

Measuring Tolerance of Homosexuality in the Mass Public Across Countries and Over Time

July 01, 2023

Authors

- Byung-Deuk Woo, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6902-7576>, Postdoctoral Researcher, Institute of Social Data Science, Pohang University of Science and Technology, byungdeukwoo@gmail.com
- Hyein Ko, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9497-9656>, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Political Science, University of Iowa, hyein-ko@uiowa.edu
- Yuehong Cassandra Tai, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7303-7443>, Postdoctoral Fellow, Center for Social Data Analytics, Pennsylvania State University, yhcasstai@psu.edu
- Yue Hu, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2829-3971>, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Tsinghua University, yuehu@tsinghua.edu.cn
- Frederick Solt, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3154-6132>, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Iowa, frederick-solt@uiowa.edu

Measuring Tolerance of Homosexuality in the Mass Public Across Countries and Over Time

July 01, 2023

Abstract

Tolerance of homosexuality has increased in many countries over recent decades, but the resulting scholarship has been hindered by the limited available data on these trends in public opinion. To overcome this problem, we present the Tolerance of Homosexuality (TOL-H) dataset, which combines a comprehensive collection of survey data with a latent-variable model to provide annual time-series estimates of public attitudes toward homosexuality across 119 countries and over as many as 49 years that are comparable across space and time. We show these data perform well in validation tests and demonstrate their potential by replicating an influential but recently questioned finding that more income inequality yields less tolerance of homosexuality. We anticipate that the TOL-H data will become a crucial source for cross-regional, cross-national, and longitudinal research that improves our understanding of the sources and consequences of tolerance of homosexuality.

Abstract wordcount: 146 words

Manuscript wordcount: 6781 words

Public attitudes toward homosexuality have been changing toward greater tolerance in many countries over the past several decades, and these often-rapid shifts have attracted sustained interest from researchers. The resulting scholarship has been hampered, however, by the limited available data on these trends in public opinion. Mirroring the coverage of the survey projects on which they were based, these works have either investigated the causes or consequences of dynamics in public opinion over time in only one country or region (see, e.g., Abou-Chadi and Finnigan 2019; Dotti Sani and Quaranta 2022), on the one hand, or differences in public opinion across a broad cross-regional sample of countries but in just a small number of years, on the other (see, e.g., Ayoub and Garretson 2017; Adamczyk 2017). Indeed, given the severe constraint of data availability on this topic, it is not at all surprising that there are also important contributions, even recently, that are limited in *both* space *and* time (see, e.g., Zhou and Hu 2020; Winkler 2021; Paradelo-López, Antón, and Jima-González 2023). The paucity of comparable data that has shaped this literature undermines our confidence in our understanding not only because the data are scant in general but also because they are biased geographically. Naturally, the narrower the evidentiary base upon which conclusions are built, the more susceptible these conclusions will be to collapse (see King, Keohane, and Verba 2021, 23). This is especially true where, as here, what suitable data exist are geographically concentrated. There is much more data and hence research on public opinion regarding homosexuality in the countries of Europe and North America than elsewhere (Adamczyk and Liao 2019, 410); this geographic bias makes scope conditions difficult to discern and so potentially leaves even theories that find empirical support less generally applicable than perhaps often assumed (see Wilson and Knutsen 2022, 1037).

To address these issues, this article presents the Tolerance of Homosexuality (TOL-H) dataset. The TOL-H dataset combines a comprehensive collection of responses to national and cross-national surveys with recent developments in latent-variable modeling of public opinion to provide estimates of public attitudes toward homosexuality that are comparable across many countries and over many years. These latent-variable estimates perform well in validation tests: they are very strongly correlated with single survey items tapping views of

homosexuality, and they also relate strongly to other concepts thought causally connected to public opinion on homosexuality. The TOL-H dataset provides a much firmer basis for testing the implications of theories by providing many more observations across a wider scope of countries and time than previously available sources. We demonstrate its potential in this regard by replicating the foundational but recently questioned finding of Andersen and Fetner (2008) that more income inequality yields less tolerance. We anticipate that the TOL-H data will become a crucial source for cross-regional, cross-national, and longitudinal research that improves our understanding of the sources and consequences of tolerance of homosexuality.

Existing Data and Research on Attitudes Toward Homosexuality

The TOL-H dataset aims to address a shortcoming in the available datasets on public opinion toward homosexuality: researchers have been forced to choose between studying tolerance in many countries *or* over many years, but not both. Figure 1 illustrates the trade-off between the breadth of country coverage and the number of years available for each country. It plots, for each survey project in the TOL-H source data described below, the number of countries for which data on attitudes toward homosexuality are available against the mean number of years these data are available per country. Some survey projects ask more than one question on the topic, but here, only the most frequently asked single question on the topic is shown. An ‘L’ shape is readily evident. Many surveys, clustered in the lower left at the bend in the L, ask questions about tolerance of homosexuality in only a few different country-year contexts. Some though, such as the U.S. General Social Survey and the British Social Attitudes project in the top left, have fielded such questions repeatedly over many years in a single country, although even these efforts fall short of complete time series. Others, including the World Values Survey and the Pew Global Attitudes project along the bottom and towards the right, provide information about many countries across one or a few years. The European Social Survey, which surveyed respondents in 39 countries in as many as ten years (mean: 6.6 years) over two decades, provides the most over-time data for the most countries, followed by

the AmericasBarometer (34 countries, mean years: 5.4). No single survey combines broad, cross-regional country coverage with longitudinal time-series data.




Figure 1: Countries and Mean Years Observed in Survey Datasets

Figure 2 shows how the available data have influenced scholarship on the topic. Using the Web of Science and Google Scholar, we assembled a sample of prominent published articles on public opinion toward homosexuality (see the online appendix for details). These articles had publication dates as early as 1974 and as late as 2020 (median: 2010) and were cited in the Web of Science from 2 to 490 times (median: 72.5). We then examined these articles to find the number of countries and years investigated in each. As the zoomed portion of the plot emphasizes, many of these articles might be described as using case-study or small- n research designs. Just over a third consider only a single year in a single country; together with works that study one country in just two years they comprise nearly half of our sample.

Among the works that investigate more contexts, the data employed tend to be longitudinal or cross-national, but only very rarely both. Roughly a fifth of these articles examine ten or more years of data within a single country. Clements and Field (2014), for example,




Figure 2: Countries and Mean Years Observed in Prominent Research

tracks changes in British attitudes in 13 different survey projects conducted in 42 different years; Yang (1997) similarly reports trends in public opinion in the United States drawing on many surveys conducted in 26 different years. Research considering data from more than five countries encompass less than a sixth of these articles. One recent piece, Hildebrandt, Truedinger, and Wyss (2019), draws on the fifth and sixth waves of the WVS to create a single cross-section of 73 countries and argues that modernization leads to more tolerance and in turn, in democracies, more rights recognized; the influential work by Adamczyk and Pitt (2009) similarly employs a single cross-section of the WVS, in its case the fourth wave, to examine how individuals' religiosity and their countries' religious heritages shape their attitudes about homosexuality. Reynolds (2013) looks at the most countries of any of these prominent works, 81, combining WVS and Pew Global Attitudes data to obtain 146 observed

country-years (mean observed years per country: 1.8) with which to evaluate how attitudes influence policy. The article examining the most country-years of public opinion in this sample is Redman (2018), an investigation of policy feedback on public opinion that uses the second through sixth WVS waves to provide a total of 203 country-years in 70 countries, that is, 2.9 observed years per country on average. Hooghe and Meeusen (2013), which also studies policy feedback, is the cross-national study with the most longitudinal data in the sample: it employs the first five waves of the ESS to provide a total of 123 country-years across 29 countries for a mean of 4.2 observed years per country. Within this sample of prominent works, none of the articles including five or more countries is able to examine public opinion in more than five years in any of the countries included in their analyses.

That these L-shaped distributions in the available datasets and the resulting analyses should limit our confidence in our conclusions should be readily evident. The single-country studies that make up the vertical part of the L, even those over many years, leave questions regarding the generalizability of their findings to other parts of the world (see, e.g., King, Keohane, and Verba 2021, 210). The cross-national analyses on the horizontal, with just one or at most a handful of time points to leverage, on the other hand, often raise concerns that differences across countries are being conflated with over-time causal processes (see, e.g., Jackman 1985, 173–74). That a disproportionate share of research on public opinion regarding homosexuality and of the available surveys on which this research is based focuses on Europe and North America (see Adamczyk and Liao 2019, 410) only compounds these issues. As Wilson and Knutsen (2022, 1037) points out, such geographic bias makes the scope conditions of even cross-national studies difficult to discern.

A dataset that falls to the upper right of Figure 1 would address these issues and allow researchers to reach conclusions that are more robust. In the next section, we describe the national and cross-national surveys and the latent-variable model we use to this end, along with the resulting TOL-H dataset.

Estimating Tolerance of Homosexuality Across Space and Time

To generate estimates of tolerance of homosexuality cross-nationally and longitudinally that are comparable across space and over time, we first assemble a comprehensive collection of survey questions on the topic. The relevant surveys are sparse, providing no relevant data for many countries and years, and incomparable, employing many different survey items, but collectively they have often asked questions about homosexuality over the past half-century. In all, we identified 45 items that were asked in no fewer than five country-years in countries surveyed at least three times; these items were drawn from 405 different national and cross-national survey datasets.¹ Together, these items were asked in 119 different countries in at least three time points over the 49 years from 1973 to 2022, yielding a total of 3,467 country-year-item observations. Observations for every year in each country surveyed would total 5,831, and a complete set of country-year-items would include 262,395 observations. Viewed from this complete-data perspective, the sparsity of the available source data is readily evident. On the other hand, we do have in the source data 1,479 country-years for which there is at least *some* information about the extent of tolerance of homosexuality in the population, that is, very nearly 50% of the 2,976 country-years spanned by the data we collected. Still, the many different survey items employed render these data incomparable and so difficult to use together.

