Sexuality Research and Social Policy

Class Foundations of Sexual Prejudice toward Homosexuals

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	SRSP-D-20-00047R2
Full Title:	Class Foundations of Sexual Prejudice toward Homosexuals
Article Type:	Original Research
Keywords:	Sexual prejudice; social class; working class conformism; matching; homophobia; social change
Corresponding Author:	Stef Adriaenssens Katholieke Universiteit Leuven Brussels, BELGIUM
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Stef Adriaenssens
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Stef Adriaenssens
	Jef Hendrickx, Ph.D.
	Johanna Holm
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Funding Information:	
Abstract:	<p>Introduction Sexual prejudice negatively affects the quality of life and life chances of those involved. Manual workers are consistently found to be less accepting of homosexuality in studies of sexual conformism. This can be seen as an application of Lipset's 'working class conformism'. Our core hypothesis is that this lower tolerance is rooted in working class experiences. Counter-arguments are that that social class does not matter in contemporary society, and that the relationship is spurious, with education as the true cause.</p> <p>Methods</p> <p>We test the central hypothesis with European survey data. First, we regress sexual prejudice on time trends and class with repeated cross-sections from the European Social Survey, ranging from 2002 to 2016. As an extra check, this is also applied to the European Values Study, going back to 1981. Further, we test the spuriousness argument with a matching design, testing whether stratification accounts for the lag.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>The time series shows a stable lag between working class members and others against the general trend of decreasing sexual prejudice. The matching design provides evidence that working class membership in itself is a factor behind differences in sexual prejudice.</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>Contrary to 'death of class' conjectures, working class membership is related to sexual prejudice. This contribution brings in evidence that this gap is due to experiences of belonging to the working class, and not solely to educational differences.</p> <p>Policy Implications</p> <p>Occupational experiences, especially in low-skill manual labour, have social effects in areas such as sexual prejudice. Improving quality of work thus facilitates a more</p>

	inclusive society for sexual minorities.
Response to Reviewers:	We included an extensive response to reviewers in the submitted documents.

Class Foundations of Sexual Prejudice toward Homosexuals

Stef Adriaenssens¹, Jef Hendrickx², Johanna Holm³

Declarations

Ethics approval

Not applicable

Consent to participate

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the studies, to the original data collection entities of EVS and ESS.

Consent to publish

¹ Corresponding author

KU Leuven, Faculty of Economics and Business, Campus Brussels, Research Centre for Economics. Warmoesberg 26, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium. Email: stef.adriaenssens@kuleuven.be.

² KU Leuven, Faculty of Economics and Business, Campus Brussels, MEES Research Centre for Mathematics, Econometrics, and Statistics. Warmoesberg 26, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium. Email: jef.hendrickx@kuleuven.be.

³ KU Leuven research student, Email: johannamikaela.holm@student.kuleuven.be

Not applicable

Class Foundations of Sexual Prejudice toward Homosexuals

Abstract

Introduction

Sexual prejudice negatively affects the quality of life and life chances of those involved. Manual workers are consistently found to be less accepting of homosexuality in studies of sexual conformism. This can be seen as an application of Lipset’s ‘working class conformism’. Our core hypothesis is that this lower tolerance is rooted in working class experiences. Counter-arguments are that that social class does not matter in contemporary society, and that the relationship is spurious, with education as the true cause.

Methods

We test the central hypothesis with European survey data. First, we regress sexual prejudice on time trends and class with repeated cross-sections from the European Social Survey, ranging from 2002 to 2016. As an extra check, this is also applied to the European Values Study, going back to 1981. Further, we test the spuriousness argument with a matching design, testing whether stratification accounts for the lag.

Results

The time series shows a stable lag between working class members and others against the general trend of decreasing sexual prejudice. The matching design provides evidence that working class membership in itself is a factor behind differences in sexual prejudice.

Conclusions

Contrary to ‘death of class’ conjectures, working class membership is related to sexual prejudice. This contribution brings in evidence that this gap is due to experiences of belonging to the working class, and not solely to educational differences.

Policy Implications

Occupational experiences, especially in low-skill manual labour, have social effects in areas such as sexual prejudice. Improving quality of work thus facilitates a more inclusive society for sexual minorities.

Keywords: sexual prejudice; social class; working class conformism; Matching;
homophobia; social change.

Word count: 10,359 (excluding annexes)

1. Introduction

Whether non-heterosexual practices and identities are assessed as unwanted or unjustified, differs considerably among Western societies, but also *within* these societies. Negative attitudes towards homosexuals and other sexual minorities are not a late 20th-century invention, neither as a reality, nor as a concept (Greenberg & Bystry, 1982). Long-lived as they may be, there are strong indications that these norms and beliefs have consistent effects on the lives and life chances of sexual minorities, and even that they affect society as a whole. On average, life satisfaction and well-being among gay, lesbian and bisexual people is lower (Perales, 2016). Central to our problem is that this is partially due to the popular evaluation of homosexuality as wrong (Pachankis & Bränström, 2018). These stigma may also indirectly bar the access to fundamental rights (Sherkat, Powell-Williams, Maddox, & de Vries, 2011), facilitating antigay violence in turn (Parrott & Peterson, 2008). This loop risks to create a vicious cycle of decreasing quality of life (Berggren, Bjørnskov, & Nilsson, 2017). Some new research suggests that the economic costs of the social exclusion of gays and lesbians and the lack of formal protection may also affect overall economic development of societies (Badgett, Waaldijk, & Rodgers, 2019).

In short, sexual prejudices against homosexual persons – often denoted as “homophobia” or “homonegativity” - matter in the social world, and matter for individual lives. They incur negative effects on the people involved, and also on society as a whole. This contribution focuses on the striking differences in sexual prejudice among social classes. In that respect, sexual prejudice is a *pars pro toto*

of the general more ‘conformist’ position of the working class (de Regt, Smits, & Mortelmans, 2012).

This article contributes to two debates. First, it tests predictions based on the theory of ‘working class conformism’, checking whether the working class indeed differs consistently in its judgment of homosexuality. Second, we aim to settle the debate as whether this difference is no more than a spurious relationship. We proceed in three steps. We first document the more negative assessment of homosexuality in the working class. Second, it is tested whether this relationship has withered through time. This allows us to test, in its most basic wording, the ‘death of class’ thesis: the prediction of the withering effect of class on the normative evaluation of deviations from heteronormativity. Because the distance in sexual prejudice between manual workers and the rest of society does not wither, the least one can say is that class still matters. This second step also sheds light to a more advanced discussion that has hitherto gone without serious empirical tests. Against the background of increasing levels of education, a decreasing effect of class through time could support the thesis that education and not class affects differences in sexual prejudice. As this is proven *not* to happen, it is more likely that class experiences actually play a role in sexual prejudice. In a third and final step, we test this hypothesis more rigidly with the help of a matching design. The confirmation through this design provides further support for the active role of occupational experience as a socializing institution in the development of (in)tolerant attitudes toward sexual minorities.

This article proceeds as follows. The next section provides an outline of the theoretical arguments and debates about sexual prejudice and working class conformism. Section 2 proceeds by developing a number of hypotheses. After the design and data (section 3), we discuss the results (section 4). A final section summarizes and discusses the findings.

2. Sexual prejudice and social class

We hypothetically attribute differences in sexual prejudice to social class. Before we discuss these predictions and the design developed to test them adequately in the third subsection, the literature regarding (in)tolerance toward homosexuality, and its connection to social class are to be discussed. The following two subsections do precisely that.

2.1. Sexual prejudice and homophobia

For the purpose of this paper, homosexuality itself is defined as same-sex sexual activities, or the identification of oneself as such. This definition therefore encompasses gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. The concept of homophobia was originally developed by George Weinberg, defining it as the social distance of individuals towards homosexuals (Weinberg, 1972). Because of Weinberg's stress on the emotional dimension, we follow Herek's (2004) suggestion to use the more encompassing concept of sexual prejudice. In this vein, homophobia can be described as a dimension of sexual prejudice, mainly referring to the emotional aspect. Sexual prejudice then is used in this contribution as negative attitudes,

valuation, beliefs, or norms towards homosexuals (compare Herek, 2004, p. 16).

In this subsection, we further discuss the main findings of existing empirical research into homophobia.

It will become clear from the overview that most of this research is strongly data-driven and theory-poor. The state of affairs nevertheless allows for some important conclusions, at the very least identifying the covariates one needs to control for, and documenting the recurring conclusion that Western societies have generally become more tolerant toward homosexuality in the past decades.

