of tolerance increases by 111% when one holds the belief that thinking for self is the most important thing to teach children.

No other variables are statistically significant in this regression, nevertheless, it is important to highlight the independent variables helping the poor, and helping the sick. Helping the poor is positively related to tolerance of adolescent sex (b = .623; p< .141); the likelihood of tolerance increases by approximately 87% when one holds the belief that the individual is

Table 16: Logistic Regressions of Adolescent Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 2004

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	.001	.016	.004	1.001
Attend	-.051	.081	.398	.950
Education	-.060	.075	.651	.941
Income	.017	.066	.066	1.017
Conservativism	-.478**	.169	8.039	.620
Minority	.561	.526	1.134	1.752
Female	-.165	.421	.153	.848
Population Size	.411	.436	.889	1.508
Think for Self	.747†	.414	3.255	2.110
Help Poor	.623	.424	2.165	1.865
Help Sick	-.104	.374	.078	.901
Constant	.462	1.530	.091	1.587
Cox/Snell	.129			
Nagelkerke	.177			
N	137			

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

responsible for poverty. Helping the sick is negatively related to tolerance of adolescent sex (b = -.104; p< .781); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 10% when one holds the belief that the government is responsible for the sick.

Tolerance of Extramarital Sex

Results of logistic regression on extramarital sex in 2004 are shown below (Table 17). This regression explains approximately 46% of the variance in tolerance toward extramarital sexual behaviors. In this regression frequent church attendance is inversely related to tolerance of extramarital sex (b = -.778; p< .004); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 54% with each increase on the attendance scale. Income is positively related to tolerance of extramarital sex (b = 1.366; p< .037); the likelihood of tolerance increases by 292% for each increase on the income scale.

No other variables in this regression were statistically significant, nevertheless, it is important to highlight the effect of the independent variables thinking for self, helping the poor, and helping the sick. Thinking for self is negatively related to tolerance of extramarital sex (b = -.274; p< .736); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 24% when one holds the belief that teaching children to think for themselves is unimportant. Helping the poor is negatively related to tolerance of extramarital sex (b = -.660; p< .357); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 48% when one holds the belief that the government is responsible for those living in poverty. Helping the sick is negatively related to tolerance of extramarital sex (b = -.659; p< .377); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 48% when one holds the belief that the government is responsible for the sick.

Table 17: Logistic Regressions of Extramarital Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 2004

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	.043	.034	1.605	1.044
Attend	-.778**	.269	8.387	.459
Education	.089	.159	.311	1.093
Income	1.366*	.655	4.343	3.920
Conservativism	.608	.396	2.350	1.836
Minority	1.466	.906	2.616	4.331
Female	.778	.857	.824	2.178
Population Size	.331	.967	.117	1.392
Think for Self	-.274	.813	.114	.760
Help Poor	-.660	.717	.848	.517
Help Sick	-.659	.745	.782	.518
Constant	-20.273	8.517	5.665	.000
Cox/Snell	.222			
Nagelkerke	.464			
N	130			

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

Logistic Regressions for 2006

Support for the hypothesized relationship between thinking individualism and adolescent sexual behaviors (hypothesis 1) was found in this regression analysis, but not for homosexual, premarital, or extramarital sexual behaviors. Support for the hypothesized relationship between responsibility for helping the poor individualism (hypothesis 2) and perceived sexually deviant behaviors was not found in this regression analysis. Support for the hypothesized relationship

between responsibility for helping the sick individualism (hypothesis 3) and perceived sexually deviant behaviors was not found in this regression analysis.

Tolerance of Homosexual Sex

Results of logistic regression on homosexual sex in 2006 are shown below (Table 18). This regression explains approximately 37% of the variance in tolerance toward homosexual sexual behaviors. In this regression frequent church attendance is inversely related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b = -.144; p< .078); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 13% for each increase of one on the attendance scale. Conservativism is also inversely related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b = -.571; p< .001); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 44% for each increase of one on the conservativism scale. Race is negatively related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b = -1.931; p< .000); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 86% when one is Black or Other race. Population size is positively related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b = .931; p< .027); the likelihood of tolerance increases by approximately 154% when one lives in a community that exceeds 9000 in population.

Though not statistically significant, thinking for self, helping the poor, and helping the sick are important variables to discuss. Thinking for self is positively related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b = .227; p< .590); the likelihood of tolerance increases by approximately 26% when one holds the belief that thinking for one's self is the most important thing to teach children. Helping the poor is negatively related to tolerance of homosexual sex (b = -.102; p< .789); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 10% when one holds the belief that the government is responsible for the poor. Helping the sick is also negatively related

Table 18: Logistic Regressions of Homosexual Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 2006

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	-.008	.016	.242	.992
Attend	-.144†	.082	3.096	.866
Education	.056	.079	.512	1.058
Income	-.075	.075	.981	.928
Conservativism	-.571**	.169	11.395	.565
Minority	-1.931**	.501	14.866	.145
Female	.391	.444	.776	1.479
Population Size	.931*	.421	4.882	2.537
Think for Self	.227	.422	.290	1.255
Help Poor	-.102	.382	.071	.903
Help Sick	-.303	.374	.657	.738
Constant	3.262	1.728	3.562	26.094
Cox/Snell	.278			
Nagelkerke	.372			
N	146			

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

to tolerance of homosexual sex (b = -.303; p< .418); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 26% when one holds the belief that the government is responsible for caring for the sick.

Tolerance of Premarital Sex

Results of logistic regression on premarital sex in 2006 are shown below (Table 19). This regression explains approximately 44% of the variance in tolerance toward premarital sexual behaviors. In this regression frequent church attendance is inversely related to tolerance

of premarital sex (b = -.709; p< .000); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 51% for each increase of one on the attendance scale.

Table 19: Logistic Regressions of Premarital Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 2006

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	.014	.023	.403	1.015
Attend	-.709**	.141	25.099	.492
Education	.085	.070	1.478	1.089
Income	.048	.101	.225	1.049
Conservativism	.061	.215	.080	1.063
Minority	.795	.587	1.833	2.215
Female	-.039	.531	.005	.962
Population Size	-.205	.603	.116	.814
Think for Self	-.423	.582	.528	.655
Help Poor	.021	.480	.002	1.021
Help Sick	-.244	.471	.268	.784
Constant	2.500	1.800	1.930	12.180
Cox/Snell	.287			
Nagelkerke	.438			
N	152			

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

No other variables were statistically significant in this regression. However, it is important to discuss the independent variables thinking for self, helping the poor, and helping the sick. Thinking for one's self is negatively related to tolerance of premarital sex (b = -.423; p< .467); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 35% when one holds the belief that teaching children to think for themselves is unimportant. Helping the poor is positively related

to tolerance of premarital sex (b = .021; p< .965); the likelihood of tolerance increases by 2% when one holds the belief that the individual is responsible for their poverty. Helping the sick is negatively related to tolerance (b = -.244; p< .605); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 22% when one holds the belief that the government is responsible for the sick.

Tolerance of Adolescent Sex

Results of logistic regression on adolescent sex in 2006 are shown below (Table 20). This regression explains approximately 8% of the variance in tolerance toward adolescent sexual

Table 20: Logistic Regressions of Adolescent Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 2006

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	-.006	.017	.138	.994
Attend	-.157*	.072	4.746	.855
Education	.024	.060	.164	.976
Income	.068	.071	.924	1.071
Conservativism	-.145	.164	.776	.865
Minority	.033	.428	.006	1.033
Female	.013	.391	.001	1.013
Population Size	-.233	.412	.320	.792
Think for Self	-.108	.398	.074	.897
Help Poor	.084	.363	.053	1.087
Help Sick	-.266	.353	.567	.767
Constant	.606	1.519	.159	1.833
Cox/Snell	.057			
Nagelkerke	.080			
N	153			

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

behaviors. In this regression frequent church attendance is inversely related to tolerance of adolescent sex (b = -.157; p< .029); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 14% for each increase of one on the attendance scale.

No other variables were statistically significant in this regression. However, it is important to discuss the independent variables thinking for self, helping the poor, and helping the sick. Thinking for one's self is negatively related to tolerance of adolescent sex (b = -.108; p< .786); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 21% when one holds the belief that teaching children to think for themselves is unimportant. Helping the poor is positively related to tolerance of adolescent sex (b = .084; p< .818); the likelihood of tolerance increases by approximately 9% when one holds the belief that the individual is responsible for their poverty. Helping the sick is negatively related to tolerance of adolescent sex (b = -.266; p< .452); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 55% when one holds the belief that the government is responsible for the sick.

Tolerance of Extramarital Sex

Results of logistic regression on extramarital sex in 2006 are shown below (Table 21). This regression explains approximately 21% of the variance in tolerance toward extramarital sexual behaviors. In this regression conservativism is inversely related to tolerance of extramarital sex (b = -.667; p< .013); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 49% for each increase of one on the conservativism scale.

No other variables were statistically significant in this regression. Thinking for one's self is negatively related to tolerance of extramarital sex (b = -.552; p< .411); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by 42% when one holds the belief that teaching children to think for themselves is unimportant. Helping the poor is positively related to tolerance of extramarital sex

(b = .583; p< .311); the likelihood of tolerance increases by approximately 79% when one holds the belief that the individual is responsible for their poverty. Helping the sick is negatively related to tolerance of extramarital sex (b = -.583; p< .314); the likelihood of tolerance decreases by approximately 44% when one holds the belief that the government is responsible for the sick.

Table 21: Logistic Regressions of Extramarital Sexual Behaviors on Independent Variables, 2006

	B	S.E.	Wald	Exp(B)
Age	-.016	.029	.308	.984
Attend	-.102	.140	.537	.903
Education	-.074	.104	.510	.929
Income	-.098	.096	1.032	.907
Conservativism	-.667*	.268	6.176	.513
Minority	-.564	.782	.520	.569
Female	.755	.750	1.013	2.127
Population Size	-.316	.664	.227	.729
Think for Self	-.552	.671	.677	.576
Help Poor	.583	.576	1.025	1.791
Help Sick	-.583	.579	1.013	.558
Constant	2.792	2.547	1.202	16.319
Cox/Snell	.093			
Nagelkerke	.209			
N	152			

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

Summary of Results

The following tables (see Tables 22, 23, and 24) provide a visual summary of the analysis. Each table provides the odds of tolerance toward the four perceived deviant sexual behaviors under investigation. For each year, and for every sexual behavior, the independent

variables are displayed. Statistical significance is displayed, in the customary fashion, for the independent variables that represent facets of individualism, where applicable. All other variables are displayed only if the results were statistically significant. Discussion and conclusions regarding these data are contained in the next chapter.

Table 22: Odds of Tolerance 1998-2000

	1998				2000			
	Homo	Premar	Adol	Extra	Homo	Premar	Adol	Extra
Think	81†	156%**	5%	-22%	85%†	-31%	-19%	10%
Sick	-25%	-20%	-22%	25%	-3%	27%	-56%**	-3%
Poor	46%	36%	21%	-36%	-6%	-33%	-27%	56%
Attend	-22%**	-33%**	-29%**		-28%**	-43%**	-31%**	-23%**
Age	-4%**	-2%†	-4%		-2%*		-4%**	
Race	-60%*							
Conservat.	-24%*	-34%**	-28**		-36%**	-31%**	-22%*	-24%†
Sex								
Size	141%*		111%*					136%†
Education	13%*		17%*		27%**	16%†		
Income				25%				

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

Table 23: Odds of Tolerance 2002-2004

	2002				2004			
	Homo	Premar	Adol	Extra	Homo	Premar	Adol	Extra
Think	3%	99%	58%	-7%	80%	100%	111%†	-24%
Sick	-4%	46%	8%	-37%	173%*	-43%	-9%	-48%
Poor	-19%	-33%	6%	-51%	-32%	125%	86%	-48%
Attend	-31%**	-46%**	-19%*		-31%**	-25%**		-54%**
Age								
Race		-71%*						333%
Conservat.	-46%**	-28%†	-27%*		-37%*		-38%**	
Sex	117%†				154%†			
Size								
Education	44%**				32%**			
Income					21%†			292%*

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

Table 24: Odds of Tolerance 2006

	2006			
	Homo	Premar	Adol	Extra
Think	25%	-34%	-21%	-42%
Sick	-26%	-21%	-54%	-41%
Poor	9%	2%	8%	79%
Attend	-13%†	-50%**	-14%*	
Age				
Race	-85%**			
Conservat.	-43%**			-48%*
Sex				
Size	153%*			
Education				
Income				

* <= .05, ** <=.01, †<.10

Chapter Five

Discussion

Qualitative Assessment

A goal of this research was to contribute to the literature on tolerance of sexual behaviors, specifically adolescent sex, premarital sex, homosexual sex, and extramarital sex. Based on the modernization theoretical perspectives of Hawdon (2005) and, to a lesser degree, Inglehart (1990; 2000), Inglehart and Baker (2001), Norris and Inglehart (2003), and Inglehart and Norris (2006), I examined whether individualism was related to tolerance of these sexual behaviors that some perceive as deviant. With few exceptions the hypotheses derived from the theory and sensitizing concepts used by those who conduct research in the area of individualism were not supported. The purpose of this chapter is to briefly review the results and pose some reasons why the expected relationships were not found. Arguably, it is more difficult to interpret findings when the relationships among key variables are not found than it is when one's hypotheses are supported. Nevertheless, lack of expected relationships is still useful in that they can suggest that theoretical reformation, changing of methodological procedures or both may be needed. I address these issues at the end of this chapter.

Individualism was conceptualized in three ways, thinking individualism, responsibility for helping the poor individualism, and responsibility for helping the sick individualism. Each type of individualism was theorized as representing a facet of individualism, which is thought to be multivalent and a self-expressive value (Fischer 2008; Inglehart 2001). The primary research question that guided this research was: Is individualism related to attitudes toward adolescent sex, premarital sex, extramarital sex, and homosexual behavior? I hypothesized a positive relationship between individualism and a tolerance for these four forms of sexual behavior.

Twenty binomial logistic regressions were conducted to ascertain the relationship among the variables. The analyses performed in this study did not support the argument that valuing individualism increases tolerance of these forms of sexual behavior. With only five exceptions, the hypotheses were rejected. Nonetheless, claims that individualism is unrelated to tolerance of the sexual practices under investigation may be overstated.

Thinking Individualism

Theoretically, thinking individualism was posited to be positively related to the tolerance of four types of sexual behavior. The bivariate correlations between thinking for one's self and the tolerance variables were some of the strongest and statistically significant for all years for homosexual, premarital, and adolescent sexual behaviors. However, thinking for one's self proved to have mixed results in the binomial logistic regressions for all the years under investigation. This measure was only statistically significant and related to tolerance in three instances, each time for a different sexual behavior (homosexual sex in 1998, premarital sex in 1998, and adolescent sex in 2004). In each instance, the relationship was positive. The differences between the correlations and logistic regressions suggest that the correlations may have been spurious. A possible variable that could be related to both is the frequency of church attendance which is discussed further below.