Consider the most frequently asked item in the data we collected, which asks respondents whether they think homosexuality “can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between,” using a ten-point scale. Employed by the Asia Barometer, the European Values Survey, the Latinobarómetro, and the World Values Survey, this question was asked in a total of 527 different country-years. Even this question, the *most common* survey item asked, constitutes only 18% of the country-years spanned by our data. The available public opinion data on this topic are very sparse as well as incomparable.

The upper left panel of Figure 3 shows the dozen countries with the highest count of country-year-item observations. The United States, with 190 observations, is far and away

¹The complete list of survey items is included in the online appendix.




Figure 3: Countries and Years with the Most Observations in the Source Data


the best represented country in the source data, followed by the United Kingdom, Germany, Sweden, and Poland. Again we see how, as the review in Adamczyk and Liao (2019, 410) notes, more data has been collected in North America and Europe than in the rest of the world. At the other end of the spectrum, four countries—Cambodia, Côte d’Ivoire, Sri Lanka, and Tajikistan—have only the minimum three observations required to be included in the source dataset at all. The upper right panel shows the twelve countries with the most years observed; this group is similar, but with Ireland, Norway, and Slovenia joining the list and Spain, Hungary, and Finland dropping off. The bottom panel counts the countries observed in each year and reveals just how few relevant survey items were asked before 1990. Country coverage reached its peak in 2008, when surveys in 79 countries included items on homosexuality.

Latent variable models of public opinion drawing on cross-national survey data have attracted considerable attention in recent years (see Claassen 2019; Caughey, O’Grady, and Warshaw 2019; McGann, Dellepiane-Avellaneda, and Bartle 2019; Kolczynska et al. 2020). To estimate public gender egalitarianism across countries and over time, we draw on the latest of these methods that is appropriate for data that is both sparse and incomparable,

the Dynamic Comparative Public Opinion (DCPO) model (Solt 2020c). In brief, the DCPO model is a population-level two-parameter ordinal logistic item response theory (IRT) model with country-specific item-bias terms; for a detailed description, see the online appendix and Solt (2020c, 3–8). Here, we focus on how it deals with the principal issues raised by the survey data described above, incomparability and sparsity.

The DCPO model accounts for the incomparability of different survey questions with two parameters. First, it incorporates the *difficulty* of each question’s responses, that is, the amount of tolerance of homosexuality that is indicated by a given response. That each response evinces more or less of our latent trait is most easily seen with regard to the ordinal responses to the same question: to strongly agree with the statement “the law should recognise same-sex relationships,” evinces more tolerance than responding “agree,” which is more tolerant than “neither agree nor disagree,” which shows more tolerance than “disagree,” and in turn “strongly disagree.” The same thing is true across questions. For example, strongly agreeing with the statement “homosexual couples should be able to adopt children” likely expresses more tolerance than merely responding that same-sex relationships should be not be criminalized. Second, the DCPO model accounts for each question’s *dispersion*, its noisiness with regard to our latent trait. A lower dispersion indicates that changes in responses to the question are more faithfully translated to changes in the underlying tolerance of homosexuality. These two parameters, difficulty and dispersion, together generate comparable estimates of the latent variable from source data questions that are not directly comparable.

The sparsity in the source data—the interruptions in the time series of each country caused by unobserved country-years, and the fact that even many observed country-years have only one or few observed items—is addressed by the DCPO model using local-level dynamic linear models, also known as random-walk priors. This means that, for each country, each year’s value of tolerance is modeled as the previous year’s estimate plus a random shock. These dynamic models smooth the estimates of tolerance of homosexuality over time and allow estimation even in years for which little or no survey data is available, albeit at the expense of greater measurement uncertainty.



Note: Gray whiskers represent 80% credible intervals.

Figure 4: TOL-H Scores, Most Recent Available Year

We estimated the DCPO model on the source data using the `DCPO` and `cmdstanr` packages for R (Solt 2020a; Gabry and Češnovar 2022), running four chains for 2,000 iterations each and discarding the first half as warmup. All \hat{R} diagnostics were below 1.02, which indicates that the model converged.

Despite the potential for divergences between responses to questions on the morality of homosexuality and those on what civil rights are properly accorded homosexuals, as Adamczyk and Liao (2019, 407) anticipated, “respondents across a range of different countries do not draw major distinctions between these two dimensions”: the dispersion parameters indicate that all of the survey items load well on the single latent variable of tolerance for homosexuality (see Table A2 in the online appendix). The result is estimates for each of the 2,976 country-years spanned by the source data of mean tolerance of homosexuality, which together comprise the TOL-H dataset. With data on 119 countries for 6 to 49 years—a mean of 25.0 years—the TOL-H dataset is literally off the charts: it falls beyond the bounds of Figure 1.

Figure 4 displays the most recent available TOL-H score for each of the 119 countries and territories in the dataset. Iceland, the Netherlands, Belgium, and the Scandinavian countries are the places where the public is most accepting of homosexuality. The latest scores for Ethiopia, Uganda, Armenia, Egypt, and Mali indicate there is very little tolerance in those countries.

Figure 5 displays how TOL-H scores have changed over time in sixteen countries. It further underscores what is already evident in Figure 4: the cross-regional scope of the TOL-H dataset allows comparison of countries too often neglected in political science analyses (see Wilson and Knutsen 2022). The figure also shows that while public opinion toward homosexuality has grown rapidly more tolerant in some countries, such as Sweden and the United States, attitudes have changed much more gradually over time in others, like Poland and China. Tolerance has advanced and retreated somewhat as in Czechia and more completely as in Russia. And in countries such as Nigeria and Uganda, the extent of tolerance of homosexuality in the public has been steadily scant. The breadth of these differences stand





Figure 5: Tolerance Over Time Within Selected Countries

as a challenge to our explanations for the causes and consequences of public tolerance of homosexuality.

Validating the Tolerance of Homosexuality Scores

Before these estimates can be used, however, they must be validated: the mere fact that we can generate estimates for tolerance of homosexuality does not automatically mean that they are suitable for analysis. As is the case with any other new measure, validation tests of cross-national latent variables are crucially important (see, e.g., Hu et al. 2023). Figure 6 and Figure 7 provide evidence of this measure’s validity with tests of convergent validation and construct validation. Convergent validation refers to tests of whether a measure is empirically associated with alternative indicators of the same concept (Adcock and Collier 2001, 540). In Figure 6, the TOL-H scores are compared to responses to individual source-data survey items that were used to generate them; this provides an ‘internal’ convergent validation test (see, e.g., Caughey, O’Grady, and Warshaw 2019, 689; Solt 2020c, 10). The left panel is a scatterplot of country-years in which the TOL-H scores are plotted against




Note: Gray whiskers and shading represent 80% credible intervals.

Figure 6: Convergent Validation: Correlations Between TOL-H Scores and Individual Source-Data Survey Items

the percentage of respondents who gave an accepting response to the most commonly asked item in the source data: whether homosexuality can always be justified, scored ten, never be justified, scored zero, or something in between. For this plot, responses of six or greater are considered as indicating that respondents consider homosexuality justified more often than not. The middle panel shows responses to the question with the most data-rich cross-section, “And what about sexual relations between two adults of the same sex, is it always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all?” in the International Social Survey Program’s 2008 module on Religion, plotting our latent variable of tolerance against the percentage who responded “wrong only sometimes” or “not at all.” Finally, in the right panel, the U.S. General Social Survey’s series on this same item—the longest of any item in any single country in the source data—was used to evaluate how well the TOL-H scores capture change over time. The correlations, estimated taking into account the uncertainty in the measures, are very strong in all three cases.

Figure 7 moves on, then, to construct validation. Construct validation refers to demon-



Note: Gray whiskers represent 80% credible intervals.

Figure 7: Construct Validation: Correlations Between TOL-H Scores and Tolerance of Homosexuality Survey Items

strating, for some *other* concept believed causally related to the concept a measure seeks to represent, that the measure being tested is empirically associated with measures of that other concept (Adcock and Collier 2001, 542). More traditional attitudes toward gender roles are often argued to yield more intolerance of homosexuals (see, e.g., Brown and Henriquez 2008). The left panel compares traditional gender attitudes, measured as the percentage of those agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement, “A husband’s job is to earn money; a wife’s job is to look after the home and family,” in eight ISSP surveys (Family and Changing Gender Roles in 1988, 1994, 2002, and 2012; and Religion in 1991, 1998, 2008, and 2018), with the TOL-H scores. Consistent with theory, there is a clear, strong negative relationship between these two measures: when and where publics hold more traditional views of gender roles, they tend also to be less tolerant of homosexuality.

As a result of policy responsiveness, that is, the influence of public opinion on policy (see, e.g., Lax and Phillips 2009), and policy feedback, the influence of policy on public opinion (see, e.g., Abou-Chadi and Finnigan 2019; Earle et al. 2021), public tolerance of

homosexuality is expected to be closely related to policies recognizing same-sex relationships. The figure’s center panel presents violin plots of the distribution of TOL-H scores in the most recent available year across three groups of countries: those that currently have no or minimal legal recognition of same-sex relationships, those that recognize civil unions, and those with marriage equality. The gray-shaded ‘violins’ depict mirrored kernel density plots of the observations in each group; their areas are proportional to the number of observations. The violins are inset with box-and-whisker plots showing the 25th percentile, median, and 75th percentile as horizontal lines in a box; the dashed vertical whiskers then extend to the farthest observation within 1.5 times the interquartile range, that is, the height of the box; and all observations beyond that distance are shown individually as white circles (see Tukey 1977). This relationship is very strong.

A third oft-theorized relationship is that liberal democracies promote generally more tolerant attitudes that lead to greater tolerance of homosexuality (see, e.g., Adamczyk 2017). The right panel of Figure 7 plots the TOL-H score of the most recent available year for each country against the V-Dem Liberal Democracy Index for that country-year. Here, too, the relationship is in the expected direction and strong. The evidence of construct validation in Figure 7, together with the evidence of convergent validation in Figure 6, demonstrates the validity of the TOL-H scores as measures of the public’s tolerance of homosexuality.