The empirical literature indeed provides strong evidence of a distinct change toward decreasing sexual prejudice, in particular since the 1980s (Baunach, 2012; Berggren et al., 2017; Clements & Field, 2014; Sherkat et al., 2011), also for at least one non-Western society, Taiwan (Cheng, Wu, & Adamczyk, 2016). This general trend may coincide with sexual prejudice becoming more localized in subgroups (Baunach, 2012; O'Brien, 2015). If this were to apply to class too, it might be that certain classes become one of those subgroups.

These cultural shifts are associated with legal changes, with more countries legally protecting sexual minorities, and legalizing same-sex marriages and adoptions (Adamczyk & Pitt, 2009; Hooghe & Meeusen, 2013). Flores and Park (2018) show that increasing tolerance correlates well with decriminalization of same-sex practices and better protection of sexual minorities. They also document remarkable interaction effects with the level of democracy, freedom of the press, and rule of law. It nevertheless is not entirely clear, whether legislative changes affect norms and beliefs, or conversely

(Adamczyk & Liao, 2019).

A large part of research into individual-level determinants of sexual prejudice focuses on religion. The baseline conjecture is that most organized religious groups denounce homosexuality, or at the very least homosexual practices (Jäckle & Wenzelburger, 2015), indirectly also impacting on law and policy (Štulhofer & Rimac, 2009; van den Akker, van der Ploeg, & Scheepers, 2013). The success of religious groups to capture public opinion partially depends on the country's level of modernization (Jäckle & Wenzelburger, 2015). Conversely, the effect of religious beliefs on the assessment of homosexuality seems to be stronger in countries where people have real choices about their religious self (Adamczyk & Pitt, 2009; Donaldson, Handren, & Lac, 2017). It should be added that there exists a strong existing intergenerational socialization effect of religious involvement too (Kelley & De Graaf, 1997; Voas & Storm, 2012), so that a religious upbringing may have an effect on people's level of sexual prejudice, regardless of the personal level of religious involvement. Country-level religiosity nevertheless does not seem to affect sexual prejudice in itself. A European multi-level study (Slenders, Sieben, & Verbakel, 2014) concludes that country-level religiosity has no influence, if controlled for a vector of individual and country-level characteristics.

Religious denominations do not evenly associate with sexual prejudice. Muslims (Doebler, 2015; van den Akker et al., 2013) and Confucians (Adamczyk & Cheng, 2015) are generally more disapproving of homosexuality. Orthodox Christians and more radical strands of Protestantism exhibit more negative

convictions toward homosexuality (Baunach, 2012; Berggren et al., 2017; Schnabel, 2016), while one US-based research concludes that believers from Jewish and Roman-Catholic denominations report lower levels of sexual prejudice than non-religious persons (Baunach, 2012).

Individuals with higher levels of (formal) education are generally more tolerant towards homosexuals (Baunach, 2012; Slenders et al., 2014; van den Akker et al., 2013), due to the exposure to egalitarian norms regarding lesbians and gays throughout their education, according to some (Van de Meerendonk & Scheepers, 2004). A survey of higher education students indeed indicates that intolerance was negatively related to the study year (Lottes & Kuriloff, 1994). Longitudinal evidence by la Roi and Mandemakers (2018) exploited the British Household Panel Survey to disentangle the fixed effects (stable personal characteristics) from the effects of education. Somewhere around two third of the difference based on educational attainment, is attributable to individual and family characteristics (amongst which the educational level of the parents). The net effect of education on sexual prejudice nevertheless survives, although the contribution is smaller than the correlation indicates.

Features such as gender, age, and marital status are relevant in explaining differences in sexual prejudice too. There is a stable gender effect, meaning that more males than females express intolerance towards homosexuals (Haney, 2016; Herek, 1988; Lottes & Kuriloff, 1994; Slenders et al., 2014; van den Akker et al., 2013). Marital status also relates to tolerance (Baunach, 2012; Jäckle & Wenzelburger, 2015; van den Akker et al., 2013). Finally, younger people are most likely to be tolerant of homosexuality

(Andersen & Fetner, 2008; Jäckle & Wenzelburger, 2015).

What then about socio-economic factors, the focus of this contribution? A first approach is to investigate the impact of macro-level economic features. For one thing, homonegativity is, more than anti-migrant feelings, negatively related to GDP per capita (Meeusen & Kern, 2016). National welfare levels predict the level of tolerance quite well, as documented by Andersen and Fetner (2008). In a recent analysis, the Pew Research Center (2020) finds that half of the variation in sexual prejudice at the country level is attributable to differences in overall welfare ($r=0.71$). Average income is not the only relevant feature, though: Doebler (2015) finds that countries with higher income inequality also show higher levels of sexual prejudice. The most elaborate analysis, well founded in theory, builds on Inglehart's (1971) postmaterialism thesis (Andersen & Fetner, 2008). This thesis essentially argues that if people grow up in conditions of sufficient material sustenance and physical security, they will start to adopt 'postmaterialist values' such as a preference for free choice, tolerance, and self-expression. Inglehart (2018) explicitly cites tolerance of homosexuality as part of these values, and expects it to be produced by economic development.

Micro-level analyses are more central to our interest in individuals' relative positions. If we apply Inglehart's thesis as a starting point, one would expect a stronger propensity toward postmaterialism for higher classes and income groups, but also that the distance is relative to the differences in living standard, and thus of overall inequality. There is some empirical support for the first prediction. For

instance, Barrett & Pollack (2005) found that working-class homosexuals are less likely to self-express as gay, and to participate in gay social groups. Also, discrimination against gay men at the workplace is concentrated in blue-collar male-dominated jobs (Elmslie & Tebaldi, 2007). Persell et al (2001), for the US, and Alozie et al (2017), for Africa, document increased levels of sexual prejudice among people with low real incomes or poor job access and job security. Slenders et al (2014) find a robust positive relation between income and tolerance toward homosexuality, regardless of the control variables.

Svallfors (2006) directly studies class, and finds that social class strongly correlates to sexual prejudice, which is confirmed by Andersen and Fetner (2008). Professionals and managers are more tolerant, and there is less tolerance in working class members. These findings can still be interpreted as support for the postmaterialism thesis: better economic conditions foster tolerance. At the same time, however, the higher levels of sexual prejudice in working classes members are not affected by the nation's development level, as also argued by Svallfors (2006). Regardless of inequality levels, the relative distance in sexual prejudice remains more or less equal. This contradicts the postmaterialism thesis, and provides support for the conjecture that *within*-country inequalities as captured by social class, matter for tolerance toward homosexuality. The question then is why this would be the case? We will argue that the 'working class conformism' thesis can provide a theoretical rationale.

Summarizing, there is a profusion of studies empirically documenting correlates of tolerance of homosexuality. From the overview the scarcity of strongly theory-driven research becomes apparent,

and it also seems that most studies are correlational. We make an attempt to base our predictions regarding the working class-specificity on the theoretical rationale of the so-called ‘Lipset thesis (next section).

2.2. The social stratification of sexual prejudice

Before we proceed, it is important to make clear what we mean by working class in this contribution.

We use the concept to refer to those people who hold an occupation of routine physical work in a labour contract relationship. As indicated, we focus on the hypothetical effect of the experiences of working class existence on the normative assessment of homosexuality. A critical issue in stratification research, indeed, is how socio-economic positions engrain people with different beliefs and norms toward groups and individuals, amongst which homosexuals. Working class conformism enforces homogeneity by excluding different identities, according to Bourdieu (1996, p. 444): “L’univers des possibles est fermé” [The set of possibilities is closed]. We investigate how these class-related norms and beliefs are rooted in socio-economic positions. Because the debate is not settled, we now further explain the contradictory theoretical positions, based on the theoretical starting point of the *Lipset thesis*. Then we discuss two potential objections against Lipset’s argument.