Interestingly, the relationship between individualism, tolerance, and extramarital sex was always negative except for the year 2000. It is not surprising that extramarital sex might have different patterns of relationships compared to the other variables. Of all the behaviors, extramarital sex was viewed most negatively in all years. This makes sense when one takes into account the notion that marriage is the approved venue for sexual expression in the dominant culture of the United States (Christopher and Sprecher 2000). Extramarital sex is antithetical to

marriage and disapproval is nearly universal; the impact of extramarital involvement is often the cited reason for marital dissolution (Christopher and Sprecher 2000; Liu 2000; Thornton and Young-DeMarco 2001). Further, discussions of individualism frequently include voluntary membership groups and suggest that individualism does not negate conformity to and taking care of the groups that one has voluntarily joined (Fischer 2008). Thus, approval of behaviors in which no one is potentially harmed is consistent with an expressive individualism view, but disapproval of harm to the dyad, as is often caused by extramarital sex (Liu 2000), would be expected when a marriage is viewed as a voluntary group. Fisher sums up this argument when he writes, individuals "are morally free to leave but not morally free to trespass the implicit contract. One can chose to divorce, but not to cheat; to change congregations, but not to be indifferent; to quit a job, but not to be insubordinate; to leave the nation, but not to betray it" (Fischer 2008:370).

Responsibility for Helping Sick and Helping Poor

Responsibility for helping the sick was statistically significant and negatively related to tolerance only twice (adolescent sex in 2000, and homosexual sex in 2006). There were no instances in which helping the poor was statistically significant and the relationship to tolerance was as much negative as it was positive throughout the five years of this research, but the relationship was so weak that the direction holds no substantive meaning. Although responsibility (not including for members of one's voluntary association) was a dimension of individualism as articulated by Shulruf et al., (2007), the theoretical link between this form of individualism and tolerance was not found. As discussed below, this might have more to do with the operationalization of the variable than the conceptualization or theoretical arguments.

Frequent Church Attendance

By far the most robust measure in this analysis was the relationship between frequency of church attendance and tolerance. Frequent church attendance was strongly related to decreases in tolerance of all sex types, in all years. Frequency of church attendance was most strongly related to tolerance toward premarital sex. Interestingly, frequency of church attendance had a greater negative effect in 2006 than in 1998. Also of interest are the attitudes toward adolescent sex and church attendance that waned by the end of the study period. The relationship between attitudes toward extramarital sex and church attendance was only statistically significant in 2000 and 2004. The relationship between homosexual sex and church attendance was relatively stable throughout most of the study period, but dropped rather precipitously in the final year under investigation.

Theoretically, the lack of tolerance with regard to church attendance is not unexpected. Though church attendance is not the best measure of religiosity, it does stand in as a proxy measure of religiosity in this research. This is particularly the case if we refer to Fischer (2007), who noted that Americans voluntarily submit to the constraints of group membership, and religious organizations have been consistently found to be disapproving of many types of behaviors that are considered deviant and provide protective factors against participation in deviance (see, for example, Rothwell and Hawdon 2008; Weinberg, Lottes, and Shaver 2000; Reiss 1980). Hawdon (2005) argued that with the increases in modernization and rationalization, increases in secularism would occur. In this research, frequency of church attendance was used as the measure of secularism as it was assumed that low attendance would suggest a more secular worldview than that what was held by those who attend church more often. Thus, the importance

of frequency of church attendance for predicting tolerance is consistent with Hawdon's (2005) theory.

Methodological Limitations

Although the logistic regressions provided considerable evidence that the individualism variables were not related in the ways predicted, the regressions offer little information about why they are not related. In a search for an explanation about the lack of support for the theory, methodological concerns have to be considered. It is a familiar lament that secondary data do not contain the variables that one would include if one were designing the survey. Even the face validity of the individualism variables was somewhat questionable, but even this claim is weak because of the lack of a concise conceptual definition of individualism. Further, it would have been helpful to have variables that would have allowed me to replicate earlier research. For example, Shulruf et al. (2007) used the variable "I prefer to be self-reliant [rather] than dependent on others."

The selection of the three individualism variables would fall under the rubric of using what was available and not so much having the ideal questions. The GSS or other data sets I explored did not have variables that were better suited to the research questions. Other measures, such as "freedom is being *left alone* to do what I want," and "freedom is having the power to *choose* and do what I want in life" (see GSS codebook for a complete description in Davis et al. 2007) perhaps would have been better operational definitions of individualism. However, these measures were only present for 1 to 2 years during the period under investigation and, thus, would have not been appropriate for use. The variable that asked if teaching a child to think for one's self is the most important thing was potentially a weak indicator. This question might have been tapping into people's views on children becoming individuals who are independent of their

parents (a developmental process); if so, then the question might not be measuring the dimension of uniqueness that was part of how individualism has been used by some other researchers (Shulruf et al., 2007). For example, two items used in the unique dimension of individualism used by Shulruf et al. (2007) were "I enjoy being unique and different from others," and, "I consider myself as a unique person separate from others." Rothwell and Hawdon (2008; 259) assert that those adhering to individualism should believe that one should "stand out" from the crowd and "glorify non-conformity. Thinking that one's child should learn to think for himself or herself may not be the best operational definition, in spite of the fact that this was used by Rothwell and Hawdon (2008).

The questions about being responsible for helping the sick and the poor were thought to measure the dimension of individualism that included prioritizing one's self over others that are included in my conceptualization, but these might have been measures of social conservatism and not individualism. Additionally, the variables asking if the behaviors were wrong only included three choices. A larger number of response categories might have led to a greater distribution of responses, which potentially could have changed the results.

One last methodological note concerns the sample size. In this research, it was necessary to work with different sample sizes based on the years being analyzed. Frequencies and descriptive statistics were performed with the whole sample. Pairwise deletion for the correlations and listwise deletion for the logistic regressions resulted in different sample sizes for each year and each statistical test. Listwise deletion in the logistic regressions reduced sample population considerably. A larger sample size would have, perhaps, resulted in different findings. Critiquing one's methodology as a justification for the lack of support for one's theory is often an easier claim to make than questioning one's theoretical argument, thus it can be

viewed as a copout. Still, potential weaknesses in the data and methodological choices have to be considered.

Finally, as mentioned previously, the analysis did not support the theoretical perspective utilized in this research. Although it is certainly possible that the theoretical perspective is untenable, I do not think that is a determination that can be made at this juncture. I combined the theoretical perspectives of Hawdon (1996; 2005) and Inglehart (1990; 2000), and to a lesser degree, Inglehart and Baker (2001), Norris and Inglehart (2003), and Inglehart and Norris (2006). Individualism is only a small element of these larger and macro-level theories. This is particularly the case with Hawdon (1996; 2005), where secularism and social mobility are central to his theoretical argument. Significant questions remain as to the nature of individualism, and thus its relationship to tolerance of perceived deviant behavior must be addressed in greater depth before determining the utility of the larger theoretical perspectives.

Individualism

A question that is generated from this research is whether individualism should continue to garner attention by those who want to understand attitudes toward behaviors and engaging in acts that are classified by some as deviant. In spite of the results obtained here, I am not yet ready to discard it as an important concept. From early theorists such as de Tocqueville to recent empirical studies (Farias and Lalljee 2008), individualism has been of interest to sociologists and others. Macro-level studies that classify countries based on individualism have been done by Hawdon (2005), Inglehart and Baker (2001), and Norris and Inglehart (2006). Inglehart and Baker (2001), who have classified the United States as individualistic, have stated that the U.S. was a deviant case in that it is actually less individualistic than other countries. At the micro-level there is a large body of research that has examined the relationship between individualism

and a host of other variables. Additionally, considerable attention has been given to conceptualizing individualism. It is this latter body of scholarship that I suggest needs to be further developed before discarding individualism as not relevant to the study of sexual behavior and deviance.

As noted throughout, it is problematic that there are so many different ways of defining individualism, and it does not seem like a consensus is growing as to what it is. Is individualism valuing responsibility for one's self (Shulruf et al. 2007); limited government (Oyserman et al. 2002); freedom to make one's own choices (Waterman 1984 as cited in Oyserman et al. 2002); self-expressive (Inglehart and Baker 2001); rampant (Hawdon 2005:327); rights over duties (Hofstede 1980 as cited in Oyserman et al. 2002); personal autonomy (Swidler 2001; 1986) or uniqueness (Shulruf et al. 2007)? Does it have seven domains (Oyserman et al. 2002) or three (Shulruf et al. 2007)? Is individualism the opposite of collectivism (Forbes et al. 2009) or authoritarianism (Gelfand et al. 1996)? If theoretical arguments continue to be made about the role of individualism as a factor that affects deviant or sexual behaviors, an essential starting place would be clearer conceptualization of it. A suggestion for future research is to conduct a series of qualitative interviews that ask how the interviewees define individualism and if they perceive that individualism is related to their level of tolerance.

Sexual Behavior

A goal of this research was to explore factors related to tolerance of four sexual behaviors. The research was motivated, in part, as a means of contributing to the literature on sexual behavior and deviance. It is well established that attitudes toward a behavior are related to participating in the behavior. Thus, this research has the potential to expand this line of research.

The longitudinal nature of this research gave insight to the levels of tolerance over the years studied. As noted elsewhere, the level of tolerance for each type of behavior did not increase linearly over the 9 years. The year 2006 was the most tolerant year only for premarital sex. A particularly interesting finding was that tolerance for homosexual sex had the largest difference between years, with a low of 36% in 1998, a high of 40% in 2002. In 2006, 39% said that homosexual sex was sometimes or never wrong. This pattern of changes during this time period is particularly intriguing as homosexual sex was at the forefront of the cultural wars. Consider, for example, the rhetorical campaign of two consecutive terms of George Bush particularly as it regarded civil and marriage rights for homosexuals and his abstinence only campaigns. Based on the data presented here, it would be incorrect to conclude that people in the United States are becoming increasingly liberal or conservative in their tolerance for these four types of sexual behavior.

Tolerance or more specifically, a lack thereof, is a way of establishing and reinforcing moral boundaries, which, in turn, have implications for behavior. Examining factors that affect tolerance, as was done here, may ultimately provide insight to why individuals engage in behavior that have historically met with social disapproval.

References Cited

Alan Guttmacher Institute. 2006. "U.S. Teenage Pregnancy Statistics National and State Trends and Trends by Race and Ethnicity", *AGI Reports*. Retrieved August 29, 2008 from http://www.guttmacher.org/sections/adolescents.php.

Allen, Elizabeth S. and Donald H. Baucom. 2004. "Adult Attachment and Patterns of Extradyadic Involvement." *Family Process* 43(4):467-488.

Altemeyer, Bob. 1981. *Right Wing Authoritarianism*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Atkins, David, Donald Baucom, and Neil Jacobson. 2001. "Understanding Infidelity: Correlates in a National Random Sample." *Journal of Family Psychology* 15:735-749.

Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton. 1985. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. New York, NY: Perennial Library (Harper & Row Publishers).

Bernstein, Mary. 1997. "Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement." *American Journal of Sociology* 103(3):531-565.

Blumstein, Philip, and Pepper Schwartz. 1983. *American couples: Money, Work, Sex.*New York: William Morrow.

Blow, Adrian J. and Kelley Hartnett. 2005. "Infidelity in Committed Relationships II: A Substantive Review." *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy* 31(2):183-216.

Brown, E. M. 2001. *Patterns of Infidelity and their Treatment,* 2nd edition. Philadelphia, PA: Brunner-Routledge.

Butler, Amy C. 2005. "Gender Differences in the Prevalence of Same-Sex Sexual Partnering: 1988-2002." *Social Forces* 84(1):421-449.

-----2000. “Trends in Same-Gender Sexual Partnering: 1988-1998.” *Journal of Sex Research* 37(4):333-343.

Christopher, F. Scott and Susan Sprecher. 2000. “Sexuality in Marriage, Dating and Other Relationships: A Decade Review.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62(4):999-1017.

Connell, R. W. 1992. “A Very Straight Gay: Masculinity, Homosexual Experience, and the Dynamics of Gender.” *American Sociological Review* 57(6):735-751.

Cherlin, Andrew. 2004. “The Deinstitutionalization of American Marriage.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66(4):848-861.

Davis, James A. Tom W. Smith, and Peter V. Marsden. 2007. “General Social Survey, 1972-2006 [Cumulative File] Codebook.” *Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

de Tocqueville, Alexis. 1945. *Democracy in America*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Durkheim, Emile. [1887] 1933. *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York, NY: MacMillan.

Ellis, Sonja J., Celia Kitzinger, and Sue Wilkinson. 2002. “Attitudes Towards Lesbians and Gay Men and Support for Lesbian and Gay Human Rights Among Psychology Students.” *Journal of Homosexuality* 44(1):121-138.

Farias, Miguel and Mansur Lalljee. 2008. “Holistic Individualism in the Age of Aquarius: Measuring Individualism/Collectivism in New Age, Catholic and Atheist/Agnostic Groups.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 47(2):277-289.

Finer, Lawrence B. 2007. “Trends in Premarital Sex in the United States, 1954-2003.” *Public Health Reports* 122:73-78.

Fischer, Claude S. 2008. “Paradoxes of American Individualism.” *Sociological Forum* 23(2):363-372.

Forbes, Gordon, Xiaoying Zhang, Krystyna Doroszewicz, and Kelly Haas. 2009. “Relationships Between Individualism–Collectivism, Gender, and Direct or Indirect Aggression: A Study in China, Poland, and the US.” *Aggressive Behavior* 35:24–30.

Forste, Renata and Koray Tanfer. 1996. “Sexual Exclusivity Among Dating, Cohabitating, Married Women.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 58(1):33-47.

Gelfand, Michele J., Harry C. Triandis, and Darius K-S. Chan. 1996. “Individualism Versus Collectivism or Versus Authoritarianism?” *European Journal of Social Psychology* 26:397-410.

Habermas, Jurgen. 1970. *Toward as Rational Society: Student Protest, Science and Politics*. Boston, MA: Beacon.

------. 1979. *Communication and the Evolution of Society*. Boston, MA: Beacon.

Harding, David J. and Christopher Jencks. 2003. “Changing Attitudes Toward Premarital Sex: Cohort, Period, and Aging Effects.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 67:211-226.

Hawdon, James E. 1996. “Cycles of Deviance: Structural Change, Moral Boundaries, and Drug Use, 1880-1990.” *Sociological Spectrum* 16:183-207.

-----2005. *Drug and Alcohol Consumption as Functions of Social Structures: A Cross Cultural Sociology*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellon Press.

Herek, Gregory M. 2002. “Heterosexuals’ Attitudes Toward Bisexual Men and Women in the United States.” *The Journal of Sex Research* 39(4):264-274.

-----2000a. “Sexual Prejudice and Gender: Do Heterosexuals’ Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men Differ?” *Journal of Social Issues* 56(2):251-266.

-----2000b. “Internalized Homophobia Among Gay Men, Lesbians, and Bisexuals” pp. 281-283 in *Readings for Diversity and Social Justice*, edited by Adams, M., W. Bloomingfeld, R. Castaneda, H. Hackman, M. Peters, and X. Zuniga. New York, NY: Routledge.

Herek, Gregory and John Capitanio. 1995. “Black Heterosexuals’ Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men in the United States.” *The Journal of Sex Research* 32(2):95-105.

Hofstede, Geert. 1980. *Culture’s Consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

hooks, bell. 2000. “Homophobia in Black Communities” pp. 283-287 in *Readings for Diversity and Social Justice*, edited by Adams, M., W. Bloomingfeld, R. Castaneda, H. Hackman, M. Peters, and X. Zuniga. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hui, C. Harry, 1988. “Measurement of Individualism-Collectivism. *Journal of Research in Personality* 22(1):17-36

Humphreys, Laud. 1975. *Tearoom Trade: Impersonal Sex in Public Places*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Inglehart, Ronald. 2000. “Globalization and Postmodern Values.” *The Washington Quarterly* 23(1):215-228.