Testing Theories on the Tolerance of Homosexuality: Revisiting ‘Economic Inequality and Intolerance’

To illustrate the utility of the TOL-H data, we revisit Andersen and Fetner’s (2008) foundational work on economic inequality and intolerance. That article argues that postmaterialist theory (see, e.g., Inglehart and Welzel 2005) implies that greater inequality should be expected to yield greater intolerance of homosexuality: if economic prosperity is what provides societies with the security needed to leave such traditional biases behind, then when a society’s prosperity (and security) is not broadly shared, more tolerant attitudes will not be

broadly shared either.² Supporting this view, its analysis found that more economic inequality leads to more intolerance of homosexuality. Despite the article’s influence, it was flagged in a recent review of the literature as a study for which “more research is needed to replicate and confirm [its] findings” (Adamczyk and Liao 2019, 415). Indeed, one recent work finds no support at all for the hypothesized relationship between inequality and tolerance of homosexuality (Zhang and Brym 2019, 515).

One difference between these two works, Andersen and Fetner (2008) and Zhang and Brym (2019), that is potentially important to their diverging conclusions is the sample employed. Both works draw on World Values Survey data, but the group of countries each examines differs in size and in kind. Noting the particular importance to democracies of tolerance of social and political difference, Andersen and Fetner (2008) examined only democratic countries. The article’s analyses included 35 countries, observed in just one to four years each, for a total of 63 country-years, that is, a mean of 1.8 years observed per country. The sample analyzed in Zhang and Brym (2019), on the other hand, incorporated a wider range of cases including non-democracies. This broader scope—along with the additional WVS survey waves conducted in the time between the two pieces’ writing—yielded 88 countries and 214 country-year observations for an increased mean number of years observed of 2.4 per country. So although the different conclusion reached in Zhang and Brym (2019, 517) may, as the piece suggests, reflect the larger sample of countries that study included, it may have also resulted from the inclusion of non-democratic countries, revealing a scope condition to the theory presented in Andersen and Fetner (2008).

The TOL-H data allow us to revisit the Andersen and Fetner (2008) hypothesis with many, many more observations of economic inequality and tolerance from a broader sample of countries than either of these two previous works and also to assess whether tolerance in the advanced democratic countries is distinctively sensitive to income inequality. Our

²An alternate, possibly complementary, theory would be that greater inequality gives wealthier individuals both greater means and enhanced motive to promote religiosity among their fellow citizens (see, e.g., Solt, Habel, and Grant 2011; Solt 2014), and more religiosity in turn works to decrease tolerance (see, e.g., Adamczyk and Pitt 2009). We leave distinguishing between these two theories to future research.

sample of democracies includes the 36 democratic countries of the OECD, each observed in 21 (Costa Rica) to 49 (the United States) consecutive years (mean: 33.4 years, median: 31.5 years), a total of 1203 country-year observations. The broader sample of all countries includes 114 countries, observed in 2 to 49 consecutive years each, for a total of 2623 country-year observations. That is, the TOL-H dataset provides a number of country-year observations for our sample of democracies that is some 19 times greater than that considered in Andersen and Fetner (2008), and it gives us a number of country-years in our sample of all countries that is about 12 times greater than that in the sample employed in Zhang and Brym (2019). This much larger evidentiary base provides us with a much firmer basis for drawing conclusions regarding both the theory and its potential scope conditions (see, e.g., King, Keohane, and Verba 2021, 23).

The independent variable, economic inequality, is measured using the Gini index of disposable income inequality. The Gini index ranges from 0, indicating perfect equality in the distribution, in this case, of income after taxes and government transfers, to 100, indicating a perfectly unequal distribution in which a single household receives all such income. The data are drawn from the Standardized World Income Inequality Database (Solt 2020b).

We also include the country-year-level and country-level control variables included in the analysis in Andersen and Fetner (2008). Data on GDP per capita (in thousands of constant 2015 U.S. dollars) are provided by the World Bank’s World Development Indicators (World Bank 2023). A series of dichotomous country-level variables identify each country’s religious heritage—countries are coded as having alternately a Catholic, Orthodox, Eastern, or Islamic heritage, with those with a Protestant heritage treated as the reference category—and countries with a Communist history are also identified with such a variable (see Inglehart and Welzel 2005). Finally, although its presence does not impact the conclusions drawn below, we add a dichotomously-coded variable for the presence of marriage equality, which takes on a value one in country-years where same-sex marriage was legal and zero otherwise (at the time of publication of Andersen and Fetner (2008), only five countries had legalized same-sex marriage, and the data analyzed in that piece ended before any of those policy

adoptions).

Shor et al. (2007) shows that the best way to analyze such pooled time series is by using a Bayesian multilevel model that includes varying intercepts for each country and for each year. Varying intercepts for each country account for heteroskedasticity across space due to, e.g., omitted variable bias, while permitting the inclusion of time-invariant predictors such as religious heritage and communist past. Varying intercepts for each year take into account ‘time shocks’ that operate on all countries simultaneously (Shor et al. 2007, 171–72). We further employ the ‘within-between random effects’ specification, meaning each of the time-varying predictors is decomposed into its time-invariant country mean and the time-varying difference between each country-year value and this country mean. The time-varying difference variables capture the short-term effects of the predictors, while the time-invariant country-mean variables reflect their—often different—long-run, “historical” effects (Bell and Jones 2015, 137). This specification has been shown superior for addressing omitted variable bias and endogeneity to fixed effects and other commonly used specifications for time-series cross-sectional data like these (see Bell and Jones 2015). The measurement uncertainty in the data for both tolerance of homosexuality and income inequality was incorporated into the analysis as well (see Tai, Hu, and Solt 2022). The model was estimated using the **brms** R package (Bürkner 2017).

The results are presented in Figure 8. Greater income inequality is associated with less tolerance of homosexuality, both in the long run and in the short term, in both samples of countries. Looking at the ‘historical,’ long-run effect of income inequality, we see that in the democratic sample, a two-standard deviation increase in a country’s mean inequality is associated with 14.2 points less tolerance (95% credible interval: -22.4 to -5.1 points), while across all countries this estimated difference was -6.1 (95% c.i.: -10.6 to -1.6) points. In the short run, a two-standard-deviation year-to-year change was found to decrease tolerance 1.3 points (95% c.i.: -2.3 to -0.3) among democracies. If anything, the estimated decline in tolerance was even larger when all countries are considered: 2.2 (95% c.i.: -2.8 to -1.6) points. Having much more data provides strong evidence that income inequality decreases tolerance




Figure 8: Predicting Tolerance of Homosexuality

of homosexuality in public opinion and that democracies are not particularly sensitive to this effect.

Conclusion

The TOL-H dataset, by combining a comprehensive collection of the available survey data with recent advances in latent variable modeling, provides a new window on public opinion toward homosexuality across space and time. Until now, scholars interested in how and why public opinion towards homosexuality has shifted in recent decades and the ramifications of these shifts have struggled with the limited availability of data. Surveys with relevant items

are sparse, not asked in all countries every year; incomparable, not asking the same questions; and, compounding these two issues, geographically concentrated. As a result, research on the topic has been limited, at best, to longitudinal studies of single countries and regions that may not generalize elsewhere or to cross-sections and small panels that offer little leverage against conflating differences across countries with changes over time. Our understanding has consequently suffered. The TOL-H dataset offers a means of overcoming these problems and gaining a better grasp of the causes and consequences of the extent of tolerance of homosexuality in publics around the world.

Researchers can access the TOL-H data in two ways. For those interested in using the TOL-H estimates in statistical analyses, the entire dataset may be downloaded from the Harvard Dataverse. And quick comparisons are facilitated by a user-friendly web application on the TOL-H website that plots tolerance over time for up to four countries. Updates to the dataset will be released as new survey data on tolerance of homosexuality are made available. Current and future versions of the TOL-H should enable a wave of new research on what factors lead a public to hold a greater tolerance of homosexuality and how a more tolerant public influences other social and political phenomena.

References

- Abou-Chadi, Tarik, and Ryan Finnigan. 2019. "Rights for Same-Sex Couples and Public Attitudes Toward Gays and Lesbians in Europe." *Comparative Political Studies* 52 (6): 868–95.
- Adamczyk, Amy. 2017. *Cross-National Public Opinion About Homosexuality: Examining Attitudes Across the Globe*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Adamczyk, Amy, and Yen-Chiao Liao. 2019. "Examining Public Opinion about LGBTQ-Related Issues in the United States and Across Multiple Nations." *Annual Review of Sociology* 45 (1): 401–23.
- Adamczyk, Amy, and Cassady Pitt. 2009. "Shaping Attitudes about Homosexuality: The Role of Religion and Cultural Context." *Social Science Research* 38 (2): 338–51.
- Adcock, Robert, and David Collier. 2001. "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research." *American Political Science Review* 95 (3): 529–46.
- Andersen, Robert, and Tina Fetner. 2008. "Economic Inequality and Intolerance: Attitudes Toward Homosexuality in 35 Democracies." *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (4): 942–58.
- Ayoub, Phillip M., and Jeremiah Garretson. 2017. "Getting the Message Out: Media Context and Global Changes in Attitudes Toward Homosexuality." *Comparative Political Studies* 50 (8): 1055–85.
- Bell, Andrew, and Kelvyn Jones. 2015. "Explaining Fixed Effects: Random Effects Modeling of Time-Series Cross-Sectional and Panel Data." *Political Science Research and Methods* 3 (1): 133–53.
- Brown, Michael J., and Ernesto Henriquez. 2008. "Socio-Demographic Predictors of Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians." *Individual Differences Research* 6 (3).
- Bürkner, Paul-Christian. 2017. "brms: An R Package for Bayesian Multilevel Models Using Stan." *Journal of Statistical Software* 80: 1–28.
- Clements, Ben, and Clive D. Field. 2014. "Public Opinion Toward Homosexuality and Gay