We argue that sexual prejudice is directly rooted in people’s conformism. The historical starting point of these debates is Seymour Lipset’s (1959) influential article on the so-called ‘authoritarianism’ of the working class. It should be noted beforehand that Lipset’s ‘authoritarianism’ is an inadequate concept

1 to describe its object (as argued in Svallfors, 2006, pp. 124-125). We follow Kohn's conceptualization of
2
3 'conformism': rigid adherence to what is deemed proper, and the related intolerance toward those who
4
5 do not conform to this (Kohn, 1977, p. 79). Alternatively, Altemeyer (1988; 1992) argues that
6
7 conformism is a subset of authoritarianism (his authoritarianism scale indeed contains an item about
8
9 norms toward homosexuality (Altemeyer, 2002)). In both cases, sexual prejudice is one aspect of
10
11 conformism, basically referring to the tolerance towards nonconformist sexual activities. Scale
12
13 evaluations confirm that authoritarianism correlates well with measures of prejudice toward sexual
14
15 minorities (Grey, Robinson, Coleman, & Bockting, 2013).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Lipset's original thesis (1959) argued that social class moulds people's worldviews, also in areas unrelated
25
26 to socio-economic interests. An alleged working-class tendency to support authoritarian parties is based
27
28 on negative attitudes toward outsiders, such as ethnic minorities or people with 'deviant' sexualities.
29
30
31
32 Lipset argues that these differences are rooted in social and economic insecurity, more punitive
33
34 parenting, and relative isolation from society's mainstream cultural change. We refer to this hypothesis
35
36 of conformism being rooted in class positions as the *Lipset thesis*.
37
38
39
40
41

42 In later research, lower levels of autonomy and power at work have been identified as the central sources
43
44 of working-class conformism. On average, people in working class occupations indeed are closely
45
46 supervised at work, and score lower on autonomy and power in the workplace (Stephens et al., 2014).
47
48
49
50

51 This thesis has been well elaborated and empirically tested, especially by Melvin Kohn and associates
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(Kohn, Naoi, Schoenbach, Schooler, & Slomczynski, 1990; Kohn et al., 1997; Kohn, Slomczynski, & Schoenbach, 1986; Kohn et al., 2002; Schooler, 2007). The central thesis is that “the class-values relationship can be interpreted as resulting from class-associated conditions of life, occupational conditions in particular” (Kohn, 1977, p. xxxiv). Kohn (1977) acknowledges the role of education, but occupational experiences have an additive effect on dimensions of conformism, amongst which those related to sexuality. The latter mechanism, depicted as ‘occupational moulding’ (p. 192), is a process by which manual workers learn to value conformity to authority, basically because they benefit from it. This ‘moulding’ entails an expectation not to exceed what has been socially defined as proper and acceptable behaviour. In the realm of sexual behaviour, this implies that anything that deviates from heteronormative expectations, is considered unacceptable. Conversely, other people’s socialization from working, for instance in managerial positions, learns them that they are required to autonomously pursue their goals, and self-direct their behaviour. The conformist tendency is reinforced by the associated norm that prescribes one should be willing to monitor the behaviour of peers, and, if need be, to punish others who deviate. In short, the Lipset thesis as we conceive it, theorizes that some feature of class differences, in particular socialization effects grounded in occupational experiences, are at the root of a stronger attachment to conformist norms and beliefs in the working class .

A number of objections could be brought against the idea backing up the *Lipset thesis*. The first objection, the so-called *death of class thesis* generally argues that class membership in late-modern

1 society is no longer consequential for social life or personal identities. The second, more specific and
2
3 subtle piece of criticism argues that not class in itself, but the correlate education, accounts for the
4
5 relation between working class positions and sexual prejudice. This *spuriousness thesis* conveys that the
6
7 real causal factor behind conformist dispositions is education, not class.
8
9

10
11 First, the *death of class thesis* (Pakulski & Waters, 1996a) argues that class has lost its analytical
12
13 relevance and utility nowadays. Pakulski and Waters (1996b, p. 670), probably the most vocal advocates
14
15 of this thesis, oppose the claim that class directly affects identities and attitudes. Societies can be ordered
16
17 according to their ‘classness’ (Pakulski, 2005, p. 154), with industrial societies having had a high degree
18
19 of ‘classness’. This is due to the relatively uniform working conditions in factories and bureaucracies,
20
21 and the ensuing collective identities based on socio-economic positions. Contemporary societies have a
22
23 low degree of classness due to occupational differentiation, and therefore classes are supposed to become
24
25 less relevant. This implies, amongst others, that also unskilled, low-reward, manual workers have
26
27 developed beliefs and norms “shared with all other members of society” (Pakulski & Waters, 1996b, p.
28
29 681). This would imply that there is no such thing as a normative distance regarding conformism,
30
31 including sexual prejudice, between manual workers and other parts of the (active) population. There
32
33 is a rather straightforward way to test this criticism: if the difference in norms or attitudes remains
34
35 stable or widens through time, the prediction is falsified.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The second piece of criticism is closer to typical inference problems in empirical debates. Some scholars
2
3 argue that the relationship between class, on the one hand, and conformist norms and beliefs, on the
4
5 other, is spurious. Without a doubt, education is closely associated to class positions. The authors argue
6
7 that the relationship between class position and conformism is merely an optical illusion, because
8
9 education is the real factor driving the relationship. This *spuriousness thesis* indeed states that the root
10
11 of working class conformism is poor education (e.g. Dekker & Ester, 1987). It is argued that the
12
13 spuriousness of the class variable is consistent with the conclusion that the variable tends to lose its
14
15 effect on conformism if controlled for education (for instance, Houtman, 2003). In short, class and
16
17 conformism correlate because of the covariate education.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 All in all, we lack conclusive evidence to decide whether the *spuriousness thesis* or the *Lipset thesis* gets
31
32 sufficient support. The empirical strategy of regressing some conformist attitude to class and educational
33
34 levels, and the conclusion that the class variable becomes less powerful or loses every predictive power,
35
36 might just as well be used to reverse the argument. A strong relation between the independent variables
37
38 class and education makes that the coefficients of conformism regressed on both variables may be
39
40 imprecise. It is therefore not clear whether class or education is the real factor behind prejudice, or that
41
42 both (or none) account for it. It then is hard to determine the net effect of class respectively education
43
44 on the tolerance toward sexual minorities with the help of straightforward regressions. We design a
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

different approach, that should allow us to test whether social class, understood as the socializing effects of labour market and job experiences, affects the position toward homosexuality.

2.3. Attributing sexual prejudice to working class positions

Where does this bring us? In this subsection, we build on the discussed debate about the alleged nature of the working class-prejudice association. We make use of this debate to infer a number of testable predictions. First, we hypothesize how the *death of class thesis* can be tested. Then, more importantly, we state a number of hypotheses aimed at testing whether the *Lipset thesis* can withstand the objections from the *spuriousness thesis*. These predictions are thus aimed at clarifying and solving the question as whether the relationship either is spurious or captures that working class life actually engenders sexual prejudice.

We argue that the association between working-class positions and sexual prejudice is not solely rooted in educational differences, but can also be attributed to professional socialization. We test this general idea in two ways, that add up to existing research. Most research accounting for the effect of stratification on norms and beliefs, makes use of multivariate techniques. These studies usually regress some construct of norms and beliefs on class positions and a number of control variables, amongst which the educational level. Debates about whether the occupational experiences or the covariate of educational attainment account for the effect, may then be studied through the hypothetical disappearance of the effect of the class variable in a regression that controls for education. It should be

clear that this design provides some indication of the effects of both education and class position, on the condition that the control variables are carefully selected. Nevertheless, these outcomes remain inconclusive. We argue that alternative designs are needed to come to more firm conclusions. We test two important conjectures. First, the so-called *death of class* thesis (Pakulski & Waters, 1996a), applied to prejudice, argues that class stopped influencing beliefs and norms. We test this by documenting, with the help of repeated cross-sections between 2002 and 2016, the change in distance in sexual prejudice between unskilled manual workers and the rest of the active population. If this distance disappears, or if there is a marked decrease, this could be understood as support for the *death of class* thesis. If it remains stable or widens, this result would provide a falsification. As a robustness check, we also test the effect with repeated cross-sections between 1981 and 2008, with the downside that these cross-sections are less comparable through time.

Hypothesis 1a: *The lead in average self-reported sexual prejudice of working class members does not decrease significantly since 2002.*

Hypothesis 1b: *The lead in average self-reported sexual prejudice of working class members does not decrease significantly since the 1980's.*

Second, we aim to test the *Lipset* versus the *spuriousness* theses, in order to decide whether occupational experiences socialize manual workers in sexual prejudice. The trend of increasing levels of education, also among unskilled workers, is exploited to provide a first indication of the validity of either thesis. A decreasing effect of low-skilled working class membership on sexual prejudice, would support the

spuriousness thesis: not class, but its correlate education then would be the factor affecting sexual prejudice. In the case of a rejection of the spuriousness thesis, one cannot infer that it provides convincing evidence for the Lipset thesis, however. There are good arguments that this would not suffice as evidence of the efficacy of working class experiences on sexual prejudice.

Hypothesis 2a: *Against the background of increasing educational attainment of working class members, their lead in sexual prejudice remains stable through time.*

The direct impact of relative positions rooted in the occupational structure on sexual prejudice, will be further tested with the help of a matching approach. This matching design exploits the diversity of educational levels in the working class. The design matches respondents on their educational level, so that they differ in their occupational position only. Testing whether people with similar educational backgrounds, who simultaneously differ in their membership of the class of low-skilled manual workers, still differ significantly in their tolerance toward homosexuality, should provide a more rigid test of the effect of being in a working-class occupation.

