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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The importance of multicultural awareness and multicultural sensitivity has attained a significant level of importance within the field of psychology. In particular, the realm of practitioner training has been the focus of significant amounts of research on the impact and effectiveness of different modalities of multicultural training (Ladany, Inman, Constantine, & Hofheinz, 1997; Pope-Davis & Coleman, 1997; Sodowsky, Kuo-Jackson, Richardson, & Corey, 1998; Steward, 1996).

The desire for competency in multicultural awareness and multicultural sensitivity among mental health practitioners has evolved as a result of experiences by minority group members with various elements of the American mental health system. Typically, minority group members underutilize available public mental health services, and receive services that are inadequate, inappropriate, or both (Dana, 1993; Lopez & Nunez, 1987).

The domain of multiculturalism in the United States has traditionally encompassed members of four minority groups: African-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, Asian-Americans, and Native-Americans. A somewhat recent development within the field of multicultural training for practitioners has been a resumption of the debate over what exactly should be encompassed within the realm of multiculturalism. One component of this debate has been whether and to what extent the issues of another minority group,
homosexuals, should be included in formalized multicultural training models (Dworkin and Gutierrez, 1989).

**World View**

The necessity for multicultural awareness and sensitivity has come about in large part due to the concept of world view, or culturally specific cognitions. A specific cultural group's world view emerges as a function of that group's need to make sense of and assign meaning to life experiences that are of relevance and importance. Components of world view (as outlined in Dana, 1983) include:

1) group identity, or a "collective consciousness" that includes the history of the group, as well as behaviors that are sanctioned by the group.

2) individual identity, or the individual's concept of self as a member of the larger group.

3) group beliefs, among which are cognitions about health, spirituality, and locus of control.

4) group values, among which are cognitions about human nature, relationships, time, and activities.

5) group language, or unique and specific communications styles that are culturally specific. (pp. 9-13).

It is both the inconsistency and incompatibility between the world view of minority groups and that of the dominant culture that causes the aforementioned problems minorities typically experience with the mental health system.
Clearly, an integral component that may strongly influence worldview among minority group members is the perception (both individually and collectively by members of that group) of how they are treated by the dominant culture. Following next is an examination of how this treatment can influence both identity development and worldview among members of two minority groups, African-Americans and homosexuals.

The African-American Experience

When conducting research on issues of importance to minority group members, researchers typically make an estimation of how many members of the general population comprise that specified group. Reliable estimates of the distribution of African-Americans in the general population are generally easy to obtain. Recent census data estimate that there are approximately 34,370,000 African-Americans in the United States. This figure comprises approximately 12.7% of the overall U.S. population, which is estimated at 270,029,000. African-Americans comprise the largest ethnic minority group in the United States, followed closely by Hispanics (who comprise approximately 11.3% of the overall population), Asians (3.8%), and Native Americans (0.9%) (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1998). Individuals who consider themselves biracial, especially those with African-American ethnicity who prefer to identify with the dominant Anglo culture in the United States, may have underreported this ethnicity in the census data (Ponterotto & Casas, as cited in Dana, 1993).

African-American Identity Development

For the purposes of this study, Cross' cognitive model of nigrescence, or the process by which an individual becomes aware of his or her African-American identity, is
examined (Cross, 1971; 1978). The Cross model is a stage development model, and is based on two broad assumptions: 1) an individual's identity acquisition is developmental in nature; and 2) it is the interactions between the individual and the environment in which he or she operates that influence the stability of behavior during each stage, as well as modulating the changes in behavior that occur between and among the various stages. Cross' model identifies five stages through which individuals progress in the course of becoming aware of their African-American identity. The stages of the model are as follows:

**Stage I: Pre-encounter.** The individual has a world view that is Eurocentric (i.e., consistent with the dominant Anglo culture). African-Americanism is impugned, and the individual suffers from psychological disturbance due to the resulting dissonance.

**Stage II: Encounter/Reinterpretation.** As a direct result of the pain, confusion, and anxiety that characterize Stage I, the individual begins a strongly motivated search for his or her identity.

**Stage III: Immersion-Emersion.** As a result of the emerging sense of identity, the individual now begins to impugn the dominant Anglo culture. Thoughts of the individual's experience in Stage I promote feelings of guilt, as well as feelings of rage toward the dominant Anglo culture, and a sense of intense pride in being African-American.

**Stage IV: Internalization.** The individual continues to experience the feelings characteristic of stage III, although at a significantly reduced level. Strong
motivation emerges to change existing political and social institutions to help increase the individual’s sense of security.

**Stage V: Internalization-Commitment.** The individual continues to focus on the need for change characteristic of Stage IV. Emerging self-confidence and personal control are clearly evident.

Beginning in Stage III, African-American individuals may begin to engage in cognitions and behaviors characteristic of Afrocentrism (i.e., an emphasis on recognizing, relearning, and/or honoring ancestral roots and traditional African heritage). Others may attempt to become bicultural, identifying with both the African-American community and with the dominant Anglo culture. Still others may remain marginalized, maintaining neither an Afrocentric nor an Anglo perspective. Where African-Americans focus this orientation tends to be influenced by how they perceive their treatment from the dominant Anglo culture (Dana, 1993).

**Dominant Culture Treatment of African-Americans**

The mistreatment of African-Americans by the dominant Anglo culture has a long, lurid history in the United States. While a detailed presentation on the history of the African-American experience in this country since the times of slavery is beyond the scope of this study, a brief discussion of more recent and current examples of the mistreatment of African-Americans is warranted.

Historically, African-Americans have lived lives significantly influenced by the effects of both subtle and overt racism, and discrimination. Health, education, employment, and income disparities between African-Americans and Anglos remain
pervasive (Dana, 1993). The law enforcement and the criminal justice systems, institutions about which African-Americans tend to feel the most mistrustful (Terrell & Terrell, 1981), continue to be plagued by racist and discriminatory practices. For example, recent examinations of capital murder trials in both the South and West indicated that victim and perpetrator race were reliable predictors of whether or not the death penalty was sought. African-Americans who killed Anglos were significantly more likely to have the death penalty sought against them, while African-Americans who killed other African-Americans were actually less likely to be given the death penalty (Paternoster, 1984; Thomson, 1997)

In interpersonal and social contexts, media images of African-Americans can have profound effects on how they are perceived by Anglos. A study by Bodenhausen, Schwarz, Bless, and Waenke (1995) indicated that Anglos' exposure to a successful African-American exemplar increased their perceptions of and sensitivity to pervasive racism in contemporary culture, but that this effect occurred only when subjects were exposed to an African-American who was well-liked (e.g., Michael Jordan vs. Al Sharpton). The effect of increased awareness of and sensitivity to racism disappeared completely when Anglo subjects were first given information that the successful exemplar was atypical of African-Americans in general.

Within the mental health system, discriminatory and inappropriate treatment of African-Americans also remains pervasive. Misdiagnosis of mental health problems is commonplace. African-American patients are significantly more likely to receive more serious admitting diagnoses in inpatient settings, to be given a diagnosis based on genetic or biological causes, and to be treated for significantly shorter periods of time than
Anglos. (Lopez & Nunez, 1987). In addition, cultural factors in psychiatric diagnosis suggest that many diagnostic procedures are patently biased in favor of the dominant Anglo culture. Most diagnostic instruments used to assess mental illness are culturally bound, and as such are not suitable for assessing mental illness among minorities (Pavkov, Lewis, & Lyons, 1989, reviewed in Shepard, 1996).

The Homosexual Experience

As with African-Americans, any discussion of issues important to homosexuals should begin with an estimation of how many individuals comprise this minority group. A difficulty frequently encountered when conducting research on homosexuality is due to the basic lack of agreement among researchers as to exactly how a homosexual orientation or identity is defined (Cass, 1979; Chung & Katayama, 1996; Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948; Reinisch & Beasley, 1990). This issue is discussed in more detail later. Another significant difficulty results from reliable estimates of the prevalence of homosexuality in the general population being notoriously difficult to obtain. In the course of attempting to conduct research with homosexuals, another significant problem that is frequently encountered is the refusal of some individuals to acknowledge that they have homosexual thoughts, feelings, or behaviors, because they fear this information will be revealed to others and/or used against them (Bell & Weinberg, 1978; Brady & Busse, 1994).

Alfred Kinsey’s ground-breaking research in the 1940s on the sexual behavior of American males resulted in the commonly-cited statistic that 10% of the American population is homosexual. However, after his data were reported and began to be cited widely, Kinsey argued vigorously against any type of categorization of individuals, and
made no estimate of the percentage of individuals whom he believed should be categorized as homosexual. Kinsey's work primarily emphasized sexual behavior, particularly those behaviors that led to orgasm. Kinsey believed that all individuals were capable of both heterosexual and homosexual behavior, and that if individuals were to be categorized, this categorization should be done only in terms of the distribution of an individual's total experience (hence the 7-point, heterosexual-homosexual Kinsey scale). The actual data from the Kinsey study showed that 10% of respondents acknowledged being "more or less exclusively homosexual for at least three years between the ages of 16 and 55," whereas 4% acknowledged being "exclusively homosexual throughout their lives, after the onset of adolescence" (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948, pp. 650-651).

Other investigations of the prevalence of homosexuality that followed the original Kinsey study yielded various estimates on what percentage of the population was homosexual. Michaels (1996) summarized 48 years' worth of research on sexual behavior that included estimates of the prevalence of homosexuality in the general population. Various estimates ranging from a low of 1% to a high of 9.9% were obtained. Among those studies that were most well-validated (i.e., representative samples of the larger population, use of professional sex researchers, extensive interviews with individual subjects), it was found that the prevalence of homosexuality varied widely, depending primarily on two factors:

1) the dimension of homosexuality being measured (i.e., cognitive, affective, or behavioral)
2) sociodemographic characteristics being examined (e.g., gender, age, marital status, education, religious beliefs and practices, race, and locale)

These factors have resulted in a significant complication of the commonly held belief that homosexuality is randomly distributed in the population. In fact, the actual distribution of homosexuality appears to be subject to a great deal of variability, based upon various elements of the factors cited above.

Data from the National Health and Social Life Survey (NHSLS) published in 1994 supported the contention that homosexuality is not randomly distributed in the population and is subject to wide variability. The NHSLS, regarded as the most comprehensive and high quality survey of sexual behavior done in the United States to date, estimated that 5% of males had a same-sex partner since attaining adulthood, 8% of males desired same-sex sexual contact, and 3% self-identified as homosexual (Laumann, Gagnon, & Michael, 1994).

Given the aforementioned difficulties with measuring the prevalence of homosexuality in the general population, including those factors that influence prevalence, it is important that the methodology used in this study addresses this issue as thoroughly as possible. The conceptualization and measurement of the cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions of homosexuality, as well as the previously noted sociodemographic characteristics, will be addressed in more detail both below and in the Method section of the proposal.
Sexual Orientation vs. Sexual Identity.

As difficult to obtain as prevalence estimates of homosexuality have been, another significant problem commonly occurs when researchers attempt to explain exactly what is encompassed within the constructs of sexual orientation and sexual identity. Chung and Katayama (1996) conducted an extensive content analysis on 144 empirical studies from 1974-1993 that involved lesbian, gay, and bisexual subjects. Males were included in 76% of all studies, with 35% of the studies focusing exclusively on gay men. In 33% of all the studies, subjects self-identified as heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual, gay, or lesbian. As such, self-identification was the most common categorization method utilized. However, 31% of the studies made no assessment of subjects' sexual orientation or identity, or at least did not indicate what assessment method was used. The authors summarized that,

[i]t was disappointing to find that in almost one third of the lesbian/gay/bisexual studies, participants' sexual orientations could not be determined because of [either] the lack of assessment or the authors' failure to report assessment methods. It seems that participants' sexual orientations were assumed based on sampling methods . . . Without formal assessment, researchers cannot be sure what kind of sample they are studying. Hence, the validity and generalizability of their findings are questionable. (p. 56)

Chung and Katayama also argued that, since sexual orientation and sexual identity are separate constructs, to assess sexual orientation alone was to oversimplify the categorization of homosexual subjects. When oversimplifying the characteristics of individuals who comprise their samples, Chung and Katayam cautioned that researchers
should be aware that they may be dealing with only one construct (e.g., sexual orientation, or sexual identity) rather than two, and as such should interpret and apply their findings accordingly.

We thus arrive at a problem based primarily on semantic differentiation, or the lack thereof. Traditionally, the terms sexual orientation and sexual identity have been used interchangeably in the research literature. More recently, however, clearer distinctions have begun to emerge that differentiate the two terms as two separate but related constructs. Traditionally, sexual orientation has been thought of as a primarily behavioral classification. That is, an individual is labeled heterosexual, bisexual, or homosexual based upon his or her sexual behavior. In addition, sexual orientation has been considered to be relatively stable over time (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948; Reinisch & Beasley, 1990). Sexual identity, on the other hand, while including the sexual behavior element, also incorporates the components of affective preference, social behavior, and the cognitive elements of sexual attraction and fantasies. Also, sexual identity has been considered to be changeable over time, depending upon the individual's developmental progress (Cass, 1979; Chung & Katayama, 1996). To use more poetic phraseology, sexual orientation may be thought of as a snapshot in time, whereas sexual identity may be thought of as a journey along a path with many forks (where one may encounter dead-ends as well as switchbacks).

The range of assessment approaches to sexual orientation and sexual identity varies in the research literature. Chung and Katayama's (1996) comprehensive study found
six separate categories used to assess sexual orientation and sexual identity:

1) self-identification, where subjects self-identified as gay or lesbian (33% of studies)

2) sexual preference, where subjects identified what sex they were most attracted to (4%)

3) behavior, where subjects' orientation/identity was inferred based on their reported sexual behavior (9%)

4) single dimension, where subjects identified a bipolar scale point that most accurately reflected their behavior (13%)

5) multiple dimensions, which used more than one of the above categories (10%)

6) "unsure," which implied that either no method was used or it was not indicated what method was used (31%)

Clearly, a significant amount of the research literature on homosexuality has inadequately addressed the issue of how to categorize sexual orientation and sexual identity. How that issue may affect this study will be addressed in more detail in the Method section.

Models of Homosexual Identity Development

Beginning in the mid 1970s, several theoretical models of how a homosexual identity is formed and acquired began to appear in the literature. The names of the various constructs that were identified and postulated included: sexual identity development (Coleman, 1982); resocialization (Miller, 1978); coming out (Morin & Miller, as cited in Cass, 1984); identity acquisition (Troiden, 1979); and homosexual identity formation (Bell
Weinberg, 1978; Cass, 1979; Hencken & O'Dowd, 1977). These models of how an individual takes on a homosexual identity all share four characteristic elements:

1) there is a process by which individuals both perceive themselves as, and subsequently assume a self image of, homosexual;
2) homosexual self-image translates into homosexual identity as a consequence of interactions with others;
3) there are strategies (affective, cognitive, and behavioral) that are employed to help manage the individual's identity in his daily living;
4) there is a process by which the individual's new identity is assimilated into his overall sense of self.