-----1990. *Cultural Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, Ronald and Pippa Norris. 2003. “The True Clash of Civilizations.” *Foreign Policy* March-April.

Inglehart, Ronald and Wayne E. Baker. 2001. “Modernization’s Challenge to Traditional Values: Who’s Afraid of Ronald McDonald?” *The Futurist* March-April.

Johnson, Anne M., Catherine H. Mercer, Bob Erens, Andrew J. Copas, Sally McManus, Kaye Wellings, Kevin A. Fenton, Christos Korovessis, Wendy Macdowall, Kiran Nanchahal,

Susan Purdon, and Julia Field. 2001a. "Sexual Behavior in Britain: Partnerships, Practices and HIV Risk Behaviors." *The Lancet* 358:1835-1843.

Johnson, Anne, Andrew Copas, Bob Erens, Sundhiya Mandalia, Kevin Fenton, Christos Korovessis, Kay Wellings, and Julia Field. 2001b. "Effects of Computer-Assisted Self-Interviews on Reporting of Sexual HIV Risk Behaviors in a General Population Sample: A Methodological Experiment." *AIDS* 15:111-115.

Kaiser (Henry J.) Family Foundation. 2005. "US Teen Sexual Activity." Retrieved August 29, 2008 from http://www.kff.org/youthhivstds/upload/U-S-Teen-Sexual-Activity-Fact-Sheet.pdf .

Kimmel, Michael. 2000. "Masculinity as Homophobia: Fear, Shame, and Silence in the Construction of Gender Identity" pp. 213-219 in *Readings for Diversity and Social Justice*, edited by Adams, M., W. Bloomingfeld, R. Castaneda, H. Hackman, M. Peters, and X. Zuniga. New York, NY: Routledge.

-----. 2005. *Manhood in America: A Cultural History.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Kinsey, Alfred. 1953. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female.* Philadelphia, PA: Saunders.

Kinsey, Alfred, Wardell Pomeroy, and Clyde Martin. 1948. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Kite, Mary E. and Bernard E. Whitley, Jr. 1996. "Sex Differences in Attitudes Toward Homosexual Persons, Behaviors, and Civil Rights: A Meta-Analysis." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 22(4):336-353.

Klein, David A. and William P. Adelman. 2008. "Adolescent Pregnancy in the U.S. Military: What We Know and What We Need to Know." *Military Medicine* 173(7):658-665.

Klein, John D., and the Committee on Adolescence. 2005. "Adolescent Pregnancy: Current Trends and Issues." *Pediatrics* 116(1):281-286.

Laumann, E., J. Gagnon, R. Michael, and S. Michael. 1994. *The Social Organization of Sexuality*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1996. *American Exceptionalism: A Double-Edged Sword*. New York, NY: Norton.

Liu, Chien. 2000. "A Theory of Marital Sexual Life." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62(2):363-374.

Loftus, Jeni. 2001. "America's Liberalization in Attitudes Toward Homosexuality, 1973-1998." *American Sociological Review* 66(5):762-782.

McClay, Wilfred M. 2007. "Secularism, American-Style." *Culture and Society* 44:160-163.

Messner, Steven F. 1982. "Societal Development, Social Equality, and Homicide: A Cross-National Test of a Durkheimian Model." *Social Forces* 61(1):225-240.

Moore, Melanie. 2001. "Alfred Kinsey." Pp. 7-10 in *Encyclopedia of Criminology and Deviant Behavior* Vol. III Sexual Deviance, edited by Clifton Bryant. Philadelphia, PA: Brunner-Routledge.

Mosher, William, Anjani Chandra, and Jo Jones. 2005. "Sexual Behavior and Selected Health Measures: Men and Women 15-44 Years of Age, United States, 2002." *Advance Data from Vital and Health Statistics* 362:1-56.

Nelson, Thomas E. and Donald R. Kinder. 1996. "Issue Frames and Group-Centrism in American Public Opinion." *The Journal of Politics* 58:1055-1078.

Norris, Pippa and Ronald Inglehart. 2006. "God, Guns, and Gays: Supply and Demand of Religion in the U.S. and Western Europe. *Public Policy Research* Dec. 2005-Feb.

2006.

Oyserman, Daphna. Heather M. Coon, and Markus Kemmelmeier. 2002. "Rethinking Individualism and Collectivism: Evaluation of Theoretical Assumptions and Meta-Analyses." *Psychological Bulletin* 128(1):3-72.

Reiss, Ira L. 1980. "Sexual Customs and Gender Roles in Sweden and America: An Analysis and Interpretation." Pp. 191-220 in *Research on the Interweave of Social Roles: Women and Men*, edited by H. Lopata. Greenwich, CT: JIA Press.

Rothwell, Virginia and James E. Hawdon. 2008. "Science, Individualism, and Attitudes Towards Deviance: The Influence of Modernization and Rationalization." *Deviant Behavior* 29(4):253-274.

Risman, Barbara and Pepper Schwartz. 2007. "After the Sexual Revolution: Gender Politics in Teen Dating." Pp. 313-318 in *Feminist Frontiers*, edited by Verta Taylor, Nancy Whittier, and Leila Rupp. Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.

Santore, Daniel. 2008. "Romantic Relationships, Individualism and the Possibility of Togetherness: Seeing Durkheim in Theories of Contemporary Intimacy." *Sociology* 42(6):1200-1217.

Schalet, Amy T. 2000. "Raging Hormones, Regulated Love: Adolescent Sexuality and the Constitution of the Modern Individual in the United States and the Netherlands." *Body and Society* 6(1):75-105.

Scott, Jacqueline. 1998. "Changing Attitudes to Sexual Morality: A Cross-National Comparison." *Sociology* 32(4):815-845.

Schwartz, Norbert and Daphna Oyserman. 2001. "Asking Questions about Behavior: Cognition, Communication, and Questionnaire Construction." *American Journal*

of Evaluation. 22(2):127-160.

Shulruf, Boaz, John Hattie, and Robyn Dixon. 2007. "Development of a New Measurement Tool for Individualism and Collectivism." *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment* 25(4):385-401.

Smith, Tom W. 1990. "Liberal and Conservative Trends in the United States Since World War II." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 54(4):479-507.

Singelis, Theodore M. 1994. "The Measurement of Independent and Interdependent Self-Construals." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 20(5):580-591.

Solstad, Kim and Davor Mucic. 1999. "Extramarital Sexual Relationships of Middle-aged Dutch Men: Attitudes and Behavior." *Maturitas* 32:51-59.

Swidler, Ann. 1986. "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies." *American Sociological Review* 51:273-286.

-----2001. *Talk of Love: How Culture Matters*. Chicago, Il: University of Chicago Press.

Teitler, Julien O. 2002. "Trends in Youth Sexual Initiation and Fertility in Developed Countries: 1960-1995." *The Annals of the American Academy* 580:134-152.

Thompson, Anthony P. 1983. "Extramarital Sex: A Review of the Research Literature." *The Journal of Sex Research* 19(1):1-22.

Thornton, Arland, and Linda Young-DeMarco. 2001. "Four Decades of Trends in Attitudes Toward Family Issues in the United States: The 1960s Through the 1990s." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 63(4):1009-1037.

Treas, Judith. 2002. "How Cohorts, Education, and Ideology Shaped a New Sexual Revolution on American Attitudes Toward Nonmarital Sex, 1972-1998." *Sociological Perspectives* 45(3):267-283.

Treas, Judith and Deirdre Giesen. 2000. "Sexual Fidelity Among Married and Cohabitating Americans." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62(1):48-60.

Triandis, Harry C. and Michele J. Gelfand. 1998. "Converging Measurements of Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74(1):118-128.

Waterman, Alan S. 1984. *The Psychology of Individualism*. New York, NY: Praeger.

Weber, Max. 1930. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Weeks, Jeffrey, Janet Holland, and Matthew Waites. 2003. *Sexualities and Society: A Reader.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Weinberg, Martin S., Isa Lottes, and Frances M. Shaver. 2000. "Sociocultural Correlates of Permissive Sexual Attitudes: A Test of Reiss's Hypothesis About Sweden and the United States." *The Journal of Sex Research* 37(1):44-52.

Welzel, Christian, Ronald Inglehart, and Hans-Deiter Klingemann. 2003. "The Theory of Human Development: A Cross-Cultural Analysis." *European Journal of Political Research* 42:341-379.

Widmer, Eric D., Judith Treas, and Robert Newcomb. 1998. "Attitudes Toward Nonmarital Sex in 24 Countries." *The Journal of Sex Research* 35(4):349-358.

Wiederman, Michael W. 1997. "Extramarital Sex: Prevalence and Correlates in a National Survey." *The Journal of Sex Research* 34(2):167-174.

Worth, Heather, Alison Reid, and Karen McMillan. 2002. "Somewhere Over the Rainbow: Love, Trust, and Monogamy in Gay Relationships." *Journal of Sociology* Volume 38(3): 237–253.

Appendix A

1998 Frequencies—All Variables

1998 Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18.00	6	.2	.2	.2
	19.00	36	1.3	1.3	1.5
	20.00	36	1.3	1.3	2.8
	21.00	48	1.7	1.7	4.5
	22.00	37	1.3	1.3	5.8
	23.00	42	1.5	1.5	7.2
	24.00	37	1.3	1.3	8.6
	25.00	50	1.8	1.8	10.3
	26.00	61	2.2	2.2	12.5
	27.00	50	1.8	1.8	14.3
	28.00	77	2.7	2.7	17.0
	29.00	57	2.0	2.0	19.0
	30.00	53	1.9	1.9	20.9
	31.00	56	2.0	2.0	22.8
	32.00	66	2.3	2.3	25.2
	33.00	74	2.6	2.6	27.8
	34.00	83	2.9	2.9	30.7
	35.00	79	2.8	2.8	33.5
	36.00	71	2.5	2.5	36.0
	37.00	71	2.5	2.5	38.5
	38.00	63	2.2	2.2	40.8
	39.00	71	2.5	2.5	43.3
	40.00	70	2.5	2.5	45.8
	41.00	63	2.2	2.2	48.0
	42.00	63	2.2	2.2	50.2
	43.00	61	2.2	2.2	52.4
	44.00	67	2.4	2.4	54.7
	45.00	54	1.9	1.9	56.6
	46.00	52	1.8	1.8	58.5
	47.00	49	1.7	1.7	60.2
	48.00	51	1.8	1.8	62.0
	49.00	50	1.8	1.8	63.8
	50.00	42	1.5	1.5	65.3
	51.00	72	2.5	2.5	67.8
	52.00	40	1.4	1.4	69.2
	53.00	34	1.2	1.2	70.4
	54.00	37	1.3	1.3	71.7
	55.00	45	1.6	1.6	73.3
	56.00	42	1.5	1.5	74.8
	57.00	33	1.2	1.2	76.0
	58.00	34	1.2	1.2	77.2
	59.00	26	.9	.9	78.1

	60.00	31	1.1	1.1	79.2
	61.00	26	.9	.9	80.1
	62.00	33	1.2	1.2	81.3
	63.00	22	.8	.8	82.1
	64.00	28	1.0	1.0	83.1
	65.00	27	1.0	1.0	84.0
	66.00	23	.8	.8	84.8
	67.00	29	1.0	1.0	85.9
	68.00	24	.8	.8	86.7
	69.00	24	.8	.8	87.6
	70.00	30	1.1	1.1	88.6
	71.00	24	.8	.8	89.5
	72.00	26	.9	.9	90.4
	73.00	41	1.4	1.4	91.8
	74.00	20	.7	.7	92.5
	75.00	27	1.0	1.0	93.5
	76.00	20	.7	.7	94.2
	77.00	21	.7	.7	94.9
	78.00	12	.4	.4	95.4
	79.00	18	.6	.6	96.0
	80.00	15	.5	.5	96.5
	81.00	12	.4	.4	97.0
	82.00	13	.5	.5	97.4
	83.00	14	.5	.5	97.9
	84.00	7	.2	.2	98.2
	85.00	13	.5	.5	98.6
	86.00	9	.3	.3	98.9
	87.00	12	.4	.4	99.4
	88.00	6	.2	.2	99.6
	89.00	12	.4	.4	100.0
	Total	2828	99.9	100.0	
Missing	System	4	.1		
Total		2832	100.0		

Attend 1998

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 NEVER	546	19.3	19.6	19.6
	1.00 Less Than ONCE A YEAR	294	10.4	10.5	30.1
	2.00 ONCE OR TWICE A YEAR	296	10.5	10.6	40.7
	3.00 SEVERAL TIMES A YEAR	307	10.8	11.0	51.8
	4.00 ONCE A MONTH	206	7.3	7.4	59.1
	5.00 2-3X A MONTH	244	8.6	8.8	67.9
	6.00 NEARLY EVERY WEEK	188	6.6	6.7	74.6
	7.00 EVERY WEEK	489	17.3	17.5	92.2
	8.00 SEVERAL TIMES A WEEK	218	7.7	7.8	100.0
	Total	2788	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	44	1.6		
Total		2832	100.0		

1998 Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	2	.1	.1	.1
	2.00	5	.2	.2	.2
	3.00	10	.4	.4	.6
	4.00	9	.3	.3	.9
	5.00	8	.3	.3	1.2
	6.00	23	.8	.8	2.0
	7.00	21	.7	.7	2.8
	8.00	82	2.9	2.9	5.7
	9.00	75	2.6	2.7	8.3
	10.00	113	4.0	4.0	12.3
	11.00	138	4.9	4.9	17.2
	12.00	851	30.0	30.2	47.4
	13.00	270	9.5	9.6	57.0
	14.00	350	12.4	12.4	69.4
	15.00	146	5.2	5.2	74.6
	16.00	412	14.5	14.6	89.2
	17.00	86	3.0	3.0	92.2
	18.00	109	3.8	3.9	96.1
	19.00	41	1.4	1.5	97.6
	20.00	69	2.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	2820	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	12	.4		
Total		2832	100.0		

1998 Income

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 LT $1000	42	1.5	2.3	2.3
	2.00 $1000 TO 2999	42	1.5	2.3	4.5
	3.00 $3000 TO 3999	40	1.4	2.2	6.7
	4.00 $4000 TO 4999	27	1.0	1.5	8.2
	5.00 $5000 TO 5999	32	1.1	1.7	9.9
	6.00 $6000 TO 6999	43	1.5	2.3	12.2
	7.00 $7000 TO 7999	41	1.4	2.2	14.4
	8.00 $8000 TO 9999	63	2.2	3.4	17.8
	9.00 $10000 - 14999	199	7.0	10.8	28.6
	10.00 $15000 - 19999	198	7.0	10.7	39.3
	11.00 $20000 - 24999	238	8.4	12.9	52.2
	12.00 $25000 OR MORE	884	31.2	47.8	100.0
	Total	1849	65.3	100.0	
Missing	System	983	34.7		
Total		2832	100.0		

1998 Conservativism

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 EXTREMELY LIBERAL	64	2.3	2.4	2.4
	2.00 LIBERAL	357	12.6	13.3	15.6
	3.00 SLIGHTLY LIBERAL	351	12.4	13.0	28.7
	4.00 MODERATE	986	34.8	36.6	65.3
	5.00 SLGHTLY CONSERVATIVE	432	15.3	16.1	81.4
	6.00 CONSERVATIVE	415	14.7	15.4	96.8
	7.00 EXTRMLY CONSERVATIVE	86	3.0	3.2	100.0
	Total	2691	95.0	100.0	
Missing	System	141	5.0		
Total		2832	100.0		

