An Analysis of Tolerance Variation Among Adherents to Feminist, Environmentalist and Gay Rights Principles

Angela T. Fiquet

Master's Thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

in

Sociology

Peggy L. de Wolf, Co-Chair
Carol A. Bailey, Co-Chair
Ellsworth R. Fuhrman
Michael D. Hughes

March, 1998
Blacksburg, Virginia

An Analysis of Tolerance Variation Among Adherents to Feminist,
Environmentalist and Gay Rights Principles

Angela T. Fiquet

(ABSTRACT)

To the extent that the United States is a post-industrial society, whereby the means and ends of social production are social, and the production and reproduction of knowledge are shaped by reflexivity and continuous reconceptualizations of reality, what it means to be "tolerant" has been subjected to multiple ideologies. Supposedly freed from collectively imposed identities, social scientists have argued that in a postmodern society, individuals actively construct their own identities. In this study, it is questioned how multiple, trans-class and trans-disciplinary identities affect beliefs and behavior. Subject to exploration are expressions of tolerance, embodied as the expression of attitudes toward the following groups of traditionally nonconforming individuals: atheists, communists, racists and homosexuals.

Using 1993 General Social Survey data, independent attitudinal variables were constructed from indexed items measuring opinions about ideas embraced by three "new" social movements: the women's, environmental and gay rights' movements.
Socio-structural and attitudinal variables were regressed on tolerance, the dependent variable, which was divided into general and group-specific indexes.   Education and urbanism were shown to be significant predictors of tolerance, while gender and political ideology were not significant predictors of tolerance. Positive correlations resulted between general tolerance and pro-feminist, pro-environmentalist and pro-gay rights attitudes.

In conclusion, the prediction that individuals scoring high on measurements of feminism, environmentalism and pro-homosexuality, which all expound ideological convictions that refute traditional norms and value systems, would also demonstrate high levels of tolerance was greatly substantiated. Lending support for Bobo and Licari's (1989) argument, it is agreed that demographic, or social structural, variables alone are insufficient determinants of tolerance. Furthermore, although new social movements are chiefly organized around identity, rather than class, issues, even historically "tolerant" individuals, such as feminists, were shown to be less tolerant of certain groups, such as, in this study, racists.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 4: Findings

Chapter 5: Conclusions

INTRODUCTION

1.1   Statement of the Problem and Research Plan

History has revealed tolerance to be a highly complex phenomenon. Tolerance is a multifaceted and abstract precept which is extremely challenging to study empirically. One weakness evident from previous research is the oversimplification of tolerance.

After the political and social turmoil of the 1960s, numerous sociologists attempted to quantify tolerance, pinpoint exactly who was tolerant of whom, and uncover the determinants of tolerance. However, because of their primary reliance on quantifiable sociodemographic variables, one can only draw a barrage of narrow, contradictory and often unrelated conclusions.

The purpose of this thesis is to continue the search for correlates of tolerance. In this thesis, theoretical concepts derived from the new social movements (NSM) literature are applied to the study of tolerance.   Within the social arena, social movements (SMs) are one of the premier ways that intolerance is combated.

Although some researchers have partially included the groups that will be studied here, none have applied NSM theoretical concepts to the study of tolerance. The contribution this research offers to the existing body of research is threefold. First, this work simultaneously analyzes different classes of independent variables. Second, it includes a detailed multivariate analysis. Third, not one, but a series of dependent variables are used. The dependent variables analyzed in this study include the major variables past researchers have focused on, such as race, educational level and gender, as well as the new perspective of what I term attitudinal variables.

By applying social movement theory and ideas embraced by various new social movements[1], this research will investigate the relationship between socio-structural and attitudinal variables and tolerance of nonconforming individuals. Given the limitations of the

---

[1]Although Melucci contends that contemporary movements "are not 'new' or 'old', but bring together forms of action that involve various levels of the social structure" (1995, in Johnston & Klandermans, eds, p.53), I will not partake in this debate and will continue to employ the term NSM.

secondary data source used, in this study, direct participation in social movements is not measured. Rather, attitudes toward ideas expressed by the environmental movement, women's movement and gay rights movement are operationalized as indexed, independent variables as a means of testing their relationship to multiple forms of tolerance, which is the dependent variable. In sum, the interest for this research lies in the sociological characteristics and attitudes that predispose one toward having "tolerant" beliefs.

Based upon theoretical considerations, the independent variables will be divided into two types: structural and attitudinal. Generally, structural variables will include demographic characteristics, such as race and level of education. Attitudinal variables will encompass personal choices and opinions, such as political views.

1.2 Contribution to Existing Research

Sociological studies to date have paid little attention to the relationship between SMs and tolerance. No studies were found that simultaneously explored environmentalism, feminism and gay rights as correlates of tolerance. Given that these movements are commonly cited in conjunction with each other as embodying NSM qualities, this is surprising.

The ideologies of the three SMs outlined in this study all embrace the concept of inalienable rights: environmentalism for nature and the others for specific groups. In this paper, it will be questioned whether empirical evidence can be found in support of the theory that those advocating tolerance of their particulars will also display a general attitude of tolerance. The amount of tolerance individuals have for nonconformists (such as atheists, homosexuals, communists, racists and militants) has been chosen to measure other individuals' level of beliefs in human and/or natural rights. In this analysis, both attitudinal and structural variables will be explored as correlates of multiple forms of tolerance.

Chapter Two

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 The Concept of Tolerance

Tolerance has been heralded as a core component of democratic society for as long as democracy itself has existed. Within American society in particular, the concept of tolerance is as old as the nation itself. "The First Amendment is at the nation's tradition of tolerance...thus, tolerance for ideas and political groups that might be unpleasant or unpopular was enshrined in the nation's Constitution" (Griessman, 1993, p.78) The ability to tolerate, or the right to agree to disagree, is the hallmark of civil society. According to Lipset (1960), tolerance is essential to the functioning of a democracy and, therefore, is a crucial topic for political sociological inquiry. Thus, to the extent that the United States is a democratic nation, exhibiting tolerance becomes a key component that epitomizes the actualization of American nationalism.

2.2 Tolerance and the Social Sciences

Throughout the past several decades, sociologists and political scientists have approached the concept of tolerance via several routes. Liberal political theorists by the early 1940s claimed tolerance to be the "true virtue of a democratic society" (Ricci, 1984). At this point, tolerance was defined as

> a willingness to accept the fact that anyone can err and that everyone should therefore be guaranteed the right to express opinions in an attempt to persuade the majority to adopt them...(Ricci, 1984, p.152).

The notion of a tolerant citizenry represented personal characteristics which political leaders and social thinkers supported. Not only was tolerance useful for maintaining the facade of true public representation, but it also embodied the values of skepticism and "open-minded receptivity to new ideas which characterized the scientific temperament" (Ricci, 1984, p.152). In this light, espousing tolerant attitudes reinforced the myth that minority views would, in accordance with the principles of democracy, be ensured a political voice.

3

However, after World War II, the value of tolerance was revised. Originating in Lipset's (1960) work, the concept of "working-class authoritarianism" stated that the poor in Western societies would be more likely to support Communism than liberal, democratic principles, such as civil liberties (Ricci, 1984).

As Ricci points out, according to behaviorists, such as Dewey and Popper, the poor do not possess the characteristics required for "good citizenship". Thus, in order to glean support for "right" and "good" liberal principles, the concept of tolerance has to be revisited and revised. Stemming from Rosak's argument, if left unchecked, modern society may cause "the unthinkable to become thinkable and the intolerable to become tolerable" (1969, p.47 cited in Ricci, 1984, p.181). Consequently, "counterculture theorists", including the psychologist Eric Fromm and political scientist Herbert Marcuse, determined that conditions leading to an intolerable social order, which could lead to a corrupt society, should not be tolerated. In essence, there is some discernable formula for the "good society", which the citizenry may be unaware of, yet must be sought after by those who have the true knowledge.

2.3   Post-Industrial Society and Identity Construction

According to descriptions by some theorists, the United States in the 1990's may be identified as a post-industrial society (Stehr, 1994; Cohen, 1985; Bell, 1973). In a post-industrial society, the means and ends of social production are social (Cohen, 1985; Gibbons et al, 1994), as opposed to primarily material, products. Domination and power are situated in the cultural sphere of production, and knowledge production reconstructs the interpretation of both the human and nonhuman world (Cohen, 1985).

According to Touraine, what distinguishes post-industrialism from earlier societal types is that society itself is "capable of producing its own knowledge, normative guidelines, and sociocultural forms" (Cohen, 1985, p.702). In his theories regarding collective behavior, this change in emphasis to everyday life occurrences results in a conceptualization of the struggle for a democratic society to be framed "in terms of a population's right to choose its own kind of life and identity" (Cohen, 1985, p.702). Additionally, post-industrial society is characterized by an increased reflexivity (Touraine cited in Cohen, 1985).

While societal reflexivity for Touraine entails an expansion of both civil society and the public sphere, for Gibbons et al. (1994) it presents a dilemma:

> "In modern society the links between agents and structure may be loosening, freeing individuals from constraints of social class identities or prescribed workplace and gender roles and enabling them to modify these constraining structures through their own reflexive behavior. But individualisation, and reflexivity, remain grounded in particular, if now more volatile, contexts" (p.103).

In the context of knowledge production, these relaxed links between social structure and individuals reduce the substantive distinctions between different realms of society. One example, provided by Gibbons (1994), is the link between the cultural industry and the humanities, which also directly impacts the economy and shapes lifestyles, values and political culture (p.104). The argument is taken further when it is stated that, because individuals are now freed from identities that are collectively imposed, they may now select cultural habits, objects and references by which they can actively construct their own, new reflexive identities (p.104). Higher education plays a large role in this process, offering validation and "a form of social credentialisation" for challenging firmly established hierarchial principles (Gibbons, 1994, p.104). In other words, although structural constraints have not been abolished, in American society today, individuals may construct identities more independently than previously. Additionally, these identities are far more likely to be knowledge based, as opposed to being adopted because of class or traditions.

If the theories proposed are true, and new modes of knowledge production shape and influence personal identity, which in turn may affect collective identities, how do these multiple, trans-class, trans-disciplinary and even trans-gender identities affect beliefs and behavior?

2.4 New Social Movements and Identity Formation

Coinciding with this post-industrial societal stage are new social movements (Cohen, 1985). Examples of NSMs are the women's, environmental, antinuclear and peace movements (Gamson, 1992). NSMs vary from social movements, such as socialism and nationalism, in several ways. First, unlike SMs, NSMs are not class based. Actors engage in struggles for a

"post-bourgeois," "post-patriarchal" and democratic society (Cohen, 1985). Action is grassroots oriented and the target is the social domain of civil society as opposed to the economy or the state. According to Cohen, the focus of NSMs' work, democratizing structures present in everyday life, is pursued via modes of communication and by establishing collective identities.

Social movement theorists following the identity-oriented paradigm, such as Touraine, contend that the identities of actors in NSMs are different not because of their actions, but rather because of "the level of reflexivity and the changed locuses and stakes of struggles that correspond to the emergence of a new societal type" (Cohen, 1985, p.702). Objections to these concepts, vocalized by Cohen, are grounded in the notion that there is no discontinuity in the historical trend of civil society and that social struggles cannot be categorized according to societal type. While these criticisms can be further refuted, a discussion about the best methodological procedure for analyzing civil society is outside the scope of this research.