- Rights in Great Britain.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 78 (2): 523–47.
- Dotti Sani, Giulia M., and Mario Quaranta. 2022. “Mapping Changes in Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians in Europe: An Application of Diffusion Theory.” *European Sociological Review* 38 (1): 124–37.
- Earle, Megan, Mark Romeo Hoffarth, Elvira Prusaczyk, Cara MacInnis, and Gordon Hodson. 2021. “A Multilevel Analysis of LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender) Rights Support Across 77 Countries: The Role of Contact and Country Laws.” *British Journal of Social Psychology* 60 (3): 851–69.
- Gabry, Jonah, and Rok Češnovar. 2022. *Cmdstanr: R Interface to “CmdStan”*.
- Hildebrandt, Achim, Eva-Maria Truedinger, and Dominik Wyss. 2019. “The Missing Link? Modernization, Tolerance, and Legislation on Homosexuality.” *Political Research Quarterly* 72 (3): 539–53.
- Hooghe, Marc, and Cecil Meeusen. 2013. “Is Same-Sex Marriage Legislation Related to Attitudes Toward Homosexuality? Trends in Tolerance of Homosexuality in European Countries Between 2002 and 2010.” *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 10 (4): 258–68.
- Hu, Yue, Yuehong Cassandra Tai, Hyein Ko, Byung-Deuk Woo, and Frederick Solt. 2023. “Support for Democracy Is Multidimensional: Why Unidimensional Latent Variable Measures of Democratic Support Are Invalid.” SocArXiv. <https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/rym8g/>.
- Inglehart, Ronald, and Christian Welzel. 2005. *Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jackman, Robert W. 1985. “Cross-National Statistical Research and the Study of Comparative Politics.” *American Journal of Political Science* 29 (1): 161–82.
- King, Gary, Robert O Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 2021. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. New edition. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lax, Jeffrey R., and Justin H. Phillips. 2009. “Gay Rights in the States: Public Opinion and Policy Responsiveness.” *American Political Science Review* 103 (3): 367–86.
- Paradela-López, Miguel, José-Ignacio Antón, and Alexandra Jima-González. 2023. “How

- Much Have We Changed? Long-Term Determinants of Attitudes Toward Homosexuality in Chile.” *Latin American Research Review*, 1–20.
- Redman, Shane M. 2018. “Effects of Same-Sex Legislation on Attitudes Toward Homosexuality.” *Political Research Quarterly* 71 (3): 628–41.
- Reynolds, Andrew. 2013. “Representation and Rights: The Impact of LGBT Legislators in Comparative Perspective.” *American Political Science Review* 107 (2): 259–74.
- Shor, Boris, Joseph Bafumi, Luke Keele, and David Park. 2007. “A Bayesian Multilevel Modeling Approach to Time-Series Cross-Sectional Data.” *Political Analysis* 15 (2): 165–81.
- Solt, Frederick. 2014. “Reversing the Arrow? Economic Inequality’s Effect on Religiosity.” In *Religion and Inequality in America: Research and Theory on Religion’s Role in Stratification*, 337–53. Cambridge University Press.
- . 2020a. “Measuring Income Inequality Across Countries and Over Time: The Standardized World Income Inequality Database.” *Social Science Quarterly* 101 (3): 1183–99.
- . 2020b. “Modeling Dynamic Comparative Public Opinion.” SocArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/d5n9p>.
- Solt, Frederick, Philip Habel, and J. Tobin Grant. 2011. “Economic Inequality, Relative Power, and Religiosity.” *Social Science Quarterly* 92 (2): 447–65.
- Tai, Yuehong ‘Cassandra’, Yue Hu, and Frederick Solt. 2022. “Democracy, Public Support, and Measurement Uncertainty.” *American Political Science Review* FirstView. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1017/S0003055422000429>.
- Tukey, John W. 1977. *Exploratory Data Analysis*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Wilson, Matthew Charles, and Carl Henrik Knutsen. 2022. “Geographical Coverage in Political Science Research.” *Perspectives on Politics* 20 (3): 1024–39.
- Winkler, Stephen. 2021. “Media’s Influence on LGBTQ Support Across Africa.” *British Journal of Political Science* 51 (2): 807–26.
- World Bank. 2023. *World Development Indicators*. <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.KD>.

- Yang, Alan S. 1997. "Trends: Attitudes Toward Homosexuality." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 61 (3): 477–507.
- Zhang, Tony Huiquan, and Robert Brym. 2019. "Tolerance of Homosexuality in 88 Countries: Education, Political Freedom, and Liberalism." *Sociological Forum* 34 (2): 501–21.
- Zhou, Min, and Tianyang Hu. 2020. "Social Tolerance of Homosexuality: A Quantitative Comparison of Mainland China, Singapore, and Taiwan." *Chinese Sociological Review* 52 (1): 27–55.

Measuring Tolerance of Homosexuality in the Mass Public Across Countries and Over Time

July 01, 2023

Appendices

Contents

Appendix A: Sample of Published Articles on Public Opinion and Homosexuality	A2
Appendix B: Survey Items Used to Estimate Tolerance of Homosexuality	A8
Appendix C: The DCPO Model	A14
Appendix References	A16

Appendix A: Sample of Published Articles on Public Opinion and Homosexuality

To generate a sample of published articles on public opinion and homosexuality, we combined results from two searches, the first on the Web of Science and the second on Google Scholar. Web of Science topic searches return articles in which the search terms appear in the title or abstract. We executed the following search: TS=("public opinion" AND (homosexual* OR gay OR LGB*)). The fifty most cited empirical research articles returned were retained for our sample. Google Scholar, [according to its about page](#), "aims to rank documents the way researchers do, weighing the full text of each document, where it was published, who it was written by, as well as how often and how recently it has been cited in other scholarly literature." We searched "public opinion" homosexuality and identified the first fifty research articles returned. To ensure comparability of citation counts, we collected the Web of Science records for this second group of articles (Google Scholar, because it includes citations in books, white papers, working papers, some journals not in the Web of Science collection, and other sources, tends to report higher—and sometimes *much* higher—numbers of citations for the same article). Then we added the Web of Science records for the Google Scholar results to our original Web of Science sample and dropped all duplicates, yielding a total of 86 different articles. Each of the articles was then consulted to identify its number of countries and mean years observed per country. This information is listed in Table A1 below.

Table A1: Prominent Research Articles on Public Opinion Toward Homosexuality

Article	Countries Observed	Mean Years Observed per Country	Country-Years Observed	WoS Citations
Loftus 2001	1	21	21	490
Herek 2002	1	1	1	457
Nelson and Kinder 1996	1	1	1	407
Lax and Phillips 2009a	1	9	9	371
Norton and Herek 2013	1	1	1	330
Adamczyk and Pitt 2009	40	1	40	318
Olson et al. 2006	1	1	1	312
Lax and Phillips 2012	1	12	12	276
Lewis 2003	1	31	31	274
Lax and Phillips 2009	1	12	12	256
Andersen and Fetner 2008a	2	3	6	241
Andersen and Fetner 2008	35	1.8	63	228
Haider-Markel and Joslyn 2008	1	2	2	216
Yang 1997	1	26	26	201
Baunach 2012	1	14	14	192
Sherkat et al. 2011	1	13	13	187
Brewer 2003a	1	3	3	180
Perez-Brumer et al. 2015	1	1	1	180
Tankard and Paluck 2017	1	1	1	172
Herek et al. 2003	1	1	1	172
Brewer 2003	1	2	2	159
Hicks and Lee 2006	1	14	14	146
Gerhards 2010	27	1	27	139
Sherkat et al. 2010	1	4	4	139
Brace et al. 2002	1	16	16	136
Frost et al. 2016	1	1	1	135
Van Den Akker et al. 2013	20	3.8	75	135
Oldenburg et al. 2015	1	1	1	122
Whitehead 2010	1	1	1	103
Avery et al. 2007	1	15	15	98
Hooghe and Meeusen 2013	29	4.2	123	93
Lewis 2011	1	22	22	93
Brewer 2002	1	1	1	92
Price et al. 2005	1	1	1	91
Lindaman, Haider-Markel 2002	1	16	16	88
Doan et al. 2014	1	1	1	86
Clements and Field 2014	1	42	42	86
Lewis and Gossett 2008	1	6	6	86
Flores 2015	1	1	1	85
Baiocco et al. 2013	1	1	1	79
Flores and Barclay 2016	1	2	2	78
Craig et al. 2005	1	1	1	76
Hooghe et al. 2010	2	1	2	73
Lewis et al. 2017	1	1	1	72
Schwartz 2010	1	1	1	72

(continued)

Article	Countries Observed	Mean Years Observed per Country	Country- Years Observed	WoS Citations
Bishin et al. 2016	1	2	2	71
Reynolds 2013	81	1.8	145	71
Kreitzer et al. 2014	1	3	3	69
Price and Hsu 1992	1	2	2	69
Baunach 2011	1	3	3	67
Willnat et al. 2002	1	1	1	67
Barth et al. 2009	1	1	1	66
Schnabel 2016	1	25	25	65
Gearhart and Zhang 2014	1	1	1	65
Herek and Glunt 1991	1	1	1	65
Whitehead and Perry 2015	1	1	1	62
Ayoub and Garretson 2017	72	2.4	173	62
Stipp and Kerr 1989	1	1	1	60
Detenber et al. 2007	1	1	1	55
Stoutenborough et al. 2006	1	14	14	54
Jaspers et al. 2007	1	10	10	40
Pollock 1994	1	2	2	38
Brewer 2014	30	1	30	34
Roggemans et al. 2015	1	1	1	33
Alston 1974	2	7	14	25
Kazyak and Stange 2018	1	2	2	23
Redman 2018	70	2.9	203	23
Engel 2013	1	6	6	21
Perry and Whitehead 2016	1	1	1	18
Deboer 1978	8	2.3	18	18
Seltzer 1993	1	2	2	16
Roder and Lubbers 2016	4	2	8	13
Hildebrandt et al. 2017	19	2.9	54	12
Lewis 2001	1	19	19	12
Kleiner 2018	23	3	68	12
Rayside and Bowler 1988	3	3.7	11	11
Burke 2008	1	21	21	10
Hetzel 2011	1	1	1	9
Perry and Snawder 2016	1	1	1	8
Tolkachev and Tolordava 2020	2	3	6	6
Hildebrandt et al. 2019	73	1	73	6
Lau et al. 2017	1	2	2	6
Hayes 1997	1	4	4	5
Kuyper et al. 2018	3	1	3	3
Becker and Todd 2018	1	2	2	2
Northcott and Reutter 1991	1	1	1	2