1998 Minority

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 White	2241	79.1	79.1	79.1
	1.00 Black and Other	591	20.9	20.9	100.0
	Total	2832	100.0	100.0	

1998 Female

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Men	1232	43.5	43.5	43.5
	1.00 Women	1600	56.5	56.5	100.0
	Total	2832	100.0	100.0	

1998 Population Size

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Population Size of 9000 or less	855	30.2	30.2	30.2
	1.00 Population Size of 9000 or greater	1977	69.8	69.8	100.0
	Total	2832	100.0	100.0	

1998 Thinking for Self

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Not Important--Low Individualism	952	33.6	50.6	50.6
	1.00 Most Important--High Individualism	928	32.8	49.4	100.0
	Total	1880	66.4	100.0	
Missing	System	952	33.6		
Total		2832	100.0		

1998 Helping the Poor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Gov Should Help Peeps--Low Individiualism	239	8.4	18.6	18.6
	2.00 Agrees with Both	818	28.9	63.6	82.1
	3.00 Peeps Should Help Selves--High Individualism	230	8.1	17.9	100.0
	Total	1287	45.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1545	54.6		
Total		2832	100.0		

1998 Helping the Sick

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Gov Should Help Peeps--Low Individiualism	473	16.7	38.1	38.1
	2.00 Agrees with Both	610	21.5	49.2	87.3
	3.00 Peeps Should Help Selves--High Individualism	158	5.6	12.7	100.0
	Total	1241	43.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1591	56.2		
Total		2832	100.0		

1998 Homosexual Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always and Almost Always Wrong	1117	39.4	63.7	63.7
	1.00 Sometimes and Never Wrong	636	22.5	36.3	100.0
	Total	1753	61.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1079	38.1		
Total		2832	100.0		

1998 Premarital Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always Wrong	476	16.8	26.4	26.4
	1.00 Almost Always, Sometimes and Never Wrong	1328	46.9	73.6	100.0
	Total	1804	63.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1028	36.3		
Total		2832	100.0		

1998 Adolescent Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always Wrong	1318	46.5	71.7	71.7
	1.00 Almost Always, Sometimes and Never Wrong	520	18.4	28.3	100.0
	Total	1838	64.9	100.0	
Missing	System	994	35.1		
Total		2832	100.0		

1998 Extramarital Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always and Almost Always Wrong	1697	59.9	91.8	91.8
	1.00 Sometimes and Never Wrong	151	5.3	8.2	100.0
	Total	1848	65.3	100.0	
Missing	System	984	34.7		
Total		2832	100.0		

1998 Descriptive Statistics

1998 Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	2828	18.00	89.00	45.5569	17.10013
Attendance	2788	.00	8.00	3.6392	2.77069
Education	2820	.00	20.00	13.2507	2.92751
Income	1849	1.00	12.00	10.0379	2.85862
Conservativism	2691	1.00	7.00	4.0977	1.38973
Minority	2832	.00	1.00	.2087	.40644
Female	2832	.00	1.00	.5650	.49585
Population Size	2832	.00	1.00	.6981	.45917
Thinking	1880	.00	1.00	.4936	.50009
Helping Poor	1287	1.00	3.00	1.9930	.60386
Helping Sick	1241	1.00	3.00	1.7462	.66663
Homosexual	1753	.00	1.00	.3628	.48095
Premarital	1804	.00	1.00	.7361	.44085
Adolescent	1838	.00	1.00	.2829	.45054
Extramarital	1848	.00	1.00	.0817	.27400
Valid N (listwise)	0				

2000 Frequencies—All Variables

2000 Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18.00	7	.2	.2	.2
	19.00	44	1.6	1.6	1.8
	20.00	40	1.4	1.4	3.2
	21.00	37	1.3	1.3	4.6
	22.00	39	1.4	1.4	5.9
	23.00	48	1.7	1.7	7.7
	24.00	52	1.8	1.9	9.5
	25.00	53	1.9	1.9	11.4
	26.00	58	2.1	2.1	13.5
	27.00	47	1.7	1.7	15.1
	28.00	45	1.6	1.6	16.7
	29.00	56	2.0	2.0	18.7
	30.00	62	2.2	2.2	20.9
	31.00	62	2.2	2.2	23.1
	32.00	77	2.7	2.7	25.9
	33.00	45	1.6	1.6	27.5
	34.00	55	2.0	2.0	29.4
	35.00	55	2.0	2.0	31.4
	36.00	62	2.2	2.2	33.6
	37.00	63	2.2	2.2	35.8
	38.00	76	2.7	2.7	38.6
	39.00	53	1.9	1.9	40.4
	40.00	73	2.6	2.6	43.0
	41.00	60	2.1	2.1	45.2
	42.00	73	2.6	2.6	47.8
	43.00	70	2.5	2.5	50.3
	44.00	70	2.5	2.5	52.8
	45.00	69	2.4	2.5	55.2
	46.00	55	2.0	2.0	57.2
	47.00	54	1.9	1.9	59.1
	48.00	62	2.2	2.2	61.3
	49.00	48	1.7	1.7	63.0
	50.00	51	1.8	1.8	64.8
	51.00	42	1.5	1.5	66.3
	52.00	58	2.1	2.1	68.4
	53.00	51	1.8	1.8	70.2
	54.00	46	1.6	1.6	71.8
	55.00	26	.9	.9	72.8
	56.00	42	1.5	1.5	74.3
	57.00	29	1.0	1.0	75.3
	58.00	29	1.0	1.0	76.3
	59.00	34	1.2	1.2	77.5

	60.00	32	1.1	1.1	78.7
	61.00	38	1.3	1.4	80.0
	62.00	29	1.0	1.0	81.1
	63.00	29	1.0	1.0	82.1
	64.00	20	.7	.7	82.8
	65.00	18	.6	.6	83.4
	66.00	32	1.1	1.1	84.6
	67.00	27	1.0	1.0	85.5
	68.00	28	1.0	1.0	86.5
	69.00	20	.7	.7	87.3
	70.00	22	.8	.8	88.0
	71.00	21	.7	.7	88.8
	72.00	28	1.0	1.0	89.8
	73.00	28	1.0	1.0	90.8
	74.00	20	.7	.7	91.5
	75.00	19	.7	.7	92.2
	76.00	20	.7	.7	92.9
	77.00	20	.7	.7	93.6
	78.00	22	.8	.8	94.4
	79.00	22	.8	.8	95.2
	80.00	17	.6	.6	95.8
	81.00	17	.6	.6	96.4
	82.00	15	.5	.5	96.9
	83.00	17	.6	.6	97.5
	84.00	17	.6	.6	98.1
	85.00	15	.5	.5	98.6
	86.00	11	.4	.4	99.0
	87.00	5	.2	.2	99.2
	88.00	5	.2	.2	99.4
	89.00	17	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	2809	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	.3		
Total		2817	100.0		

2000 Attend

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 NEVER	583	20.7	21.3	21.3
	1.00 LessThan ONCE A YEAR	219	7.8	8.0	29.3
	2.00 ONCE A YEAR	334	11.9	12.2	41.5
	3.00 SEVerRL TIMES A YeaR	369	13.1	13.5	55.0
	4.00 ONCE A MONTH	197	7.0	7.2	62.2
	5.00 2-3X A MONTH	221	7.8	8.1	70.3
	6.00 NeaRLY EVERY WEEK	131	4.7	4.8	75.0
	7.00 EVERY WEEK	488	17.3	17.8	92.9
	8.00 SEVERAL TIMES A WEEK	195	6.9	7.1	100.0
	Total	2737	97.2	100.0	
Missing	System	80	2.8		
Total		2817	100.0		

2000 Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	1	.0	.0	.0
	2.00	3	.1	.1	.1
	3.00	6	.2	.2	.4
	4.00	6	.2	.2	.6
	5.00	9	.3	.3	.9
	6.00	22	.8	.8	1.7
	7.00	20	.7	.7	2.4
	8.00	95	3.4	3.4	5.8
	9.00	69	2.4	2.5	8.2
	10.00	106	3.8	3.8	12.0
	11.00	153	5.4	5.4	17.5
	12.00	823	29.2	29.3	46.8
	13.00	290	10.3	10.3	57.1
	14.00	374	13.3	13.3	70.4
	15.00	127	4.5	4.5	74.9
	16.00	393	14.0	14.0	88.9
	17.00	90	3.2	3.2	92.1
	18.00	114	4.0	4.1	96.2
	19.00	39	1.4	1.4	97.6
	20.00	68	2.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	2808	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	.3		
Total		2817	100.0		

2000 Income

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 LT $1000	41	1.5	2.3	2.3
	2.00 $1000 TO 2999	53	1.9	2.9	5.2
	3.00 $3000 TO 3999	37	1.3	2.0	7.2
	4.00 $4000 TO 4999	30	1.1	1.7	8.9
	5.00 $5000 TO 5999	30	1.1	1.7	10.5
	6.00 $6000 TO 6999	33	1.2	1.8	12.3
	7.00 $7000 TO 7999	28	1.0	1.5	13.9
	8.00 $8000 TO 9999	73	2.6	4.0	17.9
	9.00 $10000 - 14999	197	7.0	10.8	28.7
	10.00 $15000 - 19999	181	6.4	10.0	38.7
	11.00 $20000 - 24999	200	7.1	11.0	49.7
	12.00 $25000 OR MORE	915	32.5	50.3	100.0
	Total	1818	64.5	100.0	
Missing	System	999	35.5		
Total		2817	100.0		

2000 Conservativism

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 EXTREMELY LIBERAL	107	3.8	4.0	4.0
	2.00 LIBERAL	308	10.9	11.6	15.7
	3.00 SLIGHTLY LIBERAL	285	10.1	10.8	26.5
	4.00 MODERATE	1054	37.4	39.9	66.3
	5.00 SLGHTLY CONSERVATIVE	390	13.8	14.8	81.1
	6.00 CONSERVATIVE	411	14.6	15.5	96.6
	7.00 EXTRMLY CONSERVATIVE	89	3.2	3.4	100.0
	Total	2644	93.9	100.0	
Missing	System	173	6.1		
Total		2817	100.0		

2000 Minority

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 White	2213	78.6	78.6	78.6
	1.00 Black and Other	604	21.4	21.4	100.0
	Total	2817	100.0	100.0	

2000 Female

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Men	1229	43.6	43.6	43.6
	1.00 Women	1588	56.4	56.4	100.0
	Total	2817	100.0	100.0	

2000 Population Size

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Population Size 9000 or less	845	30.0	30.0	30.0
	1.00 Population Size 9000 or greater	1972	70.0	70.0	100.0
	Total	2817	100.0	100.0	

2000 Thinking for Self

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Not Important--Low Individualism	960	34.1	51.5	51.5
	1.00 Most Important--High Individualism	903	32.1	48.5	100.0
	Total	1863	66.1	100.0	
Missing	System	954	33.9		
Total		2817	100.0		

2000 Helping the Poor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Gov Should Help Peeps--Low Individualism	263	9.3	20.6	20.6
	2.00 Agrees with Both	786	27.9	61.6	82.2
	3.00 Peeps Should Help Selves--High Individualism	227	8.1	17.8	100.0
	Total	1276	45.3	100.0	
Missing	System	1541	54.7		
Total		2817	100.0		

2000 Helping the Sick

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Gov Should Help Peeps--Low Individualism	539	19.1	43.7	43.7
	2.00 Agrees with Both	586	20.8	47.5	91.2
	3.00 Peeps Should Help Selves--High Individualism	109	3.9	8.8	100.0
	Total	1234	43.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1583	56.2		
Total		2817	100.0		

2000 Homosexual Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always and Almost Always Wrong	1073	38.1	63.2	63.2
	1.00 Sometimes and Never Wrong	624	22.2	36.8	100.0
	Total	1697	60.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1120	39.8		
Total		2817	100.0		

2000 Premarital Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always Wrong	502	17.8	28.0	28.0
	1.00 Almost Always, Sometimes and Never Wrong	1290	45.8	72.0	100.0
	Total	1792	63.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1025	36.4		
Total		2817	100.0		

2000 Adolescent Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always Wrong	1337	47.5	72.5	72.5
	1.00 Almost Always, Sometimes and Never Wrong	508	18.0	27.5	100.0
	Total	1845	65.5	100.0	
Missing	System	972	34.5		
Total		2817	100.0		

2000 Extramarital Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always and Almost Always Wrong	1646	58.4	90.3	90.3
	1.00 Sometimes and Never Wrong	177	6.3	9.7	100.0
	Total	1823	64.7	100.0	
Missing	System	994	35.3		
Total		2817	100.0		

2000 Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	2809	18.00	89.00	46.0224	17.36582
Attendance	2737	.00	8.00	3.5254	2.74691
Education	2808	.00	20.00	13.2646	2.86922
Income	1818	1.00	12.00	10.0490	2.91889
Conservativism	2644	1.00	7.00	4.0972	1.41475
Minority	2817	.00	1.00	.2144	.41049
Female	2817	.00	1.00	.5637	.49601
Population Size	2817	.00	1.00	.7000	.45832
Thinking	1863	.00	1.00	.4847	.49990
Helping Poor	1276	1.00	3.00	1.9718	.61929
Helping Sick	1234	1.00	3.00	1.6515	.63563
Homosexual	1697	.00	1.00	.3677	.48232
Premarital	1792	.00	1.00	.7199	.44919
Adolescent	1845	.00	1.00	.2753	.44681
Extramarital	1823	.00	1.00	.0971	.29617
Valid N (listwise)	0				

2002 Frequencies—All Variables

2002 Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18.00	4	.1	.1	.1
	19.00	25	.9	.9	1.1
	20.00	32	1.2	1.2	2.2
	21.00	40	1.4	1.5	3.7
	22.00	46	1.7	1.7	5.3
	23.00	68	2.5	2.5	7.8
	24.00	58	2.1	2.1	9.9
	25.00	61	2.2	2.2	12.1
	26.00	54	2.0	2.0	14.1
	27.00	48	1.7	1.7	15.8
	28.00	51	1.8	1.9	17.7
	29.00	43	1.6	1.6	19.3
	30.00	61	2.2	2.2	21.5
	31.00	53	1.9	1.9	23.4
	32.00	62	2.2	2.3	25.7
	33.00	76	2.7	2.8	28.4
	34.00	57	2.1	2.1	30.5
	35.00	59	2.1	2.1	32.6
	36.00	55	2.0	2.0	34.6
	37.00	64	2.3	2.3	37.0
	38.00	49	1.8	1.8	38.7
	39.00	54	2.0	2.0	40.7
	40.00	60	2.2	2.2	42.9
	41.00	54	2.0	2.0	44.9
	42.00	44	1.6	1.6	46.5
	43.00	63	2.3	2.3	48.7
	44.00	47	1.7	1.7	50.5
	45.00	51	1.8	1.9	52.3
	46.00	70	2.5	2.5	54.9
	47.00	52	1.9	1.9	56.7
	48.00	61	2.2	2.2	59.0
	49.00	43	1.6	1.6	60.5
	50.00	47	1.7	1.7	62.2
	51.00	52	1.9	1.9	64.1
	52.00	58	2.1	2.1	66.2
	53.00	45	1.6	1.6	67.9
	54.00	45	1.6	1.6	69.5
	55.00	39	1.4	1.4	70.9
	56.00	47	1.7	1.7	72.6
	57.00	35	1.3	1.3	73.9
	58.00	33	1.2	1.2	75.1
	59.00	33	1.2	1.2	76.3