Within the resource mobilization social movement literature, identity is often framed as part of a group process (Tilly, 1978). Although social-psychological interpretations of identity are severely criticized, it has been noted that:

> "it is necessary to analyze those aspects of experience that shape the interpretation of interests, individual and collective, and affect the very capacity of actors to form groups and mobilize. This is especially true for contemporary collective actors who do not target the state or the economy for inclusion and whose identities cannot be deduced from these subsystems." (Cohen, 1985, p.688)

Two NSMs cited by Cohen where this must be done are the feminist and environmentalist movements. These movements partake in defending opportunities for the formation of new identities and solidarities and "involve conflict between social adversaries over the control of a *social* field" (Cohen, 1985, p.690).

Furthermore, identifying with any SM is part of a collective process. As inherent in the term, movements are **social**. Collective identities are socially constructed and cannot be reduced to an aggregation of individual attitudes (Taylor & Whittier, 1992, in Johnston and Klandermans, eds.). However, both individual and group identities are crucial to daily life and the study of social movements has always been divided between focusing on collective action and individual motivations (Mellucci cited in Johnston & Klandermans, eds.). While this study is restricted

from uncovering motivations, it does look at beliefs and attitudes that are at least partially responsible for determining behavior.

2.5 Belief Systems and Heterogeneity

When analyzing survey responses to study ideological beliefs about any particular SM, it is important to recognize that, even among the movement's constituents, heterogeneity exists among individual viewpoints (Turner & Killian, 1987). For example, in his study of environmental groups' beliefs, Stallings (1973) found that the greatest degree of homogeneity exists among leaders but the majority of nonmember supporters displayed only a small amount of homogeneity in responses. One explanation Turner & Killian (1987) offer to explain this phenomenon is that each adherent brings his/her own background and world view with them to the movement. So, the movement's value orientations are interpreted through this framework.

2.6 Tolerance

2.6.1   The History of Tolerance Research

How attitudes towards environmentalism, feminism and gay rights are associated with tolerance is the subject of this study. However, the majority of studies that have examined issues regarding tolerance have not explored the subject from this position. Consequently, one is left with a fragmented and substantively unrelated research history. Because the content of past research agrees with little more than the general subject of tolerance, the studies cited here will focus on those methodologically similar to the current study.

2.6.2   Social Movements and Tolerance

Despite the importance of tolerance as a precursor of SM activity, little research has been done examining the relationship between tolerance and social movements. However, in his study of the relationship between anti-white attitudes and activism, Marx (1969) found that blacks who belonged to a civil-rights organization exhibited anti-white attitudes less frequently than those who did not belong to such an organization (Turner & Killiman, 1987).

Marx's deduction, that "for many militants their relative tolerance for whites is part of a generally tolerant world view related to their greater sophistication and greater exposure to official values" (Marx, 1969, p.203 cited in Turner & Killiman, 1987, p.233), suggests that tolerance cannot simply be explained by participation in a movement. Instead, there appears to be a combination of individual as well as social group explanations for their behavior.

While researchers in the past two decades have meagerly pursued the study of tolerance, this issue enjoyed abundant popularity during the 1970s. In the seventies, a considerable amount of research was conducted on tolerance using the GSS, or other similar social survey data. Since a thorough review of the literature has revealed more studies than those discussed here, I have chosen to only focus on those studies that include at least one variable related to the present research.

2.6.3 Gender and Race Differences in Tolerance

Although gender is an important variable for much sociological inquiry, this seems not to be the case for the study of tolerance. First, the majority of studies on tolerance include gender only as a control variable, and not as the focus of the study. Second, this body of research indicates that gender explains only a small portion of the variation in tolerance. Third, in the one study that focused on gender, using 1974 GSS data, Ruggerio and Weston (1977) found no difference between men and women on the extension of civil liberties to nonconformists.

Similar to gender, few studies were found that exclusively centered on the relation between race and tolerance. The one study by Ernst et al. (1990) that did focus on race found a race-gender interaction. Furthermore, a potential weakness of this study is that they exclusively measured tolerance of homosexuality and did this by specifically measuring attitudes toward AIDS. Although lower levels of tolerance for homosexuals were initially found to be displayed by blacks, most of the racial difference in their study was actually a gender difference. The greatest disparity over attitudes towards homosexuality existed between black verses white females. Black females expressed the highest percentage of negative attitudes towards AIDS and homosexuality.

2.6.4 Tolerance and Education

Education appears to be a primary predictor of tolerance (Phelan et al, 1995; West, 1977; Jelen & Wilcox, 1990; Price & Hsu, 1992; O'Donnell, 1993), although the support for this relationship is not unanimous (Wilson, 1994; Ernst et al., 1991; Bobo & Licari, 1989;).

In traditional liberal theory, education is postulated as the cure for all of society's ills. According to such classical thinkers as John Stuart Mill (1956), humans are rational creatures which acquire, through education, the capacity for reason. As long as this capacity is preserved, the promise of a good democratic society is upheld.

So, does higher education ensure higher levels of tolerance and the ensuing "good" society as Mill projected? Empirically, this is debatable. Boggs (1981), for instance, asserts that higher education plays a crucial role in the development of alternative social movements (feminism, civil rights, environmentalism).

Other studies have also confirmed education to be the most significant predictor of tolerance (O'Donnell, 1993; Jelen & Wilcox 1990). In Jelen & Wilcox's (1990) analysis of five different religious groups, it was education, not religious affiliation, that explained differences in political tolerance. Additionally, in predicting tolerance of new religious movements (NRMs), education has been found to be the most significant predictor (O'Donnell, 1993).

Yet, if one continues to pursue education as the critical explanation of tolerance, one will have to face the growing number of studies that have rejected education as the savior of the tolerance question. Critics of using demographic variables to explain tolerance, such as Bobo & Licari (1989) and Ernst et al. (1991), argue that education alone may not be the decisive factor.

Bobo & Licari's (1989) analysis of 1984 GSS data found that education's effect on tolerance, defined as willingness to extend civil liberties to nonconformist groups, is mediated by what they call "cognitive sophistication". This suggests that certain demographic traits may account for increased levels of tolerance and that education alone is not the entire picture.

Additional limitations about education as the primary predictor of tolerance can be drawn. For instance, even though O'Donnell (1993) found education to be the most significant predictor of tolerance, it appears that the topical area in which one is "educated" will have an

impact upon tolerance. This is evidenced by the finding that academics are the most tolerant subgroup of NRMs, while, not surprisingly, Christian clergy are the least tolerant. Certainly, education per se is not the decisive factor here since clergy may have been "educated" for a comparable number of years as academics.

Because past research using education as an explanatory variable is plagued by inconsistency, this current analysis will follow along the lines suggested by Bobo & Licari. Namely, the value of education is not being disputed. Education is predicted to have a significant positive impact on tolerance; Yet, it is only anticipated to partially explain social tolerance.

2.6.5   Tolerance, Liberalism and Political Ideology

Lurking quietly behind the curtain of much social tolerance research is the concept of American liberalism. Taken from a political science perspective, America's democratic government is, in and of itself, an expression of liberalism. Democratic ideology includes

> consent, accountability, limited or constitutional government, representation, majority rule, minority rights, the principle of political opposition, religious toleration, equity before the law, the rights of juridical defense, and individual self-determination over a broad range of personal affairs (McClosky, 1964, p.363, cited in Ricci, 1984).

Despite broad public acceptance of the tenets described above, the majority of Americans do not consider themselves to be liberal (GSS, 1994). Yet, research has elucidated the centrality of liberalism to social tolerance (Price & Hse, 1992; Phelan, 1995). As such, any inclusive study of tolerance must include political ideology.

Furthermore, one's political ontology may help to further explain education's contradictory position. Liberal attitudes, combined with educational level, appear to be decisive for understanding tolerance. Looking at public opinion toward AIDS, higher levels of education and agreement with liberal politics, which promote civil rights and tolerance of diverse individuals, are found to coincide with positive attitudes and sentiments for gays, AIDS policies, and victims (Price & Hsu, 1992).

10

In an attempt to further clarify the liberal/tolerance link, Phelan et al. (1995) proposed three models: liberal attitudes as a result of cognitive and personality development, direct socialization, or ideological refinement. In their study of tolerance for the homeless, education was found to lead to greater tolerance but not to agreement in extending economic support. The socialization model is accepted for explaining how one comes to embrace liberalism. Finally, it is concluded that, in America, education socializes individuals to believe in equality of opportunity and respect, but not in equal end results for all. Thus, one can be tolerant yet not wish to work towards the betterment of individuals' lives. Re-conceptualized in SM terms, one may agree with a movement's ideology yet not feel compelled to act and/or join.

From a macro-sociological perspective, Mueller (1988) argues that, as a whole, in US society, public tolerance of Leftists has risen, but the public's understanding and concern with civil liberties is minimal.

Using GSS data to test for differences in levels of tolerance for left and right political groups, Wilson's (1994) research reveals that, when considering cohort succession, there is an increase in tolerance for left groups, but not right groups. Again, higher levels of education only explained part of this phenomenon. Changes in attitudes over time within cohorts yielded a decrease in tolerance toward right groups.

Overall, this research suggests that an increased toleration for unpopular groups reflects not a growing acceptance of such groups, but rather an understanding of the need for allowing controversial concepts, which are often disapproved of by the majority. This, as mentioned in the introduction, is the hallmark of a democratic society.

Research about political tolerance, via the extension of general legal principles, such as equal employment opportunities and freedom of speech and press, to numerous political and social groups reveals that individuals who express support for the extension of civil liberties toward groups such as the Ku Klux Klan and neo-Nazis do so for ideological reasons (Riggle & Ellis, 1994). Supporting an individual's right to do something, whether it is to speak, protest, write, etc, because it is their civil right and not because of the activity's actual content is to act upon an ideologically-grounded conviction. In other words, commitment to upholding civil rights is an ideologically-based act.

11

Tolerance in general is often pursued for purely ideological reasons. However, ideology alone is not the entire explanation. For homosexuals in particular, extension of general legal principles has been affected not only by an ideological perspective, but also by attitudes, which may be affectively determined. As a whole, in Riggle & Ellis's (1994) research, homosexuals were disliked and the granting of civil liberties to them was affected by attitudes. One explanation offered for this phenomenon is that homosexuality is a social/lifestyle issue whereas homosexuals constitute a political group deserving of political rights.

Approaching the same topic from a different route, legal discourse has been pursued as an alternative means of analyzing political tolerance for nonconformity. Using this method, Kessler (1993) suggests that political differences are socially constructed. Differences in tolerance, especially between elites and the general public, are explained as the result of one's location in social relations. Thus, it is argued that laws and legal institutions are culturally situated and therefore affect tolerance accordingly.

As should be apparent by now, explaining variation in political tolerance is an arduous task which has been undertaken in a variety of ways. Another theory which has traditionally been used to explain such variation is the level of exposure to sociocultural diversity (Stouffer, 1955). Although this theory was originally based upon gender, Manale (1990) draws upon Stouffer's work to test labor status and political tolerance. Her findings include a significant relationship between labor status and political tolerance for women but not for men and illustrate that housewives have the lowest tolerance scores, indicating a class-based difference in tolerance.

2.6.6 Tolerance and Homosexuals

While only one study has been uncovered dealing specifically with homosexuals and their level of tolerance for other socially defined deviants, this study directly addressed some of the concerns that have been raised about "true" tolerance.