Prominent Works

- Adamczyk, Amy, and Cassady Pitt. 2009. "Shaping Attitudes about Homosexuality: The Role of Religion and Cultural Context." *Social Science Research* 38 (2): 338–51.
- Alston, Jon P. 1974. "Attitudes Toward Extramarital and Homosexual Relations." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 13 (4): 479–81.
- andersen, Robert, and Tina Fetner. 2008a. "Cohort Differences in Tolerance of Homosexuality - Attitudinal Change in Canada and the United States, 1981-2000." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72 (2): 311–30.
- . 2008b. "Economic Inequality and Intolerance: Attitudes Toward Homosexuality in 35 Democracies." *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (4): 942–58.
- Avery, Alison, Justin Chase, Linda Johansson, Samantha Litvak, Darrel Montero, and Michael Wydra. 2007. "America's Changing Attitudes Toward Homosexuality, Civil Unions, and Same-Gender Marriage: 1977-2004." *Social Work* 52 (1): 71–79.
- Ayoub, Phillip M., and Jeremiah Garretson. 2017. "Getting the Message Out: Media Context and Global Changes in Attitudes Toward Homosexuality." *Comparative Political Studies* 50 (8): 1055–85.
- Baiocco, Roberto, Nicola Nardelli, Lina Pezzuti, and Vittorio Lingiardi. 2013. "Attitudes of Italian Heterosexual Older Adults Towards Lesbian and Gay Parenting." *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 10 (4): 285–92.
- Barth, Jay, and Janine Parry. 2009. "Political Culture, Public Opinion, and Policy (Non)diffusion: The Case of Gay- and Lesbian-Related Issues in Arkansas." *Social Science Quarterly* 90 (2): 309–25.
- Baunach, Dawn Michelle. 2011. "Decomposing Trends in Attitudes Toward Gay Marriage, 1988-2006." *Social Science Quarterly* 92 (2): 346–63.
- . 2012. "Changing Same-Sex Marriage Attitudes in America from 1988 Through 2010." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 76 (2): 364–78.
- Becker, Amy B, and Maureen E Todd. 2018. "Watching the Evolution of the American Family? Amazon's Transparent, Ecological Systems Theory, and the Changing Dynamics of Public Opinion." *Journal of Homosexuality* 65 (9): 1120–37.
- Bishin, Benjamin G., Thomas J. Hayes, Matthew B. Incantalupo, and Charles Anthony Smith. 2016. "Opinion Backlash and Public Attitudes: Are Political Advances in Gay Rights Counterproductive?" *American Journal of Political Science* 60 (3): 625–48.
- Brace, P, K Sims-Butler, K Arceneaux, and M Johnson. 2002. "Public Opinion in the American States: New Perspectives Using National Survey Data." *American Journal of Political Science* 46 (1): 173–89.
- Brewer, Paul R. 2003. "The Shifting Foundations of Public Opinion about Gay Rights." *Journal of Politics* 65 (4): 1208–20.
- . 2014. "Public Opinion about Gay Rights and Gay Marriage." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 26 (3): 279–82.
- Brewer, Paul R. 2002. "Framing, Value Words, and Citizens' Explanations of Their Issue Opinions." *Political Communication* 19 (3): 303–16.
- Brewer, Pr. 2003. "Values, Political Knowledge, and Public Opinion about Gay Rights - a Framing-Based Account." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 67 (2): 173–201.
- Burke, Susan K. 2008. "Removal of Gay-Themed Materials from Public Libraries: Public Opinion Trends, 1973-2006." *Public Library Quarterly* 27 (3): 247–64.
- Clements, Ben, and Clive D. Field. 2014. "The Polls-Trends Public Opinion Toward Homosexuality and Gay Rights in Great Britain." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 78 (2): 523–47.
- Craig, SC, MD Martinez, JG Kane, and J Gainous. 2005. "Core Values, Value Conflict, and Citizens' Ambivalence about Gay Rights." *Political Research Quarterly* 58 (1): 5–17.
- De Boer, Connie. 1978. "The Polls: Attitudes Toward Homosexuality." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 42 (2): 265–76.
- Detenber, Benjamin H, Mark Cenite, Moses Ky Ku, Carol Pl Ong, Hazel Y Tong, and Magdalene Lh Yeow. 2007. "Singaporeans' Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men and Their Tolerance of Media Portrayals of Homosexuality." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 19 (3): 367–79.
- Doan, Long, Annalise Loehr, and Lisa R. Miller. 2014. "Formal Rights and Informal Privileges for Same-Sex Couples: Evidence from a National Survey Experiment." *American Sociological Review* 79 (6): 1172–95.
- Engel, Stephen M. 2013. "Frame Spillover: Media Framing and Public Opinion of a Multifaceted LGBT Rights Agenda." *Law & Social Inquiry* 38 (2): 403–41.

- Flores, Andrew R. 2015. "Attitudes Toward Transgender Rights: Perceived Knowledge and Secondary Interpersonal Contact." *Politics Groups and Identities* 3 (3): 398–416.
- Flores, Andrew R., and Scott Barclay. 2016. "Backlash, Consensus, Legitimacy, or Polarization: The Effect of Same-Sex Marriage Policy on Mass Attitudes." *Political Research Quarterly* 69 (1): 43–56.
- Frost, David M., Ilan H. Meyer, and Sharon Schwartz. 2016. "Social Support Networks Among Diverse Sexual Minority Populations." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 86 (1): 91–102.
- Gearhart, Sherice, and Weiwu Zhang. 2014. "Gay Bullying and Online Opinion Expression: Testing Spiral of Silence in the Social Media Environment." *Social Science Computer Review* 32 (1): 18–36.
- Gerhards, Juergen. 2010. "Non-Discrimination Towards Homosexuality the European Union's Policy and Citizens' Attitudes Towards Homosexuality in 27 European Countries." *International Sociology* 25 (1): 5–28.
- Haider-Markel, Donald P., and Mark R. Joslyn. 2008. "Beliefs about the Origins of Homosexuality and Support for Gay Rights - an Empirical Test of Attribution Theory." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72 (2): 291–310.
- Hayes, Bernadette C. 1997. "The Influence of Gender on Public Attitudes Toward Homosexual Rights in Britain." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 9 (4): 361–85.
- Herek, Gregory M. 2002. "Gender Gaps in Public Opinion about Lesbians and Gay Men." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 66 (1): 40–66.
- Herek, Gregory M., JP Capitanio, and KF Widaman. 2003. "Stigma, Social Risk, and Health Policy: Public Attitudes Toward Hiv Surveillance Policies and the Social Construction of Illness." *Health Psychology* 22 (5): 533–40.
- Herek, Gregory M., and EK Glunt. 1991. "AIDS-Related Attitudes in the United-States: A Preliminary Conceptualization." *Journal of Sex Research* 28 (1): 99–123.
- Hetzel, Carole J. 2011. "Exploring the Relationship Between Public Opinion and Personal Attitudes and Behavior Toward Lesbians and Gay Men: Social Conformity Revisited." *Journal of Homosexuality* 58 (10): 1421–41.
- Hicks, Gary R., and Tien-tsung Lee. 2006. "Public Attitudes Toward Gays and Lesbians: Trends and Predictors." *Journal of Homosexuality* 51 (2): 57–77.
- Hildebrandt, Achim, Eva-Maria Trüdinger, and Sebastian Jäckle. 2017. "Sooner or Later: The Influence of Public Opinion and Religiosity on the Enactment of Laws Recognizing Same-Sex Unions." *Journal of European Public Policy* 24 (8): 1191–1210.
- Hildebrandt, Achim, Eva-Maria Truedinger, and Dominik Wyss. 2019. "The Missing Link? Modernization, Tolerance, and Legislation on Homosexuality." *Political Research Quarterly* 72 (3): 539–53.
- Hooghe, Marc, Ellen Claes, Allison Harell, Ellen Quintelier, and Yves Dejaeghere. 2010. "Anti-Gay Sentiment Among Adolescents in Belgium and Canada: A Comparative Investigation into the Role of Gender and Religion." *Journal of Homosexuality* 57 (3): 384–400.
- Hooghe, Marc, and Cecil Meeusen. 2013. "Is Same-Sex Marriage Legislation Related to Attitudes Toward Homosexuality?" *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 10 (4): 258–68.
- Jaspers, Eva, Marcel Lubbers, and Nan Dirk De Graaf. 2007. "'Horrors of Holland': Explaining Attitude Change Towards Euthanasia and Homosexuals in the Netherlands, 1970–1998." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 19 (4): 451–73.
- Kazyak, Emily, and Mathew Stange. 2018. "Backlash or a Positive Response?: Public Opinion of LGB Issues After Obergefell v. Hodges." *Journal of Homosexuality* 65 (14): 2028–52.
- Kleiner, Tuuli-Marja. 2018. "Public Opinion Polarisation and Protest Behaviour." *European Journal of Political Research* 57 (4): 941–62.
- Kreitzer, Rebecca J., Allison J. Hamilton, and Caroline J. Tolbert. 2014. "Does Policy Adoption Change Opinions on Minority Rights? The Effects of Legalizing Same-Sex Marriage." *Political Research Quarterly* 67 (4): 795–808.
- Kuyper, Lisette, Elena Sommer, and Sarah Butt. 2018. "Gender Gaps in the Measurement of Public Opinion about Homosexuality in Cross-National Surveys: A Question-Wording Experiment." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 30 (4): 692–704.
- Lau, Holning, Geoffrey Yeung, Rebecca L Stotzer, Charles Q Lau, and Kelley Loper. 2017. "Assessing the Tongzhi Label: Self-Identification and Public Opinion." *Journal of Homosexuality* 64 (4): 509–22.
- Lax, Jeffrey R., and Justin H. Phillips. 2009. "Gay Rights in the States: Public Opinion and Policy