Among the various models, there is considerable overlap in the emphasis on change and growth that is seen as central to the idea of identity development. In addition, socialization is consistently seen as a key element in the evolution of identity. Most of the models envision identity formation and development as occurring sequentially or in stages. These sequential or stage processes are characterized by elements that include accepting the label homosexual as descriptive of the self, disclosure of the identity to increasing numbers of other individuals, reinforcement of the identity by positive interactions with others, and an increase in the amount and quality of social contacts with other homosexuals.

Despite the noted similarities in the emphasis on change and growth as central to identity formation, direct comparison among all models would be extremely problematic. Primarily, this difficulty results from the inconsistency among theorists as to exactly what
is encompassed within the construct of identity. In addition, most of the models do not clearly delineate the cognitive, affective, and behavioral changes that occur during each stage or sequence of development. Some stages or sequential points may be identified in relation to their cognitive aspects, with no mention of affective and/or behavioral components, whereas other stages or sequential points within the same model may be identified only in relation to their behavioral components, with no mention of any corresponding affective and/or cognitive aspects. Most importantly, the Cass model, which is discussed in detail in the next section, differs from most others in that it does not support the contention, commonly held, that the acquisition of a homosexual identity is something negative. Finally, Cass' model differs from all others in that it is intended to describe the identity formation process for both males and females.

**Cass' Theoretical Model of Homosexual Identity Formation**

Vivienne Cass first published her theoretical model of homosexual identity formation in 1979. The Cass model shares much structural similarity with Cross' (1971, 1978) five-stage cognitive models of nigrescence, or the process of becoming aware of African-American identity. Like the Cross model, Cass' model is based upon two expansive assumptions: 1) identity is acquired through a process of development; 2) both stability of and changes in behavior during the developmental process are based on interactions between individuals and the environments in which they operate (Cass, 1979). According to Cass (1984),

[T]he process involved in the acquisition of a homosexual identity is one of identity change in which a previously held image of sexual orientation is replaced with a
homosexual image. In most cases, the former image is likely to have been heterosexual, since the promotion of an ideal heterosexual image is one of the most prominent features of socialization in industrial societies. Homosexuals commonly report the process to be one of change from a heterosexual to a homosexual identity. (p. 145)

Cass’ model postulates that there are six stages through which individuals progress in the course of acquiring a homosexual identity, and that the length of time taken to progress through the stages will be highly variable among individuals. Differentiation among the various stages is based upon how the individual perceives his or her behavior, and upon the actions that are a result of these perceptions. Cass theorizes that an individual’s age will have a significant effect on how he or she copes with the stages of the developmental model. This is believed to be due primarily to continually evolving societal attitudes and expectations about homosexuals in general, with the assumption that older homosexuals will have had the experience of far more negative societal attitudes and expectations about them than younger homosexuals. Cass also believes that males and females will experience acquisition of a homosexual identity differently, primarily because of the difference in sex-role socialization experiences had by males and females (Cass, 1979, 1984). For the purposes of this study, acquisition of identity among males will be the sole focus.

According to Cass, each individual has an active role in the acquisition of a homosexual identity. At any point in the process of development, the individual may actively and consciously choose not to develop any further; it is at this point that identity
foreclosure is said to have occurred. Therefore, Cass’ model necessitates that the individual has to be willing to allow their homosexual identity to form (Cass, 1979).

The model also distinguishes between private and public elements of identity. These elements, although related, can be and often are separate (e.g., an individual privately has a homosexual identity, while publicly he has an identity of being heterosexual). During the later stages of development, these public and private elements become more congruent, as individuals begin to integrate their homosexual identity into their overall concept of self (Cass, 1979, 1984).

The framework of Cass’ model is founded in interpersonal congruency theory. According to Cass, “Interpersonal congruency theory is based on the assumption that stability and change in human behavior are dependent on the congruency or incongruence that exists within an individual’s interpersonal environment. Growth occurs when the individual attempts to resolve the inconsistency between perception of self and others.” (p.220). Cass believes that, largely due to current societal attitudes and beliefs about homosexuality, it is likely impossible for an individual to achieve a homosexual identity that is completely congruent (particularly congruence of affect and cognition), but that incongruence in the final stage of development may be reduced to a level that, for the individual, is manageable and tolerable. This difficulty arises from the fact that, by and large, homosexuals are socialized into a society that, in general, has been and continues to be heterosexist and anti-gay (Cass, 1979).
Cass' Stages of Identity Formation

Stage I: Identity Confusion. Due to the aforementioned socialization into a heterosexist/anti-gay culture, the individual first moves into identity formation in somewhat of a pre-development stage, in that the individual thinks of himself as both heterosexual and non-homosexual, and the individual's intrapersonal system (i.e., his self-perception of his own attributes, and his perception of his behaviors that result from those attributes) supports the contention that the individual is part of the dominant heterosexual culture. As a result of exposure to information about homosexuality (e.g., from various media, or through interpersonal interaction), it is the conscious awareness that homosexuality may be relevant to the individual that denotes the beginning of the identity formation process. Encountering information about homosexuality is not a necessary and sufficient condition to begin the identity formation process; the individual must be willing to ask a question to the effect of, "Who am I?" and must be willing to consider that a statement to the effect of, "My behavior may be homosexual" is directly relevant to him. This consideration necessarily introduces an element of incongruence into a self-perception that was previously stable. That is, the individual realizes that his perceptions of his own behavior (which includes feelings and thoughts as well as overt actions) are now at odds both with his sense of self as being heterosexual, as well as with others' perceptions of his being heterosexual. To resolve this incongruence, the individual may adopt one of three approaches:

1) The individual accepts that the meaning of his behavior is both correctly indicative of homosexuality and is acceptable. He questions his heterosexual
identity. He likes the idea of his behavior being labeled homosexual, and typically begins to gather additional information about what it means to be homosexual.

2) The individual accepts that the meaning of his behavior is correctly indicative of homosexuality but is not desirable. He refuses to question his heterosexual identity by inhibiting all behavior that may be homosexual, inhibiting the receipt of information about homosexuality, and denying that any such information is personally relevant to him. Where these strategies are employed successfully, identity foreclosure takes place.

3) The individual rejects his behavior as both not indicative of homosexuality and not desirable. He may define homosexuality according to a strict stereotype and as such is able to define the meaning of his own behavior as non-homosexual in nature. Examples of situations in which this strategy is commonly employed include all-male prison settings and among male prostitutes. Where these strategies are employed successfully, identity foreclosure takes place.

In Stage I, the identity crisis and the inner turmoil it creates are rarely revealed to others. Due to the intensely personal nature of the matter, most individuals attempt to resolve the incongruence on their own.

**Stage II: Identity Comparison.** If identity foreclosure has not taken place, the individual now begins to move toward the idea that not only may his behavior, thoughts and feelings be homosexual, but that his self-perception now includes the statement, “I may be homosexual.” The individual also begins to feel a heightened sense of not belonging to society as a whole. The primary task of Stage II involves the individual
dealing with the social isolation that arises from this new self-perception and the heightened level of incongruence. The sense of feeling different from the dominant heterosexual culture results in the individual feeling isolated and anguished. The individual begins to feel that a statement to the effect of, “I’m the only one in the world like this,” is directly relevant to him. As the individual begins to accept himself as both not heterosexual and possibly homosexual, he quickly becomes aware that the familiar expectations that normally accompany heterosexual behavior are not only no longer relevant for him, but that these expectations have not been replaced by any new ones. The loss of this familiarity, and the sense of alienation that it necessarily creates, leads the individual to adopt one of four approaches:

1) The individual readily accepts the sense of not belonging to the dominant heterosexual culture. He devalues the importance of most others, while at the same time he begins to positively evaluate those who have rejected traditional heterosexual roles (e.g., the need for marriage or for children), or those who value nonconformity as something special or exciting. However, he still continues to present a public image of being heterosexual. This tactic serves two purposes: it insulates the individual from others’ negative evaluations of homosexuality; and, it affords him time for becoming accustomed to his increasing commitment to a homosexual identity. Presenting a public image of heterosexuality at this stage is accomplished with relative ease, as the individual simply continues to engage in the expected behaviors that normally accompany heterosexuality.
2) The individual accepts the meaning of his behavior as homosexual, but finds a self-image of being homosexual as undesirable. He may identify his behavior as homosexual only as it relates to a particular person, may label himself as bisexual with the potential for being able to engage in heterosexual behavior, may identify his homosexual behavior as a temporary phase, or may claim personal innocence for and lack of control over his homosexual behaviors. The individual still strives to present a public image of being heterosexual.

3) The individual accepts his self-image as homosexual and accepts the meaning of his behavior as homosexual, but views the behavioral component as undesirable, due his strong sense of social alienation. The individual acknowledges that he has homosexual thoughts and feelings, but is committed to avoiding any overt actions that may be homosexual in nature. Where this strategy is successfully employed, identity foreclosure occurs.

4) The individual rejects both his self-image and his behaviors as homosexual, and wishes to change both. The individual inhibits all homosexual behavior, devalues homosexuals, and favorably evaluates all heterosexuals. Where this strategy is successful, identity foreclosure occurs. Where it is repeatedly unsuccessful, the individual’s perception of alienation may lead to such a strong sense of self-hatred that the individual may attempt suicide.

Stage III: Identity Tolerance. At this point, the individual begins to turn away from a heterosexual identity and begins to commit more to a homosexual identity. He realizes that a statement to the effect of, “I am probably homosexual” is directly relevant to him.
This increased level of commitment allows the individual to begin acknowledging needs that are social, emotional and sexual in nature. It also serves to heighten the alienation the individual feels from the dominant heterosexual culture, and magnifies the incongruence between how the individual perceives himself and how he is perceived by others.

To decrease the sense of alienation and reduce the incongruence felt, the individual seeks out interactions with other homosexuals, and begins to come into contact with the gay subculture. As a result of these contacts, the individual begins to realize that not only are there others like him, but that there are also others who evaluate him positively for being gay. The primary result of this positive evaluation is that the individual’s sense of alienation begins to focus much more strongly on the dominant heterosexual culture. To compensate for this increasing sense of alienation, the individual becomes increasingly more detached from heterosexuals, and becomes much more selective about the heterosexuals with whom he will associate.

Of primary importance at this stage of development is the emotional quality of interaction with other homosexuals, as at this point the individual is still merely tolerating rather than fully embracing a homosexual identity. The effect on the individual of a positive contact at this stage will be significantly different from that of a negative contact. A positive contact will enhance the value and importance of other homosexuals in the individual’s mind. As the individual comes to see that his self-image and behavior are evaluated favorably by other homosexuals, his beliefs about his own self-image and behavior will become more positive and more congruent. This tends to result in both a stronger commitment to a homosexual identity, as well as an increased desire for contact.
with the gay subculture. A negative contact, on the other hand, tends to result in devaluation of the gay subculture. While many factors may contribute to a negative contact (e.g., poor social skills, low self-esteem, fear of exposure as homosexual), a negative contact usually results in the individual devaluing both his behavior and his self-image as homosexual. An already negative self-identity can become markedly negative at this point. To deal with such a negative self-identity, the individual may either reduce his amount of contact with homosexuals, or may inhibit entirely homosexual behaviors. Where this latter strategy is employed successfully, identity foreclosure occurs. However, when the individual only reduces his amount of contact with the gay subculture and with homosexuals, he is still acknowledging that he has social, emotional and sexual needs that can only be fulfilled through contact with homosexuals. As such, he is still afforded the opportunity to benefit from the positive aspects offered by interaction with the gay subculture, such as positive gay role models, the opportunity to meet a partner, the chance to learn how to better manage a homosexual identity, and socialization in subculture behavior.

**Stage IV: Identity Acceptance.** The defining characteristic of stage four is the individual’s increasing contact with other homosexuals. The individual realizes that a statement to the effect of, “I am homosexual” is directly relevant to him. Rather than simply being tolerated, the self-image of the individual as homosexual is accepted. The individual begins to develop and cultivate social relationships that are homosexual in nature. He continues to evaluate other homosexuals more favorably, and begins to be influenced by the groups with whom he associates in the gay subculture.
Of significance here are the attitudes and beliefs that such groups collectively hold. Some groups may believe that homosexuality is acceptable as both a private and public identity. Other groups, however, may hold the belief that homosexuality is only valid as a private identity, but should not be revealed publicly. If the individual is most strongly influenced by the latter group, the members of which support only partial legitimization of a homosexual identity, the individual may employ one or more strategies to keep his homosexual identity private. He may continue to publicly project an image of heterosexuality, "passing" as a straight person. He may limit contact with heterosexuals who threaten to increase the incongruence between his public and private identities (e.g., family members). Or he may selectively disclose his homosexual identity to certain heterosexuals who will keep this information confidential. When any or all of these strategies are employed successfully, the individual’s incongruence is decreased to a mostly manageable level, and identity foreclosure results. It is important to note that a significant number of gay men are found in this category, in which they are able to interact successfully and productively in both heterosexual and homosexual environments, and this proves to be an acceptable manner for many homosexuals to live their lives. If, however, the individual is most strongly influenced by those group members who hold the belief that homosexuality is a legitimate identity publicly as well as privately, the individual’s incongruence will continue to increase. That is, he will become even more acutely aware of the difference between his own self-perception of being totally acceptable as a homosexual and the rejection of this concept by members of the dominant heterosexual culture. This increased incongruence leads to the next stage of development.
Stage V: Identity Pride. To aid in managing this by now significant incongruence, the individual begins to employ tactics to devalue the importance of heterosexuals and to evaluate other homosexuals more positively. This allows the individual to perceive as less important his evaluation by heterosexuals, and to place more importance on how he is perceived and evaluated by other homosexuals. The individual creates a dichotomy wherein everyone falls into the category of being either homosexual or heterosexual. Homosexuals are seen as credible and significant, whereas heterosexuals are perceived as discredited and insignificant. The individual realizes that a statement to the effect of, “I am gay, I am good, I am proud” is directly relevant to him. This stage of development is marked by the individual’s immersion into the gay subculture. As the individual begins to devalue and discredit heterosexuals, he also devalues and discredits heterosexual institutions (e.g., marriage, parenthood), insofar as they are perceived to discredit and devalue homosexuality. The individual accepts his homosexual identity and prefers it to a heterosexual identity. At this stage of development, the individual may become confrontational with the dominant heterosexual culture, and may feel compelled to become an activist who advances gay causes. It is only through such confrontation that some individuals believe they can validate the gay subculture as good and as preferable to heterosexual culture. By becoming confrontational, the individual intentionally forces himself to abandon the strategies he may have used previously to conceal his sexual identity, and allows himself to begin using disclosure of his sexual identity as a mechanism for coping with incongruence. Disclosure most directly decreases incongruence by bringing consistency to the individual’s public identity with his private identity as
homosexual. Disclosure also permits more situations where the individual’s identity is able to be publicly known to others, thereby reinforcing the individual’s sense of himself as homosexual. Where the individual perceives disclosure as threatening in some way (e.g., the potential for losing his job, ostracization by his family), he may be forced to alter these important life situations, and as a coping strategy may choose to just not actively conceal his identity, rather than disclosing it.