As a group, homosexuals are significantly more tolerant of other deviant groups, namely drug addicts, ex-convicts, hippies, alcoholics, prostitutes, mentally ill, and political extremists, than are non-deviant college students (Corbett et al., 1977).

2.6.7 Tolerance and Community Type

One demographic variable that remains pertinent is the size and type of living location, such as whether one is from a rural or urban area. Much research has been dedicated to the examination of community type and the development of various ideologies, including religious, political, gender and economic beliefs.

Illustrative of regionalism's effect on political and tolerance attitudes are the works of Tuch (1987) and Ellison & Musick (1993). In an analysis of 1972-85 GSS data, Tuch (1987) found that although demographic variables may not account for all variations in tolerance levels, overall urbanites and non-Southerners are more racially tolerant than non-urban and non-Southern persons. And, over time, the effects of urbanism on tolerance have increased while simultaneously regional effects have diminished.

Tuch's (1987) finding is consistent with Ellison & Musick's (1993) findings that reveal significant differences in tolerance for left-wing groups, such as communists, atheists and homosexuals, by Southerners and non-Southerners, even after religion and other sociodemographic variables have been controlled.

Urbanism has also been identified as having a strong impact upon the development of personality (Wilson, 1991). In another analysis using GSS data, urbanism was found to lead to greater levels of tolerance (Wilson, 1991). Even when individuals, who were originally from cities, relocated to non-urban areas, they still exhibited greater tolerance than their non-urban neighbors. In fact, they often exhibit an even greater level of tolerance than they originally expressed. Thus, Wilson (1991) concludes that migration furthers tolerance. The community type where one relocates to is inconsequential in inhibiting tolerance.

In this study, the only aspect of community type being measured is where one currently resides. Wilson (1991) has demonstrated that migration leads to higher levels of tolerance. Therefore, if an individual in the present study has relocated to a city, this experience is likely to have changed his/her perceptions and attitudes about nontraditional persons in a pro-tolerant way and, consequently, will have little to no negative impact on tolerance.

2.6.8   Tolerance and Racists

Despite the conceptual clarity and consensus of definition for such groups as atheists and communists, racists as a group sometimes mean different things to different audiences. In this paper, racist attitudes will be aligned with Doob's (1993) definition of racism as "an ideology that contends that actual or alleged differences between different racial groups assert the superiority of one racial group." Reinterpreted by Griessman, "as ideology, racism is a system of interconnected ideas, beliefs and attitudes that justifies a group's or society's particular institutions, interests, and behaviors" (p.17). This is how racism will be conceptualized in this study. Describing individual racism as a manifestation of attitudes and beliefs, racists will be seen as exhibiting their racist ideology via opinions. It is therefore believed that the attitudes and beliefs being measured via the tolerance items in this research capture the presence of racism.

2.6.9   Summary of Tolerance Research

To summarize, overwhelmingly, what past research indicates is that the display of tolerance cannot solely be identified by demographic traits, such as years of education or other sociodemographic variables. Instead, it must also be pursued via a social psychological approach. Attitudes must be measured in addition to sociodemographic traits. It is for this reason that I have attempted to measure tolerance via stated personal beliefs, and in this new formulation lies the strength of this research.

2.7   The Women's Movement

As operationalized in this study, "feminism" refers to the most basic, elemental components of liberal and egalitarian feminism. From this standpoint, the notion of an inclusive definition of "woman" as applicable to all women is rejected. Sex is asserted to be an insufficient criterion from which a generalized definition of "woman" can be developed. As illustrated by the founders of the National Organization of Women (NOW) in their Statement of Purpose, their goal was "true equality for all women in America...a fully equal partnership of the sexes...in truly equal partnership with men" (cited in Castro, 1990). This is how "feminism" will

14

be conceptualized in this research - as the exhibition of an underlying desire for gender equality, as expressed particularly in non-domestic employment and political capacities.

In general, liberal feminists view individuals and institutions as having the capacity to change. Congruent with some sociological explanations, reality is viewed as reflexive of structure and situation. Consequently, sexist individuals and institutions are a result of sexist socialization. Education is seen as the key to women's advancement in society (NOW, Statement of Purpose) and, according to Steinem (1973), one goal of egalitarian feminism is to present an alternative reality which induces women to question the norms they take for granted. So, for instance, the norm of women performing unpaid household labor should be replaced by an egalitarian view of all human labor as being worthy of reward (Castro, 1990 citing Steinem, 1976).

Congruent with Gamson (in Morris & Mueller, eds, 1992), the women's movement can be viewed as a NSM[2]. Crucial to the concept of NSM theory, as well as to the new women's movement in particular, is the notion that identification cuts across all economic classes (Kauffman, 1990; Melucci, 1989; Gamson in Morris & Mueller, eds, 1992). Identity issues are central to NSMs. Just as radical feminists' notions of the "personal as political" (Taylor & Whittier in Morris & Mueller, ed., 1992), coined by Hanisch and revocalized in the majority of radical feminist theories, NSM theories assert that collective social and political processes and subjective personal experiences collide to form collective identities (Melucci, 1989; Cohen, 1985).

Collective identity as a crucial distinguishing element for NSMs (B. Epstein, 1990; Boggs, 1986; Cohen, 1985; Melucci, 1985, 1989; Touraine, 1985; Pizzorno, 1978) is commonly defined as a shared self-identification that arises from common interests and actions. Despite the fact that *collective* identity and institutional affiliation cannot be determined in this research,

---

[2]A criticism of NSM theory is that the distinction is ethnocentric b/c "it privileges one...subset of social movements that happen to be predominantly white, middle class, and located in Western Europe and North America...when they become a reified category of analysis - *the* new social movements - many of the most important social movements of the past two decades are rendered invisible" (Gamson, p.58). Although some theorists, such as Cohen (1985) have tried to resolve this problem by referring to the NSMs as "contemporary," criticism persists.

drawing partially upon Taylor & Whittier's (1992) definition of a social movement community as a network of individuals that hold interests in opposition to dominant groups, attitudes towards issues relevant to particular movements can be used to distinguish individuals sensitive to certain topics from the majority. However, it is important to note that as a post-modernist, social constructivist paradigm (B. Epstein, 1990, cited in Taylor & Whittier), NSMs envision identity as being partially constructed via social and political activity. Therefore, this study is clearly not attempting to determine causality of identity; it is merely analyzing how possession of certain attitudes commonly identified within various social movements affect levels of tolerance.

Although disagreement persists as to the precise moment of origin of the "new" feminist movement, with some analysts citing the close of WWII (Castro, 1990) and others, as well as common public perception, citing the 1960s (Taylor & Whittier, cited in Richardson & Taylor, ed., 1992), many historical events that occurred during the 1960s markedly affected feminism. First, in 1964, Congress added Title VII to the Civil Rights Act, banning discrimination on the basis of sex (as well as race, religion and ethnic origin). In 1966, NOW was formed by Betty Friedan. This organization's mission was aimed at fighting sexual discrimination in all realms of life - social, economic and political. In June of 1968, Beverly Jones and Judith Brown prioritized the struggle between the sexes over the struggle among classes. With this decrement, the Women's Liberation Movement had begun.

Primarily, what differentiates the earlier "Women's Rights Movement" from the later "Women's Liberation Movement" is that the former focused on sexual discrimination, while the latter concentrated its efforts on sexual oppression (Castro, 1990). Furthermore, according to Castro (1990):

> While Betty Friedan and the earlier Women's Rights movement had proposed that the remedy was a mass movement by women into the working world, the theorists of the later Women's Liberation movement laid down a precondition that women must first liberate themselves through the process of consciousness-raising, with the intention of developing an ideology and an action program appropriate to a political movement (p.25).

However, the political advent of the new feminist movement began on August 26, 1970, when thousands of women refused to perform household and/or sexual duties as part of a national

women's demonstration.

Theoretically, it is primarily the ideological differences between liberal and radical feminism that have given shape to second wave feminism's revised perspectives. For instance, mainstream, or "contemporary liberal" feminism is rooted in the notion that women do not have power because equal opportunity to compete and succeed in male-dominated arenas, such as economics and politics, has not been achieved (Taylor & Whittier, 1992, in Richardson & Taylor, ed.). However, according to Eisenstein (1981), this liberal ideology fundamentally varies little from its established ideology in the nineteenth century, when the concept of feminism arose during the abolitionist movement.

The strategies and goals of liberal feminists continue to be legal, economic and political equality between the sexes. To accomplish this task, both society and women, via education and training, must be changed. In comparison,

> "radical feminists hold that in all societies, institutions and social patterns are structured to maintain and perpetuate gender inequality and that female disadvantage permeates virtually all aspects of sociocultural and personal life" (Taylor & Whittier, p.535, 1992, in Richardson & Taylor, ed.).

In order for equality to be achieved, radical feminists call for a reconceptualization of all the major institutions and systems of power, including marriage and sexuality. In other words,

> "radical feminism is a transformational politics engaged in a fight against female disadvantage and the masculinization of culture. Its ultimate vision is revolutionary in scope: a fundamentally new social order that eliminates the sex-class system and replaces it with new ways of defining and structuring experience" (Taylor & Whittier, pp.536-37, 1992, in Richardson & Taylor, ed.).

Although the scope of feminism for this research is mainstream, understanding radical feminism's contribution to feminist ideology is crucial to NSM theory. Some feminists, and particularly radical feminists, have pursued an alternative use of dialectical materialism whereby ideologies of rape (Brownmiller, 1975), political systems (Millet, 1985) and psychoanalysis/Freudian theory are seen as illustrative of universal applications of sexual politics

favoring men. This reconceptualization, in turn, can lead to participation and consciousness raising in the movement as being an "identity altering experience....Becoming a feminist can transform a woman's entire self-concept and way of life...". (Taylor & Whittier, p.537, 1992, citing Cassell, 1977).   As viewed by Castro, the adaptation of Marxist theory to suit feminist principles provides a counterideology about the "natural inalienable rights of all human beings" (Castro, p. 42). Additionally, American feminism has "produced a powerful protest against the *sociological reality of gender domination*" (Kathleen Barry, 1990, p.xi of forward in Castro).

2.8   The Environmental Movement

The environmental movement has grown as an alternative reaction to and rejection of the assumption that economic growth can continue without a foreseeable limit (Murphy, 1994) and that science will find all the answers to the problem of resource exhaustion. Originating in the 1960s, and gaining widespread recognition and glamour with Earth Day in 1970, the environmental movement is currently in its third decade of existence (Cylke, 1993; Rosenbaum, 1991). Since its inception, the movement has undergone considerable change. What Rosenbaum terms "Environmental Era II" began with the close of the Reagan administration. Historically, this era marks the onset of an attitude of willingness within both the White House and Congress to create policies to deal with major environmental problems that resulted during Reagan's term in office. This heightened awareness of environmental concerns is due to a combination of factors: Reagan's pro-business, anti-environment agenda; scandals within the EPA; specific disasters such as the spill resulting from Exxon's tanker *Valdez* running aground in Alaska; specific attention to climate changes and ozone depletion; and media coverage of activist activities (Cylke, 1993). Out of all the factors though, the mass media is the most predominant influence shaping how Americans perceive environmental events.