Hypothesis 2b: *After matching working class members in educational attainment, they show a significant lead in sexual prejudice.*

3. Data and methods

Summarizing the design discussion in the theoretical sections, we aim to perform two sets of analyses:

(1) a time series analysis based on repeated cross-sections, regressing sexual prejudice on social class

and control variables; (2) a matching design estimating the treatment effect of low-skilled working class experiences. In the following paragraphs we briefly present the data used, and subsequently discuss the designs for both sets of analyses.

3.1. Data and central measures

We rely on the dataset that combines the repeated cross-sections of the *European Social Survey*, with eight biennial surveys (2002-2016). Our analyses' dependent variable is an item that has been asked in the same way throughout the different waves, gauging the agreement on the statement 'gays and lesbians are free to live life as they wish' (five-point Likert scale). We are aware of the limitations of this single-item measure, and potential bias that may result from it (an extensive discussion in Adamczyk & Liao, 2019). However, there are no better alternatives in cross-country and longitudinal designs such as ours. Furthermore, Adamczyk and Liao (2019) do show that different measures at the country level usually reveal similar response patterns.

For reasons of consistent classification, we always confine our analyses to the active respondents. Only respondents with paid work are retained. From the original 230,152 cases, 113,321 (49,2%) have paid work. In the final regressions, 94,336 cases (83,2% of the active persons) are included, due to missing cases and the fact that farmers are excluded. The social class of unskilled manual workers is well founded in stratification literature, as part of the so-called 'EGP class scheme' (Goldthorpe, 2007). Ganzeboom and Treiman (2003, 2010) coded the ESS data to the EGP class scheme. The main analyses make use

of class VIIa, representing semi- and unskilled manual workers: these are workers in routine manual occupations, exchanging closely monitored working time (or even piece work) against a wage in a labour contract. The reference category consists of all the other working respondents (see annex I for an overview).

Table 1: Overview of variables and measures used in the analyses

Waves	European Social Survey, bi-annual, 2002-2016 (8 waves).
Dependent variable: sexual prejudice	Five-point Likert scale (1:Agree strongly, 2:Agree, 3:Neither agree nor disagree, 4:Disagree, 5:Disagree strongly) “Gays and lesbians are free to live life as they wish” (<i>freehms</i>).
Independent variable: social class	EGP-11 (the Goldthorpe/Erikson/Portocarero class scheme), coded by Ganzeboom & Treiman (2003, 2010): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Base model: semi- and unskilled manual workers (Class VIIa). Agricultural workers and self-employed farmers are excluded. Reference category: classes I-VI Robustness test: also include dummy variables for skilled manual workers (Class VI) and agricultural workers (Class VIIb) Reference category: classes I-V Annex I provides an overview of the class scheme.
CONTROL VARIABLES	
Education	ISCED educational level, 5 categories (ISCED 0-1: Primary education or less, ISCED 2 : Lower secondary education, ISCED 3 : Upper secondary education, ISCED 4 : Post-secondary non-tertiary education, ISCED 5-6: Tertiary education) (<i>edubvla</i>).
Age	Age in years (<i>agea</i>).
Gender	Two categories, reference: female (<i>gndr</i>).
Family status	Five categories : Married or legally living together (reference category), Separated, Divorced, Widowed, Single. Constructed with <i>marital</i> (waves 1-2), <i>maritala</i> (waves 3-4), <i>maritalb</i> (waves 5-8) and, for France, <i>maritalfr</i> .
Religious denomination	Recoded into those reporting not to belong to a denomination (reference group) and six religious or denominational groups (Roman Catholic, Protestant or Reformed, Orthodox, other Christian denomination, Muslim, and any other religious denomination). Constructed with <i>rlgblg</i> and <i>rlgdnm</i> .
Religious involvement	7-point scale of the frequency the respondent attends religious services (<i>rlgatnd</i>).
Urbanization	Five categories : A big city (reference category), Suburbs or outskirts of big city, Town or small city, Country village, Farm or home in countryside (<i>domicil</i>).
Migration background	1 if respondent or respondent’s mother or father is not born in country, and 0 otherwise. Constructed with <i>brmcntr</i> , <i>facntr</i> and <i>mocntr</i>
Country	14 countries : Belgium, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The Netherlands, UK (<i>cntry</i>).

¹ Indications in italics refer to the name of the variable in the ESS-datasets.

1
2
3 In the regressions, a vector of control variables is introduced, as presented in Table 1. The controls are
4
5
6 based on the empirical research discussed in the literature section. The control variables included are
7
8
9 age, gender, marital status, religious denomination and involvement, urbanization, migration
10
11
12 background, and education. Education is crucial, as explained earlier. A 5-category ISCED is used. Some
13
14
15 descriptive statistics are summarized in Table 2. We present analyses on the pool of countries that have
16
17
18 been sampled in all eight waves. This common pool consists of 14 countries.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 2: Descriptives of the central variables and covariates

Year	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010	2012	2014	2016
Sexual prejudice (mean)	2.04	1.99	1.97	1.87	1.88	1.85	1.73	1.73
<u>Class (%)</u>								
Semi- or unskilled	14.6%	13.4%	15.3%	14.7%	14.6%	15.0%	14.4%	13.1%
Skilled manual workers	9.2%	9.5%	8.7%	8.3%	8.3%	7.8%	7.4%	7.6%
Other classes	76.2%	77.1%	76.0%	77.0%	77.1%	77.2%	78.2%	79.3%
<u>Education (%)</u>								
ISCED 0-1	7.1%	7.5%	7.5%	6.6%	6.2%	5.3%	3.7%	3.4%
ISCED 2	15.3%	14.7%	13.5%	13.8%	13.9%	12.8%	12.1%	10.6%
ISCED 3	42.3%	40.3%	39.8%	36.9%	35.8%	36.6%	35.4%	34.6%
ISCED 4	3.1%	3.9%	4.6%	4.4%	5.7%	6.0%	6.8%	7.2%
ISCED 5-6	32.3%	33.5%	34.6%	38.2%	38.5%	39.3%	42.1%	44.2%
Gender (% male)	55.4%	53.5%	53.2%	52.4%	51.4%	51.9%	51.7%	51.5%
Age (mean)	40.8	41.1	41.5	41.8	42.3	43.0	43.5	43.7
<u>Marital status</u>								
Married or living together	57.9%	56.4%	58.6%	57.0%	55.2%	54.9%	54.6%	55.7%
Separated	2.2%	2.3%	1.8%	2.1%	1.5%	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%
Divorced	7.9%	8.0%	9.5%	10.0%	9.8%	10.0%	10.2%	9.2%
Widowed	1.8%	1.9%	2.1%	1.9%	1.7%	1.8%	1.9%	1.6%
Single	30.2%	31.4%	28.0%	29.0%	31.7%	32.4%	32.6%	32.7%
<u>Religious denomination (%)</u>								
No denomination	48.3%	48.4%	49.6%	46.8%	46.0%	48.6%	49.7%	47.8%
Roman Catholic	32.4%	34.8%	34.1%	34.9%	34.7%	33.2%	32.5%	33.5%
Protestant/Reformed	15.7%	13.5%	12.9%	14.3%	14.3%	13.4%	12.9%	13.2%
Eastern Orthodox	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%
Other Christian	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.9%	1.5%	1.2%	1.2%	1.3%
Islamic	1.0%	1.0%	1.3%	1.5%	1.9%	1.8%	2.1%	2.5%
Other	0.9%	0.7%	0.6%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%	1.0%	1.1%
Religious involvement (mean)	2.39	2.37	2.30	2.28	2.32	2.29	2.28	2.29
<u>Urbanization (%)</u>								
A big city	15.5%	17.2%	16.6%	17.1%	17.6%	18.5%	16.9%	16.4%
Suburbs or outskirts	16.7%	15.5%	14.8%	14.2%	13.9%	13.9%	13.6%	12.7%
Town or small city	30.3%	30.0%	30.7%	32.2%	30.3%	31.7%	32.6%	32.7%
Country village	31.2%	29.7%	31.7%	30.6%	31.6%	29.9%	31.1%	31.7%
Farm or countryside	6.3%	7.6%	6.2%	6.0%	6.7%	6.0%	5.7%	6.5%

Migration background (%)	14.4%	15.0%	16.3%	17.5%	18.1%	18.8%	19.6%	20.4%
<u>Country (<i>n</i>)</u>								
Belgium	837	809	842	850	804	870	804	820
Switzerland	1,006	1,093	920	915	777	804	800	836
Denmark	1,288	1,188	1,218	1,317	1,409	1,351	1,502	1,458
Spain	622	701	957	1,224	852	749	809	871
France	403	487	987	984	810	867	862	867
UK	1,015	481	687	1,146	1,100	932	997	911
Hungary	607	268	533	557	651	713	734	660
Ireland	906	983	681	704	833	939	892	1,186
The Netherlands	1,062	857	892	885	899	860	883	760
Norway	1,075	1,025	1,034	950	871	950	808	856
Poland	697	640	679	648	759	773	668	710
Portugal	683	790	909	866	724	752	476	357
Sweden	1,127	1,089	1,131	1,059	803	967	947	814
Slovenia	522	374	557	486	532	437	429	568
<i>n</i>	11,850	10,785	12,027	12,601	11,824	11,964	11,611	11,674

3.2. Regression analyses

The regressions estimate both the general societal trend, and the dynamic in the distance in sexual prejudice between unskilled manual workers and the rest of the active population based on European Social Survey data, covering the period 2002-2016. All regression estimations were weighted by post-stratification weights.