	60.00	30	1.1	1.1	77.4
	61.00	31	1.1	1.1	78.5
	62.00	32	1.2	1.2	79.7
	63.00	34	1.2	1.2	80.9
	64.00	38	1.4	1.4	82.3
	65.00	30	1.1	1.1	83.4
	66.00	20	.7	.7	84.1
	67.00	30	1.1	1.1	85.2
	68.00	26	.9	.9	86.2
	69.00	27	1.0	1.0	87.1
	70.00	34	1.2	1.2	88.4
	71.00	36	1.3	1.3	89.7
	72.00	23	.8	.8	90.5
	73.00	22	.8	.8	91.3
	74.00	24	.9	.9	92.2
	75.00	26	.9	.9	93.1
	76.00	31	1.1	1.1	94.3
	77.00	19	.7	.7	94.9
	78.00	15	.5	.5	95.5
	79.00	9	.3	.3	95.8
	80.00	16	.6	.6	96.4
	81.00	13	.5	.5	96.9
	82.00	11	.4	.4	97.3
	83.00	15	.5	.5	97.8
	84.00	14	.5	.5	98.3
	85.00	11	.4	.4	98.7
	86.00	6	.2	.2	98.9
	87.00	10	.4	.4	99.3
	88.00	6	.2	.2	99.5
	89.00	13	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	2751	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	14	.5		
Total		2765	100.0		

2002 Attend

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 NEVER	513	18.6	18.7	18.7
	1.00 Less Than ONCE A YEAR	194	7.0	7.1	25.8
	2.00 ONCE A YEAR	385	13.9	14.0	39.8
	3.00 SEVerRaL TIMES A YeaR	357	12.9	13.0	52.8
	4.00 ONCE A MONTH	188	6.8	6.9	59.7
	5.00 2-3X A MONTH	258	9.3	9.4	69.1
	6.00 NeaRLY EVERY WEEK	180	6.5	6.6	75.6
	7.00 EVERY WEEK	455	16.5	16.6	92.2
	8.00 SEVERAL TIMES A WEEK	213	7.7	7.8	100.0
	Total	2743	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	22	.8		
Total		2765	100.0		

2002 Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	5	.2	.2	.2
	1.00	2	.1	.1	.3
	2.00	15	.5	.5	.8
	3.00	2	.1	.1	.9
	4.00	6	.2	.2	1.1
	5.00	8	.3	.3	1.4
	6.00	25	.9	.9	2.3
	7.00	14	.5	.5	2.8
	8.00	66	2.4	2.4	5.2
	9.00	60	2.2	2.2	7.4
	10.00	88	3.2	3.2	10.6
	11.00	137	5.0	5.0	15.5
	12.00	818	29.6	29.7	45.3
	13.00	265	9.6	9.6	54.9
	14.00	374	13.5	13.6	68.5
	15.00	157	5.7	5.7	74.2
	16.00	377	13.6	13.7	87.9
	17.00	93	3.4	3.4	91.2
	18.00	128	4.6	4.6	95.9
	19.00	43	1.6	1.6	97.5
	20.00	70	2.5	2.5	100.0
	Total	2753	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	12	.4		
Total		2765	100.0		

2002 Income

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 LT $1000	44	1.6	2.5	2.5
	2.00 $1000 TO 2999	69	2.5	3.9	6.3
	3.00 $3000 TO 3999	37	1.3	2.1	8.4
	4.00 $4000 TO 4999	24	.9	1.3	9.8
	5.00 $5000 TO 5999	37	1.3	2.1	11.9
	6.00 $6000 TO 6999	20	.7	1.1	13.0
	7.00 $7000 TO 7999	26	.9	1.5	14.4
	8.00 $8000 TO 9999	60	2.2	3.4	17.8
	9.00 $10000 - 14999	163	5.9	9.2	27.0
	10.00 $15000 - 19999	155	5.6	8.7	35.7
	11.00 $20000 - 24999	181	6.5	10.2	45.8
	12.00 $25000 OR MORE	964	34.9	54.2	100.0
	Total	1780	64.4	100.0	
Missing	System	985	35.6		
Total		2765	100.0		

2002 Conservativism

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 EXTREMELY LIBERAL	47	1.7	3.5	3.5
	2.00 LIBERAL	143	5.2	10.7	14.3
	3.00 SLIGHTLY LIBERAL	159	5.8	11.9	26.2
	4.00 MODERATE	522	18.9	39.2	65.4
	5.00 SLGHTLY CONSERVATIVE	209	7.6	15.7	81.1
	6.00 CONSERVATIVE	210	7.6	15.8	96.9
	7.00 EXTRMLY CONSERVATIVE	41	1.5	3.1	100.0
	Total	1331	48.1	100.0	
Missing	System	1434	51.9		
Total		2765	100.0		

2002 Minority

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 White	2188	79.1	79.1	79.1
	1.00 Black and Other	577	20.9	20.9	100.0
	Total	2765	100.0	100.0	

2002 Female

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Men	1228	44.4	44.4	44.4
	1.00 Women	1537	55.6	55.6	100.0
	Total	2765	100.0	100.0	

2002 Population Size

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Population Size 9000 or less	858	31.0	31.0	31.0
	1.00 Population Size 9000 or greater	1907	69.0	69.0	100.0
	Total	2765	100.0	100.0	

2002 Thinking for Self

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Not Important--Low Individualism	452	16.3	50.3	50.3
	1.00 Most Important--High Individualism	447	16.2	49.7	100.0
	Total	899	32.5	100.0	
Missing	System	1866	67.5		
Total		2765	100.0		

2002 Helping the Poor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Gov Should Help Peeps--Low Individualism	154	5.6	22.7	22.7
	2.00 Agrees with Both	420	15.2	61.9	84.7
	3.00 Peeps Should Help Selves--High Individualism	104	3.8	15.3	100.0
	Total	678	24.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2087	75.5		
Total		2765	100.0		

2002 Helping the Sick

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Gov Should Help Peeps--Low Individualism	287	10.4	43.6	43.6
	2.00 Agrees with Both	308	11.1	46.8	90.4
	3.00 Peeps Should Help Selves--High Individualism	63	2.3	9.6	100.0
	Total	658	23.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2107	76.2		
Total		2765	100.0		

2002 Homosexual Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always and Almost Always Wrong	529	19.1	59.8	59.8
	1.00 Sometimes and Never Wrong	355	12.8	40.2	100.0
	Total	884	32.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1881	68.0		
Total		2765	100.0		

2002 Premarital Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always Wrong	242	8.8	27.3	27.3
	1.00 Almost Always, Sometimes and Never Wrong	643	23.3	72.7	100.0
	Total	885	32.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1880	68.0		
Total		2765	100.0		

2002 Adolescent Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always Wrong	644	23.3	72.4	72.4
	1.00 Almost Always, Sometimes and Never Wrong	246	8.9	27.6	100.0
	Total	890	32.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1875	67.8		
Total		2765	100.0		

2002 Extramarital Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always and Almost Always Wrong	849	30.7	93.6	93.6
	1.00 Sometimes and Never Wrong	58	2.1	6.4	100.0
	Total	907	32.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1858	67.2		
Total		2765	100.0		

2002 Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	2751	18.00	89.00	46.2828	17.37049
Attendance	2743	.00	8.00	3.6624	2.70204
Education	2753	.00	20.00	13.3640	2.97392
Income	1780	1.00	12.00	10.0742	3.05157
Conservativism	1331	1.00	7.00	4.1247	1.38502
Minority	2765	.00	1.00	.2087	.40644
Female	2765	.00	1.00	.5559	.49696
Population Size	2765	.00	1.00	.6897	.46270
Thinking	899	.00	1.00	.4972	.50027
Helping Poor	678	1.00	3.00	1.9263	.61290
Helping Sick	658	1.00	3.00	1.6596	.64549
Homosexual	884	.00	1.00	.4016	.49050
Premarital	885	.00	1.00	.7266	.44598
Adolescent	890	.00	1.00	.2764	.44747
Extramarital	907	.00	1.00	.0639	.24479
Valid N (listwise)	0				

2004 Frequencies—All Variables

2004 Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18.00	27	1.0	1.0	1.0
	19.00	33	1.2	1.2	2.1
	20.00	32	1.1	1.1	3.3
	21.00	38	1.4	1.4	4.6
	22.00	36	1.3	1.3	5.9
	23.00	47	1.7	1.7	7.6
	24.00	50	1.8	1.8	9.4
	25.00	55	2.0	2.0	11.3
	26.00	59	2.1	2.1	13.4
	27.00	52	1.8	1.9	15.3
	28.00	69	2.5	2.5	17.8
	29.00	43	1.5	1.5	19.3
	30.00	55	2.0	2.0	21.3
	31.00	52	1.8	1.9	23.1
	32.00	52	1.8	1.9	25.0
	33.00	58	2.1	2.1	27.0
	34.00	70	2.5	2.5	29.5
	35.00	62	2.2	2.2	31.8
	36.00	58	2.1	2.1	33.8
	37.00	45	1.6	1.6	35.4
	38.00	54	1.9	1.9	37.4
	39.00	51	1.8	1.8	39.2
	40.00	73	2.6	2.6	41.8
	41.00	58	2.1	2.1	43.8
	42.00	49	1.7	1.7	45.6
	43.00	60	2.1	2.1	47.7
	44.00	68	2.4	2.4	50.2
	45.00	57	2.0	2.0	52.2
	46.00	58	2.1	2.1	54.3
	47.00	62	2.2	2.2	56.5
	48.00	57	2.0	2.0	58.5
	49.00	61	2.2	2.2	60.7
	50.00	59	2.1	2.1	62.8
	51.00	53	1.9	1.9	64.7
	52.00	58	2.1	2.1	66.7
	53.00	40	1.4	1.4	68.2
	54.00	36	1.3	1.3	69.5
	55.00	50	1.8	1.8	71.2
	56.00	56	2.0	2.0	73.2
	57.00	53	1.9	1.9	75.1
	58.00	36	1.3	1.3	76.4
	59.00	39	1.4	1.4	77.8

	60.00	44	1.6	1.6	79.4
	61.00	43	1.5	1.5	80.9
	62.00	43	1.5	1.5	82.4
	63.00	36	1.3	1.3	83.7
	64.00	26	.9	.9	84.7
	65.00	32	1.1	1.1	85.8
	66.00	29	1.0	1.0	86.8
	67.00	41	1.5	1.5	88.3
	68.00	22	.8	.8	89.1
	69.00	22	.8	.8	89.9
	70.00	22	.8	.8	90.7
	71.00	22	.8	.8	91.4
	72.00	18	.6	.6	92.1
	73.00	12	.4	.4	92.5
	74.00	23	.8	.8	93.3
	75.00	25	.9	.9	94.2
	76.00	14	.5	.5	94.7
	77.00	8	.3	.3	95.0
	78.00	17	.6	.6	95.6
	79.00	22	.8	.8	96.4
	80.00	9	.3	.3	96.7
	81.00	15	.5	.5	97.3
	82.00	15	.5	.5	97.8
	83.00	11	.4	.4	98.2
	84.00	7	.2	.2	98.4
	85.00	11	.4	.4	98.8
	86.00	8	.3	.3	99.1
	87.00	4	.1	.1	99.3
	88.00	7	.2	.2	99.5
	89.00	14	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	2803	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	9	.3		
Total		2812	100.0		

2004 Attend

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Never	471	16.7	16.8	16.8
	1.00 Less than once or twice a year	198	7.0	7.1	23.9
	2.00 Once a year	396	14.1	14.1	38.0
	3.00 Several times a year	371	13.2	13.2	51.3
	4.00 Once a month	191	6.8	6.8	58.1
	5.00 Two or three times a month	255	9.1	9.1	67.2
	6.00 Nearly every week	169	6.0	6.0	73.2
	7.00 Every week	508	18.1	18.1	91.4
	8.00 Several times a week	242	8.6	8.6	100.0
	Total	2801	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	11	.4		
Total		2812	100.0		

2004 Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	4	.1	.1	.1
	1.00	1	.0	.0	.2
	2.00	7	.2	.2	.4
	3.00	3	.1	.1	.5
	4.00	2	.1	.1	.6
	5.00	4	.1	.1	.7
	6.00	17	.6	.6	1.4
	7.00	17	.6	.6	2.0
	8.00	54	1.9	1.9	3.9
	9.00	59	2.1	2.1	6.0
	10.00	72	2.6	2.6	8.5
	11.00	156	5.5	5.6	14.1
	12.00	734	26.1	26.1	40.2
	13.00	265	9.4	9.4	49.6
	14.00	403	14.3	14.3	64.0
	15.00	174	6.2	6.2	70.2
	16.00	450	16.0	16.0	86.2
	17.00	106	3.8	3.8	90.0
	18.00	138	4.9	4.9	94.9
	19.00	51	1.8	1.8	96.7
	20.00	93	3.3	3.3	100.0
	Total	2810	99.9	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.1		
Total		2812	100.0		

2004 Income

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 LT $1000	38	1.4	2.3	2.3
	2.00 $1000 TO 2999	48	1.7	2.8	5.1
	3.00 $3000 TO 3999	27	1.0	1.6	6.7
	4.00 $4000 TO 4999	36	1.3	2.1	8.8
	5.00 $5000 TO 5999	22	.8	1.3	10.1
	6.00 $6000 TO 6999	28	1.0	1.7	11.8
	7.00 $7000 TO 7999	22	.8	1.3	13.1
	8.00 $8000 TO 9999	35	1.2	2.1	15.2
	9.00 $10000 - 14999	143	5.1	8.5	23.6
	10.00 $15000 - 19999	145	5.2	8.6	32.2
	11.00 $20000 - 24999	179	6.4	10.6	42.8
	12.00 $25000 OR MORE	965	34.3	57.2	100.0
	Total	1688	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1124	40.0		
Total		2812	100.0		

2004 Conservativism

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Extremely Liberal	46	1.6	3.5	3.5
	2.00 Liberal	120	4.3	9.2	12.7
	3.00 Slightly Liberal	153	5.4	11.7	24.4
	4.00 Moderate	497	17.7	38.0	62.3
	5.00 Slightly Conservative	214	7.6	16.3	78.7
	6.00 Conservative	223	7.9	17.0	95.7
	7.00 Extremely Conservative	56	2.0	4.3	100.0
	Total	1309	46.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1503	53.4		
Total		2812	100.0		

2004 Minority

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 White	2234	79.4	79.4	79.4
	1.00 Black and Other	578	20.6	20.6	100.0
	Total	2812	100.0	100.0	

2004 Female

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Men	1280	45.5	45.5	45.5
	1.00 Women	1532	54.5	54.5	100.0
	Total	2812	100.0	100.0	

2004 Population Size

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Population Size 9000 or less	866	30.8	30.8	30.8
	1.00 Population Size 9000 or greater	1946	69.2	69.2	100.0
	Total	2812	100.0	100.0	

2004 Thinking for Self

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Not Important--low individualism	445	15.8	51.3	51.3
	1.00 Most important--high individualism	423	15.0	48.7	100.0
	Total	868	30.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1944	69.1		
Total		2812	100.0		