The individual’s perception of how others react to the disclosure of his homosexuality now affects whether or not he will progress any further in his identity development. If the individual perceives others’ reactions as negative, this is generally what he expects and is consistent with his belief that heterosexuals are antigay, thereby reinforcing his devaluation of heterosexuals. As the individual here feels no sense of incongruence between how he expects to be perceived and how he is perceived, identity foreclosure occurs. However, if the individual perceives others’ reactions to his disclosure as positive, this is inconsistent with his what he expects, and adds to the incongruence. In attempting to resolve this latest incongruence, the individual progresses to the final stage of development.

**Stage VI: Identity Synthesis.** The individual enters this final stage of development when he perceives others’ reactions to the disclosure of his identity as positive. The individual realizes that the previously held dichotomy that favorably evaluated homosexuals and devalued heterosexuals is no longer necessarily valid. The individual begins to acknowledge that there are some heterosexuals who can and will accept his identity as readily as he does. As the individual gains experience interacting with such
accepting and supportive heterosexuals, he begins to view these individuals more favorably and begins to build trust in them. At the same time, heterosexuals who continue to devalue the homosexual individual are in turn devalued even further. Incongruence is now at a minimal and easily manageable level, as the individual's private and public identities coalesce into a single image. The individual still experiences the anger that is characteristic of Stage V, but at a decreased level, mainly as the result of positive interactions with supportive heterosexuals. The pride characteristic of Stage V is still present as well, but is diminished somewhat as the individual begins to accept the similarities between homosexuals and heterosexuals, and begins to acknowledge that the dissimilarities do not necessarily indicate superiority. The individual is able to integrate his homosexual identity with all other aspects that comprise the self. Rather than the primary aspect, the individual's homosexuality is considered to be one among many important aspects that identify and define him (Cass, 1979).

Testing the Cass Model

Due to the problems inherent in other models of sexual identity, Cass developed a research program to test the validity of her model. While three of the previously mentioned models (Bell & Weinberg, 1977; McLellan, 1977; Troiden, 1979) had been empirically tested using an interview technique with subjects, there remained some questions about the influence of subjectivity (e.g., multiple raters without interrater reliability measures), raising concerns about these models' generalizability to other samples.
In its final form, Cass' model used 16 factors that were deemed to be inherent to the developmental process used to describe her model of homosexual identity formation. Cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions were identified for each inherent factor, which included: commitment; disclosure; generality (i.e., the global extent of identity); identity evaluation; group identification; social interaction; alienation; inconsistency (e.g., between public and private identity); sexual orientation activity; acculturation; deference to others (i.e., those deemed to be important to the individual); dichotimization (i.e., between heterosexuals and homosexuals); personal control; strategies (i.e., those that promote/prevent the formation process); personal satisfaction (e.g., with current life circumstances); and professional contact (e.g., with mental health professionals).

To test her theoretical model, Cass created questions and statements that were of relevance to each dimension (cognitive, affective, and behavioral) of the 16 factors. The resulting questionnaire was administered to 166 homosexual subjects (103 male, 63 female). To score the questionnaire, Cass predicted how an individual at a particular stage of development might respond to each question or statement. For example, the statement, "I am fairly certain I am not a homosexual" would be considered to load on the commitment factor, in both cognitive and affective dimensions (i.e., the degree to which an individual accepts a homosexual self-image, as well as the feelings the individual has about accepting a homosexual self-image). Cass, in this example, predicted that an individual in Stage I of development would be the most likely to endorse such a statement. Predicted responses were made for all questions and statements; the predicted response
was then assumed to be the correct response for each stage of development, and was incorporated into a predicted profile for each stage.

Cass then formulated two hypotheses to test her model. Hypothesis I predicted, for each individual in a particular stage of development, that the individual’s response profile would show the most similarity with the predicted profile for that particular stage, when compared with other stage profiles. Each individual had been assigned to a particular stage based upon his or her endorsement of a one-paragraph, narrative description of how an individual might be ideally characterized for that particular stage. In addition, Hypothesis I predicted that there would be a corresponding decrease in similarity of profiles as a function of the “distance” from other profiles (e.g., the responses of an individual in Stage I would be most similar to the predicted profile for Stage I, less similar to the predicted profile for Stage II, and progressively dissimilar across the other stages to Stage VI, with which the individual’s responses would be least similar). Hypothesis II predicted, for each group in a particular stage of development, that each group’s responses would show the most similarity with the predicted profile for that stage, when compared with responses of groups in other stages, and would show progressively less similarity with the responses of groups at more “distant” stages of development.

Results of Cass’ testing indicated support for Hypothesis I for stages I, V, and VI. Hypothesis II was completely supported for all stages. Finally, to rule out bias in the construction of the questionnaire (as well as the keys used to score the questionnaire), a discriminant analysis was conducted to analyze the differences between the subject groups.
Results indicated that the six groups were distinguishable, with 97.0% of the cases correctly classified by the discriminant analysis, and were summarized as follows:

There is an overall trend for subjects . . . to acknowledge the hypothesized profile or ideal description of their particular stage (rather than profiles of other stages) as corresponding more closely to their current mode of functioning. There is also a tendency for subjects at a particular stage to show greater similarity with the hypothesized profile of that particular stage when compared with subjects at all other stages. (Cass, 1984, p. 162)

Years later, Cass refined her model slightly to include a type of pre-encounter stage (see Cross, 1971), which she called Prestage I. In Prestage I, the individual assumes that his identity is not gay and is heterosexual, or at least is supposed to be heterosexual. The individual perceives himself as belonging to the majority group of heterosexuals, or at least believes that he should belong to this group. The individual sees heterosexuality as the norm, as desirable and acceptable, while at the same time conceptualizing homosexuality as abnormal, stigmatizing, and having minority status.

In the course of revising her model, Cass also made two important additions to the concept of homosexual identity formation. First, she contends that, at the present time, all of what is known about sexual identity development is specific to Western cultures, perhaps also including cultures that have been strongly influenced by modern Western thinking. Cass makes this distinction in response to her sense that many mental health professionals, theorists, and researchers have taken an ethnocentric view of sexual identity development, and have assumed that what is currently known about homosexual identity
formation is generalizable to all people, without regard for their cultural background or social history. According to Cass, it is important to note that,

[M]uch of psychological functioning and human behavior is specific to the sociocultural environment in which people live, rather than the result of inner psychological mechanisms that can be found universally in all human beings. This understanding of identity formation calls for a shift in the thinking of mental health practitioners who have previously adopted the traditional psychological approach that a lesbian, gay, or bisexual identity is the result of inner developmental processes. Rather than a focus solely on inner psychological processes, it is the relationship between individual and environment, represented often in patterns of interaction between people, that now requires our attention.

(p. 229-230)

Cass also acknowledged that considerable differences may exist between individuals who fall into the same stage of identity development according to her model, and likens this to differences that may occur between men and women, or between different ethnic or religious groups (Cass, 1996).

The Gay Identity Questionnaire

Among the recommendations made by Cass (1979, 1984) for her model of identity development were calls for further testing and validation of the model. In 1994, Brady and Busse used the principles of Cass’ model to create the Gay Identity Questionnaire (GIQ). The GIQ is comprised of 45 true-or-false items that are used to classify an individual’s current stage of identity development based on Cass’ model. Forty-two of the questions
are used to assign the individual to a particular stage of development; three additional items are used as a validity measure to confirm that the individual does in fact have homosexual thoughts, feelings, and behaviors.

Brady and Busse (1994) worked extensively with Cass’ identity formation model in the course of creating the measure. They began with an outline of Cass’ model, which resulted in 100 items deemed as characteristic and descriptive of an individual at a particular stage of development. Next, these 100 items were submitted to a panel of four independent raters who had studied the elements of Cass’ model. Interrater reliability for the items was established by selecting only those items agreed upon by at least three of the four raters as being characteristic of a particular stage of development. Sixty-three items were then incorporated into a pilot measure to establish the reliability of items on the measure. Two pilot studies with different populations were conducted, resulting in a revised 45-item measure. Brady and Busse also incorporated a background questionnaire into their study. The background questionnaire contained demographic information to describe the test sample, as well as a composite measure of psychological well-being that the researchers used to help establish construct validity for the measure. Overall reliability of the composite measure of well-being was in the moderate to high range (Cronbach’s coefficient $\alpha = .78$)

Psychometric Properties of the GIQ. The final version of the GIQ was administered to 225 male subjects. All 225 subjects indicated that they had homosexual thoughts, feelings, and/or had engaged in homosexual behavior. Internal consistency reliability scores, according to the Kuder-Richardson formula, were as follows: Stage III,
\( \alpha = .76; \) Stage IV, \( \alpha = .71; \) Stage V, \( \alpha = .44; \) and Stage VI, \( \alpha = .78 \) (the authors were unable to obtain interitem consistency scores for Stages I and II, due to the insufficient number of subjects distributed into these two categories). In analyzing demographic data, the authors found a significant relationship \( (\chi^2 = 18.89, p < .01) \) between occupation and stage of identity formation, wherein subjects in Stage III were most likely to identify their occupation as “student” (54% of subjects), and subjects in Stage IV were most likely to identify their occupation as “professional” (69% of subjects). No other significant relationships were evident between stage of identity formation and other demographic variables, providing some support for the contention that the Cass’ model can predict stage of identity development independent of confounding demographic variables (e.g., locale, or religion).

The composite measure of psychological well-being included questions about individual subjects’ perceived happiness, loneliness, anxiety, kindness, sexual prowess, suicidal ideation, mental hygiene, and physical health. Analysis revealed a significant positive relationship between stage of identity development and the composite well-being score \( (F = 8.67, p < .001) \). In addition, a significant positive relationship was identified between stage of identity development and all but one of the individual well-being factors (kindness). Pairwise tests of comparison (Tukey’s HSD) of mean psychological well-being scores by stage of identity formation were significant for three comparisons: Stages IV, V, and VI were progressively (linearly) higher than Stage III (all \( p < .01 \)). No other pairwise comparisons were significant (Brady & Busse, 1994).
In general, use of the GIQ is supported as a brief measure of identifying stage of sexual identity development among gay men. While the GIQ appears to have good reliability, its validity in two specific respects is less clear. First, while every attempt was made to select a heterogeneous and representative sample of gay men (through recruitment of subjects in a diversity of settings), Brady and Busse acknowledged that they experienced some of the usual difficulties inherent in conducting research with gay men and lesbians, difficulties which are due primarily to fear of disclosure among members of this population (see Bell & Weinberg, 1978). Second, the inability of the authors to obtain interitem consistency scores for Stages I and II of the model highlights a notable problem with the GIQ, specifically its utility with individuals who are in these early stages of development. Both Cass (1979, 1984) and Brady and Busse (1994) acknowledged that individuals in these first two stages of development either genuinely do not see themselves as homosexual, or at least are still unwilling to embrace a homosexual identity. In addition, the authors noted that individuals at these early stages of development are in all likelihood reluctant to volunteer for research into sexual orientation and identity development, again due to the aforementioned fear of disclosure.

Despite these acknowledged shortcomings, the GIQ is currently the best available measure of identity development in gay men. Since the measure is being employed for use in an exploratory study of a potential new concept (heterosexual mistrust), its psychometric properties are deemed to be sufficient for its planned use. Cass (1979) theorized that a self-report measure of sexual orientation such as the Kinsey Scale (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948) would correlate highly with an individual's stage of
sexual identity development according to her model. Unfortunately, a test of this theory was not included as part of the GIQ validation study. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, both perceived sexual orientation and perceived sexual identity will be assessed.

**Dominant Culture Treatment of Homosexuals**

As with African-American Identity development, how individuals proceed through the stages of homosexual identity formation is strongly influenced by their perception of how they have been treated by heterosexuals. A good example with which to begin this examination is to compare two sociopolitical events that were of profound importance to both the African-American and homosexual communities. On October 16, 1995, the Million Man March was held in Washington, D.C. National Park Service estimates were that approximately 400,000 African-Americans and their supporters attended this event. On April 25, 1993, the March on Washington for Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Rights was held, also in Washington, D.C. National Park Service estimates were that approximately 400,000 gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and their supporters attended this event. Yet despite the historic significance of both marches, there was a substantial disparity in the amount of national and major regional newspaper coverage that each event received. The Million Man March, in the time period one week prior to and one week following the march, was the subject of 1,698 newspaper stories. Coverage of the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Rights March for the equivalent time period, on the other hand, was the subject of only 349 stories (a ratio of nearly five to one). Supporters of the latter march felt that the disparity in news coverage was due in large part to the perception by the press that the lesbian and gay community is less newsworthy. Supporters also lamented the fact that better
coverage of the march would have been an opportunity to provide a great deal of information to the American populace about the important contributions gays and lesbians make to American culture (Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation, 1995).

Even within the African-American community, there is a great deal of hostility directed toward those individuals in the gay rights movement who liken the oppression of homosexuals to that of African-Americans. According to Gates (1993), while most gays and lesbians are seen as worse off than African-Americans in terms of the hostile attitudes against them that are accepted by the dominant culture, gays and lesbians in general are perceived by most African-Americans as being privileged in comparison (in terms of higher incomes, higher educational achievement, and greater social mobility). For many African-Americans, who view their comparison with homosexuals as the distinction between status (i.e., being African-American) and behavior (i.e., being homosexual), there is no legitimate comparison. African-American gays and lesbians, meanwhile, commonly report the stigma of "double minority" (i.e., both racial and sexual orientation) status, where they experience discrimination in a racist gay community that parallels the dominant Anglo culture, as well as discrimination in a homophobic African-American community that parallels the dominant heterosexual culture (Klassen, Williams, & Levitt, 1989).

Negative attitudes about homosexuals are currently pervasive in most every segment of American culture, and encompass a broad spectrum of domains. Recent poll data (Gallup Organization, 1998, 1997) show that 59% of Americans believe that homosexual behavior is morally wrong; 52% feel that homosexuality should not be considered an acceptable alternative lifestyle. Only 44% of Americans believe that
homosexual behavior should be legal, compared to 47% who say it should not. Additional poll data (Leland & Miller, 1998) show that 56% of Americans believe homosexuals can change their sexual orientation through therapy, will power or religious conviction. In contrast, only 11% of homosexuals believe that their sexual orientation is something that they can change; 75% stated they believed their sexuality was something innate and not due to environmental influences.

With regard to discrimination, poll data (Peyser, 1998) show that only 33% of Americans believe that there is a lot of discrimination against gays and lesbians today, with only 29% saying the country needs to do more to protect the rights of gays. In contrast, 60% of gays and lesbians feel that there is a lot of discrimination against them today, with 83% saying the country needs to do more to protect their rights.