- Responsiveness." *American Political Science Review* 103 (3): 367–86.
- Lax, Jeffrey R., and Justin H. Phillips. 2009. "How Should We Estimate Public Opinion in the States?" *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (1): 107–21.
- . 2012. "The Democratic Deficit in the States." *American Journal of Political Science* 56 (1): 148–66.
- Lewis, Daniel C., Andrew R. Flores, Donald P. Haider-Markel, Patrick R. Miller, Barry L. Tadlock, and Jami K. Taylor. 2017. "Degrees of Acceptance: Variation in Public Attitudes Toward Segments of the LGBT Community." *Political Research Quarterly* 70 (4): 861–75.
- Lewis, Gregory B. 2003. "Black-White Differences in Attitudes Toward Homosexuality and Gay Rights." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 67 (1): 59–78.
- . 2011. "The Friends and Family Plan: Contact with Gays and Support for Gay Rights." *Policy Studies Journal* 39 (2): 217–38.
- Lewis, Gregory B., and Charles W. Gossett. 2008. "Changing Public Opinion on Same-Sex Marriage: The Case of California." *Politics & Policy* 36 (1): 4–30.
- Lewis, Gregory B., and Howard E. Taylor. 2001. "Public Opinion Toward Gay and Lesbian Teachers: Insights for All Public Employees." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 21 (2): 133–51.
- Lindaman, K., and DP Haider-Markel. 2002. "Issue Evolution, Political Parties, and the Culture Wars." *Political Research Quarterly* 55 (1): 91–110.
- Loftus, J. 2001. "America's Liberalization in Attitudes Toward Homosexuality, 1973 to 1998." *American Sociological Review* 66 (5): 762–82.
- Nelson, Thomas E., and Donald R. Kinder. 1996. "Issue Frames and Group-Centrism in American Public Opinion." *Journal of Politics* 58 (4): 1055–78.
- Northcott, Herbert C., and Linda Reutter. 1991. "Public Opinion Regarding AIDS Policy: Fear of Contagion and Attitude Toward Homosexual Relationships." *Canadian Journal of Public Health = Revue Canadienne de Sante Publique* 82 (2): 87–91.
- Norton, Aaron T., and Gregory M. Herek. 2013. "Heterosexuals' Attitudes Toward Transgender People: Findings from a National Probability Sample of Us Adults." *Sex Roles* 68 (11-12, Si): 738–53.
- Oldenburg, Catherine E., Amaya G. Perez-Brumer, Mark L. Hatzenbuehler, Douglas Krakower, David S. Novak, Matthew J. Mimiaga, and Kenneth H. Mayer. 2015. "State-Level Structural Sexual Stigma and Hiv Prevention in a National Online Sample of Hiv-Uninfected Msm in the United States." *AIDS* 29 (7): 837–45.
- Olson, LR, W. Cadge, and JT Harrison. 2006. "Religion and Public Opinion about Same-Sex Marriage." *Social Science Quarterly* 87 (2): 340–60.
- Perez-Brumer, Amaya, Mark L. Hatzenbuehler, Catherine E. Oldenburg, and Walter Bockting. 2015. "Individual- and Structural-Level Risk Factors for Suicide Attempts Among Transgender Adults." *Behavioral Medicine* 41 (3, Si): 164–71.
- Perry, Samuel L., and Kara J. Snawder. 2016. "Longitudinal Effects of Religious Media on Opposition to Same-Sex Marriage." *Sexuality and Culture* 20 (4): 785–804.
- Perry, Samuel L., and Andrew L. Whitehead. 2016. "Religion and Public Opinion Toward Same-Sex Relations, Marriage, and Adoption: Does the Type of Practice Matter?" *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 55 (3): 637–51.
- Pollock, Philip H., III. 1994. "Issues, Values, and Critical Moments: Did 'Magic' Johnson Transform Public Opinion on AIDS?" *American Journal of Political Science*, 426–46.
- Price, Vincent, and Mei-Ling Hsu. 1992. "Public Opinion about Aids Policies the Role of Misinformation and Attitudes Toward Homosexuals." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 56 (1): 29–52.
- Price, Vincent, L. Nir, and JN Cappella. 2005. "Framing Public Discussion of Gay Civil Unions." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 69 (2): 179–212.
- Rayside, David, and Scott Bowler. 1988. "Public Opinion and Gay Rights." *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue Canadienne de Sociologie* 25 (4): 649–60.
- Redman, Shane M. 2018. "Effects of Same-Sex Legislation on Attitudes Toward Homosexuality." *Political Research Quarterly* 71 (3): 628–41.
- Reynolds, Andrew. 2013. "Representation and Rights: The Impact of LGBT Legislators in Comparative Perspective." *American Political Science Review* 107 (2): 259–74.
- Röder, Antje, and Marcel Lubbers. 2016. "After Migration: Acculturation of Attitudes Towards Homosexuality Among Polish Immigrants in Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands and the UK." *Ethnicities* 16 (2):

- Roggemans, Lilith, Bram Spruyt, Filip Van Droogenbroeck, and Gil Keppens. 2015. “Religion and Negative Attitudes Towards Homosexuals: An Analysis of Urban Young People and Their Attitudes Towards Homosexuality.” *Young* 23 (3): 254–76.
- Schnabel, Landon. 2016. “Gender and Homosexuality Attitudes Across Religious Groups from the 1970s to 2014: Similarity, Distinction, and Adaptation.” *Social Science Research* 55 (January): 31–47.
- Schwartz, Joseph. 2010. “Investigating Differences in Public Support for Gay Rights Issues.” *Journal of Homosexuality* 57 (6): 748–59.
- Seltzer, Richard. 1993. “AIDS, Homosexuality, Public Opinion, and Changing Correlates over Time.” *Journal of Homosexuality* 26 (1): 85–98.
- Sherkat, Darren E., Melissa Powell-Williams, Gregory Maddox, and Kylan Mattias de Vries. 2011. “Religion, Politics, and Support for Same-Sex Marriage in the United States, 1988-2008.” *Social Science Research* 40 (1): 167–80.
- Sherkat, Darren E., Kylan Mattias de Vries, and Stacia Creek. 2010. “Race, Religion, and Opposition to Same-Sex Marriage.” *Social Science Quarterly* 91 (1): 80–98.
- Stipp, Horst, and Dennis Kerr. 1989. “Determinants of Public Opinion about AIDS.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 53 (1): 98–106.
- Stoutenborough, James W., Donald P. Haider-Markel, and Mahalley D. Allen. 2006. “Reassessing the Impact of Supreme Court Decisions on Public Opinion: Gay Civil Rights Cases.” *Political Research Quarterly* 59 (3): 419–33.
- Tankard, Margaret E., and Elizabeth Levy Paluck. 2017. “The Effect of a Supreme Court Decision Regarding Gay Marriage on Social Norms and Personal Attitudes.” *Psychological Science* 28 (9): 1334–44.
- Tolkachev, Dmitrii, and Tamar Tolordava. 2020. “Shared Past, Different Future? Russian and Georgian Authorities’ Discourse Concerning Homosexuality.” *Sexuality & Culture* 24 (2): 447–64.
- Van den Akker, Hanneke, Rozemarijn Van der Ploeg, and Peer Scheepers. 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.
- Whitehead, Andrew L. 2010. “Sacred Rites and Civil Rights: Religion’s Effect on Attitudes Toward Same-Sex Unions and the Perceived Cause of Homosexuality.” *Social Science Quarterly* 91 (1): 63–79.
- Whitehead, Andrew L., and Samuel L. Perry. 2015. “A More Perfect Union? Christian Nationalism and Support for Same-Sex Unions.” *Sociological Perspectives* 58 (3): 422–40.
- Willnat, Lars, Waipeng Lee, and Benjamin H Detenber. 2002. “Individual-Level Predictors of Public Outspokenness: A Test of the Spiral of Silence Theory in Singapore.” *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 14 (4): 391–412.
- Yang, Alan S. 1997. “Trends: Attitudes Toward Homosexuality.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 61 (3): 477–507.

Appendix B: Survey Items Used to Estimate Tolerance of Homosexuality

National and cross-national surveys have often included questions tapping attitudes toward homosexuality over the past half century, but the resulting data are both sparse, that is, unavailable for many countries and years, and incomparable, generated by many different survey items. In all, I identified 45 such survey items that were asked in no fewer than five country-years in countries surveyed at least three times; these items were drawn from 405 different survey datasets. These items are listed in the table below, along with the dispersion (α) and difficulty (β) scores estimated for each from the DCPO model. Lower values of dispersion indicate questions that better identify publics with a higher level of trust from those with lower. Items have one less difficulty score than the number of response categories. Survey dataset codes correspond to those used in the `DCPOtools` R package (Solt, Hu, and Tai 2019); they appear in decreasing order of country-years contributed.

Together, the survey items in the source data were asked in 119 different countries in at least two time points over 49 years, from 1973 to 2022, yielding a total of 3,467 country-year-item observations. The number of items observed in the source data for each country-year is plotted in Figure A1 below. The estimates of tolerance in country-years with more observed items are more precise. In country-years with fewer observed items, the estimates rely more heavily on the random-walk prior and are therefore more uncertain, and when there are no observed items, the estimates rely *entirely* on the random-walk prior and so uncertainty increases still further.