2004 Helping the Poor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Gov should help peeps--low individualism	148	5.3	22.6	22.6
	2.00 Agree with Both	410	14.6	62.7	85.3
	3.00 Peeps should help selves--high individualism	96	3.4	14.7	100.0
	Total	654	23.3	100.0	
Missing	System	2158	76.7		
Total		2812	100.0		

2004 Helping the Sick

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Gov should help peeps--low individualism	280	10.0	44.9	44.9
	2.00 Agree with Both	274	9.7	44.0	88.9
	3.00 Peeps should help selves--high individualism	69	2.5	11.1	100.0
	Total	623	22.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2189	77.8		
Total		2812	100.0		

2004 Homosexual Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always and Almost Always Wrong	541	19.2	62.3	62.3
	1.00 Sometimes and Never Wrong	327	11.6	37.7	100.0
	Total	868	30.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1944	69.1		
Total		2812	100.0		

2004 Premarital Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always Wrong	238	8.5	27.0	27.0
	1.00 Almost Always, Sometimes and Never Wrong	645	22.9	73.0	100.0
	Total	883	31.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1929	68.6		
Total		2812	100.0		

2004 Adolescent Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always Wrong	625	22.2	69.8	69.8
	1.00 Almost Always, Sometimes and Never Wrong	270	9.6	30.2	100.0
	Total	895	31.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1917	68.2		
Total		2812	100.0		

2004 Extramarital Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always and Almost Always Wrong	824	29.3	92.9	92.9
	1.00 Sometimes and Never Wrong	63	2.2	7.1	100.0
	Total	887	31.5	100.0	
Missing	System	1925	68.5		
Total		2812	100.0		

2004 Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	2803	18.00	89.00	45.9647	16.80360
Attendance	2801	.00	8.00	3.8015	2.70830
Education	2810	.00	20.00	13.6982	2.88920
Income	1688	1.00	12.00	10.2826	2.89637
Conservativism	1309	1.00	7.00	4.2269	1.40706
Minority	2812	.00	1.00	.2055	.40417
Female	2812	.00	1.00	.5448	.49808
Population Size	2812	.00	1.00	.6920	.46173
Thinking	868	.00	1.00	.4873	.50013
Helping Poor	654	1.00	3.00	1.9205	.60608
Helping Sick	623	1.00	3.00	1.6613	.66798
Homosexual	868	.00	1.00	.3767	.48485
Premarital	883	.00	1.00	.7305	.44397
Adolescent	895	.00	1.00	.3017	.45924
Extramarital	887	.00	1.00	.0710	.25701
Valid N (listwise)	0				

2006 Frequencies—All Variables

2006 Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18.00	19	.4	.4	.4
	19.00	47	1.0	1.0	1.5
	20.00	50	1.1	1.1	2.6
	21.00	52	1.2	1.2	3.7
	22.00	72	1.6	1.6	5.3
	23.00	63	1.4	1.4	6.7
	24.00	61	1.4	1.4	8.1
	25.00	74	1.6	1.6	9.8
	26.00	83	1.8	1.8	11.6
	27.00	86	1.9	1.9	13.5
	28.00	80	1.8	1.8	15.3
	29.00	79	1.8	1.8	17.1
	30.00	84	1.9	1.9	18.9
	31.00	67	1.5	1.5	20.4
	32.00	97	2.2	2.2	22.6
	33.00	88	2.0	2.0	24.5
	34.00	91	2.0	2.0	26.6
	35.00	80	1.8	1.8	28.3
	36.00	105	2.3	2.3	30.7
	37.00	89	2.0	2.0	32.7
	38.00	94	2.1	2.1	34.8
	39.00	95	2.1	2.1	36.9
	40.00	95	2.1	2.1	39.0
	41.00	94	2.1	2.1	41.1
	42.00	99	2.2	2.2	43.3
	43.00	95	2.1	2.1	45.4
	44.00	100	2.2	2.2	47.6
	45.00	79	1.8	1.8	49.4
	46.00	90	2.0	2.0	51.4
	47.00	110	2.4	2.4	53.8
	48.00	109	2.4	2.4	56.3
	49.00	97	2.2	2.2	58.4
	50.00	93	2.1	2.1	60.5
	51.00	76	1.7	1.7	62.2
	52.00	78	1.7	1.7	63.9
	53.00	89	2.0	2.0	65.9
	54.00	96	2.1	2.1	68.0
	55.00	86	1.9	1.9	69.9
	56.00	68	1.5	1.5	71.5
	57.00	58	1.3	1.3	72.8
	58.00	81	1.8	1.8	74.6
	59.00	78	1.7	1.7	76.3

	60.00	75	1.7	1.7	78.0
	61.00	57	1.3	1.3	79.2
	62.00	58	1.3	1.3	80.5
	63.00	62	1.4	1.4	81.9
	64.00	56	1.2	1.2	83.1
	65.00	42	.9	.9	84.1
	66.00	53	1.2	1.2	85.3
	67.00	45	1.0	1.0	86.3
	68.00	41	.9	.9	87.2
	69.00	42	.9	.9	88.1
	70.00	41	.9	.9	89.0
	71.00	39	.9	.9	89.9
	72.00	48	1.1	1.1	91.0
	73.00	29	.6	.6	91.6
	74.00	33	.7	.7	92.3
	75.00	39	.9	.9	93.2
	76.00	31	.7	.7	93.9
	77.00	33	.7	.7	94.6
	78.00	28	.6	.6	95.3
	79.00	22	.5	.5	95.7
	80.00	27	.6	.6	96.3
	81.00	25	.6	.6	96.9
	82.00	21	.5	.5	97.4
	83.00	19	.4	.4	97.8
	84.00	17	.4	.4	98.2
	85.00	18	.4	.4	98.6
	86.00	17	.4	.4	99.0
	87.00	7	.2	.2	99.1
	88.00	11	.2	.2	99.4
	89.00	29	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	4492	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	18	.4		
Total		4510	100.0		

2006 Attend

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Never	1020	22.6	22.7	22.7
	1.00 Less than once or twice a year	302	6.7	6.7	29.4
	2.00 Once a year	571	12.7	12.7	42.2
	3.00 Several times a year	502	11.1	11.2	53.3
	4.00 Once a month	308	6.8	6.9	60.2
	5.00 Two or Three times a month	380	8.4	8.5	68.6
	6.00 Nearly every week	240	5.3	5.3	74.0
	7.00 Every week	839	18.6	18.7	92.7
	8.00 Several times a week	329	7.3	7.3	100.0
	Total	4491	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	19	.4		
Total		4510	100.0		

2006 Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	22	.5	.5	.5
	1.00	4	.1	.1	.6
	2.00	28	.6	.6	1.2
	3.00	13	.3	.3	1.5
	4.00	11	.2	.2	1.7
	5.00	23	.5	.5	2.2
	6.00	69	1.5	1.5	3.8
	7.00	32	.7	.7	4.5
	8.00	85	1.9	1.9	6.4
	9.00	127	2.8	2.8	9.2
	10.00	152	3.4	3.4	12.6
	11.00	215	4.8	4.8	17.4
	12.00	1204	26.7	26.8	44.1
	13.00	422	9.4	9.4	53.5
	14.00	628	13.9	14.0	67.5
	15.00	212	4.7	4.7	72.2
	16.00	687	15.2	15.3	87.4
	17.00	167	3.7	3.7	91.2
	18.00	208	4.6	4.6	95.8
	19.00	78	1.7	1.7	97.5
	20.00	112	2.5	2.5	100.0
	Total	4499	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	11	.2		
Total		4510	100.0		

2006 Income

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 LT $1000	53	1.2	2.0	2.0
	2.00 $1000 TO 2999	75	1.7	2.8	4.8
	3.00 $3000 TO 3999	47	1.0	1.8	6.6
	4.00 $4000 TO 4999	53	1.2	2.0	8.5
	5.00 $5000 TO 5999	41	.9	1.5	10.1
	6.00 $6000 TO 6999	42	.9	1.6	11.7
	7.00 $7000 TO 7999	37	.8	1.4	13.0
	8.00 $8000 TO 9999	61	1.4	2.3	15.3
	9.00 $10000 - 14999	231	5.1	8.7	24.0
	10.00 $15000 - 19999	221	4.9	8.3	32.3
	11.00 $20000 - 24999	248	5.5	9.3	41.6
	12.00 $25000 OR MORE	1560	34.6	58.4	100.0
	Total	2669	59.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1841	40.8		
Total		4510	100.0		

2006 Conservativism

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Extremely Liberal	139	3.1	3.2	3.2
	2.00 Liberal	524	11.6	12.1	15.3
	3.00 Slightly Liberal	517	11.5	11.9	27.2
	4.00 Moderate	1683	37.3	38.8	66.1
	5.00 Slightly Conservative	618	13.7	14.3	80.3
	6.00 Conservative	685	15.2	15.8	96.1
	7.00 Extremely Conservative	167	3.7	3.9	100.0
	Total	4333	96.1	100.0	
Missing	System	177	3.9		
Total		4510	100.0		

2006 Minority

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 White	3284	72.8	72.8	72.8
	1.00 Black and Other	1226	27.2	27.2	100.0
	Total	4510	100.0	100.0	

2006 Female

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Men	2003	44.4	44.4	44.4
	1.00 Women	2507	55.6	55.6	100.0
	Total	4510	100.0	100.0	

2006 Population Size

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Population Size 9000 or less	1399	31.0	31.0	31.0
	1.00 Population Size 9000 or greater	3111	69.0	69.0	100.0
	Total	4510	100.0	100.0	

2006 Thinking for Self

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Not Important--low individualism	536	11.9	53.9	53.9
	1.00 Most Important--high individualism	459	10.2	46.1	100.0
	Total	995	22.1	100.0	
Missing	System	3515	77.9		
Total		4510	100.0		

2006 Helping the Poor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Gov should help peeps--low individualism	369	8.2	24.7	24.7
	2.00 Agree with both	915	20.3	61.3	86.0
	3.00 Peeps should help themselves--high individualism	209	4.6	14.0	100.0
	Total	1493	33.1	100.0	
Missing	System	3017	66.9		
Total		4510	100.0		

2006 Helping the Sick

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Gov should help peeps--low individualism	665	14.7	46.5	46.5
	2.00 Agree with both	634	14.1	44.3	90.8
	3.00 Peeps should help themselves--high individualism	132	2.9	9.2	100.0
	Total	1431	31.7	100.0	
Missing	System	3079	68.3		
Total		4510	100.0		

2006 Homosexual Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always and Almost Always Wrong	1148	25.5	60.2	60.2
	1.00 Sometimes and Never Wrong	760	16.9	39.8	100.0
	Total	1908	42.3	100.0	
Missing	System	2602	57.7		
Total		4510	100.0		

2006 Premarital Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always Wrong	509	11.3	26.3	26.3
	1.00 Almost Always, Sometimes and Never Wrong	1428	31.7	73.7	100.0
	Total	1937	42.9	100.0	
Missing	System	2573	57.1		
Total		4510	100.0		

2006 Adolescent Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always Wrong	1422	31.5	72.3	72.3
	1.00 Almost Always, Sometimes and Never Wrong	545	12.1	27.7	100.0
	Total	1967	43.6	100.0	
Missing	System	2543	56.4		
Total		4510	100.0		

2006 Extramarital Sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Always and Almost Always Wrong	1818	40.3	92.1	92.1
	1.00 Sometimes and Never Wrong	157	3.5	7.9	100.0
	Total	1975	43.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2535	56.2		
Total		4510	100.0		

2006 Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	4492	18.00	89.00	47.1416	16.89426
Attendance	4491	.00	8.00	3.5687	2.79769
Education	4499	.00	20.00	13.2934	3.22930
Income	2669	1.00	12.00	10.3024	2.87502
Conservativism	4333	1.00	7.00	4.1170	1.41435
Minority	4510	.00	1.00	.2718	.44496
Female	4510	.00	1.00	.5559	.49692
Population Size	4510	.00	1.00	.6898	.46263
Thinking	995	.00	1.00	.4613	.49875
Helping Poor	1493	1.00	3.00	1.8928	.61311
Helping Sick	1431	1.00	3.00	1.6275	.64693
Homosexual	1908	.00	1.00	.3983	.48968
Premarital	1937	.00	1.00	.7372	.44026
Adolescent	1967	.00	1.00	.2771	.44767
Extramarital	1975	.00	1.00	.0795	.27058
Valid N (listwise)	0				