At present, a clear majority of Americans agree on the need for more protection of homosexuals in only one domain: employment. According to the Gallup Organization (1998), 84% of Americans agree that homosexuals should have equal rights in terms of job opportunities. Despite this consensus, the U.S. Congress in 1996 failed to pass the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA), federal legislation which would have given homosexuals a broad measure of protection against employment discrimination based on sexual orientation. At present, protection now only exists at the state and municipal level. But according to Riccucci and Gossett (1996),

Despite the fact that 15 states and at least 144 localities have enacted or issued statutes, ordinances, or executive orders protecting gay men and lesbians from employment discrimination in the public sector, [both] public and private sector
employers in most places can and do discriminate against gay men and lesbians in
the workplace with impunity. Not only can gay men and lesbians be refused
employment but, once hired, they also can face harassment, unequal treatment
(e.g., in terms of benefits and compensation), and dismissal if their ‘secret’ gets
out. (p.175)

Additional examples of discriminatory practices against homosexuals can be found
in legislation nationwide. In 1986, a conservative U.S. Supreme Court handed down its
Bowers vs. Hardwick decision, widely heralded as a major setback for gay and lesbian
rights. In voting to uphold Georgia’s sodomy statute, the Court stated that,
“... [t]he proposition that any kind of private sexual conduct between consenting adults is
constitutionally insulated from state proscription is unsupportable” (Hall, 1992, p. 80). At
present, 20 states still maintain statutes that prohibit sodomy, with six states (AR, KS,
MD, MO, OK, & TX) maintaining statutes that prohibit only same-sex sodomy. In 1996,
Congress, in response to a legal challenge to the constitutionality of a Hawaii state statute
defining marriage as occurring only between persons of the opposite sex, rose to the
occasion and passed the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA), enacting federal legislation
that defined marriage as occurring only between persons of the opposite sex. In addition,
29 states now have statutes, all enacted since 1995, that ban same-sex marriage (National

Further examples of discrimination against homosexuals may be found in crime
statistics. According to the most up-to-date hate crime statistics from the Federal Bureau
of Investigation (1996), approximately 12% of all bias-motivated criminal acts that were
reported in the United States were perpetrated against homosexuals. Of these crimes (most of which involve assault, destruction of property, vandalism, and intimidation), 75% were perpetrated against homosexual men. At present, while 41 states in the U.S. have statutes that prescribe penalties for bias-motivated crimes, only 22 of those states include crimes based on sexual orientation.

More insidious examples of negative attitudes about and discrimination toward homosexuals are relatively easy to document. A sampling: In a 1991 survey of member physicians of the American Medical Association, 35% acknowledged that they would feel "uncomfortable" or "very uncomfortable" in a group of homosexuals (Gemson et al.). In a 1997 study of 226 college students, Rey and Gibson reported that 95% of subjects acknowledged some form of discriminatory behavior against gays or lesbians, while 33% acknowledged committing a discriminatory act that was rated as "moderately harmful" or higher. In a study of the experiences of lesbians and gay men in chemical dependency treatment programs, MacEwan (1994) found that, among 100 inpatient subjects, many were given treatment plans that implied that they were heterosexual, about 50% felt compelled to hide their sexuality throughout the course of treatment, and a majority had their sexuality treated as their main pathology. In a study involving written requests for reservations at 160 hotels and 160 bed-and-breakfast inns nationwide, couples who implied they were homosexual in their request letter received significantly more responses refusing their request (p < .005) than did couples who implied they were heterosexual (Jones, 1996). In a field study of sales clerks' attitudes toward gay, lesbian, and heterosexual couples who entered 20 different retail stores while holding hands, the
A heterosexual couple was assisted in significantly less time ($p < .001$) than were the gay or lesbian couples (Walters & Curran, 1996).

Clearly, there is a significant amount of discrimination that is perpetrated against homosexuals. The history of discrimination against African-Americans has been clearly documented as well. How might these experiences influence identity development among members of these two groups? And how might these common experiences of pervasive discrimination influence each of these groups’ world view as it relates to the dominant culture? Next, the commonalities and differences involved in the development of identity for members of these two groups will be examined.

**African-American and Homosexual Identity Formation Compared**

Cass' (1979, 1984) Theoretical Model of Homosexual Identity Formation and Cross' (1971, 1978) Five-Stage Cognitive Model of Nigrescence share many common characteristics. Both models theorize that identity formation occurs in stages. Both rely upon the assumptions that identity acquisition is developmental in nature, and that interactions between the individual and his or her environment are what affect developmental change. Both models suggest that the acquisition of identity involves replacing a previously held image of the self with a new image. This highlights one of the most significant and important similarities between the two models, in that the identities of these two groups tend to be devalued by the dominant culture. For homosexuals, a previously held affiliation with heterosexuals begins to be replaced with an affiliation with other homosexuals, despite the fact that the dominant heterosexual culture, in general, devalues homosexuality. For African-Americans, a previously held affiliation with Anglos
begins to be replaced with an affiliation with other African-Americans, despite the fact that
the dominant Anglo culture, in general, devalues African-American ethnicity. It is the drive
to reduce the cognitive dissonance described earlier in each of these models that promotes
affiliation with other members of the same minority group, even in the face of resistance
and hostility from the dominant culture.

In the first stage of both models, the individual is still identifying with the dominant
culture, and this results in significant levels of dissonance, as the individual is faced with
the inconsistency inherent in identifying with a culture that has beliefs and values that do
not match his or her own (e.g., heterosexism, racism). Stage II of each model involves
feelings of isolation and anguish, and is characterized by the individual beginning an
expansive and determined search for his or her identity. Cross' Stage III (Immersion-
Emersion) is most similar to Cass' Stage V (Identity Pride). Behavior at each of these
stages is characterized by the individual clearly identifying with his or her own minority
group, by a devaluation of the dominant culture, and by a strong sense of pride in the
affiliation with the individual's group. Cross' Stage IV (Internalization) is most similar to
Cass' Stage VI (Identity Synthesis). Behaviors in these stages are characterized by a
decreased intensity of the feelings characteristic of the preceding stage. Incorporation of
multiple elements of self-identity begins to take place as well, as the individual begins to
identify himself in more than one dimension.

At some point along the continuum of identity development (e.g., Cross' Stage III,
Cass' Stage IV), the individual may begin to adopt a "centric" worldview that, while not
completely invalidating other cultures, certainly devalues them to a point of less
significance than that of the culture of affiliation. Other available strategies that are
addressed by both models include a bicultural approach, where individuals may attempt to
interact with both the dominant and minority culture, and marginalization, wherein the
individual feels affiliation with neither the dominant culture nor with the minority group.

Three significant differences exist between the two models. First, Cass’ model
states that the time frame in which one progresses through the stages of development will
be highly variable from individual to individual. Cross agrees on this point. However, Cass
also states that an individual’s age will influence how quickly he or she progresses through
the stages. A basic premise of homosexual identity formation is that this process may
begin at any point during the life span. While many homosexual men and women report an
awareness of their same-gender sexual attraction late in childhood or in very early
adolescence, many other homosexuals do not report, or at least do not acknowledge, until
varying points in adulthood that homosexuality may be relevant to them, which is the first
step in the acquisition of a homosexual identity. The age at which an individual may begin
to consider his or her homosexuality is highly variable, and is due in large part to the
continuing evolution in American culture of attitudes and beliefs about homosexuals. In
contrast to homosexual identity formation, African-Americans tend to begin the identity
formation process very early in the life span, often in the early verbal stages of
development. This difference is due almost entirely to one factor: physical appearance.
Homosexual thoughts, feelings, and behaviors can be hidden, whereas distinctive skin
coloration cannot. So for almost all African-Americans, the identity formation process
typically begins early in life, when it is brought to their attention that they appear to be
different from members of the dominant Anglo culture. It is of importance to note here that this does not suggest or imply that African-American identity formation is any easier or less tumultuous than homosexual identity formation, only that it typically begins at a much earlier age.

The second difference between the two models relates somewhat to the previous issue. Typically, homosexuals in the course of identity formation experience a period during which they maintain separate elements to their identity. In doing so, they have one public (usually heterosexual) identity and one private (usually homosexual) identity. These public and private elements typically become more congruent as the individual progresses through the stages of development. African-Americans, on the other hand, are almost always unable to maintain separate identities as both African-American and Anglo, again due to the issue of distinctive skin tone.

The third difference between the two models is in the levels of congruency believed to be attainable once the identity formation process has been completed. According to Cross, complete congruence of affect, behavior, and cognition is the ultimate goal of identity development for African-Americans, and is believed to be attainable. On the other hand, according to Cass, complete affective, behavioral, and cognitive congruence for homosexuals is much more difficult to attain. This is due principally to the fact that homosexuals are socialized into a culture that is dominated by heterosexual values and beliefs, and that is still generally anti-homosexual in its outlook. It is important to note here that this in no way suggests that American culture is not also dominated by Anglo values and beliefs and is not somewhat anti-African-American in its outlook.
However, it is important to acknowledge that anti-African-American practices, while they may still be perpetrated in the United States, are almost universally condemned, and can carry with them serious legal and social consequences. Anti-homosexual practices, on the other hand, are clearly not universally condemned. In fact, they are often both socially and institutionally supported, and typically carry few legal sanctions outside the relatively small number of government agencies and municipalities that have legislated protection for homosexuals (Cass, 1979; Cross, 1971, 1978; Dana, 1993; Riccucci and Gossett, 1996).

**Minority Mistrust of the Dominant Culture**

In examining dominant culture treatment of African-Americans, it is not unreasonable to assume that many, if not most, African-Americans view the dominant culture as generally Anglocentric and anti-African-American in its behaviors and beliefs. How this treatment affects African-Americans' world view, in particular group beliefs, is examined next, followed by a discussion of research into how this treatment has affected African-Americans' interactions with and beliefs about the dominant culture. Finally, the minority mistrust issue is explored from the perspective of homosexuals, and how members of this minority group may view and interact with the dominant culture.

**Cultural Mistrust**

Kardiner and Ovesey (1951) first identified this psychosocial phenomenon, and defined the concept of cultural mistrust as the extent to which African-Americans mistrust the dominant White culture. They saw the concept of cultural mistrust as maladaptive, and believed that a lack of trust was inherent to unhealthy personality adjustment. Terrell and Terrell (1981) summarized nearly fifteen years' worth of research about the concept of
cultural mistrust, and found a great deal of disagreement and considerable controversy over whether or not cultural mistrust was indicative of personality pathology. In contrast to how the concept was originally defined, subsequent theorists (Grier and Gibbs, as cited in Terrell and Terrell, 1981) believed cultural mistrust to be healthy, adaptive, and ultimately essential for members of an oppressed minority such as African-Americans.

Kardiner and Ovesey’s (1951) concept of cultural mistrust identifies a tendency toward suspiciousness of White persons that manifests itself in four distinct domains:

1) educational and training settings, where African-Americans tend to feel mistrustful of a system they see as dominated and controlled by Whites.

2) political and legal systems, where African-Americans feel alienated by a lack of proper political representation, as well as mistrustful of a legal system that is frequently perceived as more concerned with controlling African-Americans than with protecting and serving them.

3) work and business environments, which Whites tend to dominate and control, and where African-Americans experience disproportionately high levels of both unemployment and under-employment, and have a significant number of low-wage jobs.

4) interpersonal and social contexts, clearly manifested in racially segregated neighborhoods (where large numbers of African-Americans indicate a clear preference for living in neighborhoods populated by other African-Americans rather than Whites), as well as the overall preference for African-Americans (as well as Whites) to interact socially with members of their own race.
Terrell and Terrell (1981) noted in conclusion that while in certain circumstances, cultural mistrust could assist the minority individual in interacting with his or her environment, and could even help the individual defend against oppression, in other circumstances cultural mistrust could be counter-productive and could even be oppressive in and of itself. In their summation of the work of other theorists on this concept, Terrell and Terrell noted that while many theorists relied upon the concept of cultural mistrust to explain the behavior of African-Americans in various situations, few empirical studies of the concept had been undertaken. In addition, it was noted that there existed a complete lack of any technique for assessing the frequency or intensity with which African-Americans felt mistrustful of the dominant Anglo culture.

The Cultural Mistrust Inventory

In response to this lack of a technique for assessing cultural mistrust, Terrell and Terrell (1981) undertook a project to develop an instrument that could measure this tendency for African-Americans to feel mistrustful of both Whites and White-controlled organizations. The original Cultural Mistrust Inventory (CMI) resulted from this effort. Items comprising the original CMI were 81 statements indicative of the suspiciousness commonly evident in the four distinct domains mentioned earlier. The original measure was administered to 172 African-American males. Revisions to the CMI involved eliminating items deemed to be repetitive, to have insufficient discriminant validity between the different domains of mistrust, and items deemed to be influenced by social desirability.
The revised measure (CMI-R) contained 48 statements regarding the extent to which African-American individuals trust Whites in a variety of situations. Responses were rated on a 7-point, Likert-type scale, which ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Each of the 48 statements loads on one of four subscales: Education and Training; Interpersonal Relations; Business and Work; and Politics and Law. Based on a median split, scores on the CMI-R were divided into “high mistrust” (above the median) and “low mistrust” (below the median). High scores on the CMI-R were believed to be indicative of higher levels of mistrust. A two week test-retest reliability estimate of .86 was obtained for the measure. In addition, correlations from .34 to .47 were reported between items on the CMI-R and the total mistrust score; subscale intercorrelations ranged from .11 to .23.

Convergent, external, and further discriminant validity of the CMI-R was borne out by a series of subsequent studies. Terrell and Terrell (1984) investigated why African-American psychotherapy clients were more likely to terminate therapy prematurely (i.e., after one session) when assigned to a white therapist, and theorized that this was due in large part to the fact that African-American clients did not trust white therapists. To test this theory, Terrell and Terrell administered the CMI-R to 143 African-American clients who presented for treatment at a community mental health center. Clients were randomly assigned to either an African-American or a white therapist. Among clients seen by an African-American therapist, 25% did not return for a second session. Among those seen by a white therapist, 43% did not return. Regression analysis revealed significant main effects on premature termination rates for both counselor ethnicity and trust level.
(p < .01), as well as a significant interaction effect for these two factors (p < .01). This indicated that trust level (as measured by the CMI-R) reliably predicted premature termination based on counselor ethnicity (i.e., African-American clients with high levels of mistrust had a significantly higher rate of premature termination from therapy when assigned to a white counselor than when assigned to an African-American counselor).

Watkins and Terrell (1988) theorized that African-Americans who were mistrustful of whites might also have lowered expectations about psychotherapy. In this study, 189 African-American subjects were administered the CMI-R, as well as a questionnaire that measured subjects' expectations about counseling. Multivariate analysis of these data revealed a significant main effect for subject mistrust level (p < .025), as well as a significant interaction effect for subject mistrust level with counselor race. This indicated that trust level (as measured by the CMI-R) significantly affected expectations about psychotherapy (i.e., African-American clients with high levels of mistrust had significantly lower expectation about psychotherapy when assigned to a white therapist than when assigned to an African-American therapist).

Watkins, Terrell, Miller, and Terrell (1989) tested more specific perceptions among African-American college students about counselors' personal attributes. Results from this study found a significant main effect (p < .05) for subject mistrust level, as well as a significant interaction effect (p < .01) for subject mistrust level and counselor race. African-Americans who were highly mistrustful (according to the CMI-R) tended to view white counselors as less credible than African-American counselors, and expected white counselors to be less able to help them with problems.
Nickerson, Helms, and Terrell (1994) used the CMI-R, combined with a measure of attitudes about mental illness, as well as a measure of satisfaction with social services, to assess the attitudes of African-American college students about seeking out counseling services at clinics staffed primarily by white counselors. Results indicated that highly mistrustful African-Americans (as indicated by the CMI-R) had significantly more negative attitudes (p < .01) about seeking psychological help at a clinic staffed primarily by whites, as well as expectations that services provided by white counselors would be significantly less relevant, less impactful, and less gratifying (all three factors p < .0001) than services provided by an African-American counselor. Based upon the data obtained from these studies, it is reasonable to assume that the CMI-R has significant merit as both a reliable and valid measure of the extent to which African-Americans’ mistrust of the dominant white culture is reflected in cross-cultural therapy dyads.