A historical extension tests how far these hypothetical trends go back, replicating a similar design to EVS-data of the period 1981-2008. Although they come close, data availability forces us to design these checks slightly differently (see annex III). Also, because it proved impossible to measure the low-skilled

1 working class consistently through the waves, the regression is run separately for the periods 1981-1999
2
3 and 1999-2008.
4
5

6 The main regression presents three models. The time variable (dummies in the base estimates) and class
7
8 (low-skilled manual workers) are central to our concern. In the first model, we regress sexual prejudice
9
10 on social class, including a rich set of control variables, inspired by the research discussed earlier.
11
12
13
14
15 Dummy variables for the countries are included to control for country-specific effects. The strategic
16
17 advantage of this approach is that it captures all time-invariant characteristics at the country level,
18
19 both observed and unobserved. Because our predictions point to group or individual differences, this
20
21 approach allows for the most complete control of any higher-level covariates (Allison, 2009).
22
23
24
25

26
27 In the second model, education is added, in line with the discussed literature arguing that this provides
28
29 a test for the alleged spuriousness of the working class variable. In the third and final model, we add
30
31 interaction effects between the waves and social class. This allows to test as whether the distance
32
33 between the working class members and members of other classes diverges or converges. The standard
34
35 models are ordinary least squares regressions. One reason to choose for this model, is that it allows,
36
37 contrary to ordered logit or probit regressions, for a comparison of coefficients between several regression
38
39 estimates (Karlson, Holm, & Breen, 2012). Also, interaction terms in nonlinear models cannot
40
41 necessarily be interpreted as evidence for an interaction effect as one can do in linear models (Norton,
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Wang, & Ai, 2004)². Mood (2010) argues that linear models are legitimate, as long as the problem of
2
3 heteroscedasticity is tackled. In order to do so, we made use of cluster-robust standard errors, clustered
4
5
6 at countries within waves.
7

8
9
10 Two robustness checks are tested. First, because of the risk that the class foundation of sexual prejudice
11
12 is strengthened through time due to differential composition effects through migration flows, we ran a
13
14 robustness check excluding all respondents who themselves or their parents were born abroad. Second,
15
16 we also performed regressions on a broadened conception of the working class, that is: classes VI (skilled
17
18 manual workers), VIIa (unskilled manual workers) and VIIb (agricultural labourers) from the EGP class
19
20
21 scheme.
22
23
24
25

26 27 28 29 3.3. Matching 30

31
32
33 Matching methods have been developed with the express ambition to identify effects in observational
34
35 data, such as survey data (Rosenbaum & Rubin, 1983). These methods mimic experimental designs, by
36
37 selecting control or comparison units that have the most similar characteristics possible for units ‘under
38
39 treatment’, which in our research applies to respondents working-class occupations (Gertler, Martinez,
40
41
42 Premand, Rawlings, & Vermeersch, 2016). This set of techniques thus has a clear causal ambition,
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 ² We wish to thank the anonymous reviewer remarking this.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 allowing for the construction of a counterfactual with non-experimental data. One compares a group
 2
 3 that is subjected to a certain condition - in our case: working as an unskilled manual worker - to a
 4
 5 control group that is as similar to the treatment group as possible in terms of observed characteristics.
 6
 7
 8 We have the advantage that the debate about working class conformism focuses on one specific covariate
 9
 10 that biases results: education. So our design focusses at the education covariate that hypothetically
 11
 12 creates a bias. For this reason, we use exact matching for the education variable.
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17 For the control variables (age, gender, urbanization, wave, and country), two types of matching are
 18
 19 used: nearest neighbour matching and kernel matching.
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24 Nearest neighbour matching selects for every individual i in the treated group, the k observations in the
 25
 26 control group that are closest (in distance) to this individual i (and with the exact same educational
 27
 28 level). A common choice is to use $k=5$. The variable of interest for individual i is compared to the
 29
 30 arithmetic mean of the k nearest observations in the control group and averaged over all individuals in
 31
 32 the treatment group. This will give an estimate of the average treatment effect of the treated (ATT).
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37 Kernel matching also compares the result of an individual i in the treated group with the weighted
 38
 39 average of individuals in the control group, but with weights that depend on the distance from the
 40
 41 treated individual. A difficulty with kernel matching is the choice of a kernel function and a bandwidth
 42
 43 parameter. Generally, a larger bandwidth increases bias, but reduces variance (Stuart, 2010). We use
 44
 45 the Stata-package *kmatch* (Jann, 2017), which adopts an Epanechnikov kernel function as default. For
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

1 the calculation of the optimal bandwidth we used the default option, which is based on the pair-matching
2
3 algorithm by Huber et al. (2015).
4

5
6 These matching techniques need a measure to calculate the distance between cases. A popular choice is
7
8 using a propensity score, but recent research showed that this can produce bias in the estimates (King
9
10 & Nielsen, 2019). Taking these potential biases into account, the Mahalanobis distance provides an
11
12 excellent alternative for the propensity score. The Mahalanobis distance is based on the variance-
13
14 covariance matrix. The balance of the covariates before and after matching is checked and reported in
15
16 annex IV. To adjust for possible remaining imbalance after matching, we also estimate the ATT in a
17
18 regression model with the covariates included as control variables.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 The treated group consists of 13,557 cases of which 13,043 were used in the matching process. On the
28
29 other hand, 41,096 cases of the 46,029 cases in the control group were used as matching individuals.
30
31
32
33 The chosen bandwidth was 1.47.
34
35

36
37 We check the robustness of our results with one additional slightly different model, by neutralizing the
38
39 effect of education even more convincingly. Therefore, we run the same matching models in which we
40
41 confine ourselves to respondents with a maximum educational level of secondary education (ISCED 3).
42
43
44 This check is performed in order to exclude a small group of extremely vertically mobile respondents,
45
46 e.g. those having tertiary education and working as a unskilled manual worker. With this robustness
47
48 check, we focus on marginal differences in education and social class. Finally, we also run the matching
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

algorithm on each wave separately. This test should allow us to exclude that the business cycle has a large effect on group composition or on sexual prejudice trends in different groups.

4. Results

4.1. Regression analyses

Table 3 summarizes the results of the regressions. Model 1 introduces the working class variable, time trends and the control variables; model 2 adds the effect of education; model 3 adds interaction effects between the waves and the working class variable. Although some interaction terms are statistically significant, the F-test of model 3 shows that the interaction effects and the working class variable are not jointly significant. The combined effect of the included interactions does not increase the model's explanatory power significantly. This means that the effect of working class on sexual prejudice does not change significantly over time, discarding the prediction of the 'death of class' thesis, and supporting hypothesis 1a. On average, working class members follow the societal trend of increasing tolerance, while their lag remains stable throughout the whole period. If anything, the lag slightly increases, although the effect is not strong enough to be conclusive. Therefore, models 1 and 2 give the best interpretation, without interaction terms between waves and class variables. All regressions support the hypothesis that medium- and low-skilled manual workers on average have stronger sexual prejudices. They report consistently more disapproval of the statement that gays and lesbians should be free to live their lives as they want.

Table 3: Regression models of effects on sexual prejudice, 2002-2016

	MODEL 1	MODEL 2	MODEL 3
Unskilled manual workers	0.17 (0.01)***	0.09 (0.01)***	-0.01 (0.04)
Waves			
Wave 2	-0.00 (0.03)	0.00 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.03)
Wave 3	-0.05 (0.04)	-0.04 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)
Wave 4	-0.15 (0.03)***	-0.13 (0.03)***	-0.14 (0.03)***
Wave 5	-0.17 (0.03)***	-0.15 (0.03)***	-0.17 (0.03)***
Wave 6	-0.19 (0.03)***	-0.17 (0.03)***	-0.19 (0.03)***
Wave 7	-0.32 (0.03)***	-0.29 (0.03)***	-0.31 (0.03)***
Wave 8	-0.32 (0.05)***	-0.29 (0.05)***	-0.31 (0.05)***
Interaction effects			
Wave2*Unskilled			0.08 (0.05)
Wave3*Unskilled			0.10 (0.06)
Wave4*Unskilled			0.10 (0.05)*
Wave5*Unskilled			0.10 (0.05)
Wave6*Unskilled			0.13 (0.06)*
Wave7*Unskilled			0.13 (0.06)*
Wave8*Unskilled			0.12 (0.06)*
Education			
ISCED 2		-0.11 (0.03)***	-0.11 (0.02)***
ISCED 3		-0.18 (0.03)***	-0.18 (0.02)***
ISCED 4		-0.29 (0.04)***	-0.29 (0.03)***
ISCED 5-6		-0.34 (0.04)***	-0.34 (0.02)***
Country dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes
Control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes
R^2	20.4%	21.3%	21.3%
F	211.25***	108.17***	1.12
N	94,627	94,336	94,336
Dependent variable: sexual prejudice.			