The new environmental movement is marked by several characteristics. First, the grassroots sector of the movement has matured and greatly expanded its reach. By the early 1990s, over 5,000 grassroots organizations were in existence. In response to the activists' efforts, state and local officials, as well as corporations, have responded to ever increasing pressure to re-examine and justify their environmental impact. Four major pieces of federal legislation have

18

resulted from grassroot efforts: the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, the addition of "right-to-know" provisions which force corporations to report all hazardous substances they use, and the establishment of Technical Assistance Grants by the federal government for local citizen groups (Cylke, 1993).

Ideologically, environmental groups have become more moderate and practical in their approach. They are less ideologically rigid and less confrontational when dealing with opposition (Rosenbaum, 1991). Although this leads to greater opportunities for political compromise, tension within the movement is growing between the militant and moderate factions. Several other conditions have also shaped the development of the movement. Globalism, radical reformation of existing laws and institutions, an increased consciousness of costs, and greater awareness of both the limits and problems blocking the achievement of environmental goals are at the forefront of activists' agendas (Rosenbaum, 1991). However, despite an increased awareness of obstacles, the movement currently enjoys more economic resources, technology, and professionally trained and politically skilled organizers than ever before, in addition to widespread public support. Environmentalists have become competent litigators, experienced lobbyists and adept and aggressive negotiators in the global arena. Activists have reached a level of status and competence where they are even able to challenge such giants as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and the claims to truth expounded by numerous "scientific experts" (Rosenbaum, 1991). These activities have led to greater publicity and respect in the eyes of the public and have facilitated a higher level of general awareness about environmental concerns. One success of environmental organizations is the expansion of public skepticism and the challenging nature of questions posed to authority figures by a more ecologically informed society.

As a movement, environmentalism does not have any single doctrine. A pluralistic ideology prevails where individuals are bound by common values, attitudes and beliefs about nature, humanity and U.S. society (Rosenbaum, 1991). Since these attitudes and beliefs differ from the mainstream culture, environmentalists, like feminists and other social movement adherents, share a nontraditional identity.

Environmentalists share a number of demographic similarities. Members of most

19

environmental organizations tend to be white, highly educated and middle to upper class. It is for this reason that the environmental movement has been criticized as being elitist. However, recent agendas have specifically attempted to focus on issues relevant to the working class and poor, such as inner-city pollution and workplace safety. Furthermore, members of the movement continue to become more ethnically diverse as environmental awareness reaches a national magnitude. Although at the national level, environmental organization continues to be dominated by "white, middle-class males" (Cylke, 1993), at the grassroots level, working-class and racially diverse individuals are becoming more involved. To some theorists, this trend will strengthen the movement: "many community activists no longer identify themselves as participants in an environmental movement. Many now view their activities as part of a movement for 'environmental justice'...[which]...acknowledges the historical race and class biases associated with many forms of environmental deterioration" (Cylke, 1993, p.68).

Politically, organizations range from "deep ecologists" on the radical left to moderate organizations like the Conservation Foundation (Rosenbaum, 1991). As previously mentioned, the majority of environmentalists are moderately to strongly liberal.

The general conviction of environmentalists is that human life is part of a larger, naturally created world order. As only one of several species, humans must act in an ethical, responsible manner and preserve the ecological balance of the planet. Situated against American culture and values, environmentalism sharply opposes most of what Americans value greatly. For instance, environmentalism disputes "market economics," does not place economic growth and material consumption above all else, abhors capitalism and rejects the notion that technology will rectify all the perils of modernity. Because most political structures support traditional American values, environmentalists also advocate for a political reformation based upon ecological preservation (Rosenbaum, 1991). A participatory democracy with a decentralized source of political power is considered desirable. In short, many environmentalists call for a cultural revolution.

Contrary to expectations based on political and economic values, public opinion polls evidence broad and energetic support for the environmental movement and its political agenda (Rosenbaum, 1991). In 1990, 63% of Americans said that environmental problems are one of the

top three or four issues they care about most (Dunlap & Scarce, 1990). Furthermore, support is distributed across the socioeconomic spectrum. Yet, despite this broadly based assertion of environmental values, Americans frequently reject policies that are "essential to implementing the environmental programs they claim to support" (Rosenbaum, 1991, p.27). This rejection is primarily due to an unwillingness to accept personal costs and inconveniences.

As noted earlier, most environmentalists are moderately to radically liberal (Palmer, 1994; Rosenbaum, 1991; Mitchell, 1980). The majority of members of the five largest national environmental organizations, National Wildlife Federation, The Wilderness Society, Sierra Club, Environmental Defense Fund and Environmental Action, self-identify as politically liberal (Mitchell, 1980). Compared to the general public, three times as many environmentalists are politically liberal or "radical". However, as Turner and Killian (1987) point out, even within the movement there is wide variation. For instance, liberals and radicals compose 23% of the National Wildlife Federation while Environmental Action consists of 82% liberal or radical members (Turner & Killian, 1987). From these statistics, it is concluded that adherents to the environmental movement are not in agreement about environmental goals and ideology, yet, on the other hand, these individuals are still rather homogenous. In assessing and reflecting upon the contradictions existent in SMs, Turner & Killian offer the following advice:

> It is often useful to think of a movement as organized about *value orientations* more than about specifically stated sets of goals and ideology. One joins with others who value the natural environment and wish to protect it, even though many are unclear just what this means in specific situations and those who are clear disagree among themselves. One joins with others who share the conviction that traditional society has dealt women a raw deal, in spite of individual uncertainty and contending views of what this means specifically. Goals and ideologies are not simply cognitive matters. They are attempts to elaborate and specify a total human response that merges the cognitive and the affective into what we sometimes call a social sentiment (1987, p.276).

Value orientations are useful for explaining SM behavior on several levels and "identify the character of the movement and the style of its adherents" (Turner & Killian, 1987, p.282). Individuals hold a wide array of beliefs and values. By focusing individual discontent on a specific, common problem shared by others with similar values and goals, solutions can be formulated. For example, the women's movement was created when the subordination of women to men came to be viewed as a result of learned attitudes and institutional injustice,

21

rather than from biological differences (Turner & Killian, 1987).

Additionally, issues can be framed to appeal to different individuals, thereby determining a movement's constituency. For example, depending on its goals, the environmental movement has at times attracted a narrow, specific group of adherents, such as marine biologists combating an oil spill, and at other times goals have been so broad that anyone could be an environmentalist, such as when environmental pollution is attributed to littering or a lack of recycling.

Despite the various ways SM theorists use value orientations, what is important here is the notion that values affect behavior. If an individual values the preservation of the environment, then s/he will be intolerant of individuals and groups that degrade it.

2.9   The Women's Movement and Environmentalism

Women have been at the forefront of the environmental movement, often active at the local level trying to make changes that would improve the environment and document the effects of toxic wastes (Murphy, 1991). Historically, women (and particularly feminists) have been allied with movements that work toward achieving tolerance and acceptance of diversity. For instance, according to Banks (1981), women were active in the anti-slavery movement and were at the forefront of the anti-vivisection movement. In addition, women have constituted the majority of animal rights movement activists, and lesbian feminists have been especially vocal in working towards eliminating anti-gay discrimination and homophobia.

This overlap of feminism and other movements was particularly evident during the 1980s, especially when "identity politics" received much attention. As some analysts have observed (Bunch, 1987), feminism "was becoming a transformational politics, a comprehensive ideology that addressed nearly every social issue, from international peace and the economic policy of the United States to animal rights" (Taylor & Whittier, p.537, 1992, in Richardson & Taylor, ed.). By associating "multiple forms of domination" as reflective of the dominant social order, feminism is able to intuitively connect various forms of exploitation.

> "Movements such as the gay and lesbian movement, AIDS movement,...and the animal rights movement have been profoundly influenced by feminist values and ideology,

22

including the emphasis on collective structure and consensus, the notion of the personal as political...and the critique of patriarchal mistreatment of animals and ecological resources" (Taylor & Whittier, p.544, 1992, in Richardson & Taylor, ed.).

In addition, Taylor & Whittier make the argument that renewed coalitions with the peace, environmentalist, socialist anti-apartheid and anti-U.S. Intervention in Latin American movements are symbolic of the feminist's movement reunification with similar political views espoused by the New Left during the 1960s.

It is in this mutual understanding, this disdain for discrimination and intolerance, whether it is of homosexuals, the environment, or women, that these NSMs are interconnected. As advocates of social change, all feminists work towards eliminating gender inequality. For instance, modern feminists, and especially radical feminists, have sought to achieve feminist goals through the transformation of traditional sex and family roles (Banks, 1981). This is congruent with the goals of the GRM because it includes the acceptance of homosexuality and the extension of civil liberties to all people.

Tolerance and equality for ethnic diversity is also inherent in feminist principles and experiences. For example, in the early days of the women's movement, many of the first male supporters in the United States were those who had already endured hatred and violence in their advocation for the abolition of slavery (Banks, 1981). The American suffrage movement also was embraced by individuals who had experienced various forms of discrimination. So, historically feminism and tolerance for those who have been discriminated against have been joint pursuits. And, despite criticism of the feminist movement as being composed of primarily white, middle-class women, popular support for the movement remains strong across ethnic lines. Citing Sapiro (1991), Taylor & Whittier (1992) point to a 1989 *New York Times / CBS* News poll which found that, while 64% of white women see a need for the women's movement, 85% of African American and 76% of Hispanic women see a need for the movement.

"Ecofeminism" is the term given to the new movement that links both the environmental and feminist movements. Ecofeminists "see the patriarchal dominations of women and other social groups as parallel to man's exploitation of 'non-human nature' (Warren, 1994, p.1). Ecofeminism is concerned with the deconstruction of male belief systems, particularly anthropocentric Christianity, and with the reconstruction of a new approach towards nature

(Baker, 1993). This is a multi-cultural movement because it analyses all social systems of domination, including but not limited to racism, classism, ageism, enthnocentrism, imperialism, colonialism and sexism (Warren, 1994). And, just as there is no singular form of feminism, there is no singular type of ecofeminism. However, the importance of all these positions lies in their rejection of any form of intolerance.

One ecofeminist in particular, Merchant (1981), argues in the *Death of Nature*, that with industrialization and the scientific revolution came a shift in the Western worldview. The original organic worldview, which saw nature as alive and interconnected, has been replaced by the mechanistic worldview, which views nature as being lifeless, passive and without a useful purpose. However, as the environmental movement continues to gain momentum, increasing numbers of participants are challenging this mechanistic/capitalistic viewpoint. Simultaneously, parts of the environmental movement are trying to overcome the anthropomorphic assumption (Brown, 1995), which places humans at the center of the universe. These new-thinkers are re-asserting the intrinsic value of nature, for lakes and rivers, as well as for both animals and human beings (Brown).

Current researchers have supported this environmental / feminist link, and point out its many benefits. Marietta (1984) asserts that environmentalism and feminism reinforce each other because, historically, it has been "macho" values and behaviors, such as possession, conquest and subjugation, that have caused the denigration of both the environment and women. Policy that will preserve the environment and create a sustainable society can be achieved by promoting such feminist behavior as personally and socially constructive conduct that is disassociated with one's sex (Marietta, 1984). Huber (1989) contends that these movements play an important role in the ongoing process of modernization. They push for the re-adaptation of the industrial system to its natural and cultural context.

2.10   The Gay Rights Movement

Since its inception in 1951 with the foundation of the Mattachine Society in Los Angeles, the gay rights movement (GRM), which was then called the "homophile movement" (Esterberg, 1994, p.429), has changed considerably. Initial homophile organizations were small, composed

of a majority of men, provided social activities and worked with professionals: "psychiatrists, medical doctors, clergy and academics to improve society's attitudes towards homosexuals" (Esterberg, 1994, p.431).