Potential for Heterosexual Mistrust

Recall the previous discussion of the various types of discrimination that are perpetrated against gays and lesbians. Based upon this information, it is by no means unreasonable to assume that gays and lesbians may have a pervasive sense of being mistreated by the dominant heterosexual culture. Cultural mistrust is said to develop among African-Americans, and to strongly influence their world view, as a result of mistreatment by the dominant Anglo culture. Does it follow, therefore, that a similar construct, that of heterosexual mistrust, may exist among gays and lesbians?

Three of the four content areas of cultural mistrust are believed to also have sufficient domain relevance for the concept of heterosexual mistrust. With regard to
political and legal systems, it is reasonable to assume that, like African-Americans, gays and lesbians may feel alienated by a lack of political representation, and might be particularly mistrustful of a legal system that may be, quite legitimately, perceived as far more concerned with controlling than with protecting gays and lesbians. With regard to work and business settings, it is reasonable to assume that gays and lesbians may be mistrustful of environments in which they have few if any basic employment rights or recourse against discrimination. In interpersonal and social contexts, where gays and lesbians often acknowledge a wish to keep their sexual orientation hidden, it is reasonable to assume that this may stem from a pervasive sense of mistrust when interacting with heterosexuals. Finally, heterosexual mistrust, like cultural mistrust, may prove to be adaptive in helping gays and lesbians to successfully interact with their environments. As such, there may be other content areas of potential heterosexual mistrust that have yet to be identified.

To summarize earlier questions: To what extent may homosexuals feel that they are mistreated by the dominant heterosexual culture? Might mistreatment by the dominant culture influence the world view of homosexuals, as it has been shown to do with African-Americans? Might this world view include constructs of suspiciousness and mistrust, as is the case with many African-Americans? The definition and measurement of these constructs will be the primary focus of this study.

Purpose of Study

This study is exploratory in nature, and investigated whether the construct of heterosexual mistrust existed in a measurable degree among gay males. In addition, the
study investigated whether and to what extent an individual's stage of homosexual identity formation was related to this construct. Based upon what this researcher believed to be a thorough and comprehensive literature search, there appears to be no published research on whether stage of homosexual identity formation is related to mistrust of heterosexuals.

**Methodological Challenges**

Two issues of relevance to this study must be addressed in some detail at this point. First, research with hidden and/or stigmatized populations often requires sampling techniques that are unique in nature to access sufficient numbers of individuals who comprise the population of interest. Such techniques may subsequently introduce questions about both bias in the data obtained and generalizability of the test results. Second, modification of an existing measure for the purposes of assessing the population of interest raises additional issues about the validity of both the new measure and its findings. These concerns are now discussed in greater detail.

**Issues With Unique Sampling Techniques**

Historically, conducting research with homosexuals has proven to be quite challenging. Difficulties in obtaining research subjects from this population are almost always due to fear of disclosure, or the unwillingness of individuals to acknowledge (despite behavioral evidence to the contrary) a homosexual orientation (Bell & Weinberg, 1978; Brady & Busse, 1994; Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948). Because the subject pool in this study was comprised, in part, of gay males, it was necessary to employ unique sampling techniques.
The primary technique used to reach subjects to participate in this study was a chain referral sampling technique known as snowball sampling. Snowball sampling has traditionally been employed when the focus of research has been an issue that is sensitive in nature. Research on such sensitive issues typically has to rely on the assistance of individuals who possess (or know of others who possess) the unique characteristic that is being researched. A snowball sample is initiated when individuals are asked to identify other individuals with whom they share a common trait. This next group of individuals is asked to identify a third group of individuals, and so on. Snowball sampling has been used most frequently in studies that necessitate in-person interviews as part of the data collection procedure (Erickson, 1979). For this study, individuals who either possess or knew of those who possess the characteristic being studied (i.e., a homosexual identity at any stage of the formation process) were asked to pass on a set of questionnaires to other individuals who possess this characteristic. It was anticipated that this technique would help to provide as large and diverse a sample as possible, given the aforementioned difficulties with obtaining subjects from this population.

Some problems are inherent in the use of snowball sampling. Ideally, the snowball technique would produce a random sample of subjects, about whom inferences could be made and easily generalized to the larger population. Unfortunately, bias may be introduced into the sample, simply by virtue of the characteristics of those individuals who are asked to distribute the questionnaires initially. For example, homosexuals who are further along in the identity development process are most likely to associate with other homosexuals who are at a similar stage of development (Cass, 1981; Brady & Busse,
1994), and as such may pass questionnaires along only to others at a similar stage, potentially missing individuals in earlier stages of development.

This issue points out a larger problem that this study encountered with sampling all elements of the target population. In terms of social visibility, homosexuals range from extremely visible (e.g., Cass' Stage V or VI) to not at all visible (e.g., Cass' Stage I or II). Locating homosexual subjects who were in the early stages of sexual identity development was expected to prove problematic. Ideally, to obtain a sample that includes a sufficient number of individuals in the earlier stages of identity development, the research design would involve sampling all individuals who comprise the population. Then, the sample would be screened to ensure that sufficient and equal numbers of subjects represented the first two stages of development. Finally, remaining subjects who represented each subsequent stage would be randomly selected in equal numbers to be part of the sample for each remaining stage, since there would likely be a disproportionately large sample that represented each of these latter stages (Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981). Obviously, such an approach was unfeasible for this study, due to both time constraints and cost prohibitions.

One way to solve the potential problem with underrepresentation of the earlier stages of development is to place special emphasis on the recruitment of subjects in these earlier stages. Since snowball sampling necessitates that individuals who comprise the initial sample identify another group of individuals who possess the same characteristic being studied, this first group of individuals may be thought of as locators, similar to informants in field studies. According to Biernacki & Waldorf (1981, pp. 152-153), the use of locators, "... assumes that knowledge is differentially distributed and that certain
persons, as a result of their past or present situations, have greater accessibility and knowledge about a specific area of life than do others. These persons can more easily develop referral chains because they may already be aware of potential respondents or may be more likely to have others reveal their potential to them. When the snowball sampling method is used and study respondents are enlisted to help find other potential respondents, they become de facto research assistants.”

The above-referenced concepts, that knowledge is differentially distributed and that certain individuals will know more about a specific area of life (and hence the individuals in that specific area), can be used to compensate for the possible underrepresentation of individuals in the earlier stages of development. Individuals who comprised the initial sample in this study (i.e., those who became de facto research assistants) were encouraged to pass on questionnaires to individuals whom they knew or believed to be in early stages of development. De facto assistants needed to understand the inclusion criteria to be helpful in such an effort (Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981), and as such were given a brief explanation that special effort should be made to pass on questionnaires to individuals who were in the early stages of development.

Another potential problem with bias in snowball sampling is that this technique tends to be biased toward more cooperative subjects (Erickson, 1979). To help counter the biases inherent in chain sampling, Heckathorn (1997) developed a method for accessing difficult to reach populations known as respondent-driven sampling. In respondent-driven sampling, subjects are rewarded on two levels: for participating in research themselves; and for recruiting their peers to participate in the same research. This
type of sampling is believed to compensate for the potential limited-inference problem with the initial sample by creating a robust chain referral system of de facto researchers who, motivated by the desire for reward, will help to create a referral system that is independent of the initial sample. The bias toward more cooperative subjects, influenced by the same desire for reward, is believed to be compensated for by the idea that uncooperative subjects will yield to appeals from peers (who will be de facto researchers), as well as being influenced by their own desire for reward. The nature of the rewards offered for this study are discussed in the Methods section.

It was hoped that these unique sampling techniques helped to compensate for the potential difficulties involved in identifying individuals in the earlier stages of development. However, it must be reiterated, once again, that individuals in the early stages of identity development (i.e., Cass’ Stage I and II) do not yet identify with the homosexual community (Cass, 1981), and as such the construct of heterosexual mistrust may not be relevant or applicable for them, even if sufficient numbers of subjects for these early stages are able to be identified.

Issues With Modifying An Existing Measure

For the purposes of this study, Terrell and Terrell’s (1981) Cultural Mistrust Inventory-Revised (CMI-R) was used as the basis for developing a new measure. Modifications to the CMI-R were made in an attempt to measure the construct of heterosexual mistrust. The new measure was called the “Heterosexual Mistrust Inventory” (HMI). Modifications to the CMI-R involved changing the inventory from a focus on perceptions by African-Americans about their relationships and interactions with Anglos
to perceptions by homosexuals about their relationships and interactions with heterosexuals. From the CMI-R, the words “white,” “black,” and “race/ethnicity” were changed to “heterosexual,” “homosexual,” and “sexual orientation,” respectively.

Modification of the CMI-R raises a multitude of concerns about the new scale’s validity. Chief among these is the question of content validity. Being a new construct that has no previous research to draw upon, the content domain of heterosexual mistrust has not been clearly defined. While the items on the HMI have been reviewed for domain relevance and appropriateness, it must be acknowledged that some unidentified items that were not included in the CMI-R may in fact have domain relevance for heterosexual mistrust (e.g., experiences with healthcare providers). A comprehensive investigation of all potential domains of heterosexual mistrust is beyond the scope of this study. However, preliminary validation analysis of the HMI was essential and was conducted. Details of this procedure are discussed in the Method section.

Other concerns about the HMI were also considered. Would the new scale actually measure the construct of heterosexual mistrust? Or is it possible that it would simply identify mistrust in general among homosexuals, independent of any target population onto which mistrust is projected? Would all the items on the modified inventory accurately measure heterosexual mistrust, or would this be affected by some other construct (e.g., general, pervasive mistrust)? To help address the issues of convergent and discriminant validity, an independent criterion for generalized mistrust was used, and was compared to the more specific mistrust that the HMI was assumed to measure. This is discussed in more detail in the Method section.
It was anticipated that the HMI would have criterion-related validity. The similarities between the different types of mistreatment imposed upon African-Americans and upon homosexuals have been thoroughly discussed in the introduction to this study. Recall that mistreatment by the dominant Anglo culture is the precipitant for the development of cultural mistrust among African-Americans. It was assumed here that the perception of mistreatment by the dominant heterosexual culture was a sufficient condition for the development of heterosexual mistrust among homosexuals. To address this issue, the HMI was administered to self-identified heterosexual males, who were assumed not to display heterosexual mistrust. Such procedures (for establishing a criterion when conducting research with new measures) have been successfully employed in the past. For example, when conducting their validation study for the African American Acculturation Scale (AAAS), Landrine and Klonoff (1994) administered the scale to both African-American and Caucasian subjects, and found significant group differences by race, where Caucasian subjects showed very low levels of acculturation to traditional African-American values and beliefs (in contrast to very high levels of traditional acculturation among many African-American subjects), while demonstrating very high levels of acculturation to values and beliefs of White society. Using the same type of logic with this study, it was anticipated that self-identified heterosexual males would demonstrate very low levels of heterosexual mistrust. Theoretically, it is assumed that an individual who self-identifies as heterosexual will not have experienced dominant culture mistreatment based on being heterosexual. Thus, such individuals theoretically will be assumed to acknowledge very low levels of heterosexual mistrust. By demonstrating that heterosexual
males acknowledge very low levels of heterosexual mistrust, the scores on the HMI for this group of heterosexual males were used to help establish criterion-related validity for the HMI for homosexual males, who were be assumed to demonstrate heterosexual mistrust to varying degrees.

Hypotheses and Research Questions

Based upon data in the research literature, support for the following hypotheses was anticipated. The new construct of heterosexual mistrust was assumed to exist in a measurable degree among gay males, wherein they would acknowledge feeling mistrustful of heterosexuals to varying degrees. It was anticipated that there would be a significant relationship between stage of identity development and level of heterosexual mistrust, such that:

Hypothesis I. Individuals in Stage V of identity development will have the highest mean mistrust scores, followed by individuals in Stage VI, Stage IV, Stage III, Stage II, and Stage I.

Hypothesis II. There would be a significant positive relationship between stage of identity development and score on the measure of self-esteem, wherein a higher stage of development will predict a higher level of self-esteem.

Hypothesis III. There would be a significant positive relationship between stage of identity development and actual sexual orientation, wherein a higher stage of development would predict an actual sexual orientation indicative of increasingly more exclusive homosexual sexual behavior.
Research Questions

The following research questions were also addressed:

Research Question I. Would there be a significant difference between individuals’ actual and preferred sexual orientation?

Research Question II. Would there be a significant relationship between stage of identity development and preferred sexual orientation?

Research Question III. Would the difference between individuals’ actual and preferred sexual orientation be significantly correlated with their stage of identity development?

Research Question IV. Would there be a significant relationship between demographic characteristics of participants (e.g., income, education level, job field) and stage of identity development?
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METHOD

Participants

Data for the gay male sample were collected from 128 volunteer subjects who acknowledged being in a current stage of homosexual identity formation. Subjects in this sample were recruited both by direct, personal appeal from the researcher, as well as by appeals from de facto research assistants. Informed consent was documented with a cover letter (see Appendix A), which participants kept.

To establish criterion-related validity for the construct of heterosexual mistrust, three of the measures described below were administered to 125 volunteer males from an undergraduate psychology course who self-identified as heterosexual. Participants in the heterosexual sample received extra credit for their psychology course. Informed consent was documented with the same cover letter referenced above, which participants kept.

A total of 405 questionnaires was distributed for the gay male sample. Of this number, 133 were returned by mail. Five questionnaires were unusable due to lack of completion, for a total of 128 usable questionnaires. This was a usable response rate of 31.6%. Seventy-five percent of the gay sample (n = 97) resided in Texas. An additional 8% of gay subjects resided in Maryland, with 2% each from California and Kansas, and 1% each from Arkansas, Ohio, and Oklahoma. Eleven percent of subjects (n = 15) did not
indicate their current state of residence. Mean age of the gay sample was 31.1 years (SD = 10.1), with a range from 16 to 55 years. Additional demographic data for the sample are presented in Table 1.

Demographic data for the sample of heterosexual males were as follows: mean age of the sample (n = 125) was 20.7 years (SD = 3.1), with a range from 18 to 37 years; 6% of the sample (n = 7) was Asian/Pacific Islander, 10% (n = 12) was Black, 7% (n = 9) was Hispanic, 74% (n = 93) was White, and 3% (n = 4) indicated they were biracial or multiracial.

Measures

Demographic Questionnaire. A demographic questionnaire was administered to the gay sample. This questionnaire was designed to elicit general information about participants (e.g., age, race, income, religion, etc.), as well as more specific information about behaviors and experiences unique to the gay subculture (see Appendix A).

Kinsey Scales. To assess participants' self-reported sexual orientation, two versions of the Kinsey Scale (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948) were administered to both samples. Recall the aforementioned difficulties with measuring cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions of homosexuality that were discussed earlier in the introduction to this study. Cass (1979) theorized that an individual's self-reported sexual orientation would correlate highly with stage of identity development, implying that as an individual progressed further along in homosexual identity formation, he or she would move further toward the "exclusively homosexual" category according to Kinsey's categorization scheme. Both Cass (1979, 1984) and Chung and Katayama (1996) noted that past sexual
behavior and future preferred sexual behavior may differ considerably, particularly as individuals progress further along in the identity formation process. To avoid the oversimplification of categorizing homosexual participants that Chung and Katayama (1996) lamented in their content analysis of 144 empirical studies on gay and lesbian issues, the Kinsey measure was used to assess both past behavior and future preference in regard to sexual orientation.