1	Regressions are based on the <i>European Social Survey</i> , 8 waves between 2002 and
2	2016.
3	F-tests compare each model with the previous one; for the first model with the null-
4	model (model with only a constant).
5	Reported: coefficient (cluster-robust standard errors); * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, ***
6	$p < 0.001$.
7	Data weighted by post-stratification weight (<i>pspwght</i>)
8	·Waves: 1=2002 (reference category); 2=2004; 3=2006; 4=2008; 5=2010; 6=2012; 7=2014; 8=2016
9	·Education: ISCED (reference: ISCED 0-1)
10	·Controls not reported: Age, Gender, Family status, Denomination, Religious involvement, Urbanization,
11	Migration background
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	
61	
62	
63	
64	
65	

From the EVS analyses (annex III), it can be inferred that the same holds true for the 1980s and 1990s, providing support for hypothesis 1b.

The effect of class on sexual prejudice remains after controlling for the educational level of the respondents. The strength of the effect is compressed, but it survives the controls nevertheless.

Education in itself indeed has, as predicted, a strong and consistent negative effect on sexual prejudice.

All regressions show clear time effects of decreasing sexual prejudice. Between 2002 and 2016 a decrease in sexual prejudice of 0.3 on a five-point scale is shown over the entire period. The EVS estimations (annex III) indicate that this trend already started in the 1980s.

The robustness checks (annex II) confirm the central conclusions from the base estimates. Differential effects of migration on social class composition do not affect the outcome: a replication on respondents who were native-born, as were their parents, yields a similar result. Maybe even more important is the conclusion that an extended definition of working class, including skilled manual labourers and farm

1 labourers, comes to the same conclusion. These results bring in robust evidence supporting hypotheses
2
3 1a, 1b and 2a.
4
5
6

7 4.2. Matching models 8 9

10 The fact that the higher average level of sexual prejudice in the working class is consistent, robust, and
11
12 persistent, may suggest that it is not sensitive to increasing educational levels. Nevertheless, as argued
13
14 before, the regressions may not suffice as evidence of this relationship in a sufficiently credible way.
15
16
17 Therefore, we designed a matching analysis. The main results of this matching are summarized in
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 4. These results clearly support the hypothetical effect of medium- or low-skilled working class membership on sexual prejudice. The alternative specification confirms the outcome (annex IV). Confining our analysis to respondents with ISCED-levels one to three, reduces the treatment effect somehow, but it remains significant at the 0.001 level. In short, the robustness test provides further support for the class-prejudice connection.

The treatment effect is surprisingly strong. Over all the waves, which we take as our central measure, the effect is quite large in both matching designs, and has a size that is quite similar to the regression result. In short, these estimates bring in support for the effect of working class membership on prejudice, thus supporting hypothesis 2b.

Table 4: Matching – ATT of low-skilled manual workers on sexual prejudice

Wave	n	Kernel matching	Kernel matching (regression adjusted)	NN(5)-matching	NN(5)-matching (regression adjusted)
1: 2002	13,264	0.011 (0.032)	0.013 (0.030)	0.034 (0.033)	0.036 (0.030)
2: 2004	13,047	0.074 (0.032)*	0.076 (0.031)*	0.079 (0.033)*	0.079 (0.031)*
3: 2006	13,679	0.112 (0.032)***	0.113 (0.031)***	0.118 (0.032)***	0.119 (0.031)***
4: 2008	13,897	0.085 (0.029)**	0.088 (0.028)**	0.084 (0.030)**	0.085 (0.028)**
5: 2010	12,851	0.114 (0.032)***	0.114 (0.030)***	0.125 (0.033)***	0.112 (0.030)***
6: 2012	13,226	0.111 (0.032)***	0.113 (0.030)***	0.127 (0.033)***	0.128 (0.030)***
7: 2014	12,758	0.126 (0.034)***	0.126 (0.031)***	0.149 (0.034)***	0.152 (0.032)***
8: 2016	12,935	0.096 (0.034)**	0.096 (0.031)**	0.091 (0.036)*	0.086 (0.032)**
All waves	105,657	0.091 (0.012)***	0.092 (0.011)***	0.097 (0.012)***	0.099 (0.011)***
<p>Dependent variable: sexual prejudice.</p> <p>Reported coefficient : ATT (standard error); significance * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.</p> <p>ATT = average treatment effect on treated</p> <p>Exact matching on education; kernel or nearest-neighbour (5 to 1) matching (NN(5)) on age, gender, urbanization, countries, ESS wave (only the estimates in the final row)</p>					

To assess the quality of the matching, we compare (before and after matching) the standardized mean difference and the variance ratio between the treated and the untreated group (annex IV). We show the results for the kernel matching, since they were better than the nearest neighbour matching. All covariates are very well balanced after matching. This also explains the small differences between the estimations with and without regression adjustment for the covariates in

Table 4.

5. Conclusion and discussion

We hypothesize that working-class subjects, due to their working and living experiences, are more susceptible to sexual prejudice. Because of the roots of this effect in working experiences, we expect that it does not wither through time. These predictions are built on work by Seymour Lipset (1959), and even more so, on the elaboration and empirical work by Melvin Kohn and his collaborators (for instance Kohn, 1977; Kohn et al., 1997; Kohn et al., 2002; Schooler, 2007). The conjecture that life experiences and the ensuing differential socialization have an impact on people's norms and beliefs regarding homosexuality, contradicts the so-called *spuriousness thesis* (Dekker & Ester, 1987; Houtman, 2003). The latter argues that not class in itself, but its correlate education is the real cause of differences in sexual prejudice. It goes without saying that the validity of the Lipset thesis concurrently would imply a rejection of the *death of class* thesis: the conjecture that class does not affect people's attitudes, norms and beliefs anymore. Overall, one can conclude that there is strong support for what we termed the *Lipset thesis*: medium- and low-skilled manual worker on average report higher levels of sexual prejudice. Also, the time trend of this distance between working class members and others remains remarkably stable. It neither has the tendency to converge, nor to widen. This is quite important, as it substantiates and broadens the conclusion from earlier research (e.g., Andersen & Fetner, 2008; Svallfors, 2006) that

1 a number of features of stratification that differ between societies, do not seem to affect the gap in
2
3 conformism between working class and the rest of society. This now also seems to apply to changes
4
5 through time, which shows amongst others that increasing levels of the average absolute educational
6
7 level of the working class do not affect the gap. A limitation that is enshrined in the lack of consistent
8
9 measures in Europe of social class and sexual prejudice through time, is that the time trends between
10
11 1981 and 2016 are not consistently measured. Future research could attempt to replicate this design to
12
13 repeated cross-sections that have a more consistent long-term measure of class and sexual prejudice.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 An important potential objection may be that the educational effect may be relative rather than
21
22 absolute. In that case, the stable distance might reflect that working class members keep up in increasing
23
24 educational levels, but that they do not close the education gap. This would then be in line with the
25
26 Goldthorpe's argument (2000) that class differentials in educational attainment have changed very little
27
28 through time. These conclusions discard expectations of a reduction in the average educational
29
30 attainment gap, which would be commensurable with the *death of class* thesis, as much as dystopic
31
32 culturalist predictions of a widening educational gap.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 The central problem that this contribution attempts to clarify, however, is as whether the consistent
42
43 class difference in prejudice is spurious, or is actually rooted in different life experiences among classes.
44
45
46