Table A2: Indicators Used in the Tolerance of Homosexuality Latent Variable Model

Survey Item Code	Country-Years	Question Text	Response Categories	Dispersion	Difficulties	Survey Dataset Codes
just10	527	Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, or something in between, using this card. READ OUT STATEMENTS. COME ONE ANSWER FOR EACH[Homosexuality]	[1-10]1 Never Justifiable 10 Always justifiable	0.42	0.01, 0.30, 0.54, 0.75, 1.39, 1.70, 1.98, 2.35, 2.63	evs, wvs, asiab, lb, caucasusb
neigh2	520	Homosexuals. Would you mind having them as neighbors?	0 Do not have a problem with having them as neighbors / 1 Do not want them as neighbors	0.86	-0.33	evs, wvs, lits, cid, lb, fsdreligion, amb
free5	264	Homosexuality is a personal behavior, others should not blame	1 Strongly disagree / 2 disagree / 3 Neither / 4 Agree / 5 Strongly Agree	1.23	-3.08, -1.54, -0.08, 2.69	ess, res, seessp, cgss
accept2	211	And which one of these comes closer to your opinion?	1 homosexuality is a way of life that should be accepted by society / 2 homosexuality is a way of life that should not be accepted by society	0.62	0.63	uspew, gallup, pew, pewrel
approve4	209	A sexual relationship between two adults of the same sex	1 Very bad 2 Fairly bad 3 Not so bad 4 Definitely not bad	0.21	0.55, 1.00, 1.58	usgss, issp, lat, bsa, allbus, pgss, issr, chcep, seessp, jgss, nsss, twscs
run10	177	And now, changing the topic and thinking of homosexuals, how strongly do you approve or disapprove of such people being permitted to run for public office?	1 Strongly Disapprove 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Strongly Approve	0.56	-0.67, -0.32, -0.05, 0.21, 0.65, 0.95, 1.27, 1.66, 1.99	amb
hioff10	140	Using a scale from 1 to 10, please tell me how you would feel about having a person from each of the following groups in the highest elected political position in	1 Not at all comfortable / 23456789 / 10 Totally comfortable	0.16	-0.83, -0.53, -0.22, 0.02, 0.50, 0.76, 1.06, 1.44, 1.75	eb
approve3	92	Is homosexual behavior morally acceptable, morally wrong, or is it not a moral issue?	1 morally acceptable / 2 morally wrong / 3 not a moral issue	0.44	0.86, 2.00	uspew, pew, pewrel
marry4a	90	Overall, do you support or oppose allowing gays and lesbians to marry legally?	1 Support strongly 2 Support somewhat 3 Oppose somewhat 4 Oppose strongly	0.82	-0.59, 1.06, 3.36	nbcwsj, lat, uspew, prri, abcwapo, pewrel, pew, lb, aes
marry4e	85	For each of the following propositions, tell me if you Homosexual marriages should be allowed throughout Europe?	Totally agree 1 totally disagree 4	0.09	-0.01, 0.84, 2.06	eb
marry10	80	How strongly do you approve or disapprove of same-sex couples having the right to marry?	1 Strongly disapprove / 23456789 / 10 Strongly approve	0.24	0.18, 0.48, 0.68, 0.86, 1.17, 1.36, 1.58, 1.82, 2.07	amb

(continued)

Survey Item Code	Country-Years	Question Text	Response Categories	Dispersion	Difficulties	Survey Dataset Codes
adopt5	80	How acceptable or unacceptable do you consider the following issues? That homosexual and lesbian couples have the right to adopt children	1 completely unacceptable 2 unacceptable 3 neither acceptable nor unacceptable 4 acceptable 5 completely acceptable	0.76	-0.61, 0.74, 1.77, 3.37	bsa, ess, belgiumes, dkes, nores, icenes
parent5	79	How much do you agree or disagree with this statement? Homosexual couples are as good parents as other couples	Agree strongly 1 strongly disagree 5	0.88	-1.52, 0.30, 1.53, 3.49	wvs, evs
ashamed5	73	If a close family member was a gay man or a lesbian, I would feel ashamed.	Agree strongly 1 Disagree strongly 5	1.01	-2.55, -0.88, 0.39, 2.30	ess
marry3	69	What is your view on same-sex marriage?	1 Favour same-sex marriage / 2 Oppose same-sex marriage, but would accept civil unions / 3 Oppose entirely same-sex marriage	0.97	-0.74, 0.90	ipsos, cgeis
rights4	57	To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? Gay, lesbian and bisexual people should have the same rights as heterosexual people	Totally agree 1 totally disagree 4	0.72	-1.31, -0.12, 1.67	eb, itanes
approve4a	56	To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? There is nothing wrong in a sexual relationship between two persons of the same sex	Totally agree 1 totally disagree 4	0.71	-0.93, 0.34, 2.00	eb
adopt4a	55	Same-sex couples' right to adopt is a good thing	1 strongly agree / 2 somewhat agree / 3 somewhat disagree / 4 strongly disagree	0.55	0.01, 1.03, 2.31	prri, ipsos, priatlantic, fsdelection, ptvs
adopt5a	53	How would you feel about the following statement? Do you agree or disagree with them? Homosexual couples should be able to adopt children	Agree strongly 1 strongly disagree 5	1.70	-0.90, 1.41, 3.01, 5.61	evs, som, snes, ptvs
adopt2	51	Do you favor or oppose allowing gay or lesbian couples to adopt a child?	1 Favor 2 Oppose 8 DK/No opinion 9 NA/Refused	0.10	1.60	gallup, anes, cnn, psra, abcwapo, bsa, eb, pew, angus
marry4c	47	Same-sex marriage is or could be harmful to society	1 strongly disagree / 2 somewhat disagree / 3 somewhat agree / 4 strongly agree	0.45	-0.77, 0.33, 1.48	ipsos
marry2	39	Do you think homosexuals should or should not have equal rights to marry one another?	1 Should have equal rights to marry 2 Should not have equal rights to marry 8 DK/No opinion 9 NA/Refused	0.88	1.20	cnn, abcwapo, psra, ap, gallup, uspew, cces, eb, angus, aes
ff5	39	same sex female couple can bring up a child as well as a male-female couple	1 Strongly agree / 2 Agree / 3 Neither agree nor disagree / 4 Disagree / 5 Strongly disagree	0.74	-0.73, 0.87, 1.62, 3.67	issp

(continued)

Survey Item Code	Country-Years	Question Text	Response Categories	Dispersion	Difficulties	Survey Dataset Codes
mm5	39	same sex male couple can bring up a child as well as a male-female couple	1 Strongly agree / 2 Agree / 3 Neither agree nor disagree / 4 Disagree / 5 Strongly disagree	0.72	-0.38, 1.17, 1.94, 3.80	issp
marry5a	33	Here are some statements about general social concerns. Please say whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with each of these statements. Same-sex marriages should be prohibited by law	1 Strongly agree / 2 Agree / 3 Neither agree nor disagree / 4 Disagree / 5 Strongly disagree	0.65	-0.71, 0.39, 1.15, 2.56	ees, ptvs, ines, aes
approve5	30	What about sexual relations between two adults of the same sex?	1 Always wrong 2 Mostly wrong 3 Sometimes wrong 4 Rarely wrong 5 Not wrong at all	0.11	0.46, 0.80, 1.32, 1.65	bsa, cgss
adopt4	29	For each of the following propositions, tell me if you Adoption of children should be authorised for homosexual couples throughout Europe	Totally agree 1 totally disagree 4	0.76	0.67, 1.81, 3.31	eb
marry5	28	Agree: The law should recognise same-sex relationships	1 Strongly agree / 2 Agree / 3 Neither agree nor disagree / 4 Disagree / 5 Strongly disagree	0.56	-0.26, 0.69, 1.51, 2.96	issp, usgss, bsa, som, chcep, nsss, aussa, kgss
marry11	28	I would like you to tell me your views on various issues: same-sex marriage	0 fully in favour of same sex marriage / 123456789 / 10 fully opposed to same sex marriage	1.13	-0.41, -0.15, 0.17, 0.46, 0.67, 1.57, 1.82, 2.15, 2.50, 2.91	ees
neigh10	27	Having a homosexual	1 Not at all comfortable / 23456789 / 10 Totally comfortable	0.86	-2.37, -1.94, -1.50, -1.20, -0.55, -0.23, 0.14, 0.68, 1.21	eb
civil2	22	.Allowing homosexual couples to have the same benefits as married heterosexual couples, such as health benefits inheritance rights and Social Security survivor benefits	1 Support 2 Oppose 8 DK/No opinion 9 NA/Refused	0.86	0.61	abcwapo, eb, politbarometer, gallup
accept4	20	Homosexuals are people who should be accepted like anybody else	Agree completely 1 Disagree completely 4	0.90	-2.04, -0.92, 0.91	cdcee
pension4	16	Couples of the same sex should be entitled to a widow's/widower's pension as if they had lived with a partner of the opposite sex	1 strongly agree / 2 agree / 3 disagree / 4 strongly disagree	0.82	-0.75, 0.20, 2.04	eb
marry4d	13	Gays and lesbians should be allowed to get married	1 strongly agree / 3 somewhat agree / 5 somewhat disagree / 7 strongly disagree	0.20	0.44, 1.15, 2.42	uspew, fsdelection, cnes, poc, canadianes, twscs
neigh5	13	For each of the following types of people, please tell me whether you would like having people from this group as neighbors, dislike it, or not care: Homosexuals	1 strongly dislike / 2 somewhat dislike / 3 would not care / 4 somewhat like / 5 strongly like	0.45	-0.38, 0.19, 1.54, 2.20	afrob

(continued)