Appendix B

Table 1

Correlations

		ZAge Age Rcoded as is with a Z	ZAttend Attend recoded as is with a Z--high values indicative high church attendance--low indicative of low church attendance	ZEduc Educ Recoded as is with a Z	ZIncome Recoded Respondent's Income	ZPolviews Polviews recoded as is with a Z	ZRace Respondents race	ZSex Gender	ZSize Size collasped into 2 categories	ZThink Thinking Individualism	ZZPoor Helppoor recoded as is with ZZ	ZZSick Helpsick recoded as is with ZZ	ZHomo Homosex recoded--categories collasped	ZPremars Premarsx recoded--categories collasped	ZTeens Teensex recoded-categories collasped	ZXmars Xmarsex recoded--categories collasped
ZAge Age Rcoded as is with a Z	Pearson Correlation	1	.167**	-.175**	.178**	.113**	-.148**	.051**	-.080**	-.051*	.074**	.114**	-.229**	-.189**	-.195**	-.044
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.007	.000	.027	.008	.000	.000	.000	.000	.060
	N	2828	2784	2816	1847	2687	2828	2828	2828	1878	1287	1240	1751	1800	1834	1846
ZAttend Attend recoded as is with a Z--high values indicative high church attendance--low indicative of low church attendance	Pearson Correlation	.167**	1	.058**	-.044	.220**	.077**	.148**	-.047*	-.079**	-.008	.030	-.310**	-.423**	-.300**	-.156**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.002	.058	.000	.000	.000	.012	.001	.780	.290	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	2784	2788	2777	1825	2653	2788	2788	2788	1852	1264	1222	1728	1776	1810	1821
ZEduc Educ Recoded as is with a Z	Pearson Correlation	-.175**	.058**	1	.257**	-.048*	-.115**	-.033	.123**	.258**	.097**	.024	.232**	.125**	.115**	.033
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.002	.	.000	.013	.000	.082	.000	.000	.000	.396	.000	.000	.000	.153
	N	2816	2777	2820	1845	2682	2820	2820	2820	1874	1282	1237	1746	1795	1828	1842
ZIncome Recoded Respondent's Income	Pearson Correlation	.178**	-.044	.257**	1	.022	-.142**	-.192**	-.006	.082**	.115**	.099**	.079**	.088**	.050	.043
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.058	.000	.	.344	.000	.000	.811	.004	.001	.006	.008	.002	.081	.138
	N	1847	1825	1845	1849	1782	1849	1849	1849	1229	813	780	1150	1192	1200	1211
ZPolviews Polviews recoded as is with a Z	Pearson Correlation	.113**	.220**	-.048*	.022	1	-.081**	-.060**	-.073**	-.105**	.212**	.258**	-.322**	-.248**	-.213**	-.118**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.013	.344	.	.000	.002	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	2687	2653	2682	1782	2691	2691	2691	2691	1793	1229	1190	1661	1732	1759	1745
ZRace Respondents race	Pearson Correlation	-.148**	.077**	-.115**	-.142**	-.081**	1	.048*	.184**	-.120**	-.206**	-.134**	-.083**	-.052*	-.004	.024
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.	.011	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.026	.875	.299
	N	2828	2788	2820	1849	2691	2832	2832	2832	1880	1287	1241	1753	1804	1838	1848
ZSex Gender	Pearson Correlation	.051**	.148**	-.033	-.192**	-.060**	.048*	1	.031	.052*	-.119**	-.113**	.041	-.085**	-.106**	-.088**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.007	.000	.082	.000	.002	.011	.	.098	.025	.000	.000	.087	.000	.000	.000
	N	2828	2788	2820	1849	2691	2832	2832	2832	1880	1287	1241	1753	1804	1838	1848
ZSize Size collasped into 2 categories	Pearson Correlation	-.080**	-.047*	.123**	-.006	-.073**	.184**	.031	1	.071**	-.038	-.081**	.129**	.082**	.108**	.040
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.012	.000	.811	.000	.000	.098	.	.002	.169	.005	.000	.000	.000	.083
	N	2828	2788	2820	1849	2691	2832	2832	2832	1880	1287	1241	1753	1804	1838	1848
ZThink Thinking Individualism	Pearson Correlation	-.051*	-.079**	.258**	.082**	-.105**	-.120**	.052*	.071**	1	.032	-.009	.248**	.194**	.154**	.028
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.027	.001	.000	.004	.000	.000	.025	.002	.	.256	.761	.000	.000	.000	.388
	N	1878	1852	1874	1229	1793	1880	1880	1880	1880	1268	1222	883	911	921	928
ZZPoor Helppoor recoded as is with ZZ	Pearson Correlation	.074**	-.008	.097**	.115**	.212**	-.206**	-.119**	-.038	.032	1	.453**	.034	-.006	-.001	.008
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.008	.780	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.169	.256	.	.000	.407	.887	.973	.843
	N	1287	1264	1282	813	1229	1287	1287	1287	1268	1287	944	596	632	638	627
ZZSick Helpsick recoded as is with ZZ	Pearson Correlation	.114**	.030	.024	.099**	.258**	-.134**	-.113**	-.081**	-.009	.453**	1	-.113**	-.095*	-.072	.013
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.290	.396	.006	.000	.000	.000	.005	.761	.000	.	.007	.019	.073	.740
	N	1240	1222	1237	780	1190	1241	1241	1241	1222	944	1241	577	608	614	608
ZHomo Homosex recoded--categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.229**	-.310**	.232**	.079**	-.322**	-.083**	.041	.129**	.248**	.034	-.113**	1	.396**	.289**	.181**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.008	.000	.001	.087	.000	.000	.407	.007	.	.000	.000	.000
	N	1751	1728	1746	1150	1661	1753	1753	1753	883	596	577	1753	827	845	1734
ZPremars Premarsx recoded--categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.189**	-.423**	.125**	.088**	-.248**	-.052*	-.085**	.082**	.194**	-.006	-.095*	.396**	1	.368**	.167**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.002	.000	.026	.000	.000	.000	.887	.019	.000	.	.000	.000
	N	1800	1776	1795	1192	1732	1804	1804	1804	911	632	608	827	1804	1785	873
ZTeens Teensex recoded-categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.195**	-.300**	.115**	.050	-.213**	-.004	-.106**	.108**	.154**	-.001	-.072	.289**	.368**	1	.205**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.081	.000	.875	.000	.000	.000	.973	.073	.000	.000	.	.000
	N	1834	1810	1828	1200	1759	1838	1838	1838	921	638	614	845	1785	1838	894
ZXmars Xmarsex recoded--categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.044	-.156**	.033	.043	-.118**	.024	-.088**	.040	.028	.008	.013	.181**	.167**	.205**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.060	.000	.153	.138	.000	.299	.000	.083	.388	.843	.740	.000	.000	.000	.
	N	1846	1821	1842	1211	1745	1848	1848	1848	928	627	608	1734	873	894	1848

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

1998 Correlations

Table 2

Correlations

		ZAge Age Rcoded as is with a Z	ZAttend Attend recoded as is with a Z--high values indicative high church attendance--low indicative of low church attendance	ZEduc Educ Recoded as is with a Z	ZIncome Recoded Income	ZPolviews Polviews recoded as is with a Z	ZRace Respondents race	ZSex Gender	ZSize Size collasped into 2 categories	ZThink Thinking Individualism	ZZPoor Helppoor recoded as is with ZZ	ZZSick Helpsick recoded as is with ZZ	ZHomo Homosex recoded--categories collasped	ZPremars Premarsx recoded--categories collasped	ZTeens Teensex recoded-categories collasped	ZXmars Xmarsex recoded--categories collasped
ZAge Age Rcoded as is with a Z	Pearson Correlation	1	.133**	-.157**	.143**	.085**	-.140**	.060**	-.048*	-.058*	.066*	.087**	-.232**	-.204**	-.209**	-.051*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.010	.013	.018	.002	.000	.000	.000	.030
	N	2809	2730	2800	1815	2637	2809	2809	2809	1857	1270	1229	1693	1787	1840	1819
ZAttend Attend recoded as is with a Z--high values indicative high church attendance--low indicative of low church attendance	Pearson Correlation	.133**	1	.076**	.000	.217**	.097**	.102**	-.045*	-.144**	.028	.080**	-.261**	-.379**	-.229**	-.151**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000	.994	.000	.000	.000	.019	.000	.334	.006	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	2730	2737	2730	1776	2573	2737	2737	2737	1799	1235	1194	1652	1754	1805	1773
ZEduc Educ Recoded as is with a Z	Pearson Correlation	-.157**	.076**	1	.236**	-.055**	-.117**	-.061**	.062**	.213**	.067*	.040	.230**	.145**	.136**	.052*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	.000	.005	.000	.001	.001	.000	.016	.166	.000	.000	.000	.025
	N	2800	2730	2808	1816	2637	2808	2808	2808	1856	1273	1231	1695	1786	1838	1820
ZIncome Recoded Income	Pearson Correlation	.143**	.000	.236**	1	.052*	-.072**	-.230**	.037	.060*	.060	.097**	.027	.061*	-.030	-.029
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.994	.000	.	.031	.002	.000	.116	.037	.087	.007	.365	.039	.294	.328
	N	1815	1776	1816	1818	1739	1818	1818	1818	1218	824	776	1096	1161	1188	1178
ZPolviews Polviews recoded as is with a Z	Pearson Correlation	.085**	.217**	-.055**	.052*	1	-.059**	-.052**	-.075**	-.105**	.217**	.260**	-.288**	-.230**	-.223**	-.149**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.005	.031	.	.002	.007	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	2637	2573	2637	1739	2644	2644	2644	2644	1746	1198	1152	1610	1687	1733	1723
ZRace Respondents race	Pearson Correlation	-.140**	.097**	-.117**	-.072**	-.059**	1	.055**	.163**	-.100**	-.162**	-.187**	-.077**	-.080**	-.009	.003
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.002	.002	.	.004	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.001	.684	.890
	N	2809	2737	2808	1818	2644	2817	2817	2817	1863	1276	1234	1697	1792	1845	1823
ZSex Gender	Pearson Correlation	.060**	.102**	-.061**	-.230**	-.052**	.055**	1	-.014	-.014	-.078**	-.097**	.031	-.060*	-.098**	-.059*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.001	.000	.007	.004	.	.473	.538	.005	.001	.198	.010	.000	.012
	N	2809	2737	2808	1818	2644	2817	2817	2817	1863	1276	1234	1697	1792	1845	1823
ZSize Size collasped into 2 categories	Pearson Correlation	-.048*	-.045*	.062**	.037	-.075**	.163**	-.014	1	.043	-.077**	-.052	.083**	.057*	.092**	.024
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.010	.019	.001	.116	.000	.000	.473	.	.064	.006	.069	.001	.016	.000	.307
	N	2809	2737	2808	1818	2644	2817	2817	2817	1863	1276	1234	1697	1792	1845	1823
ZThink Thinking Individualism	Pearson Correlation	-.058*	-.144**	.213**	.060*	-.105**	-.100**	-.014	.043	1	-.010	-.044	.237**	.164**	.156**	.023
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.013	.000	.000	.037	.000	.000	.538	.064	.	.717	.130	.000	.000	.000	.483
	N	1857	1799	1856	1218	1746	1863	1863	1863	1863	1256	1209	838	896	926	900
ZZPoor Helppoor recoded as is with ZZ	Pearson Correlation	.066*	.028	.067*	.060	.217**	-.162**	-.078**	-.077**	-.010	1	.404**	-.086*	-.051	-.060	-.041
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.018	.334	.016	.087	.000	.000	.005	.006	.717	.	.000	.043	.203	.128	.311
	N	1270	1235	1273	824	1198	1276	1276	1276	1256	1276	935	561	626	652	603
ZZSick Helpsick recoded as is with ZZ	Pearson Correlation	.087**	.080**	.040	.097**	.260**	-.187**	-.097**	-.052	-.044	.404**	1	-.179**	-.072	-.097*	-.078
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.006	.166	.007	.000	.000	.001	.069	.130	.000	.	.000	.081	.017	.055
	N	1229	1194	1231	776	1152	1234	1234	1234	1209	935	1234	566	587	605	600
ZHomo Homosex recoded--categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.232**	-.261**	.230**	.027	-.288**	-.077**	.031	.083**	.237**	-.086*	-.179**	1	.378**	.272**	.213**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.365	.000	.001	.198	.001	.000	.043	.000	.	.000	.000	.000
	N	1693	1652	1695	1096	1610	1697	1697	1697	838	561	566	1697	817	836	1677
ZPremars Premarsx recoded--categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.204**	-.379**	.145**	.061*	-.230**	-.080**	-.060*	.057*	.164**	-.051	-.072	.378**	1	.343**	.153**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.039	.000	.001	.010	.016	.000	.203	.081	.000	.	.000	.000
	N	1787	1754	1786	1161	1687	1792	1792	1792	896	626	587	817	1792	1780	872
ZTeens Teensex recoded-categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.209**	-.229**	.136**	-.030	-.223**	-.009	-.098**	.092**	.156**	-.060	-.097*	.272**	.343**	1	.318**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.294	.000	.684	.000	.000	.000	.128	.017	.000	.000	.	.000
	N	1840	1805	1838	1188	1733	1845	1845	1845	926	652	605	836	1780	1845	897
ZXmars Xmarsex recoded--categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.051*	-.151**	.052*	-.029	-.149**	.003	-.059*	.024	.023	-.041	-.078	.213**	.153**	.318**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.030	.000	.025	.328	.000	.890	.012	.307	.483	.311	.055	.000	.000	.000	.
	N	1819	1773	1820	1178	1723	1823	1823	1823	900	603	600	1677	872	897	1823

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

2000 Pairwise Correlations

Table 3

Correlations

		ZAge Age Rcoded as is with a Z	ZAttend Attend recoded as is with a Z--high values indicative high church attendance--low indicative of low church attendance	ZEduc Educ Recoded as is with a Z	ZIncome Recoded Income	ZPolviews Polviews recoded as is with a Z	ZRace Respondents race	ZSex Gender	ZSize Size collasped into 2 categories	ZThink Thinking Individualism	ZZPoor Helppoor recoded as is with ZZ	ZZSick Helpsick recoded as is with ZZ	ZHomo Homosex recoded--categories collasped	ZPremars Premarsx recoded--categories collasped	ZTeens Teensex recoded-categories collasped	ZXmars Xmarsex recoded--categories collasped
ZAge Age Rcoded as is with a Z	Pearson Correlation	1	.117**	-.116**	.113**	.127**	-.135**	.034	-.067**	-.025	.072	.088*	-.192**	-.195**	-.157**	.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.078	.000	.453	.060	.025	.000	.000	.000	.991
	N	2751	2733	2741	1774	1324	2751	2751	2751	895	675	654	881	878	883	904
ZAttend Attend recoded as is with a Z--high values indicative high church attendance--low indicative of low church attendance	Pearson Correlation	.117**	1	.059**	-.014	.154**	.100**	.155**	-.051**	-.089**	-.017	-.010	-.265**	-.396**	-.227**	-.166**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.002	.543	.000	.000	.000	.008	.008	.657	.799	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	2733	2743	2739	1777	1325	2743	2743	2743	893	675	655	880	881	886	903
ZEduc Educ Recoded as is with a Z	Pearson Correlation	-.116**	.059**	1	.200**	-.048	-.096**	-.004	.073**	.198**	.060	.022	.206**	.160**	.093**	-.012
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.002	.	.000	.078	.000	.821	.000	.000	.120	.571	.000	.000	.005	.711
	N	2741	2739	2753	1779	1328	2753	2753	2753	897	677	656	882	883	887	905
ZIncome Recoded Income	Pearson Correlation	.113**	-.014	.200**	1	.043	-.090**	-.138**	.002	.113**	.099*	.130**	.042	.070	.035	-.009
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.543	.000	.	.204	.000	.000	.944	.006	.035	.006	.309	.095	.408	.822
	N	1774	1777	1779	1780	877	1780	1780	1780	601	451	435	585	571	571	598
ZPolviews Polviews recoded as is with a Z	Pearson Correlation	.127**	.154**	-.048	.043	1	-.043	.015	-.094**	-.092**	.174**	.187**	-.291**	-.267**	-.248**	-.087**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.078	.204	.	.119	.594	.001	.007	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.010
	N	1324	1325	1328	877	1331	1331	1331	1331	873	658	638	862	863	866	885
ZRace Respondents race	Pearson Correlation	-.135**	.100**	-.096**	-.090**	-.043	1	.043*	.206**	-.131**	-.179**	-.124**	-.112**	-.106**	-.022	-.011
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.119	.	.022	.000	.000	.000	.001	.001	.002	.507	.730
	N	2751	2743	2753	1780	1331	2765	2765	2765	899	678	658	884	885	890	907
ZSex Gender	Pearson Correlation	.034	.155**	-.004	-.138**	.015	.043*	1	.019	.067*	-.073	-.041	.063	-.140**	-.140**	-.063
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.078	.000	.821	.000	.594	.022	.	.323	.045	.056	.288	.062	.000	.000	.060
	N	2751	2743	2753	1780	1331	2765	2765	2765	899	678	658	884	885	890	907
ZSize Size collasped into 2 categories	Pearson Correlation	-.067**	-.051**	.073**	.002	-.094**	.206**	.019	1	.042	-.106**	-.077*	.091**	.050	.091**	.080*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.008	.000	.944	.001	.000	.323	.	.210	.006	.049	.007	.133	.007	.016
	N	2751	2743	2753	1780	1331	2765	2765	2765	899	678	658	884	885	890	907
ZThink Thinking Individualism	Pearson Correlation	-.025	-.089**	.198**	.113**	-.092**	-.131**	.067*	.042	1	.051	-.015	.173**	.172**	.150**	.017
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.453	.008	.000	.006	.007	.000	.045	.210	.	.190	.698	.000	.000	.002	.724
	N	895	893	897	601	873	899	899	899	899	669	650	440	434	434	449
ZZPoor Helppoor recoded as is with ZZ	Pearson Correlation	.072	-.017	.060	.099*	.174**	-.179**	-.073	-.106**	.051	1	.364**	.018	-.025	.004	-.081
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.060	.657	.120	.035	.000	.000	.056	.006	.190	.	.000	.736	.654	.945	.133
	N	675	675	677	451	658	678	678	678	669	678	543	334	322	323	342
ZZSick Helpsick recoded as is with ZZ	Pearson Correlation	.088*	-.010	.022	.130**	.187**	-.124**	-.041	-.077*	-.015	.364**	1	-.129*	.002	-.024	-.090
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.025	.799	.571	.006	.000	.001	.288	.049	.698	.000	.	.020	.973	.681	.100
	N	654	655	656	435	638	658	658	658	650	543	658	328	306	307	338
ZHomo Homosex recoded--categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.192**	-.265**	.206**	.042	-.291**	-.112**	.063	.091**	.173**	.018	-.129*	1	.459**	.325**	.234**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.309	.000	.001	.062	.007	.000	.736	.020	.	.000	.000	.000
	N	881	880	882	585	862	884	884	884	440	334	328	884	432	434	876
ZPremars Premarsx recoded--categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.195**	-.396**	.160**	.070	-.267**	-.106**	-.140**	.050	.172**	-.025	.002	.459**	1	.367**	.148**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.095	.000	.002	.000	.133	.000	.654	.973	.000	.	.000	.002
	N	878	881	883	571	863	885	885	885	434	322	306	432	885	872	443
ZTeens Teensex recoded-categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.157**	-.227**	.093**	.035	-.248**	-.022	-.140**	.091**	.150**	.004	-.024	.325**	.367**	1	.224**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.005	.408	.000	.507	.000	.007	.002	.945	.681	.000	.000	.	.000
	N	883	886	887	571	866	890	890	890	434	323	307	434	872	890	448
ZXmars Xmarsex recoded--categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	.000	-.166**	-.012	-.009	-.087**	-.011	-.063	.080*	.017	-.081	-.090	.234**	.148**	.224**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.991	.000	.711	.822	.010	.730	.060	.016	.724	.133	.100	.000	.002	.000	.
	N	904	903	905	598	885	907	907	907	449	342	338	876	443	448	907