One of the first lesbian magazines, created by the Daughters of Bilitis (DOB), was the *Ladder*. Articles emphasized "good manners" and took an integrationist stance as a personal and political strategy. "The Daughters of Bilitis endorsed an attempt to change the individual to suit society" (Esterberg, 1994, p.432). While ultimately the DOB merged with the women's movement, their approach accentuates the difference between the early and present strategies of gay organizations.

Originally grounded in Marxist sex-class ideology (Gamson, 1995), psychiatry was embraced by many gay rights activists in the hope that it could legitimate homosexuality (Stein, 1994). This period is referred to as the "pre-Stonewall" stage of the GRM and ranged from World War II to the late 1960's (Stein, 1994). "But as the gay movement grew, it came to reject psychiatry, ultimately protesting the American Psychiatric Association's classification of homosexuality as a psychological disorder" (Stein, 1994, p.292).

From the 1970's to the present constitutes the "post-Stonewall" period, an the creation of the GRM as we know it today. It appears that during this time, what it means to be gay has been reformulated; gay took on a new identity as circumstances changes in America since 1950. Since social movements are a reflection of the times, it is not surprising that the goals and ideologies of the GRM have changed as well.

> "The success of the more militant homophile groups in the late 1960's and the radical gay activist groups in the 1970's was partly the result of their willingness to emphasize the differences between lesbians and gay men and heterosexuals (Esterberg, 1994, p.438).

Recent accomplishment of the GRM include the passage, on April 23, 1990, of the Hate Crime Statistics Act, signed by President Bush, that "requires the U.S. Department of Justice to collect data on hate-motivated violence against select groups" and "the inclusion of a 'sexual orientation' provision in the Act [that] constitutes the federal government's only official legislative response to anti-gay and lesbian violence" (Jenness, 1995, p.149). However, despite

the GRM's progress, considerable discrimination still exist. Several social and political institutions continue to play an oppositional role. The U.S. military's anti-gay policy (Leggett, 1994) and the exclusion of lesbians and gay men from political rights extended to other groups (Riggle & Ellis, 1994) are two examples. For instance, while Congress passed laws (Title VII, Civil Rights Act of 1964; Employment Act of 1967; Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973) that prohibit employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, marital status, beliefs, age, national origin, or handicap, it has failed to include sexual orientation (Riggle & Ellis, 1994, p.144).

The GRM has also affected other NSMs. For instance, it was not until the emergence of the GRM that lesbians demanded recognition and support from the larger women's movement (WM) (Taylor & Whittier, 1992). The slow-to-be-accepted reaction of the WM to this category of women greatly impacted the WM, causing separatism and upheaval. Some theorists argue that lesbian feminism even constitutes its own movement, independent of both the gay liberation and liberal feminist movements (Taylor & Whittier, 1992). However, commentary on this assertion is beyond the scope of this research.

Chapter Three
DATA AND METHODS

3.1   Data

The data for this study are from the 1993 General Social Survey (GSS). This year was selected because its special topic of focus was the environmental module. The GSS originated in 1972 and has been conducted almost annually since then, by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC). Data are collected from face-to-face interviews performed by 120-140 interviewers, who are 95% women and are race-matched with respondents (Neuman, 1994). The sample is random and consists of approximately 1,500 adult United States residents. The response rate ranges between 71-79%, with refusal to participate being the main reason for non-response (Neuman, 1994).

3.2 Methods

Frequency distributions, means, standard deviations and bivariate correlation coefficients were obtained for all variables. For selected variables, several scales were constructed, using factor analyses and reliability tests. Numerous linear regressions were run regressing tolerance on social structural variables, attitudes toward various social movement principles and attitudes toward multiple forms of tolerance.

While to the identity theorists, identity formation is maintained to be a collective process that occurs through interaction, the causation and creation of identity are not being tested in this analysis. In fact, self-identification with any identity is not being questioned. Rather, agreement with sets of statements that are congruent with tenets of various NSMs are being used as indicators of certain sets of beliefs, which may or may not predispose one to actually partake of a corresponding social movement. Since mobilization is dependent upon a variety of factors, such as access to resources and capability, it would not be possible to measure actual participation from this type of analysis.

3.2.1 Complications & Concerns Associated with Tolerance Research

Explaining variation in tolerance is a task that sociologists have pursued for decades. During the past thirty years, the General Social Survey (GSS) has been a common data source for analyzing the relationship between tolerance and peoples' political affiliations, ideologies, and demographic descriptors such as gender and education (Gaugler & Sheldon, 1975; Whitt & Nelson, 1975; Weston & Ruggiero, 1977 and 1978; Bobo & Licari, 1989; Jelen & Wilcox, 1990; Wilson, 1991 and 1994). However, while numerous attempts have been made to explain differences in peoples' levels of tolerance, a great deal of variation exists in both how the researchers have conceptualized and measured tolerance and in the conclusions they have drawn. For example, some researchers have measured tolerance by using single, non-indexed variables while others have generated multiple item indexes, forming additive tolerance scales similar to those in the present study.

The conceptualization, measurement and definitions of tolerance have all affected research results, making this literature difficult to disentangle. Conceptualizing tolerance in different ways has impacted research outcomes. There are two primary ways that tolerance has been conceptualized in the literature. In some studies, tolerance is envisioned as a component of self-identity. Using this conceptualization, tolerance might be measured by asking individuals whether they agree or disagree with a statement, such as "I am a tolerant individual".

An alternative method of conceptualizing tolerance is viewing it as an action, behavior or attitude about others' actions and behaviors. Ideally, tolerance is best measured by independently observing behaviors and actions that have been defined as tolerant or intolerant. However, as one may anticipate, the definition of tolerance itself is subject to who is defining it and what their underlying assumptions and motives may be. Obviously, an ideally objective measure would be difficult, if not impossible, to obtain.

Given the above dilemma, the compromise researchers tend to abide by is to assess individual responses of self-reported behavior. For instance, a researcher may ask a respondent how s/he has acted in various situations. Then, these answers would be coded as "tolerant" or not. The least favorable, but most common, method used to measure tolerance is asking individuals how they *would* act in given situations. For example, a researcher may ask "Would

you advocate removing a book promoting atheism from a school library?", or, "Would you say it is o.k. for an atheist to give a speech promoting atheism at a school?".

While the second example is the most common approach taken in large survey data, it is also the most problematic. As both psychologists and sociologists note, social desirability weakens the possibility of receiving genuine answers. Furthermore, actions are socially structured, so, even if a person genuinely believes that s/he would act tolerantly in a given situation, actual behavior may not correspond to anticipated actions.

Despite the faults outlined with using large survey data, in this thesis, this is the approach for measuring tolerance that is being taken. In other words, tolerance is being measured by analyzing responses about anticipated future behavior.

In addition to the problems associated with conceptualizing tolerance, further complications abound over how to actually measure tolerance. Measurement issues primarily focus on single vs. multiple item indexes of tolerance. To a degree, this overlaps with conceptual issues, such as who is relied upon as a valid source for identifying whether a particular behavior is tolerant or not. However, debates over measurement issues take the task one step further and ask what actually counts as tolerance. For example, removing a book about atheism from the library is qualitatively different from removing spoiled food from the cafeteria. Obviously, most would agree that the first example is demonstrative of tolerance, or intolerance, because it relates specifically to civil rights, while the food example may be a question of health or cleanliness, but not a measure of tolerance. Although this example may be clear, other examples are embedded far deeper in the debate over what exactly constitutes tolerance in American society.

This thesis is also constrained by the problems associated with GSS data. Nonetheless, one strength of this research is that such complexities have been acknowledged whereas other research masks such shortcomings and often does not concede that they even exist. A second strength of this study lies in the multiple indicator measurement of tolerance. The definition and measurement of tolerance is as broad and encompassing as possible with the constraints of the data.

Here, tolerance is specifically situated in the realm of civil rights. Therefore, multiple measures of extending civil rights to diverse groups are being used. Tolerance of homosexuals,

racists, atheists and communists in various social settings is being measured. Lastly, this study is incorporating both self-reported behavior and perceptions about future behavior and attitudes.

Despite the great deal of attention this study has given toward measuring tolerance in a multifaceted way, one perceived limit is that the majority of tolerance indicators being used fall into the politically left camp. Atheism, communism and homosexuality are traditionally "left" ideologies. The only measurement of politically "right" attitudes in this study is racists. However, because the focus of this study is not on the variety of types of tolerance, but rather on correlates of certain forms of tolerance given one's responses to attitudes typically associated with the NSMs feminism, environmentalism and gay rights, this point is irrelevant.

3.2.2   Past and Present Conceptualizations of Tolerance

Most previous tolerance studies cited in this paper have used only a compiled tolerance index. By dividing tolerance into attitudes towards atheists, communists, homosexuals and racists, and by adding social-structural variables and attitudes towards other forms of tolerance, I hope to gain a deeper insight into the fine distinctions of tolerance for diverse individuals. Because this work is partially replicating previous GSS studies, the results can be compared to see if more complete explanations can be drawn. However, in this study, militants have been excluded because of their markedly less visible role in US society during the 1990s, so comparisons for this sub-group are not possible.

3.3 Hypotheses

There are numerous hypotheses being tested by this research. Most fundamentally, whether individuals who display tolerant attitudes toward one set of NSM beliefs will also exhibit tolerant attitudes toward other, even dissimilar, groups is being questioned. An auxiliary purpose of this research is to explore what types of individuals are attracted to ideas expressed by Left NSMs, and to see if any similarities across individuals exist among the three Left NSMs.

For the structural / demographic variables, the following findings are anticipated: Education should be positively correlated with all forms of tolerance. This theory is in

congruence with several other studies (Phelan et al, 1995; West, 1977; Jelen & Wilcox, 1990; Price & Hsu, 1992; O'Donnell, 1993). It is hypothesized that racial differences in tolerance may appear but not gender differences. Blacks are predicted to exhibit intolerance toward homosexuals, yet, when comparing homosexuals and racists, Blacks should be even less tolerant of racists.   No distinct gender differences in tolerance are anticipated.

Several other predictions have been formulated from reviewing previous studies and from applying various components of SM theory. First, if the ideas expounded in NSM theory are true, then socio-economic status, as an indicator of class, should not affect tolerance. In other words, no significant relationship is expected to exist between tolerance and socio-economic status.   However, it is hypothesized that liberals should be more tolerant than conservatives of all nonconformists as well as more pro-environment and pro-feminist.

Second, if culture is crucial to the development of beliefs and loyalties, as Taylor and Whittier (1992) suggest, then ethnicity, gender and the type of community that one comes from, such as an urban or rural area, should affect one's epistemology because culture will help to determine one's norms and interpretive framework. Thus, urbanites should be more tolerant of nonconformists than non-urbanites, but, with respect to environmental attitudes, community type should not matter. However, for reasons previously alluded to, in this study gender differences are not expected. This prediction is also in alliance with Stouffer's theory whereby exposure to diversity is considered to be a partial explanation for tolerance. Yet, although urbanites are more likely to be exposed to diverse cultural and social populations, this concept is not extended to environmental attitudes. For environmental beliefs, community type should not matter.