In the original Kinsey study (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948), subjects were assigned to one of seven stages according to the Kinsey Scale. This assignment was made by a professional sex researcher, and was based on information obtained from a narrative description of the individual's past sexual behavior that was given to the researcher. For the purposes of this study, the Kinsey Scale was modified into a self-report measure, with the narrative descriptions that characterize each category transcribed into written form.

The Kinsey Scale of Actual Sexual Orientation is a paper-and-pencil task that identifies an individual’s past sexual behavior. Participants read 7 brief narrative descriptions of sexual behavior and then indicated which number identified the category that most closely described and corresponded with their past behavior (See Appendix A). The Kinsey Scale of Preferred Sexual Orientation is a paper-and-pencil task that identifies an individual’s preferred future sexual behavior. Participants read 7 brief narrative descriptions of sexual behavior and indicated which number identified the category that most closely described and corresponded with their preferred future sexual behavior (see Appendix A).
Gay Identity Questionnaire. To assess gay male participants' stage of homosexual identity formation, the Gay Identity Questionnaire (GIQ; Brady & Busse, 1994) was administered. The GIQ is a paper-and-pencil task that contains 45 true-or-false statements about homosexual identity formation. Participants scored one point for each item endorsed as “true” and zero points for each item endorsed as “false.” Each point in turn loaded on one of the six stages of identity formation. The stage in which the individual endorsed the greatest number of “true” items corresponded with the individual's current stage of identity formation. Thus, each subject was classified into one of six stages of identity formation (see Appendix A). Utilizing the Kuder-Richardson formula, internal consistency reliability scores for the GIQ with the gay male population were as follows. For Stage III, $\alpha = .65$. For Stage IV, $\alpha = .77$. For Stage V, $\alpha = .63$. And for Stage VI, $\alpha = .69$. No reliability scores were obtained for Stages I and II because no subjects were classified into either of these stages.

Heterosexual Mistrust Inventory. To assess level of mistrust of heterosexuals among participants in both samples, the Heterosexual Mistrust Inventory (HMI) was administered. The HMI is a modification of Terrell and Terrell's (1981) Cultural Mistrust Inventory-Revised (CMI-R). The CMI-R was designed to measure the level of mistrust that African-Americans have for Whites, and has a test-retest reliability estimate of .86. Correlations from .34 to .47 were reported between items on the CMI-R and the total mistrust score, with subscale intercorrelations ranging from .11 to .23 being reported as well.
The CMI-R was modified into the HMI by changing questions about relationships between African-Americans and Whites to questions about relationships between homosexuals and heterosexuals. All items on the modified measure were reviewed for domain relevance and appropriateness. This review resulted in two further modifications. First, all items on the “Education and Training” subscale were eliminated. Cross-cultural translation was poor for the items that comprised this subscale; the items were also deemed not to have construct equivalence in their modified form. Second, three additional items were eliminated on the grounds of either poor cross-cultural translation or irrelevance and inappropriateness to the domain of heterosexual mistrust. The three additional modified items that were eliminated were as follows: “Of all sexual orientations, heterosexuals are really the Indian-givers;” “Since heterosexuals can’t be trusted in business, the old saying ‘one in the hand is worth two in the bush’ is a good policy to follow;” and, “A promise from a heterosexual is about as good as a three dollar bill.”

The HMI is a paper-and-pencil task that contains 38 statements about the extent to which homosexuals mistrust heterosexuals. Responses were rated on a 7-point, bipolar, Likert-type scale, ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” The scoring direction for 19 of the 38 items was reversed in an attempt to eliminate response set distortion, such as yea-saying. Each of the 38 statements loads on one of three subscales: Interpersonal Relations; Business and Work; and Politics and Law. Scores are then obtained for each of the three subscales, as well as an overall mistrust score. Higher scores on the HMI are indicative of greater levels of mistrust of heterosexuals (see
Appendix A). Psychometric properties and validational information for the HMI are reported post hoc in the Results section.

**Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale.** To obtain a measure of self-esteem, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE, Rosenberg, as cited in Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991) was administered. The RSE was designed to be a global measure of self-worth or self-acceptance. Cronbach’s α scores ranging from .77 to .88 have been obtained for the RSE; one to two week test-retest reliability scores ranging from .82 to .85 have been reported as well. The RSE is a paper-and-pencil task that contains 10 statements about how individuals feel about themselves. Responses are rated on a 4-point, bipolar, Likert-type scale, ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” The scoring direction for 5 of the 10 items has been reversed in an attempt to eliminate response set distortion, such as yea-saying. Higher scores on the RSE are indicative of higher levels of self-worth and self-acceptance (see Appendix A).

**Interpersonal Trust Scale.** To obtain a general measure of mistrust, the Interpersonal Trust Scale (ITS; Rotter, as cited in Wrightsman, 1991) was administered. The ITS was designed to be a broad measure of trust in a variety of interpersonal situations. Internal consistency reliability of the ITS has been reported at .76; test-retest reliabilities of .68 and .56 have been reported at 3-month and 7-month intervals, respectively. The ITS is a paper-and-pencil task that contains 25 statements about how trusting an individual would feel in different situations. Responses are rated on a 5-point, bipolar, Likert-type scale, ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” The scoring direction for 13 of the 25 items has been reversed in an attempt to eliminate
response set distortion, such as yea-saying. Lower scores on the ITS indicate greater levels of interpersonal mistrust (see Appendix A).

Procedure

Participants were recruited from among the following resources:

1) APA Division 44 mail list, the e-mail list server for the APA’s Society for the Psychological Study of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Issues.

2) LGBPpsych mail list, the e-mail list server for gay, lesbian, and bisexual graduate students in psychology.

3) COURAGE, the gay, lesbian, and bisexual student support group at the University of North Texas.

4) other college-affiliated gay and lesbian student support groups that had Internet web sites.

5) Out Youth Dallas, a social support group for gay and lesbian youth in the Dallas, TX, area.

6) 10% Youth, an education and information group for gay and lesbian youth in the Dallas, TX, area.

A respondent-driven sampling system (Heckathorn, 1997) was employed with the gay male sample to maximize subject participation. Rewards were made available as incentives for participation in this research. Gay male participants were informed that a drawing for a cash reward (one $50 reward and six $25 rewards) was available to those participants willing to provide their name and mailing address. De facto research assistants, who received a direct, personal appeal from the researcher, were informed that
a $150 and a $75 cash reward would be given to the individual who recruited the most additional and next-most additional participants. All questionnaire packets given to de facto assistants were assigned a unique code number which identified that assistant. The $150 and $75 rewards were given to the assistants who had the highest and next-highest number of packets returned by January 30th, 1999, which contained his or her unique code number.

In the cover letter, participants were told that the purpose of the study was to assess how sexual orientation affects cultural belief systems. The questionnaire packets distributed to the heterosexual sample were comprised of the cover letter, HMI, and two Kinsey measures. The questionnaire packets distributed to the gay male sample were comprised of the cover letter and all the measures described above. Participants marked their answers to each questionnaire directly on the questionnaire form. Participants from the gay sample who wished to enter the drawing for the cash reward were provided with a separate form on which to write their name and address so that they could be contacted if they were selected in the reward lottery. Packets for the gay sample were distributed with two pre-addressed, postage paid envelopes attached, with instructions for the questionnaires and the reward request form to be returned to the researcher in separate envelopes.
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RESULTS

Descriptive statistics were calculated for all variables measured. Correlation matrices, t-tests, analyses of variance (ANOVA), and Chi-square contingency tables were used to identify and analyze relationships among variables. Because the distribution of the data in a few categories was markedly skewed, some categories were combined to eliminate the effects of outliers. These data transformations are clearly noted where they have been utilized. All analyses that follow use the transformed scores.

Descriptive Statistics

Primary demographic data for the homosexual male sample are presented in Table 1. Additional descriptive data are as follows. Thirteen percent of the subjects (n = 17) reported having "come out" as homosexual to their fathers before age 18, 46% (n = 59) had come out some time after age 18, and 32% (n = 41) had not come out at all to their fathers. Thirteen percent of the subjects (n = 17) reported having come out to their mothers before age 18, 60% (n = 67) came out some time after age 18, and 18% (n = 23) had not come out at all to their mothers. As for political beliefs, 15% of the subjects (n = 19) described themselves as either somewhat or very conservative, 23% (n = 29) described themselves as moderate, and 55% (n = 70) described themselves as either somewhat or very liberal. Some subjects omitted answers to the demographic questions.
Ninety-two percent of the homosexual sample (n = 118) could be categorized as being in Stage III, IV, V, or VI of Cass' Homosexual Identity Formation Model, a distinction based on each subject's responses to the Gay Identity Questionnaire (GIQ). The remaining subjects (n = 10) could not be assigned to a unique stage of identity formation because they endorsed equal numbers of items in two or more categories of the GIQ. To maintain consistency with the procedure used in the original validation study of the GIQ (Brady & Busse, 1994), data from these ten subjects were eliminated when statistical analysis included stage of identity formation as a variable. Frequency data for Stage of Homosexual Identity Formation (HIF) are presented in Table 2. There were no subjects who could be categorized as being in Stage I or II of HIF. In addition, only four subjects could be categorized as being in Stage III of HIF. Thus, data from these four subjects were also eliminated when analysis included stage of identity formation as a variable.

Descriptive statistics for the other self-report measures were as follows. For the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE), mean score for the sample (n = 127) was 33.1 (SD = 4.8), with a range from 21-40. Skew (-.58) and kurtosis (-.19) of the RSE scores were within acceptable limits. Reliability for the RSE was in the high range (Cronbach's $\alpha = .87$). For the Interpersonal Trust Scale (ITS), mean score for the sample (n = 128) was 80.5 (SD = 10.7), with a range from 55-122. Skew (.17) and kurtosis (.25) for the ITS scores were also within acceptable limits. Reliability for the ITS was in the moderate range (Cronbach's $\alpha = .72$).
Associations Among Measures

In the course of exploratory data analysis, some significant relationships were discovered among other elements of the data. There were significant group differences by race for general mistrust (as measured by the ITS) among the gay male sample members, $F(3, 113) = 6.97, p < .001$, where Black and Hispanic gay men acknowledged significantly more general mistrust than did White gay men. Results of post hoc pairwise comparisons, utilizing Tukey’s HSD test, are presented in Table 3.

To determine the relationship between general mistrust (as measured by ITS scores) and stage of HIF, a one-way ANOVA was utilized, with ITS scores as the dependent variable and stage of HIF as the independent variable. Results indicated significant group differences in general mistrust for stage of HIF, $F(2, 111) = 6.17$, $p < .01$, where subjects in Stage V of HIF acknowledged significantly more general mistrust ($M = 87.15$) than did subjects in Stage VI ($M = 77.98$). No differences in general mistrust were evident between Stage IV and Stages V or VI.

The final step of exploratory data analysis involved constructing a correlation matrix to determine associations among measures. This matrix analyzed relationships among age, HMI score, RSE score, and ITS score. These results are presented in Table 4.

Heterosexual Mistrust

Because the Heterosexual Mistrust Inventory (HMI) was a newly created and untested measure, extensive data analysis was conducted on the HMI, including reliability, validity, and factor analysis.
Internal consistency reliability. Internal consistency reliability of the HMI for the homosexual male sample (n = 128) was very high (Cronbach's $\alpha = .91$). Item-total correlations for the 38 items that comprised the HMI ranged from .11 to .66. Cronbach's $\alpha$ when individual questions were deleted from the overall scale ranged from .90 to .91. Reliability of the three individual subscales was in the moderate range and was as follows: Business and Work (BW) subscale, $\alpha = .76$; Interpersonal Relations (IR) subscale, $\alpha = .67$; and Politics and Law (PL) subscale, $\alpha = .67$. Correlations (Pearson's) among the three subscales were as follows: between BW and IR, $r = .72$; between BW and PL, $r = .66$; and between IR and PL, $r = .53$.

Criterion related validity. Mean, standard deviation, and range data were calculated for the HMI administered to the sample of homosexual males, as well as the sample of heterosexual males. Data from the sample of heterosexual males was used to help establish criterion-related validity for the HMI; the descriptive statistics for both groups are presented in Table 5. To test criterion-related validity of the HMI, t-tests for two independent samples were conducted that compared both the mean overall mistrust scores and the mean subscale mistrust scores for the heterosexual and homosexual samples. This analysis of between-groups differences revealed a significant mean difference by sexual orientation between the two groups, $t (251) = 3.74$, $p < .001$, wherein homosexual males ($M = 122.15$) acknowledged significantly more mistrust of heterosexuals than did heterosexual males ($M = 109.62$). Because the overall mistrust score is a composite of the three subscales comprising the HMI, further analysis was
warranted to determine if significant group differences among the three subscales were evident between the heterosexual and homosexual samples (as was evident with the overall mistrust scores). There was a significant difference in means between the two groups for the Politics and Law subscale, $t(251) = 6.74, p < .001$, wherein homosexual males acknowledged significantly more mistrust of heterosexuals in situations involving politics and law than did heterosexual males. There were not significant group differences for the other two subscales. Results of these analyses are also presented in Table 5.

Utilizing analysis of variance (ANOVA), a significant main effect of race for mistrust scores was found with both samples. For the heterosexual sample, Blacks' heterosexual mistrust scores ($M = 127.50$) were significantly higher, $F(4, 120) = 3.49, p < .01$, than were Whites' ($M = 106.76$). The homosexual sample also showed that Blacks' heterosexual mistrust scores ($M = 143.08$) were significantly higher, $F(4, 123) = 3.06, p < .025$, than were Whites' ($M = 117.95$). A test of the interaction effect (sexual orientation x race) indicated that this interaction was not significant ($F = 0.30, p = .583$). Thus, it can be stated with certainty that, for both these samples, there is in fact a sexual orientation effect, as well as a race effect. There was not a significant correlation between age and mistrust scores for either sample.

**Convergent and discriminant validity.** Evidence for convergent validity of the HMI was provided by using the Interpersonal Trust Scale (ITS), a well-validated measure of general mistrust, on the theory that conceptually related constructs (i.e., specific mistrust as measured by the HMI, and general mistrust as measured by the ITS), would correlate highly with each other. Lower scores on the ITS indicate greater levels of interpersonal
mistrust. The correlation between the HMI and ITS was in fact highly significant ($r = -.42$, $p < .001$), indicating that specific mistrust and general mistrust were related for this sample, but not simply redundant.

Evidence for discriminant validity of the HMI was anticipated to be provided by the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE), a well-validated measure of self-esteem, on the theory that conceptually unrelated constructs (i.e., mistrust and self-esteem) would not correlate well. Lower scores on the RSE are indicative of lower levels of self-worth and self-acceptance. However, a significant correlation was revealed between the HMI and the RSE ($r = -.21$, $p < .05$), indicating that, for this sample, heterosexual mistrust and self-esteem are not completely independent of each other. However, the two constructs only share about 4% of their variability.