47 A matching design brought in more convincing evidence than the dominant approach of controlling for
48
49 covariates. The results support the existence of the relationship between working class and sexual
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 prejudice. A potential limitation may be that the matching approach has to rely on observables. Some
2
3 unobserved features may still have a bearing on people's attitudes. Two aspects spring to mind, and
4
5 may help to see under which conditions the unobserved characteristics might pose a problem. The first
6
7
8 set of unobserved features may be those elements of life histories that affect sexual prejudice in a durable
9
10
11 way. More in particular socialization effects such as religious upbringing or being raised in another social
12
13
14 class then their own class may have an effect. In a different vein, it may be the case that personality
15
16
17 differences may affect people sexual prejudice. Wang et al (2020) indeed found that especially
18
19
20 agreeableness is the dimension of the Big Five personality traits that was consistently related to lower
21
22
23 levels of support for same sex marriage. It should be noted, nevertheless, that these unobserved aspects
24
25
26 only bias the outcome on the condition that they largely concentrate in certain classes, and in particular
27
28
29 in the working class.
30

31
32
33 The use of people with higher credentials in the working class, does not take into account that the latter
34
35
36 group may differ significantly in unobserved characteristics from higher-class members with similar
37
38
39 credentials. Nevertheless, the matching design is closer to an experimental design than the research
40
41
42 published hitherto, predominantly based on regression approaches. Therefore, we are quite confident
43
44
45 that our estimations are more convincing than the designs that have hitherto been brought forward in
46
47
48 the debate.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 One alternative explanation could be that the working class over time consists more and more of
2
3 uniformly lowly educated individuals³. In that case, the working class would become a more homogenous
4
5 groups of prejudiced people, but also a shrinking group. However, descriptive explorations, point to an
6
7 increase in educational level of the working class that is at least at pace with the rest of the active
8
9 population. The different pace of educational change among classes is nevertheless an interesting starting
10
11 point for further research.
12
13
14
15
16

17 Our contribution substantiates Melvin Kohn's approach. It brings in further evidence that experiences
18
19 of low autonomy and incentives to comply lead to an attachment to conformity, and mobilize resistance
20
21 to sexual minorities. In a more general language, this means that increased tolerance is partly rooted in
22
23 the economic conditions in which people live. People's occupational quality, and the economic conditions
24
25 under which they make a living, are not just relevant from the perspective of the quality of working
26
27 life; they just as well spill over into tolerance toward those that differ in sexual practices or identities.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 ³ We wish to thank the anonymous reviewer for this interesting counterargument.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- Adamczyk, A., & Cheng, Y.-h. A. (2015). Explaining attitudes about homosexuality in Confucian and non-Confucian nations: Is there a 'cultural' influence? *Social Science Research*, 51, 276-289. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2014.10.002
- Adamczyk, A., & Liao, Y.-C. (2019). Examining public opinion about LGBTQ-related issues in the United States and across multiple nations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 45(1), 401-423. doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-073018-022332
- Adamczyk, A., & Pitt, C. (2009). Shaping attitudes about homosexuality: The role of religion and cultural context. *Social Science Research*, 38(2), 338-351. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2009.01.002
- Allison, P. D. (2009). *Fixed effects regression models*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Alozie, N. O., Thomas, K., & Akpan-Obong, P. (2017). Global liberalization on homosexuality: Explaining the African gap. *The Social Science Journal*, 54(2), 120-131. doi:10.1016/j.soscij.2016.09.001
- Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Altemeyer, B. (2002). Changes in attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 42(2), 63-75. doi:10.1300/J082v42n02_04
- Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest, and prejudice. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 2(2), 113-133. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/hjpr20#.VfBz8BFVikq>
- Andersen, R., & Fetner, T. (2008). Economic inequality and intolerance: attitudes toward homosexuality in 35 democracies. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52(4), 942-958. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5907.2008.00352.x
- Badgett, M. V. L., Waaldijk, K., & Rodgers, Y. v. d. M. (2019). The relationship between LGBT inclusion and economic development: Macro-level evidence. *World Development*, 120, 1-14. doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.03.011
- Barrett, D. C., & Pollack, L. M. (2005). Whose gay community? Social class, sexual self-expression, and gay community involvement. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 46(3), 437-456. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.2005.00021.x
- Baunach, D. M. (2012). Changing same-sex marriage attitudes in America from 1988 through 2010. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 76(2), 364-378. doi:10.1093/poq/nfs022
- Berggren, N., Bjørnskov, C., & Nilsson, T. (2017). What aspects of society matter for the quality of life of a minority? Global evidence from the New Gay Happiness Index. *Social Indicators Research*, 132(3), 1163-1192. doi:10.1007/s11205-016-1340-3

- Bourdieu, P. (1996). *La distinction. Critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Minuit.
- Cheng, Y.-h. A., Wu, F.-C. F., & Adamczyk, A. (2016). Changing attitudes toward homosexuality in Taiwan, 1995–2012. *Chinese Sociological Review*, 48(4), 317-345. doi:10.1080/21620555.2016.1199257
- Clements, B., & Field, C. D. (2014). Public opinion toward homosexuality and gay rights in Great Britain. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 78(2), 523-547. doi:10.1093/poq/nfu018
- de Regt, S., Smits, T., & Mortelmans, D. (2012). The relevance of class in shaping authoritarian attitudes: A cross-national perspective. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 30(3), 280-295. doi:10.1016/j.rssm.2012.03.001
- Dekker, P., & Ester, P. (1987). Working-class authoritarianism: a re-examination of the Lipset thesis. *European Journal of Political Research*, 15(4), 395-415. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6765.1987.tb00884.x
- Doebler, S. (2015). Relationships between religion and two forms of homonegativity in Europe—A multilevel analysis of effects of believing, belonging and religious practice. *PLOS ONE*, 10(8), e0133538. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0133538
- Donaldson, C. D., Handren, L. M., & Lac, A. (2017). Applying Multilevel Modeling to Understand Individual and Cross-Cultural Variations in Attitudes Toward Homosexual People Across 28 European Countries. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 48(1), 93-112. doi:10.1177/0022022116672488
- Elmslie, B., & Tebaldi, E. (2007). Sexual Orientation and Labor Market Discrimination. *Journal of Labor Research*, 28(3), 436-453. doi:10.1007/s12122-007-9006-1
- Flores, A. R., & Park, A. (2018). *Examining the relationship between social acceptance of LGBT people and legal inclusion of sexual minorities*. Retrieved from Los Angeles: <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Acceptance-and-Legal-Inclusion-April-2018.pdf>
- Ganzeboom, H. B. G., & Treiman, D. J. (2003). Three internationally standardised measures for comparative research on occupational status. In J. Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik & C. Wolf (Eds.), *Advances in cross-national comparison: a European working book for demographic and socio-economic variables* (pp. 159-193). New York (N.Y.): Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
- Ganzeboom, H. B. G., & Treiman, D. J. (2010). *Occupational status measures for the new international standard classification of occupations ISCO-08; with a discussion of the new classification*. Retrieved from www.harryganzeboom.nl/isol/isol2010c2-ganzeboom.pdf
- Gertler, P. J., Martinez, S., Premand, P., Rawlings, L. B., & Vermeersch, C. M. J. (2016). *Impact evaluation in practice* (Second Edition ed.). Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank and World Bank.
- Goldthorpe, J. H. (2000). *On sociology. Numbers, narratives, and the integration of research and theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Goldthorpe, J. H. (2007). *On sociology. Volume two: illustration and retrospect*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Greenberg, D. F., & Bystry, M. H. (1982). Christian intolerance of homosexuality. *American Journal of Sociology*, 88(3), 515-548.
- Grey, J. A., Robinson, B. B. E., Coleman, E., & Bockting, W. O. (2013). A systematic review of instruments that measure attitudes toward homosexual men. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 50(3-4), 329-352. doi:10.1080/00224499.2012.746279
- Haney, J. L. (2016). Predictors of Homonegativity in the United States and the Netherlands Using the Fifth Wave of the World Values Survey. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 63(10), 1355-1377. doi:10.1080/00918369.2016.1157997
- Herek, G. M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: correlates and gender differences. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 25(4), 451-477. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/3812894
- Herek, G. M. (2004). Beyond "Homophobia": Thinking about sexual prejudice and stigma in the twenty-first century. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*, 1(2), 6-24. doi:10.1525/srsp.2004.1.2.6
- Hooghe, M., & Meeusen, C. (2013). Is same-sex marriage legislation related to attitudes toward homosexuality? *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 10(4), 258-268. doi:10.1007/s13178-013-0125-6
- Houtman, D. (2003). Lipset and "working-class" authoritarianism. *American Sociologist*, 34(1-2), 85-103.
- Huber, M., Lechner, M., & Steinmayr, A. (2015). Radius matching on the propensity score with bias adjustment: tuning parameters and finite sample behaviour. *Empirical Economics*, 49(1), 1-31. doi:10.1007/s00181-014-0847-1
- Inglehart, R. (1971). The silent revolution in Europe: intergenerational change in post-industrial societies. *The American Political Science Review*, 65(4), 991-1017. doi:10.2307/1953494
- Inglehart, R. F. (2018). *Cultural evolution: People's motivations are changing, and reshaping the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jäckle, S., & Wenzelburger, G. (2015). Religion, Religiosity, and the Attitudes Toward Homosexuality—A Multilevel Analysis of 79 Countries. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 62(2), 207-241. doi:10.1080/00918369.2014.969071
- Jann, B. (2017). KMATCH: Stata module module for multivariate-distance and propensity-score matching, including entropy balancing, inverse probability weighting, (coarsened) exact matching, and regression adjustment: Boston College Department of Economics. Retrieved from <https://ideas.repec.org/c/boc/bocode/s458346.html>
- Karlson, K. B., Holm, A., & Breen, R. (2012). Comparing regression coefficients between same-sample nested models using logit and probit: a new method. *Sociological Methodology*, 42(1), 286-313. doi:10.1177/0081175012444861