Drawing from symbolic interactionism, Turner and Killian (1987) posit norms as a way for challenging groups to redefine normative frameworks that justify their work for change. It is through "frame alignment" (Snow et al., 1986, cited in Taylor & Whittier, 1992) that movements bring individuals' viewpoints into congruence with those of the rest of the movement. So, if different individuals are following different normative structures, their responses to various issues should vary. Using this paradigm, it is hypothesized that support of environmentalism and/or feminism will lead to greater tolerance of other non-dominant ideologies. Applied to this study,   individuals who score high on the feminist scale should also score high on the tolerance

31

scale, both which would indicate greater tolerance. As past research denotes, support for human rights and equality are fundamental to several NSMs. Thus, for example feminists should be more tolerant of nonconformists in general based upon their advocation of human rights.

As elaborated earlier, tolerance is anticipated to be part of an overarching word-view, not an immediate reaction to one or more groups. As a multi-faceted phenomenon, tolerance is being measured by multiple indicators. Thus, it is expected that those individuals expressing tolerant attitudes towards any one particular group will be more likely to also be tolerant of other groups. In essence, tolerance does not occur in isolation; it is predicted to cross boundaries and expand across ideological dimensions. Those scoring high on the feminism and environmentalism indexes should also score high on the tolerance indexes.

3.4 Operationalization of Variables

In order to operationalize attitudes toward feminism, environmentalism, homosexuality and tolerance of nonconformists, several indexes were constructed. Some items were reverse-coded so that, for all, a high score indicates a higher degree of the measured variable. For instance, a high score on the feminist index indicates that the individual agrees with statements that are in agreement with principles held by the women's movement. A high score on tolerance of atheists indicates that this individual agrees that atheists should be extended the same civil liberties as all other human beings. All indexes are measures of attitudes; no social structural variables are included in these scales.

3.5 Independent Variables

Several independent variables have been selected for inclusion in this study. The independent variables are divided between the categories attitudinal and social structural.

3.5.1 Attitudinal Variables

Adherence toward principles embraced by three new social movements, the Women's

Movement, the Environmentalism Movement and the Gay Rights' Movement, form the selection criteria for the independent attitudinal variables included in this study.

In order to operationalize adherence to moderate, liberal feminist principles, I created an additive scale composed of five questions. The topics these questions covered are the following: whether "women should take care of running their homes and leave running the country up to men"; whether a married woman should earn money through business or industry "if she has a husband capable of supporting her"; if men are emotionally better suited for politics than women; if you would vote for a woman for President, if she was qualified and in your political party; and lastly, whether it is better for a man to be the "achiever outside the home" while the woman takes care of the home and family. The actual questions asked in the survey are listed in Appendix I. Response categories to these questions ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Using Varimax rotation, factor analysis revealed only one factor (N=934, Eigenvalue = 2.19)[3]. The standardized alpha for this scale is .66[4].

To measure attitudes toward the environment, a general environmental scale was developed. Also an additive index, it measures hypothetical willingness to take pro-environmental actions and not actual, personal involvement at the time of questioning. The general environmental scale (alpha=.70) is composed of a total of four questions about one's willingness to engage in pro-environment activities: The first question asks about one's willingness to pay higher prices for the sake of the environment; The second asks about accepting cuts in one's living standards; The third is a question over whether people worry too much about human progress harming the environment and finally, the fourth asks if people worry too much about the environment and too little about prices and jobs. Appendix II contains the

---

[3]This number might have been higher if the variable regarding women working outside the home was excluded because the factor matrix number for this variable was only .38374, whereas it exceeded .636 for the other four variables. However, this variable was included in the index because of the theoretical importance to feminist principles of attitudes toward women being employed for paid labor.

[4]Had only attitudes toward women participating in politics, becoming president of the U.S. and working outside the home been included, the alpha would have been .70. But, again for theoretical reasons, I chose to adopt the five item scale.

33

actual environmental questions used in this research.

The GSS variables selected to measure environmental attitudes were theorized as addressing three particular environmental issues: (1) hypothetical ideas about how willing one would be to get personally involved with helping the environment (2) how involved one currently is in engaging in environmentally friendly activities and (3) what conceptual position one holds about how much we worry about the environment at the expense of economic growth and progress.

Factor analysis confirmed this anticipated distinction among the various environmental variables. Therefore, three sub-scales[5], corresponding to the environmental issues mentioned above, were created for environmentalism.

The first two item sub-scale, hypothetical personal involvement, has a factor loading of greater than .89 for each item (alpha=.74). The higher the score, the more likely the individual is to make considerable personal habit changes for the health of the environment.

The second scale, actual involvement, includes two items that measure if a person is presently engaged in activities that better the environment. The first item asks whether or not one recycles. The second item, which requires an agree/disagree response, is "I do what is right for the environment, even when it costs more money or takes up more time". Although these items factor together strongly (.791), this index has an exceptionally low alpha (alpha=.40). However, since it is the only measure of personal environmental action, it is being retained.

The last environmental sub-scale (alpha=.72), theoretical outlook, measures individuals' attitudes toward enhancing overall economic growth and progress over environmental health. It is composed of the following two statements: "People worry too much about human progress harming the environment" and "We worry too much about the future of the environment, and not enough about prices and jobs today". A high score on this scale reveals a preference for preservation of the environment over immediate human progress.

Opinions about homosexuality are measured by the following question: "What about

---

[5]For the remainder of this study, and particularly when regressing tolerance, these sub-scales are used as opposed to the general environmental index. The general environmental index is largely discarded because it is composed from the sub-scale items and is thus measuring a majority of the same variables.

sexual relations between two adults of the same sex - do you think it is always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all?". This is the only question available from the dataset to ascertain opinions about this concept.

The last attitudinal dimension, political views, measures individuals' self-identification with various political camps. Response options range from one, extremely liberal, to seven, extremely conservative. This variable is included in the attitudinal set because it is theorized that identifying oneself as conservative or liberal distinguishes an outlook about life and an ideological commitment to certain perspectives.

3.5.2 Social Structural Variables

Based upon previous research findings and theoretical expectations, several social structural independent variables are incorporated into this analysis. These include education, race, gender, socioeconomic status, community type of residence and political party type.

Education is coded in years. Gender is a dummy variable with males coded zero and females coded one. For race, whites are coded zero and blacks one, with all others being coded missing to create a dummy variable. Socioeconomic status (SES) is based on an index created by Otis Dudley Duncan which Keiko Nakao and Judith Treas developed from the 1989 GSS study of occupational prestige (GSS Handbook, 1994). The SES index ranges from 171 (lowest) to 972 (highest). Community type ranges from one to five, with 1 = a big city, 2 = the suburbs, 3 = a small city or town, 4 = a country village and 5 = a farm or country home.

Political party was recoded and, as for all of the variables, respondents answering "don't know" were included in the middle, and in this case, Independent, category[6] . Political party is a six-category ordinal scale. Response choices included 0=Strong Democrat, 1=Weak Democrat, 2= Independent/Democrat, 3=Independent, 4=Independent/Republican, 5= Weak Republican, 6= Strong Republican.

Political scientists, according to Kautz (1993), divide political party affiliation along the

---

[6]Based on conversations with Dr. Michael Hughes, it was judged best to include these "don't know" responses in the "neither agree/disagree" category, so as not to further reduce the N. I was additionally advised that previous studies have demonstrated that this does not statistically alter the results in any meaningful way.

following lines when it comes to tolerance: Republicans often criticize indiscriminant tolerance as a means of weakening the civil and moral virtues that are crucial for effective self-government; Democrats view tolerance as a means of compensating for the inequality and repression widespread in contemporary American society; Communitarians and postmodernist liberals object to the narrow conceptualization and application of tolerance purported by conservatives and see the current bestowal of tolerance as being inadequate, given the diversity that exists in communities. Given these descriptions of partisans, it is expected that liberals and Democrats will be more tolerant of nonconformists than conservatives, and will also be more likely to agree with feminist ideas. However, liberals will probably display even higher levels of tolerance than Democrats.

Yet, while the majority of studies focusing on the concept of liberalism and tolerance have demonstrated that persons identifying with liberal politics are more tolerant, one must ask "tolerant of whom?". For example, if one is a gay rights activist, then being accepting of homosexuality is not tolerance. In order to be truly tolerant, one must acknowledge the rights of those with whom one does not necessarily agree. To further clarify, take the case of feminists. One way feminists could exhibit tolerance is to acknowledge that racists have the right to voice their opinions, even though those opinions may be in direct opposition to feminism. That, is true tolerance.

3.6 Dependent Variables

This study is directed toward identifying correlates of tolerance. Several dependent variables, each measuring different aspects of tolerance, are used in this analysis. In order to assess the various aspects of tolerance individually, and then in totality , multiple indexes for measuring tolerance have been created.

Opinions regarding what civil liberties should or should not be extended to certain individuals is contingent upon whom is being referenced. In order to account for this variation, and based upon theoretical reasoning, both an aggregate and multiple subscales for tolerance were created. In other words, a general tolerance index, including all tolerance items listed in Table 1, was constructed to measure overall tolerance of nonconformists, while separate, subject-specific scales were created to measure tolerance of atheists, communists, racists and homosexuals.

Possible answers to all the tolerance items are "agree", "disagree" or "don't know". Questions posed in a "reversed" way were recoded so that all items would go in the same theoretical direction. For example, tolerant answers to the following questions about atheists (then racists, communists and homosexuals) would yield different responses: "Should such a person be allowed to teach in a college or university, or not?" (A tolerant answer would be "yes"); "If some people in your community suggested that a book he (the hypothetical atheist, communist, etc.) wrote against churches and religion should be taken out of your public library, would you favor removing this book or not?" (A tolerant answer would be "no").

3.6.1   General Tolerance Index

The general tolerance index is an additive scale of all twelve items (alpha=.89). While factor analysis identified three factors, given the strength of the first factor, which yielded an Eigenvalue of 5.48, compared to 1.25 and 1.13, and accounts for 45.7% of the variation, only the first factor was selected for inclusion in this research.

Two options existed for dividing the general tolerance index. The index could either be based upon identifying category, such as atheist or communist, or the items could be grouped according to attitudes about question topics, such as the right to teach at a college, have a book in

the library or the right to make a public speech. Since the qualitative value of the first option has greater relevance for the purposes of this study, this route was taken. It was further theorized that, since the cultural definitions of behavior vary regardless of what mode of communication is being employed, comparing people's reactions to different types of people would be far more meaningful for understanding tolerance.

3.6.2   Tolerance Sub-Scales

All items included in the sub-scales appear in Table 6 under the appropriate heading. In other words, each sub-scale consists of the three questions (one about teaching, one about having a book in the library and the right to make a public speech) for that particular group of nonconformists.

Factor analysis produced four tolerance indexes: atheists (alpha=.72), communists (alpha=.77), racists (alpha=.70) and homosexuals (alpha=.79). Each category is an additive scale. The best[7] scale is tolerance of homosexuals and the poorest scale is tolerance of racists.

---

[7]Factor loadings explain 71% of the variance for the tolerance of homosexuals scale while only 63% for the tolerance of racists index. The other two scales fall in between this range, with communists being slightly higher than atheists.

Chapter Four
Findings

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

4.1.1 Descriptive Statistics of Social Structural Variables

The descriptive statistics presented in this section are intended to provide an illustrative characterization of the sample used in this study. Means and standard deviations for all variables are presented in Table 2.