**Content validity.** Extensive factor analysis was conducted on the HMI using data obtained from the homosexual male sample. Both principal component analysis (PCA) and principal axis factoring (PAF) were employed. The PCA approach involved three separate analyses that extracted two, three, and four factors for the HMI. The PAF approach involved three separate analyses that extracted three, four, and five factors for the HMI. In each of these six extractions, initial eigenvalues indicated that Factor One accounted for 25.8% of the overall variance in mistrust scores. Although scree plots for all six extractions indicated (visually) that there were potentially three factors underlying the HMI (with Factor Two and Factor Three accounting for an additional 7.8% and 6.4% of the variance, respectively), both the rotated component matrix for the PCA approach and the pattern matrix for the PAF approach provided evidence that there are more likely two
factors underlying the HMI. This conclusion was arrived at after the following two procedures were employed. First, any item in the matrix having a highest loaded factor of less than .25 was eliminated. Second, any item having a factor loading of .40 or greater on two or more factors was eliminated (SPSS, 1998). The results of these procedures revealed that two distinct factors were left remaining and were available for extraction for the HMI. The factor loadings and items are presented in Table 7.

Results of factor analysis for Terrell and Terrell's (1981) Cultural Mistrust Inventory (CMI-R) have not been reported. Therefore, the factor structure of the CMI-R is not available for replication. None of the factor analyses showed consistent patterns of questions from the HMI that clearly or obviously loaded on the three domains of the CMI-R that were retained for the HMI (i.e., Business and Work, Interpersonal Relations, and Politics and Law). However, in-depth examination of the structure and wording of the HMI revealed an obvious and easily identifiable pattern to indicate that individual items on the HMI consistently loaded on one of two specific factors. These two factors were related to the manner in which the items were worded. All items on Factor I were positively worded statements about heterosexuals. All items on Factor II were negatively worded statements about heterosexuals. These two factors are discussed in further detail in the Discussion section.

Revised HMI

Factor analysis and data reduction conducted on the HMI resulted in a pared down and somewhat more brief measure. In its new form, the HMI is a 17-item inventory, reduced by more than half from its original 38-item form (see Table 7). Factor I includes
nine items that are all positively worded statements about heterosexuals, while Factor II includes eight items that are all negatively worded statements about heterosexuals. The two factors, when compared as separate subscales, intercorrelate strongly, $r = .55$, $p < .001$. The scoring direction for all items on Factor I is reversed. Thus, the more strongly a subject disagrees with positively worded statements about heterosexuals, the higher mistrust score the subject obtains on Factor I. On Factor II, the more strongly a subject agrees with negatively worded statements, the higher the mistrust score on Factor II. The overall heterosexual mistrust score is obtained by summing the responses to all items on the scale. All items are weighted equally in obtaining the summed heterosexual mistrust score. Internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha$) is in the high range for the new scale ($\alpha = .89$). Cronbach's $\alpha$ for Factor I and Factor II are .86 and .83, respectively.

Convergent and discriminant validity of the new scale are apparent. The overall heterosexual mistrust score from the new scale correlates well with the ITS, $r = -.40$, $p < .001$, indicating that specific mistrust and general mistrust for this sample are related. As general mistrust increases, so too does specific mistrust. The overall heterosexual mistrust score for the new scale has clearer discriminant validity. The correlation between the new scale and the RSE is not significant, $r = -.18$, $p = .062$, providing a clearer indication that, for this sample, specific mistrust and self-esteem are not related constructs.

The three reduced content-based subscales of the HMI are maintained, albeit in reduced form. The Business and Work (BW) subscale is comprised of six items (four items on Factor I, two items on Factor II), Interpersonal Relations (IR) is comprised of six items (three items on each factor), and Politics and Law (PL) is comprised of five items.
Correlations among the three content-based subscales are as follows: between BW and IR, \( r = .74 \); between BW and PL, \( r = .64 \); and between IR and PL, \( r = .67 \). Reliability for the three subscales was as follows: for BW, \( \alpha = .79 \); for IR, \( \alpha = .69 \); and for PL, \( \alpha = .73 \).

It cannot be stated with complete certainty whether factor analysis has provided a clear indication that these two factor loadings are due solely to factor variance, to method variance, or to some combination of the two. Factor I (which involves positively-worded statements about heterosexuals) has a significant correlation, \( r = -.45, p < .001 \), with the ITS (which involves general trust). The negative correlation here implies that, as subjects disagree with Factor I statements more strongly (i.e., they disagree more strongly with positive statements about heterosexuals), their general trust decreases. The two constructs share about 20% of their variability. Factor II (which involves negatively-worded statements about heterosexuals) also has a significant correlation, \( r = -.25, p < .01 \), with the ITS. While the negative correlation here implies that, as subjects agree with Factor II statements more strongly, their general trust decreases, these two constructs only share about 6% of their variability. Factor I did not have a significant correlation with the RSE (\( p = .210 \)). Factor II, however, did have a significant correlation, \( r = -.21, p < .025 \), with the RSE (which involves self-esteem). While the negative correlation here implies that, as subjects agree with Factor II statements more strongly, their self-esteem goes down, these two constructs only share about 4% of their variability.

Criterion-related validity for the new scale was investigated. Utilizing a t-test for two independent samples, mean heterosexual mistrust scores were compared for the
heterosexual and homosexual samples. There was a significant difference in overall
mistrust by sexual orientation, $t(251) = 2.81, p < .005$, where the gay male subjects had
significantly higher mistrust ($M = 51.16$) than did the heterosexual subjects ($M = 45.94$).

Criterion-related validity for the new factors was investigated. Utilizing a $t$-test for
two independent samples, mean heterosexual mistrust scores for each factor were
compared for the heterosexual and homosexual samples. While the gay male sample had
higher Factor I mean mistrust ($M = 28.42$) than did the heterosexual sample ($M = 26.27$),
this difference did not quite achieve significance, $t(251) = 1.87, p = .06$. There was,
however, a significant difference for Factor II mean mistrust, $t(251) = 3.19, p < .01$,
where the gay male sample had significantly higher mistrust scores ($M = 22.73$) than did
the heterosexual sample ($M = 19.67$).

Criterion-related validity for the content-based subscales was also investigated.
Utilizing a $t$-test for two independent samples, mean heterosexual mistrust scores for each
subscale were compared for the heterosexual and homosexual samples. The homosexual
men were significantly more mistrustful ($M = 17.06$) on the PL subscale, $t(251) = 4.59$,
$p < .001$, than were the heterosexual men ($M = 15.76$). There was no significant difference
between the two samples on the BW subscale ($p = .09$) or the IR subscale ($p = .23$).

Hypotheses and Research Questions

Concerning Hypothesis I, that an individual's stage of HIF would be related to his
overall heterosexual mistrust score, a one-way ANOVA was conducted, with overall
heterosexual mistrust score as the dependent variable and stage of HIF as the independent
variable. Because this analysis of the variance among heterosexual mistrust scores for
Cass' Stages III, IV, V, and VI of HIF violated two primary assumptions of the ANOVA (i.e., equal sample size and homogeneity of variance), the heterosexual mistrust scores for the four subjects in Cass' Stage III of HIF were eliminated. Results indicated significant group differences by stage of HIF, $F(2, 111) = 24.03, p < .001$. To further analyze these group differences, contrast tests were conducted among the three groups. With $\alpha = .01$ for each comparison, familywise error rate for the three comparisons was approximately 0.03. Overall mistrust was highest for Stage V subjects ($M = 151.2$), lower for Stage IV subjects ($M = 126.63$), and lowest for Stage VI subjects ($M = 108.14$). Multiple t-tests revealed significant differences for mean mistrust scores among all three groups. These data and results are presented in Table 6.

Concerning Hypothesis II, that stage of HIF would be related to self-esteem score (as measured by the RSE), a one-way ANOVA was conducted, with self-esteem score as the dependent variable and stage of HIF as the independent variable. Results indicated significant group differences for self-esteem based on HIF stage, $F(2, 110) = 5.03, p < .01$, where subjects in Stage VI ($M = 34.16$) had significantly higher self-esteem scores than subjects in Stage V ($M = 30.55$). There was no significant difference in self-esteem scores between subjects in Stage IV ($M = 32.47$) and Stages V and VI.

Concerning Hypothesis III, that an individual's stage of HIF would be related to his Kinsey Actual Sexual Behavior, a one-way ANOVA was conducted, with stage of HIF as the independent variable and Kinsey Actual Sexual Behavior as the dependent variable. Because of the violation of a primary assumption of the ANOVA (i.e., equal sample size), data from the three subjects who self-identified as being in Kinsey's Stage 1, 2, or 3 of
Actual Sexual Behavior were eliminated, as were data from the four subjects assigned to Cass' Stage III of HIF. Results indicated that stage of HIF was not significantly associated with Kinsey Actual Sexual Behavior, $F(4, 107) = 1.34, p = .261$.

Concerning Research Question I, that there may be a significant difference between an individual's Kinsey Preferred and Kinsey Actual Sexual Behavior, a t-test for two related samples was conducted. Results indicated a significantly stronger preference for behavior that was more exclusively homosexual in nature, $t(110) = 4.66, p < .001$. This difference was accounted for by 28% ($n = 36$) of the sample, while 64% of the sample ($n = 79$) indicated no difference in their actual and preferred sexual behaviors. A few subjects ($n = 4$) indicated a preference for sexual behavior that was more heterosexually oriented.

Research Question II, that an individual's stage of HIF might be associated with his Kinsey Preferred Sexual Behavior, was analyzed using a Chi-square contingency table. Although the results were not significant, $\chi^2(9) = 15.66, p = .074$, visual examination of the scatterplot of these two variables shows an apparent trend that suggests a higher stage of HIF may be associated with a preference for sexual behavior that is mostly or completely homosexual in nature.

Concerning Research Question III, that the difference between an individual's Kinsey Preferred and Kinsey Actual Sexual Behavior might be correlated with his stage of HIF, a one-way ANOVA was conducted, with stage of HIF as the independent variable, and difference between Kinsey Actual and Kinsey Preferred Sexual Behavior as the
dependent variable. Results indicated no significant group differences in behavior based on stage of HIF (p = .283).

Concerning Research Question IV, that there may be significant relationships between self-report data on the Demographic Questionnaire and subjects' stage of HIF, ANOVAs and multiple Chi-square contingencies were performed. These analyses revealed additional significant associations. Stage of HIF and political beliefs were associated, \( \chi^2 (8) = 17.65, p < .025 \), where subjects in Stage IV were most likely to identify their political beliefs as "moderate," whereas subjects in Stages V and VI were most likely to identify their political beliefs as "somewhat liberal." Stage of HIF and whether or not subjects had "come out" to their father were related, \( F(2, 109) = 8.02, p < .001 \), where subjects in Stage IV were significantly less likely to have "come out" to their fathers than were subjects in Stages V or VI. A nearly identical result was obtained on the analysis of stage of HIF and whether or not subjects had "come out" to their fathers, \( F(2, 109) = 8.01, p < .001 \), where subjects in Stage IV were also significantly less likely to have "come out" to their fathers than subjects in Stages V or VI. Also, stage of HIF and age at which subjects came out to their mother were related, \( \chi^2 (10) = 16.05, p < .025 \), where subjects in Stage V were most likely to indicate they came out to their mothers after age 25, and those in Stage VI were most likely to indicate they came out to their mothers between the ages of 18 and 21. Subjects in Stage IV were most likely to indicate that they hadn't yet "come out" to their mothers. The Chi-square test was utilized to analyze this latter relationship because questions about age when subjects came out to
parents were arranged on an ordinal rather than interval scale (i.e., giving several ranges of ages) on the Demographic Questionnaire.
There were two primary goals for this study. Since the concept of heterosexual mistrust was new and heretofore untested, a rather ambitious goal of the study was to describe the new concept and then develop and begin preliminary validation of a tool to measure this concept, namely the HMI. Using heterosexual males for comparison, the HMI was utilized to assess whether and to what extent heterosexual mistrust existed among gay males. Employing methodology similar to that used by Landrine and Klonoff (1994) for the development of the African-American Acculturation Scale, in this study it was theorized that heterosexual males, having experienced little if any mistreatment from other heterosexuals for being heterosexual, would show significantly less mistrust of heterosexuals than would homosexual males. The results strongly supported this theory.

The second goal of the study was to assess whether heterosexual mistrust and sexual identity development were related. Borrowing from Cass' model of Homosexual Identity Formation (1979, 1984, 1986), it was theorized that, since a gay man's perceptions of both himself and the world around him vary as a function of his stage of gay identity development, so too would his level of heterosexual mistrust vary based on that stage of development. The results also supported this theory, but with some limiting qualifications. After a discussion of the development and validation of the HMI, the findings related to
the goals of the study will be considered in some detail, with respect to both specific hypotheses of the study and their implications for future research.

Criterion-related validation of the HMI was evident in the significant difference in overall mistrust scores between the heterosexual and homosexual samples. This finding provided the main support for the theory that heterosexual mistrust among gay men would be found to exist in a measurably greater degree than among heterosexual males. Differential mistrust was most evident in the domain of Politics and Law, the only subscale of the HMI found to have significant group differences based on sexual orientation. Questions relevant to the Politics and Law domain included attitudes about the honesty, integrity, and trustworthiness of politicians and law enforcement officials. The domain of Interpersonal Relations, as well as that of Business and Work, showed differences that, while measurable, were not statistically significant. Questions relevant to these domains included attitudes about the honesty, integrity, and trustworthiness of heterosexuals in interpersonal interactions, and about heterosexual businesspeople. Implications of the differences in mistrust among these three content domains are discussed later.

Convergent validity for the HMI was evident in the strong correlations (both overall as well as all three subscales) found with the ITS. These conceptually related constructs of specific mistrust and general mistrust showed a strong relationship among the homosexual males in this sample, where, as general mistrust increased, so too did specific mistrust. The domain of Politics and Law accounted for the most shared variability between the two constructs (21%), with Business and Work accounting for
slightly less shared variability (12%), and Interpersonal Relations accounting for the least shared variability (9%). These findings suggest that not only are general mistrust and heterosexual mistrust strongly related, but that individuals with high levels of general mistrust will display this mistrust in a variety of contexts and settings, and certainly in all the contexts and settings measured by the HMI. In keeping with this concept, it was interesting to note the main effect of race on heterosexual mistrust among African-Americans in both the heterosexual and homosexual samples. African-Americans subjects were significantly more mistrustful than were White and Hispanic subjects, regardless of their sexual orientation. These findings are consistent with much prior research on mistrust among minority groups in general (Cross, 1978; Dana, 1993; Grier & Cobbs, 1968; Ponterotto & Casas, 1991; Terrell & Terrell, 1981), as well as on minority group members who are both racial/ethnic minorities in addition to being homosexual (Gates, 1993; Klassen, Williams, & Levitt, 1989). Both these sets of findings provide additional support for the notion that, among certain minority group members, mistrust of the dominant culture may exist independently of whatever domain of that culture is being measured.