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

2002 Pairwise Correlations

Table 4

Correlations

		ZAge Age Rcoded as is with a Z	ZAttend Attend recoded as is with a Z--high values indicative high church attendance--low indicative of low church attendance	ZEduc Educ Recoded as is with a Z	ZIncome Recoded Income	ZPolviews Polviews recoded as is with a Z	ZRace Respondents race	ZSex Gender	ZSize Size collasped into 2 categories	ZThink Thinking Individualism	ZZPoor Helppoor recoded as is with ZZ	ZZSick Helpsick recoded as is with ZZ	ZHomo Homosex recoded--categories collasped	ZPremars Premarsx recoded--categories collasped	ZTeens Teensex recoded-categories collasped	ZXmars Xmarsex recoded--categories collasped
ZAge Age Rcoded as is with a Z	Pearson Correlation	1	.113**	-.104**	.160**	.089**	-.159**	.019	-.057**	.009	.122**	.121**	-.088**	-.113**	-.121**	-.019
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.312	.002	.788	.002	.003	.009	.001	.000	.575
	N	2803	2793	2802	1685	1305	2803	2803	2803	866	652	622	867	879	891	885
ZAttend Attend recoded as is with a Z--high values indicative high church attendance--low indicative of low church attendance	Pearson Correlation	.113**	1	.051**	-.003	.217**	.135**	.137**	-.042*	-.134**	.062	.080*	-.350**	-.363**	-.264**	-.205**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.007	.912	.000	.000	.000	.027	.000	.116	.045	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	2793	2801	2800	1684	1305	2801	2801	2801	866	653	622	867	880	892	884
ZEduc Educ Recoded as is with a Z	Pearson Correlation	-.104**	.051**	1	.226**	-.037	-.082**	-.038*	.133**	.158**	.040	.016	.264**	.109**	.068*	.015
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.007	.	.000	.176	.000	.042	.000	.000	.309	.683	.000	.001	.043	.649
	N	2802	2800	2810	1688	1308	2810	2810	2810	868	654	623	868	882	894	886
ZIncome Recoded Income	Pearson Correlation	.160**	-.003	.226**	1	.016	-.059*	-.171**	.024	.121**	-.038	.020	.113**	-.002	-.007	.043
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.912	.000	.	.665	.015	.000	.320	.006	.467	.711	.010	.959	.870	.327
	N	1685	1684	1688	1688	779	1688	1688	1688	517	376	355	521	518	525	528
ZPolviews Polviews recoded as is with a Z	Pearson Correlation	.089**	.217**	-.037	.016	1	-.077**	-.073**	-.127**	-.102**	.238**	.254**	-.325**	-.245**	-.236**	-.125**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.176	.665	.	.006	.008	.000	.003	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	1305	1305	1308	779	1309	1309	1309	1309	844	636	608	854	865	874	873
ZRace Respondents race	Pearson Correlation	-.159**	.135**	-.082**	-.059*	-.077**	1	.028	.154**	-.093**	-.182**	-.079*	-.126**	-.082*	-.013	.104**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.015	.006	.	.131	.000	.006	.000	.049	.000	.015	.701	.002
	N	2803	2801	2810	1688	1309	2812	2812	2812	868	654	623	868	883	895	887
ZSex Gender	Pearson Correlation	.019	.137**	-.038*	-.171**	-.073**	.028	1	.014	.043	-.024	-.085*	.053	-.113**	-.096**	-.081*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.312	.000	.042	.000	.008	.131	.	.470	.208	.544	.035	.120	.001	.004	.016
	N	2803	2801	2810	1688	1309	2812	2812	2812	868	654	623	868	883	895	887
ZSize Size collasped into 2 categories	Pearson Correlation	-.057**	-.042*	.133**	.024	-.127**	.154**	.014	1	-.014	-.027	-.031	.126**	.076*	.087**	.035
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.027	.000	.320	.000	.000	.470	.	.676	.493	.434	.000	.024	.009	.292
	N	2803	2801	2810	1688	1309	2812	2812	2812	868	654	623	868	883	895	887
ZThink Thinking Individualism	Pearson Correlation	.009	-.134**	.158**	.121**	-.102**	-.093**	.043	-.014	1	.013	-.037	.223**	.161**	.096*	.026
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.788	.000	.000	.006	.003	.006	.208	.676	.	.749	.365	.000	.001	.046	.597
	N	866	866	868	517	844	868	868	868	868	647	616	417	427	433	429
ZZPoor Helppoor recoded as is with ZZ	Pearson Correlation	.122**	.062	.040	-.038	.238**	-.182**	-.024	-.027	.013	1	.458**	-.034	-.092	-.110*	-.127*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.116	.309	.467	.000	.000	.544	.493	.749	.	.000	.552	.098	.046	.024
	N	652	653	654	376	636	654	654	654	647	654	488	314	323	328	320
ZZSick Helpsick recoded as is with ZZ	Pearson Correlation	.121**	.080*	.016	.020	.254**	-.079*	-.085*	-.031	-.037	.458**	1	-.001	-.026	-.027	-.117*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.045	.683	.711	.000	.049	.035	.434	.365	.000	.	.990	.641	.626	.043
	N	622	622	623	355	608	623	623	623	616	488	623	290	314	319	298
ZHomo Homosex recoded--categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.088**	-.350**	.264**	.113**	-.325**	-.126**	.053	.126**	.223**	-.034	-.001	1	.458**	.441**	.174**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	.000	.000	.010	.000	.000	.120	.000	.000	.552	.990	.	.000	.000	.000
	N	867	867	868	521	854	868	868	868	417	314	290	868	441	445	859
ZPremars Premarsx recoded--categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.113**	-.363**	.109**	-.002	-.245**	-.082*	-.113**	.076*	.161**	-.092	-.026	.458**	1	.381**	.180**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.001	.959	.000	.015	.001	.024	.001	.098	.641	.000	.	.000	.000
	N	879	880	882	518	865	883	883	883	427	323	314	441	883	878	447
ZTeens Teensex recoded-categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.121**	-.264**	.068*	-.007	-.236**	-.013	-.096**	.087**	.096*	-.110*	-.027	.441**	.381**	1	.187**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.043	.870	.000	.701	.004	.009	.046	.046	.626	.000	.000	.	.000
	N	891	892	894	525	874	895	895	895	433	328	319	445	878	895	454
ZXmars Xmarsex recoded--categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.019	-.205**	.015	.043	-.125**	.104**	-.081*	.035	.026	-.127*	-.117*	.174**	.180**	.187**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.575	.000	.649	.327	.000	.002	.016	.292	.597	.024	.043	.000	.000	.000	.
	N	885	884	886	528	873	887	887	887	429	320	298	859	447	454	887

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

2004 Pairwise Correlations

Table 5

Correlations

		ZAge Age Rcoded as is with a Z	ZAttend Attend recoded as is with a Z--high values indicative high church attendance--low indicative of low church attendance	ZEduc Educ Recoded as is with a Z	ZIncome Recoded Income	ZPolviews Polviews recoded as is with a Z	ZRace Respondents race	ZSex Gender	ZSize Size collasped into 2 categories	ZThink Thinking Individualism	ZZPoor Helppoor recoded as is with ZZ	ZZSick Helpsick recoded as is with ZZ	ZHomo Homosex recoded--categories collasped	ZPremars Premarsx recoded--categories collasped	ZTeens Teensex recoded-categories collasped	ZXmars Xmarsex recoded--categories collasped
ZAge Age Rcoded as is with a Z	Pearson Correlation	1	.132**	-.061**	.136**	.099**	-.194**	.034*	-.053**	-.050	.079**	.120**	-.175**	-.084**	-.126**	-.030
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.022	.000	.112	.002	.000	.000	.000	.000	.181
	N	4492	4475	4482	2662	4319	4492	4492	4492	993	1489	1427	1904	1932	1962	1970
ZAttend Attend recoded as is with a Z--high values indicative high church attendance--low indicative of low church attendance	Pearson Correlation	.132**	1	.045**	.015	.214**	.082**	.112**	-.036*	-.131**	.046	.067*	-.327**	-.375**	-.267**	-.109**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.003	.431	.000	.000	.000	.015	.000	.075	.011	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	4475	4491	4483	2663	4322	4491	4491	4491	992	1488	1426	1904	1932	1960	1969
ZEduc Educ Recoded as is with a Z	Pearson Correlation	-.061**	.045**	1	.186**	-.064**	-.188**	-.015	.105**	.207**	.135**	.074**	.236**	.104**	.089**	.031
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.003	.	.000	.000	.000	.299	.000	.000	.000	.005	.000	.000	.000	.168
	N	4482	4483	4499	2663	4326	4499	4499	4499	994	1490	1429	1907	1934	1964	1973
ZIncome Recoded Income	Pearson Correlation	.136**	.015	.186**	1	.035	-.088**	-.166**	.052**	.085*	.112**	.025	.028	.021	-.012	.009
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.431	.000	.	.074	.000	.000	.007	.040	.001	.489	.352	.479	.684	.768
	N	2662	2663	2663	2669	2604	2669	2669	2669	582	847	779	1124	1132	1149	1158
ZPolviews Polviews recoded as is with a Z	Pearson Correlation	.099**	.214**	-.064**	.035	1	-.103**	-.046**	-.083**	-.078*	.187**	.242**	-.323**	-.230**	-.182**	-.137**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.074	.	.000	.003	.000	.015	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	4319	4322	4326	2604	4333	4333	4333	4333	959	1444	1381	1850	1881	1908	1910
ZRace Respondents race	Pearson Correlation	-.194**	.082**	-.188**	-.088**	-.103**	1	.027	.174**	-.130**	-.200**	-.118**	-.143**	-.060**	.022	.018
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.	.074	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.008	.320	.413
	N	4492	4491	4499	2669	4333	4510	4510	4510	995	1493	1431	1908	1937	1967	1975
ZSex Gender	Pearson Correlation	.034*	.112**	-.015	-.166**	-.046**	.027	1	.005	.065*	-.046	-.009	.042	-.092**	-.075**	-.029
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.022	.000	.299	.000	.003	.074	.	.762	.040	.075	.739	.064	.000	.001	.198
	N	4492	4491	4499	2669	4333	4510	4510	4510	995	1493	1431	1908	1937	1967	1975
ZSize Size collasped into 2 categories	Pearson Correlation	-.053**	-.036*	.105**	.052**	-.083**	.174**	.005	1	-.007	.011	-.032	.133**	.089**	.075**	.030
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.015	.000	.007	.000	.000	.762	.	.819	.659	.222	.000	.000	.001	.183
	N	4492	4491	4499	2669	4333	4510	4510	4510	995	1493	1431	1908	1937	1967	1975
ZThink Thinking Individualism	Pearson Correlation	-.050	-.131**	.207**	.085*	-.078*	-.130**	.065*	-.007	1	.008	-.002	.254**	.169**	.101*	.050
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.112	.000	.000	.040	.015	.000	.040	.819	.	.821	.951	.000	.000	.026	.260
	N	993	992	994	582	959	995	995	995	995	741	712	477	476	483	501
ZZPoor Helppoor recoded as is with ZZ	Pearson Correlation	.079**	.046	.135**	.112**	.187**	-.200**	-.046	.011	.008	1	.479**	-.045	-.043	-.008	-.095**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.075	.000	.001	.000	.000	.075	.659	.821	.	.000	.227	.256	.823	.010
	N	1489	1488	1490	847	1444	1493	1493	1493	741	1493	1168	716	713	725	745
ZZSick Helpsick recoded as is with ZZ	Pearson Correlation	.120**	.067*	.074**	.025	.242**	-.118**	-.009	-.032	-.002	.479**	1	-.078*	-.083*	-.085*	-.143**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.011	.005	.489	.000	.000	.739	.222	.951	.000	.	.042	.027	.023	.000
	N	1427	1426	1429	779	1381	1431	1431	1431	712	1168	1431	671	702	709	701
ZHomo Homosex recoded--categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.175**	-.327**	.236**	.028	-.323**	-.143**	.042	.133**	.254**	-.045	-.078*	1	.435**	.256**	.223**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.352	.000	.000	.064	.000	.000	.227	.042	.	.000	.000	.000
	N	1904	1904	1907	1124	1850	1908	1908	1908	477	716	671	1908	941	954	1895
ZPremars Premarsx recoded--categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.084**	-.375**	.104**	.021	-.230**	-.060**	-.092**	.089**	.169**	-.043	-.083*	.435**	1	.339**	.162**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.479	.000	.008	.000	.000	.000	.256	.027	.000	.	.000	.000
	N	1932	1932	1934	1132	1881	1937	1937	1937	476	713	702	941	1937	1920	961
ZTeens Teensex recoded-categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.126**	-.267**	.089**	-.012	-.182**	.022	-.075**	.075**	.101*	-.008	-.085*	.256**	.339**	1	.185**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.684	.000	.320	.001	.001	.026	.823	.023	.000	.000	.	.000
	N	1962	1960	1964	1149	1908	1967	1967	1967	483	725	709	954	1920	1967	979
ZXmars Xmarsex recoded--categories collasped	Pearson Correlation	-.030	-.109**	.031	.009	-.137**	.018	-.029	.030	.050	-.095**	-.143**	.223**	.162**	.185**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.181	.000	.168	.768	.000	.413	.198	.183	.260	.010	.000	.000	.000	.000	.
	N	1970	1969	1973	1158	1910	1975	1975	1975	501	745	701	1895	961	979	1975

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

2006 Pairwise