More specifically detailed, the sample is as follows: the modal community type is a small city or town. Seventeen percent of this sample lives in a big city, 27% reside in the suburbs, 39% live in a small city or town, 4% live in a country home and 13% live on a farm or in a rural setting. The mean years of formal education achieved are thirteen while the majority of individuals are in a moderate socioeconomic level.

Socioeconomic status (SES) ranges from 171 to 972; a high score indicates high SES. Most respondents acknowledge themselves to be "weak Democrats" (N=321, 20.3%), but this is only slightly higher than the number of "weak Republicans" (N=299, 18.9%).

The majority of this sample (N=1526), 83.9%, is white. Blacks represent just 11.1% of the population while all other ethnicities combined account for only 5%. However, recalling that race is operationalized as a dummy variable, all ethnicities other than white have been collapsed to form a white/non-white dichotomy[8]. Women are more represented (N=921, 57.3%) than men (N=685, 42.7%) in this sample.

4.1.2 Descriptive Statistics for Attitudinal Variables

Attitudes towards various beliefs and ideas about future behavior, such as whether one would participate in a future activity like accepting a standard-of-living cut for the betterment of the environment, are the second way tolerance is conceptualized and operationalized in this

---

[8]I truly regret having to perpetuate dichotomizing race, but meaningful data could not be obtained for other ethnicities because of the extremely small N. Future independent studies may wish to oversample other populations so that more inclusive results may be obtained.

study.

Although indexes were constructed for nearly every group of independent variables, political ideology remains the exception. Political attitudes are represented via a single variable. This sample tends to hold mainly moderate political views (N=624, 39.1%), but nearly one-third, or 31%, describe themselves as slightly conservative or conservative rather than slightly liberal or liberal (27%).

For the various scales, the following results were found. The mean score on the feminism scale is 10.19. The scale ranges from 5, the lowest possible score, to a maximum of 12. Overall, the sample is moderately to highly positive in its attitudes towards liberal feminist principles. The all inclusive environmental scale ranges from 11, anti-environmental, to 36, pro-environment, with the mean score being 24.44.

Attitudes about homosexuality are overwhelmingly negative. Six-hundred and seventy-one out of 1012, or 66.3%, agree that it is always wrong. However, on this issue there is either strong agreement or disagreement. Twenty-two percent (N=223) say that homosexuality is not wrong, but only 7.3% (N=74) are ambivalent about whether or not it is wrong only sometimes.

For the tolerance indexes, different trends may be extracted. The basic frequencies for all tolerance items in the GSS used in this study are presented in Table 1. The aggregate tolerance scale ranges from 12 (intolerant) to 24 (very tolerant) with a mean of 20.17. This suggests that, broadly speaking, this sample tends to be more tolerant than intolerant. The largest percentage of answers fall on the highest end of the range(N=235, 27.1%), which is extremely tolerant.

When tolerance is separated into attitudes toward specific groups of individuals, a less universally tolerant picture emerges. Sixty-nine percent of respondents said that they would extend civil liberties to communists and, from that group, 50% gave them the highest tolerance answer possible. The scores for tolerance of racists, on the other hand, were evenly distributed across all values. This sample is quite tolerant of atheists, with 67.6% granting them civil liberties. Further, it is overwhelmingly supportive of homosexuality, with almost 60% (N=592 out of 618) of the group selecting the highest degree of tolerance for homosexuals. Only 23% are moderately tolerant to intolerant of this group.

4.2   Bivariate Correlation Coefficients

Table 3 depicts pairwise[9] bivariate correlations for all variables in the analysis.

4.2.1   Education

As anticipated, education was positively correlated with all independent variable attitudinal indexes ($p<.000$)[10]. So, in other words, the more education an individual has received, the more pro-environment and pro-feminist s/he will be.

4.2.2   Gender

Overall, the hypothesis of no gender differences for tolerance was confirmed. Few significant correlations were observed for gender. However, some correlations between gender and tolerance were revealed. For instance, men were found to be more tolerant of homosexuals ($p<.01$) and racists ($p<.05$) and, surprisingly, scored higher on both the feminism ($p<.01$) and homosexuality ($p<.05$) indexes than women.

4.2.3   Race

---

[9]No substantive difference was found between listwise and pairwise bivariate correlations. I have chosen to present pairwise correlations because the number of respondents drops greatly for some of the correlations because of the nature of the data. Therefore, Ns are important to include because each question in the GSS is coded for only some individuals to receive. The survey asks random subsets various groups of questions. The feminism questions are coded one and included in ballots A and B, the environmental questions are coded four and included in ballots A, B and C, and, finally, the tolerance questions are coded three and given only to ballots B and C. Thus, Ns drop dramatically when trying to compare these three groups. Plus, it becomes very difficult to get a good estimate of feminism and tolerance because the number of cases is reduced from 1606 to 397.

[10]The lowest level of statistical significance accepted is $p<.05$ because using GSS data, which has a sample size of 1606 for 1993 when all cases are represented, will lead to even small effects being significant.

The hypothesis that blacks would be less tolerant of racists was not supported. No race difference in tolerance was found in this study. However, there is a strong (r=.34, p<.000) correlation between race (white) and positive attitudes about homosexuals. Thus, the prediction that blacks would be less tolerant of homosexuals receives confirmation.

4.2.4 Socio-Economic Status

The theory expressed in NSM literature, that identity, as opposed to class, is chiefly responsible for attitudes is not supported with this research. In this study, the higher one's SES, the more likely one will be tolerant, environmentally conscious and pro-women. Out of all the scales, the strongest correlation for SES exists for the general tolerance index (r=.33).

4.2.5 Political Party and Political Views/Ideology

Only one meaningful finding resulted from the structural variable political party affiliation: democrats were more likely to agree that homosexuality is not wrong. However, numerous significant correlations were found using the attitudinal variable political views. Support was found for the hypothesis that liberals would be more tolerant overall (r=.21, p<.000) and tolerant of each diverse group (p<.000 for each tolerance sub-index). In congruence with past findings, liberals are also more likely to be for the environment and to display positive attitudes toward women (r=.17, p<.000) and homosexuals (r=.34, p<.000).

4.2.6 Homosexuality

Adding support to previous research, structurally, individuals possessing positive attitudes towards homosexuals are also more likely to be urban (r=.14, p<.000), more educated (r=.16, p<.000), democrats and liberal in political views.

As hypothesized, strong positive correlations were found between positive attitudes toward homosexuals and general tolerance (r=.43, p<.000) and tolerance for other nonconforming groups. The weakest display of tolerance for pro-homosexuality existed among racists (r=.27, p<.000), compared to atheists (r=.42, p<.000) and communists (r=.35, p<.000).

Those agreeing that homosexuality is not wrong also were pro-feminist (r=.32, p<.000) and pro-environmentalist, although in differing degrees for environmentalism.

4.2.7   Feminism

Those exhibiting a high level of feminist attitudes were, again as predicted, more tolerant of several groups. Strong, positive correlations were found between feminists and general tolerance (r=.48, p<.000), tolerance of homosexuals (r=.48, p<.000), of atheists (r=.44, p<.000) and of communists (r=.40, p<.01). Although feminists are also tolerant of racists, the correlation is again not as strong (r=.21, p<.000).

4.2.8   Environmentalism

Lastly, as hypothesized, positive correlations between environmentalism and tolerance were found. For all four measures of environmentalism, positive, significant correlations with all tolerance measures appeared. Overall, the weakest positive correlation exists between tolerance of racists and the environmental indexes. Attitudes toward environmentalism, as an overarching concern in contract to valuing progress and economic growth, is the strongest environmental sub-scale variable correlating with the tolerance measures. For this variable, all r's are greater than .34 for every tolerance measure (p<.000), except for tolerance of racists (r=.19, p<.000).

4.2.9   Liberalism (Conceptualized / operationalized as pro-feminism, environmentalism and homosexuality)

In sum, the overriding, macro-level hypothesis, which predicted that those scoring higher on feminism, environmentalism and homosexuality would also demonstrate high levels of tolerance, has been greatly substantiated. In addition, overall general tolerance is correlated with race (r=-.13, p<.001), community type (r=-.16, p<.001), SES (r=.33, p<.001) and political views (r=-.20, p<.001). As anticipated, political party (r=.00, p>.05) is not statistically significantly related to any of the measures of tolerance. Finally, the hypothesis that the degree of tolerance is dependent upon whom one is asked to be tolerant of (such as an atheist vs.a racist) has been

supported. Individuals differ, based upon social structural variables, in their level of tolerance for nonconformists.

4.3   Multivariate Analysis

A series of linear multiple regression analyses were performed to determine the effects of multiple attitude scales on various types of tolerance. The results are presented in Table 4 and 5. The same structural variables are included for every model. For each regression, the unstandardized (b) and standardized coefficients (Beta) for each variable, in addition to the t-value which allows for the evaluation of statistical significance, are presented.

4.3.1 Regression of Social Structural Variables on General Tolerance

In Model 1[11], Table 4, only the social structural variables community type, sex, race, SES and education were regressed on general tolerance. These social-structural variables accounted for only 19% of the variance in attitudes toward nonconformists. As Table 4 demonstrates, the strongest structural predictor of general tolerance is education (b=.418), followed by community type (b=-.339) and race (b=-.970).

4.3.2 Regression of Social Structural and Attitudinal on General Tolerance

In Model 2, when attitudes toward feminist principles, homosexuals, various indicators of environmentalism[12] and political views are included, the percentage of variation explained increases to 40%. Attitudes toward women and homosexuals have a positive, significant effect on overall tolerance. However, none of the environmental scales reached statistical significance. Demographically, individuals who are white, higher educated and from cities or suburbs are more likely to be tolerant of atheists, racists, homosexuals and communists.

4.3.3 Tolerance Sub-Indexes

As previously noted, it is hypothesized that attitudes toward nonconformists are not uniform across all categories of nonconformists. Therefore, to test the relationship among the four groups represented in this dataset, as well as the effects of the other demographic and attitude variables, multiple regressions were done for each tolerance subgroup individually. The results are presented in Table 5.

---

[11]A dual-model approach is needed because prior research has primarily based tolerance research on demographic, not attitudinal, information. The strength of this research is that the inclusion of attitudinal and structural variables explain a much higher percentage of the variance in tolerance than just structural variables alone.

[12]Only sub-scales for environmentalism are included because the general index is an additive scale of these same items minus the recycling and personally helping the environment, "even when it costs more money or takes up more time" questions.

4.3.4 Regression of Social-Structural and Attitudinal Variables on Tolerance of Atheists

In Model 1, Table 5, the two strongest predictors of tolerance of atheists are attitudes toward homosexuals (b=.235) and attitudes toward feminist principles (b=.176). One's political party affiliation is also statistically significant, with Republicans being more tolerant of atheists than Democrats. None of the environmental variables or social structural variables is a statistically significant predictor of tolerance for atheists. Overall, 34% of the variance is explained by Model One.

4.3.5 Regression of Social-Structural and Attitudinal Variables on Tolerance of Communists

Tolerance of communists is the second subgroup of nonconformists evaluated. The second model in Table 5 reveals that, again, attitudes toward homosexuals (b=.171) and attitudes toward feminist principles (b=.140) are the strongest predictors of this form of tolerance. Education is the only other significant predictor for this dependent variable and shows that there is a weak, positive relationship between the number of years of education and tolerance of communists. All of the variables in Model 2 account for 27% of the variation in tolerance of communists.