- Kelley, J., & De Graaf, N. D. (1997). National context, parental socialization, and religious belief: results from 15 nations. *American Sociological Review*, 62(4), 639-659. doi:10.2307/2657431
- King, G., & Nielsen, R. (2019). Why propensity scores should not be used for matching. *Political Analysis*, 27(4), 435-454. doi:10.1017/pan.2019.11
- Kohn, M. L. (1977). *Class and conformity: a study in values*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kohn, M. L., Naoi, A., Schoenbach, C., Schooler, C., & Slomczynski, K. M. (1990). Position in the class structure and psychological functioning in the United States, Japan, and Poland. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95(4), 964-1008.
- Kohn, M. L., Slomczynski, K. M., Janicka, K., Khmelko, V., Mach, B. W., Paniotto, V., . . . Heyman, C. (1997). Social structure and personality under conditions of radical social change: A comparative analysis of Poland and Ukraine. *American Sociological Review*, 62(4), 614-638. doi:10.2307/2657430
- Kohn, M. L., Slomczynski, K. M., & Schoenbach, C. (1986). Social stratification and the transmission of values in the family: A cross-national assessment. *Sociological Forum*, 1(1), 73-102. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/684554>
- Kohn, M. L., Zaborowski, W., Janicka, K., Khmelko, V., Mach, B. W., Paniotto, V., . . . Podobnik, B. (2002). Structural Location and Personality during the Transformation of Poland and Ukraine. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 65(4), 364-385. doi:10.2307/3090108
- la Roi, C., & Mandemakers, J. J. (2018). Acceptance of homosexuality through education? Investigating the role of education, family background and individual characteristics in the United Kingdom. *Social Science Research*, 71, 109-128. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2017.12.006
- Lipset, S. M. (1959). Democracy and working-class authoritarianism. *American Sociological Review*, 24(4), 482-501. doi:10.2307/2089536
- Lottes, I. L., & Kuriloff, P. J. (1994). The impact of college experience on political and social attitudes. *Sex Roles*, 31(1), 31. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1308099487?accountid=17215>
- Meeusen, C., & Kern, A. (2016). The relation between societal factors and different forms of prejudice: A cross-national approach on target-specific and generalized prejudice. *Social Science Research*, 55, 1-15. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2015.09.009
- Mood, C. (2010). Logistic regression: Why we cannot do what we think we can do, and what we can do about it. *European Sociological Review*, 26(1), 67-82. doi:10.1093/esr/jcp006
- Norton, E. C., Wang, H., & Ai, C. (2004). Computing interaction effects and standard errors in logit and probit models. *Stata Journal*, 4(2), 154-167. Retrieved from <http://www.stata-journal.com/article.html?article=st0063>
- <http://www.stata-journal.com/sjpdf.html?article=st0063>

- 1 O'Brien, J. (2015). Heterosexism and homophobia. In J. D. Wright (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of*
2 *the Social & Behavioral Sciences (Second Edition)* (pp. 790-795). Oxford: Elsevier.
- 3 Pachankis, J. E., & Bränström, R. (2018). Hidden from happiness: Structural stigma, sexual orientation
4 concealment, and life satisfaction across 28 countries. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical*
5 *Psychology, 86*(5), 403-415. doi:10.1037/ccp0000299
- 6 Pakulski, J. (2005). Foundations of a post-class analysis. In E. O. Wright (Ed.), *Approaches to class*
7 *analysis* (pp. 152-179). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 8 Pakulski, J., & Waters, M. (1996a). *The death of class*. London: Sage.
- 9 Pakulski, J., & Waters, M. (1996b). The reshaping and dissolution of social class in advanced society.
10 *Theory and Society, 25*(5), 667-691. doi:10.1007/bf00188101
- 11 Parrott, D. J., & Peterson, J. L. (2008). What motivates hate crimes based on sexual orientation?
12 Mediating effects of anger on antigay aggression. *Aggressive Behavior, 34*(3), 306-318.
13 doi:10.1002/ab.20239
- 14 Perales, F. (2016). The costs of being “different”: sexual identity and subjective wellbeing over the life
15 course. *Social Indicators Research, 127*(2), 827-849. doi:10.1007/s11205-015-0974-x
- 16 Persell, C. H., Green, A., & Gurevich, L. (2001). Civil society, economic distress, and social tolerance.
17 *Sociological Forum, 16*(2), 203-230.
- 18 Pew Research Center. (2020). *The global divide on homosexuality persists*. Retrieved from Washington,
19 D.C.: [https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2020/06/25/global-divide-on-homosexuality-](https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2020/06/25/global-divide-on-homosexuality-persists/)
20 [persists/](https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2020/06/25/global-divide-on-homosexuality-persists/)
- 21 Rosenbaum, P. R., & Rubin, D. B. (1983). The central role of the propensity score in observational
22 studies for causal effects. *Biometrika, 70*(1), 41-55. doi:10.2307/2335942
- 23 Sandfort, T. G. M., Melendez, R. M., & Diaz, R. M. (2007). Gender nonconformity, homophobia, and
24 mental distress in Latino gay and bisexual men. *The Journal of Sex Research, 44*(2), 181-189.
25 doi:10.1080/00224490701263819
- 26 Schnabel, L. (2016). Gender and homosexuality attitudes across religious groups from the 1970s to 2014:
27 Similarity, distinction, and adaptation. *Social Science Research, 55*(Supplement C), 31-47.
28 doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2015.09.012
- 29 Schooler, C. (2007). Culture and social structure. The relevance of social structure to cultural
30 psychology. In S. Kitayama & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural psychology* (pp. 370-388).
31 New York: Guilford.
- 32 Sherkat, D. E., Powell-Williams, M., Maddox, G., & de Vries, K. M. (2011). Religion, politics, and
33 support for same-sex marriage in the United States, 1988–2008. *Social Science Research, 40*(1),
34 167-180. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.08.009
- 35 Slenders, S., Sieben, I., & Verbakel, E. (2014). Tolerance towards homosexuality in Europe: Population
36 composition, economic affluence, religiosity, same-sex union legislation and HIV rates as

- explanations for country differences. *International Sociology*, 29(4), 348-367.
doi:10.1177/0268580914535825
- Stephens, N. M., Markus, H. R., & Phillips, L. T. (2014). Social class culture cycles: How three gateway contexts shape selves and fuel inequality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65(1), 611-634.
doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115143
- Stuart, E. A. (2010). Matching methods for causal inference: A review and a look forward. *Statistical Science*, 25(1), 1-21. Retrieved from
<http://www.jstor.org.kuleuven.ezproxy.kuleuven.be/stable/41058994>
- Štulhofer, A., & Rimac, I. (2009). Determinants of homonegativity in Europe. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 46(1), 24-32. doi:10.1080/00224490802398373
- Svallfors, S. (2006). *The moral economy of class. Class and attitudes in comparative perspective*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Van de Meerendonk, B., & Scheepers, P. (2004). Denial of Equal Civil Rights for Lesbians and Gay Men in the Netherlands, 1980–1993. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 47(2), 63-80.
doi:10.1300/J082v47n02_04
- van den Akker, H., van der Ploeg, R., & Scheepers, P. (2013). Disapproval of Homosexuality: Comparative Research on Individual and National Determinants of Disapproval of Homosexuality in 20 European Countries. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 25(1), 64-86. doi:10.1093/ijpor/edr058
- Voas, D., & Storm, I. (2012). The intergenerational transmission of churchgoing in England and Australia. *Review of Religious Research*, 53(4), 377-395. doi:10.1007/s13644-011-0026-1
- Wang, C.-H., Lin, T.-j., Weng, D. L.-C., & Chang, Y.-B. (2020). Personality traits and individual attitudes toward same-sex marriage: Evidence from Taiwan. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 17(3), 524-540. doi:10.1007/s13178-019-00401-4
- Weinberg, G. H. (1972). *Society and the healthy homosexual*. New York: St. Martin's Press.