Survey Item Code	Country-Years	Question Text	Response Categories	Dispersion	Difficulties	Survey Dataset Codes
legal2	12	Do you think homosexual relations between consenting adults should or should not be legal	1 should be legal / 2 should not be legal	0.70	-0.21	gallup, abcwapo, cbsnyt, cnn, uswapo, anpas, aes
teacher4	12	School boards ought to have the right to fire teachers who are known homosexuals	1 completely agree / 2 mostly agree / 3 mostly disagree / 4 completely disagree	0.75	-1.56, -0.48, 1.18	uspew
legal2a	9	Do you think gay or lesbian relations between consenting adults should or should not be legal?	1 should be legal / 2 should not be legal	1.68	-0.03	gallup
accept2a	7	Do you feel that homosexuality should be considered an acceptable alternative lifestyle or not?	1 acceptable / 2 not acceptable	1.40	0.43	gallup, usnwr, cbsnyt
accept5	7	Homosexuals are people just like others	1 Disagree completely / 2 Disagree / 3 Neither agree nor disagree / 4 Agree / 5 Completely agree	0.46	-2.18, -1.25, -0.41, 0.79	eb, fsdim
marry4b	6	Do you think it should be LEGAL or ILLEGAL for homosexual couples to get married?	1 Legal, STRONGLY 2 Legal, SOMEWHAT 3 Illegal, SOMEWHAT 4 Illegal, STRONGLY 8 DK/No opinion 9 NA/Refused	0.84	0.40, 0.91, 1.95	abcwapo
approve5a	6	Homosexual relations are always wrong	1 strongly agree / 2 agree to some extent / 3 hard to say / 4 disagree to some extent / 5 strongly disagree	0.51	-1.24, -0.36, 1.06, 2.43	bsa, nzes
strength5	6	Strengthen the position of homosexuals, bisexuals and transsexuals in society	1 very good suggestion 2 pretty good suggestion 3 neither good nor bad suggestion 4 pretty bad suggestion 5 very bad suggestion	0.80	-0.35, 0.51, 2.70, 4.16	som
legal5	6	Homosexuals are no better than criminals and should be punished in the extreme	1 agree strongly / 2 agree / 3 neither agree nor disagree / 4 disagree / 5 disagree strongly	0.40	-1.95, -1.04, -0.39, 1.06	seessp
marry3a	5	Do you favour or oppose same-sex marriage, or do you have no opinion on this?	1 favor / 3 oppose / 8 no opinion	0.51	0.72, 2.25	canadianes

Appendix C: The DCPO Model

Research on latent variable models of public opinion based on cross-national survey data has enjoyed explosive growth in recent years (see Claassen 2019; Caughey, O’Grady, and Warshaw 2019; McGann, Dellepiane-Avellaneda, and Bartle 2019; Kolczynska et al. 2020). To estimate tolerance of homosexuality across countries and over time, we draw on the latest of these methods that is appropriate for data that is not only incomparable but also sparse, the Dynamic Comparative Public Opinion (DCPO) model presented in Solt (2020c).¹ The DCPO model is a population-level two-parameter ordinal logistic item response theory (IRT) model with country-specific item-bias terms.

DCPO models the total number of survey responses expressing at least as much tolerance of homosexuality as response category r to each question q in country k at time t , y_{ktqr} , out of the total number of respondents surveyed, n_{ktqr} , using the beta-binomial distribution:

$$a_{ktqr} = \phi \eta_{ktqr} \quad (1)$$

$$b_{ktqr} = \phi(1 - \eta_{ktqr}) \quad (2)$$

$$y_{ktqr} \sim \text{BetaBinomial}(n_{ktqr}, a_{ktqr}, b_{ktqr}) \quad (3)$$

where ϕ represents an overall dispersion parameter to account for additional sources of survey error beyond sampling error and η_{ktqr} is the expected probability that a random person in country k at time t answers question q with a response at least as positive as response r .²

This expected probability, η_{ktqr} , is in turn estimated as follows:

$$\eta_{ktqr} = \text{logit}^{-1} \left(\frac{\bar{\theta}'_{kt} - (\beta_{qr} + \delta_{kq})}{\sqrt{\alpha_q^2 + (1.7 * \sigma_{kt})^2}} \right) \quad (4)$$

In this equation, β_{qr} represents the difficulty of response r to question q , that is, the degree of tolerance the response expresses. The δ_{kq} term represents country-specific item bias: the extent to which all responses to a particular question q may be more (or less) difficult in a given country k due to translation issues, cultural differences in response styles, or other idiosyncrasies that render the same survey item not equivalent across countries.³

¹Solt (2020c) demonstrates that the DCPO model provides a better fit to survey data than the models put forward by Claassen (2019) or Caughey, O’Grady, and Warshaw (2019). The McGann, Dellepiane-Avellaneda, and Bartle (2019) model depends on dense survey data unlike the sparse data on public gender egalitarianism described in the preceding section. Kolczynska et al. (2020) is the very most recent of the five works and builds on each of the others, but the MRP approach developed in that piece is suitable not only when the available survey data are dense but also when ancillary data on population characteristics are available, so it is similarly inappropriate to this application.

²The ordinal responses to question q are coded to range from 1 (expressing the least tolerance of homosexuality) to R (expressing the most tolerance of homosexuality), and r takes on all values greater than 1 and less than or equal to R .

³Estimating δ_{kq} requires repeated administrations of question q in country k , so when responses to question q are observed in country k in only a single year, the DCPO model sets δ_{kq} to zero by assumption,

The dispersion of question q , its noisiness in relation to our latent variable, is α_q . The mean and standard deviation of the unbounded latent trait of tolerance of homosexuality are $\bar{\theta}'_{kt}$ and σ_{kt} , respectively.

Random-walk priors are used to account for the dynamics in $\bar{\theta}'_{kt}$ and σ_{kt} , and weakly informative priors are placed on the other parameters.⁴ The dispersion parameters α_q are constrained to be positive and all survey responses are coded with high values indicating more tolerance to fix direction. The difficulty β of “not so bad” (on a four-point scale ranging from “very bad” through “fairly bad” and “not so bad” to “not at all bad”) of reactions to “a sexual relationship between two adults of the same sex” is set to 1 to identify location, and for each question q the difficulties for increasing response categories r are constrained to be increasing. The sum of δ_{kq} across all countries k is set to zero for each question q :

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \delta_{kq} = 0 \quad (5)$$

Finally, the logistic function is used to transform $\bar{\theta}'_{kt}$ to the unit interval and so give the bounded mean of latent tolerance of homosexuality, $\bar{\theta}_{kt}$, which is our parameter of interest here (see Solt 2020c, 3–8).

increasing the error of the model by any country-item bias that is present. Questions that are asked repeatedly over time in only a single country pose no risk of country-specific item bias, so δ_{kq} in such cases are also set to zero.

⁴The dispersion parameters α_q are drawn from standard half-normal prior distributions, that is, the positive half of $N(0, 1)$. The first difficulty parameters for each question, β_{q1} , are drawn from standard normal prior distributions, and the differences between β s for each r for the same question q are drawn from standard half-normal prior distributions. The item-bias parameters δ_{kq} receive normally-distributed hierarchical priors with mean 0 and standard deviations drawn from standard half-normal prior distributions. The initial value of the mean unbounded latent trait for each country, $\bar{\theta}'_{k1}$, is assigned a standard normal prior, as are the transition variances $\sigma_{\theta'}^2$ and σ_{σ}^2 ; the initial value of the standard deviation of the unbounded latent trait for each country, σ_{k1} , is drawn from a standard lognormal prior distribution. The overall dispersion, ϕ , receives a somewhat more informative prior drawn from a gamma(4, 0.1) distribution that yields values that are well scaled for that parameter.

Appendix References

- Adamczyk, Amy, and Cassidy Pitt. 2009. "Shaping Attitudes about Homosexuality: The Role of Religion and Cultural Context." *Social Science Research* 38 (2): 338–51.
- Andersen, Robert, and Tina Fetner. 2008. "Cohort Differences in Tolerance of Homosexuality: Attitudinal Change in Canada and the United States, 1981–2000." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72 (2): 311–30.
- Caughey, Devin, Tom O’Grady, and Christopher Warshaw. 2019. "Policy Ideology in European Mass Publics, 1981–2016." *American Political Science Review* 113 (3): 674–93.
- Claassen, Christopher. 2019. "Estimating Smooth Country–Year Panels of Public Opinion." *Political Analysis* 27 (1): 1–20.
- Clements, Ben, and Clive D Field. 2014. "Public Opinion Toward Homosexuality and Gay Rights in Great Britain." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 78 (2): 523–47.
- Hildebrandt, Achim, Eva-Maria Truedinger, and Dominik Wyss. 2019. "The Missing Link? Modernization, Tolerance, and Legislation on Homosexuality." *Political Research Quarterly* 72 (3): 539–53.
- Hooghe, Marc, and Cecil Meeusen. 2013. "Is Same-Sex Marriage Legislation Related to Attitudes Toward Homosexuality? Trends in Tolerance of Homosexuality in European Countries Between 2002 and 2010." *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 10 (4): 258–68.
- Kolczynska, Marta, Paul-Christian Bürkner, Lauren Kennedy, and Aki Vehtari. 2020. "Trust in State Institutions in Europe, 1989–2019." SocArXiv. <https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/3v5g7/>.
- McGann, Anthony, Sabastian Dellepiane-Avellaneda, and John Bartle. 2019. "Parallel Lines? Policy Mood in a Plurinational Democracy." *Electoral Studies* 58: 48–57.
- Redman, Shane M. 2018. "Effects of Same-Sex Legislation on Attitudes Toward Homosexuality." *Political Research Quarterly* 71 (3): 628–41.
- Solt, Frederick. 2020a. "DCPO: Dynamic Comparative Public Opinion." Available at the Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN). <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=DCPO>.
- . 2020b. "Modeling Dynamic Comparative Public Opinion." SocArXiv. <https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/d5n9p>.
- Solt, Frederick, Yue Hu, and Yuehong Tai. 2019. "DCPOtools: Tools for Dynamic Comparative Public Opinion." <https://github.com/fsolt/DCPOtools>.
- Yang, Alan S. 1997. "Trends: Attitudes Toward Homosexuality." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 61 (3): 477–507.