4.3.6 Regression of Social-Structural and Attitudinal Variables on Tolerance of Racists

Model 3, tolerance of racists, is the weakest model, with only 18% of the variance being explained. White males tend to be more tolerant of racists than other groups. Additionally, positive attitudes toward homosexuality is a significant predictor of tolerance for racists.

4.3.7 Regression of Social-Structural and Attitudinal Variables on Tolerance of

Homosexuals

Finally, Model 4 illustrates the regression analysis for tolerance of homosexuals. The variance in toleration explained by this model is 37%. Positive attitudes toward homosexuality (b=.231) and projected personal environmental involvement (b=.176) are the two best items in this model for determining tolerance of homosexuals. Although only significant at the p<.05 level, education and community type are also useful predictors. Higher educated individuals and persons from cities or suburbs are more likely to express attitudes of toleration toward homosexuals.

Chapter Five
CONCLUSIONS

This research has included numerous variables in an attempt to better understand the antecedents of tolerance. Several findings uncovered by past research have been supported while a few unique and unanticipated findings have also resulted.

Consistent with the majority of research (Phelan et al, 1995; O'Donnell, 1993; Price & Hsu, 1992; Jelen & Wilcox, 1990; West, 1977), education is found to be a significant predictor of tolerance, and a significant indicator of favorable views of homosexuality and women (Phelan et al, 1995; Wilson, 1994; Boggs, 1981).

Support was found for Tuch's (1987) findings that urbanites and non-Southerns are more tolerant, yet this study did not specifically test racial tolerance, although both groups are found to be more tolerant of racists. While Ellison & Musick's research found that non-Southerners were more tolerant of atheists, communists and homosexuals than Southerners, this study found that urbanites are more tolerant of the same groups than those from rural communities, consistent with Wilson's (1991) results.

One surprising outcome is that although pro-feminists tend to be urban, liberal and democrat, the effect of feminism on tolerance is not due to liberalism, or to political party identification. Even after controlling for political ideology, feminism still accounted for a significant amount of variation. One theoretical explanation for this finding may be that to believe in feminist principles is to go against traditional societal norms. Likewise, being tolerant of diversity also refutes the traditional value system. In other words, a form of non-traditional morality is being measured. Thus, this research supports Bobo & Licari's (1989) that demographic, or social structural, variables alone are insufficient determinants of tolerance. Yet, this research contradicts their assertion that gender is the predominant explanation of tolerance of homosexuals. In the present study, gender is neither significantly correlated with attitudes toward or tolerance of homosexuals. However, as hypothesized based on their work, blacks are less tolerant of homosexuals and hold more negative attitudes towards them.

The second anomaly found is that tolerance is associated little, if at all, with environmentalism. People who display attitudes of concern for the environment and engage in pro-conserving behavior are not necessarily likely to be tolerant of nonconforming individuals.

One possibility for this finding is that environmentalists adhere to a qualitatively different form of morality. Perhaps this is due to the environmental movement's historically conservative roots, or perhaps it is because environmentalists hold an overall negative view of humanity, attributing most of the earth's problems to human causes. Ideologically, the feminist movement and gay rights movement both consistently work toward combating intolerance. The only exception is that such movements are intolerant of intolerance itself, yet, as this research illustrates, such individuals still advocate upholding civil rights, such as the freedom for racists to speak. Environmentalists, on the other hand, tend to assert that there is one right way, one moral choice. An example of this assertion is Greenpeace's ideological claim that whaling is wrong and should be stopped, at almost all costs, as their ramming of whaling ships illustrates. The environmental movement is not about letting people make a free choice; rather, it is about imposing and convincing others of the right, ecological way of living/behaving.

In essence, this research poses a paradox. Although both environmentalist and feminist affirming individuals tend to be democrat and liberal, political ideology in and of itself does not account for toleration.

Unsurprisingly, gay affirming individuals tend to be highly educated, urban, democrat and liberal. Attitudes towards homosexuality are the single most important determinant of tolerance for all nonconformists. While Corbett et al (1977) found that homosexuals themselves were more tolerant of other deviant groups, this research found that gay-affirming, but not necessary gay identifying, individuals are more tolerant.

Stepping back and viewing this research from a macro perspective, one can conclude that it is not possible to generalize equal levels of tolerance to all new social movements, or to any particular movement simply because of its political affiliation. Although NSMs are organized chiefly around identity, rather than class issues, this does not mean that identification with any one movement will necessitate across the board tolerance. By dividing tolerance into sub-groups, and thus answering the question "Tolerant of whom?", this research demonstrates that even historically tolerant groups, such as pro-same-sex relations will evidence different levels of tolerance, depending upon whom is being referred to. Thus, pro-feminists and pro-homosexuals are less tolerant of racists than say, atheists.

This study has concentrated on mainly left NSMs. Future research may look at right

movements and see if tolerance levels differ accordingly. Although Jelen & Wilcox (1990) found no correlation between political tolerance and religious denomination, others may want to analyze religiosity and religious denominations' effect on tolerance of specific groups, such as the ones studied here, particularly because Greeley (1991) found denomination and devoutness to be significant predictors of tolerance.

Cohort, age and income have in various studies been predictive of civil tolerance (Wilson, 1994; O'Donnell, 1993; West, 1977), and unpredictive in others (Steeh & Schuman, 1992). While they were excluded from this study, primarily because of the sporadic nature in which they have been included in past research as predictors of tolerance, future research may wish to include these variables in analyses.

Multiple complications inherent to secondary data research exist in this study. First, it is problematic that tolerance is a case-dependent characteristic. Restated, in order to know if an individual is truly expressing tolerance, one would have to first know his/her position on political/social topics to know whether s/he is simply confirming his/her own beliefs, or is in fact expressing tolerance. This poignantly illustrates the inadequacies of secondary data research. To uncover such covert attitudes and opinions, future researchers should engage in primary data gathering by creating detailed questions and constructing in-depth interviews.

Finally, one may even question why a researcher has chosen to measure tolerance by asking opinions about atheists, communists, racists and homosexuals as opposed to, say, abortion, religion, the right to protest, or any other form of behavior that would constitute a display of tolerance. In this thesis, those categories of non-conformists have been chosen to coincide with previous GSS research on tolerance. However, future researchers may wish to examine other forms of tolerance to test if the same findings and correlations can be found.

References

Baker, Susan. (1993). The principles and practice of ecofeminism: A review. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 2, 1, May, 4-26.

Banks, Olive. *Faces of Feminism*. Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1981.

Boggs, Carol. (1981). CNPS talk, 1980: Politics of the knowledge industry. *New Political Science*, 5-6, Winter-Spring, 89-97.

Brown, Charles. (1995). Anthropocentrism and ecocentrism: The quest for a new worldview. *Midwest-Quarterly*, 36, 2, Winter, 191-202.

Brownmiller, Susan. *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1975.

Castro, Ginette. (1990) *American Feminism: A Contemporary History*. New York: New York University Press.

Cassell, J. *A Group Called Women: Sisterhood and symbolism in the Feminist Movement*. New York: David McKay, 1977.

Cohen, Jean L. (1985) Strategy or Identity: New theoretical paradigms and contemporary social movements. *Social Research*, Vol.52, No.4, Winter.

Corbett, Sherry, Richard Troiden and Richard Dodder. (1977). Tolerance as a correlate of experience with stigms: The case of the homosexual. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 3, 1, Fall, 3-13.

Cylke, F. Kurt. *The Environment*. NY: HarperCollins College Publishers, 1993.

Doob, Christopher Bates. *Racism*. An American Cauldron. NY: Harper Collins, 1993.

Dunlap, Riley E. and Rik Scarce. (1990) "The Polls: Poll Trends Environmental Problems and Protection." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 55: 651-652.

Einstein, Z. 1981. *The Radical Future of Liberal Feminism*. New York: Longman.

Gamson, William A. *The Social Psychology of Collective Action in Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, 1992, Aldon D. Morris & Carol McClurg Mueller, eds., New Haven: Yale University Press.

Gaugler, Edward & Zalkind, Sheldon. (1975). Dimensions of civil liberties and personality: Relationships for measures of tolerance and complexity. *Journal of Social Issues*, 31, 2, Spring, 93-110.

Gibbons, Michael et al. *The New Production of Knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London: Sage Publications, 1994.

Griessman, B. Eugene. *Diversity: Challenges & Opportunities*. NY: Harper Collins College Publishers, 1993.

Habermas, Jurgen, Stephen White & Jean-Marc Ferry. (1988). Ethics, politics and history: An interview with Jurgen Habermas. *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, 14, 3-4, July-Oct., 433-439.

Huber, Joseph. (1989). Social movements. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 35, 4, July, 365-374.

Johnston, Hank and Bert Klandermans, eds. *Social Movements and Culture*. Minneapolis: Univerity of Minnesota Press, 1995.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. *Political Man: The social bases of politics*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1960.

Marietta, Don. (1984). Environmentalism, feminism and the future of American society. *Humanist*, 44, 3, May-June, 15-30.

Marcus, Eric. *Making History. The struggle for gay & lesbian equal rights, 1945-1990*. NY: Harper Collins, 1992.

McClosky, Herbert. (1964). Consensus and Ideology in American Politics, *American Political Science Review*, June.

Merchant, Carolyn. *The Death of Nature*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1980.

Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty*. New York: Library of Liberal Arts, 1956.

Millet, Kate. *Sexual Politics*. London: Virago Press, 1985.

Neuman, W. Lawrence. *Social Research Methods*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1994.

Palmer, L.M. (1994). The End of the End of Ideology. *History of European Ideas*, 19, 4-6, July, 709-713.

Ricci, David M. (1984). *The Tragedy of Political Science: Politics, Scholarship & Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Rosenbaum, Walter A. *Environmental Politics & Policy, 2nd Edition*. Washington: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1991.

Ruggiero, Josephine and Weston, Louise. (1977). Comparative analysis of male and female attitudes: Toward tolerance of nonconformists. *International Journal of Sociology of the Family*, 7, 1, Jan-June, 77-85.

Sapiro, V. (1991). In *The Annals of the American Acadmeny of Political and Social Science*, 515 (May), edited by Janet Boles.

Stallings, Rober A. (1973) Patterns of Belief in Social Movements: Clarification from an analysis of environmental groups. *Sociological Quarterly*, 14, Autumn, p.474, cited in Turner and Killian.

Stehr, Nico. *Knowledge Societies*. London: Sage Publications, 1994.

Taylor, Verta and Nancy E. Whittier. "The New Feminist Movement." In *Feminist Frontiers: Rethinking Sex, Gender and Society*, ed. Laurel Richardson and Verta Taylor. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1992.

Taylor, Verta and Nancy E. Whittier. "Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities: Lesbian Feminist Mobilization." In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, ed. Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Tilly, Charles. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley, 1978.

Turner, Ralph H. and Louis M. Killian. *Collective Behavior*. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1987.

Warren, Karen (Editor). *Ecological Feminism*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

West, Walter. (1977). Public tolerance of homosexual behavior.*Cornell Journal of Social Relations*, 12, 1, Fall, 25-36.

Weston, Louise & Ruggiero, Josephine. (1978). Change in attitudes of women toward nonconformists: A trend study. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 21, 2, April, 131-140.

Whitt, Hugh and Nelson, Hart. (1975). Residence, moral traditionaslism and tolerance of atheists. *Social Forces*, 54, 2, Dec., 328-340.