Discriminant validity of the HMI was not as much in evidence as anticipated, due to the significant relationship found between the RSE and the HMI. However, the relationship between the concept of self-esteem and heterosexual mistrust was not particularly strong, with the two only sharing 4% of their variability. With regard to the subscales of the HMI, Politics and Law shared 6% of the variability with self-esteem This
was the only subscale that had a significant correlation with the RSE. These results imply that, while self-esteem and heterosexual mistrust are related, the relationship is not particularly strong, and is likely limited to the domain of Politics and Law.

At the beginning of this study, the content domain of heterosexual mistrust was not clearly defined. It was therefore important to identify what variables or factors might underlay, account for, and influence this concept. Thus, extensive factor analysis was conducted on the HMI to delineate specific areas of interest. The original domain structure of the measure upon which the HMI was based (the CMI-R) did not coincide with the results of the factor analysis. There was no consistent or identifiable pattern of factor loadings that coincided with these three domains, and thus no factor divisions could be made based upon these three a priori domains. Therefore, the most logical and parsimonious interpretation of factor analysis for the HMI—explained in detail in the Results section—is that there are two factors underlying the measure. These two factors are characterized by statements that imply, "Heterosexuals are not bad people," and statements that imply, "Heterosexuals are bad people." Factor I, which includes positively worded statements about heterosexuals, is labeled Trust, because the statements loading on this factor suggest that heterosexuals are trustworthy. Factor II, which includes negatively worded statements about heterosexuals, is labeled Mistrust, because the statements loading on this factor suggest that heterosexuals are untrustworthy.

Factor analysis and data reduction conducted on the HMI resulted in a pared down and somewhat more brief measure. In its new form, the HMI is a 17-item inventory,
reduced by more than half from its original 38-item form. Factor I includes nine items that are all positively worded statements about heterosexuals, while Factor II includes eight items that are all negatively worded statements about heterosexuals. The three subscales are maintained, albeit in reduced form. The Business and Work subscale is comprised of six items (four items on Factor I, two items on Factor II), Interpersonal Relations is comprised of six items (three items on each factor), and Politics and Law is comprised of five items (two items on Factor I, three items on Factor II).

Reexamination of the new form of the HMI showed that validity of the new scale appears to have held up well. With regard to criterion-related validity, the new scale holds up well when the heterosexual and homosexual samples are compared on the 17 remaining items, on the two factors, and on the PL subscale. Even with the reduced number of scale items, the difference in overall mean mistrust scores remains highly significant in all these areas, and thus heterosexual mistrust among gay men is still found to exist in a measurably greater degree than among heterosexual males. The new scale maintains convergent validity, and provides clearer evidence for discriminant validity as well. Convergent validity is maintained in the new scale’s continued strong correlation with the ITS; with the new scale, as general mistrust increases, so too does specific mistrust. Discriminant validity of the new scale is evident as well. When compared to scores from the RSE, the new version of the HMI does not have a significant relationship. This lends support to the notion that, for the new scale, self-esteem and mistrust are independent constructs and are not related.
Using the aforementioned factors identified and labeled as Trust and Mistrust, a four-quadrant model of heterosexual mistrust is proposed:

1) Pervasive Trust, which involves agreement with statements that suggest heterosexuals are trustworthy and disagreement with statements that suggest heterosexuals are untrustworthy.

2) Ambivalent Trust, which involves disagreement with statements that suggest heterosexuals are trustworthy but also disagreement with statements that suggest heterosexuals are untrustworthy.

3) Ambivalent Mistrust, which involves agreement with statements that suggest heterosexuals are trustworthy but also agreement with statements that suggest heterosexuals are untrustworthy.

4) Pervasive Mistrust, which involves disagreement with statements that suggest heterosexuals are trustworthy and agreement with statements that suggest heterosexuals are untrustworthy.

The four quadrant model is represented visually in Appendix III. This conceptual model may be useful in helping to describe or even predict an individual's behavior in many domains that involve interactions between heterosexuals and homosexuals.

When the results provided by the HMI for the gay male sample are examined, the original 38-item scale and the 17-item scale remaining after item reduction both indicate that, based on mean mistrust scores, the Politics and Law subscale produces the highest mistrust score, followed by the Business and Work subscale, and then by the Interpersonal
Relations subscale. This ordering of subscales along a continuum can be explained by the following. First, it is clear that, across all three subscale domains, the heterosexual subjects felt more trusting of other heterosexuals than homosexual subjects did of heterosexuals. This finding may be attributable to similarity, and the lack of experience of personal loss as a result of mistreatment by the dominant culture. Second, for gay men, their sexuality may prove to be more relevant (and thus more likely to be a factor) in the domains of both business and work and of politics and law, when compared to interpersonal relations. For example, homosexual individuals can (and quite often do) feel the need to conceal their sexual identity from their employers and coworkers, a trend identified by Riccucci and Gossett (1996), and supported somewhat by this sample (of which 48% acknowledged not being “out” to their employer, with 31% not being “out” to coworkers). With respect to politics and law, although many gay men may take into account that politicians must take stands and make decisions on all issues (not just those of direct relevance to the gay community), there is no denying the history of mistreatment of homosexuals with regard to the legal system and its representatives (Gallup Organization, 1998; Gates, 1993; Leland & Miller, 1998; Peyser, 1998).

Based on these considerations, can the assumption be made that gay men tend to be more mistrustful in domains in which their sexuality is more likely to be relevant? Perhaps. When one considers the three domains of relevance to this study, it is reasonable to state that these domains may in fact be ordered along a continuum based on personal risk to the individual, as well as the need for concealment or disclosure of sensitive
information, in this case sexual identity. The amount of personal risk involved for an individual is particularly high when that person discloses something about himself, either voluntarily or involuntarily, that may not be received positively by someone else. When one considers the three domains with respect to severity of consequences, Politics and Law would seem to afford the greatest opportunity for personal risk. An individual who is arrested for committing homosexual sodomy faces not only legal sanctions (including jail time and financial penalties), but potential harm to his career (e.g., if his employment contract includes “crimes of moral turpitude” as grounds for termination), as well as exposure to family, friends, and work colleagues who may not have known the individual was gay. In Business and Work settings, an individual who is fired for being gay also faces the potential harm to his career and exposure concerns, but without the threat of any legal sanctions.

In the domain of Interpersonal Relations, the threat of legal, professional, and social sanctions arising from an individual’s disclosure of being homosexual would logically seem to be least significant. Indeed, for an individual to develop successful and healthy interpersonal relationships, a certain amount of personal disclosure is vital to the development of trust and the bonding process characteristic of successful interpersonal relations. In the course of engaging in social comparison and seeking emotional support from others, the individual must show a willingness to invest in the relationship, and one type of investment is the willingness to engage in risk-taking by disclosing meaningful information to others (Hill, 1987). Gay men may be less guarded in the domain of
interpersonal relationships than in both business and work and political and legal domains, where the personal risk in terms of severity of consequences is much higher, the disclosure of sensitive information potentially more harmful, and where the individual's sexual identity can be, and often is, both easily concealed and irrelevant.

Another explanation why heterosexual mistrust may be highest in the domain of politics and law relates to the number of negative experiences an individual has (or observes) in each of the three domains. Heterosexual mistrust may logically be thought of as a learned behavior, similar to the learned negative evaluation of heterosexuals characteristic of individuals in Cass' Stage V (Cass, 1979). As an individual in Cass' Stage V learns to evaluate heterosexuals negatively based on his experience being positively evaluated by other homosexuals, perhaps that individual has also learned to mistrust heterosexuals based on the amount of negative experiences either observed or personally experienced that occur in each of the three domains measured here. To use a more specific example, are we ever really not subjected to some element of politics or the law? The more time an individual spends in a particular domain, the higher likelihood he has for having a negative experience based on his sexual identity, which would logically be assumed to promote the perpetuation of mistrust. Politics and the law are pervasive in most elements of everyone's daily functioning, even to the point of having legal guidelines about what we can and cannot do in the privacy of our own homes, and with whom we can do things. Perhaps having spent the most time in the domain of politics and law, individuals have the highest likelihood of experiencing mistrust in this area. This
contention is supported by Cass' (1979) belief that one reason many gay men immerse
themselves in the gay subculture to the greatest extent possible is to reduce the number of
negative experiences they have by reducing time spent interacting with the dominant
heterosexual culture.

One issue of direct relevance to the Interpersonal Relations domain necessitates
further discussion. The finding that the IR subscale had such poor discriminant validity
between the heterosexual and homosexual samples was somewhat surprising, but may be
due to the nature of the domain itself. It may be that concerns about interpersonal
relationships are more germane to the earlier stages of HIF (i.e., Cass’ Stages I and II). It
is in these early stages of HIF that the individual experiences the greatest amount of
internal struggle with regard to his sexual identity. A primary factor in this struggle is
whether or not the individual should disclose to others his growing sense of confusion or
uncertainty about his sexual identity. At the same time the individual experiences this
internal struggle, he is concurrently experiencing a growing external sense of alienation
from the dominant culture, a culture with which he feels less and less connected. Based on
these experiences, it would seem (intuitively) that interpersonal relationships could be a
source of considerable distress and thus considerable mistrust, as the individual works
through these concurrent internal and external struggles. Unfortunately, subjects in these
earliest two stages of HIF were not among those who comprised the sample of gay males.
Thus, the finding that the domain of Interpersonal Relations was not a source of
significantly more mistrust among gay than among heterosexual males becomes somewhat
suspect. Future efforts at research in this specific area will need to address more thoroughly the difficulty in finding subjects in these earliest stages of HIF.

With regard to the hypothesis that stage of gay identity development would be related to heterosexual mistrust, the results provide strong support for this idea. The importance that stage of HIF plays in attitudes toward heterosexuals is considerable, being responsible for nearly one-third of the variability in heterosexual mistrust scores. The finding that heterosexual mistrust is highest in Stage V is certainly consistent with Cass' description of the cognitions characteristic of this stage (Cass, 1979, 1984). Individuals in Stage V, who are usually immersed in the gay subculture, devalue and discredit heterosexuals and perceive them as insignificant. The dichotomous thinking characteristic of this stage (i.e., "gay is good, straight is bad") leads to increased negative evaluations of heterosexuals, manifested in this instance as mistrust, and in this study it was the individuals in Stage V who showed the most willingness to evaluate heterosexuals negatively and as untrustworthy.

With regard to Cass' Stages IV and VI, the findings, while partly unexpected in terms of the ordering of mean mistrust scores, are in fact logical. With the defining characteristic of Stage IV being greater contact with other homosexuals and increased selectivity about contact with heterosexuals, the mistrust evident in this stage is still building in intensity, having not yet achieved the significant levels evident in Stage V. Also, the dichotomous thinking that is secondary to the pride individuals in Stage V typically display has not yet become pervasive. Along the same line of thinking, it is the
evolution through the pride and dichotomous thinking of Stages IV and V, coupled with positive interactions with supportive heterosexuals, that bring about the Stage VI realization that this dichotomy is no longer as valid or even as necessary as was once believed. The data support the idea of mistrust decreasing significantly at this level of development, as the individual begins to evaluate heterosexuals more favorably and begins to build more trust in them. To paraphrase Cass (1984), homosexuals in these later stages of development go from trusting a culture they feel a part of, to mistrusting a culture they feel different and excluded from, to once again trusting a culture from which they realize they are in fact not all that different. Weston (as cited in Meyer & Dean, 1998) saw the importance of personal empowerment in this evolution of beliefs, stating, “Gay men who overcome heterosexist attitudes . . . are able to recognize—and be critical of—heterosexism from an empowered position and are [therefore] more capable of adopting alternative values and norms” (p. 166).

The hypothesis relating stage of gay identity development and self-esteem was supported, although not to the degree anticipated. In this study, self-esteem/well being scores were found to be significantly higher only for Stage VI when compared to Stages IV and V. This partially replicates the findings of Brady and Busse (1994), who found a linear relationship between stage of development and increased self-esteem for Stages III, IV, V, and VI. This finding also provides support for the more general notion that both self-esteem and well being will be at their highest levels when an individual has completed progression through the turmoil typical of the earlier stages of development, and has
gained some sense of completion with respect to the elements that encompass their identity (Cass, 1979, 1984; Weston, as cited in Meyer & Dean, 1998).

Overall, the results of this study provided some compelling evidence in support of Cass' Homosexual Identity Formation model. One of the original questions that led to the development of this study was whether or not stage of HIF would affect attitudes toward other individuals. Results of this study show that, when using Cass' stages, exactly where an individual is found in regard to his development can have a major influence on how that individual sees and interacts with the world around him. Also, the findings here provide support for Cass' contention that an individual who has fully developed his gay identity can expect better functioning with regard to self-esteem and relationships with others than those individuals still struggling with their identity as gay men.

Regarding the hypothesis that stage of HIF would be related to Kinsey Actual Sexual Behavior, it was surprising to find no significant relationship here. Cass (1981) had theorized that an individual's actual sexual behavior according to Kinsey's (1948) categorization would correlate highly with his stage of HIF, the implication being that a higher stage of HIF would be associated with a Kinsey category more exclusively homosexual in nature. It was also surprising, with regard to Research Questions II and III, that no measurable link existed for this sample between actual and/or preferred sexual behavior and stage of HIF. Only the query posed by Research Question I was answered affirmatively, and the finding that actual and preferred sexual behavior were in fact significantly different for this sample is not surprising. When considering that sexual
orientation in this study referred exclusively to sexual behavior, a considerable body of research (Bell & Weinberg, 1978; Brady & Busse, 1994; Cass, 1979; Chung & Katayama, 1996; Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948; Michaels, 1996; Reinisch & Beasley, 1990) has shown consistently that for a number of gay men, actual and preferred sexual behavior are frequently not the same. Any number of the elements mentioned in the above-referenced studies (e.g., fear of disclosure, religious/familial/social influences, fear of disease, age, stage of identity development, etc.) may have influenced the inconsistency between actual and preferred behavior among the individuals who comprised this sample. Since the variables underlying this issue were not specifically measured by this study, the researcher cannot say with any certainty why this significant difference between actual and desired behaviors exists, or, literally, why some subjects wanted to be more gay. This does, however, seem to indicate support for a relatively recent trend identified by D'Emilio (1998), who stated, "In another period of history, someone would declare with relief they weren't gay. [This new trend] suggests that lesbian or gay identity is now sought after and treasured" (p.258). This is an area that would certainly prove to be of interest in future studies.

Additional findings of the study are noteworthy primarily with regard to the query posed by Research Question IV, but also in terms of the relationship of these findings with previous research. Nearly one-third of this sample reported not having disclosed their sexual orientation to their father, while slightly less than one-fifth had not disclosed their orientation to their mother. While this level of non-disclosure is lower than that reported
by McWhirter and Mattison (1984), who found over one-half of their sample had not disclosed their orientation to either parent, it is an indicator that coming out to parents is still problematic for many gay men. For this sample, age at disclosure of sexual orientation was independent of any demographic variables. Thus, age at disclosure of orientation is related in part to stage of identity development (as was found with disclosure to participants' mothers in this sample) and in part to some other, unmeasured factor.

McWhirter and Mattison (1984) found that their subjects tended to describe relationships with their mothers in terms of being loving, caring, physically affectionate, and important in their lives, while the same subjects tended to describe relationships with their fathers in more vague terms that implied mutual respect. Perhaps, for subjects in this study, those who were in Stage VI of identity development achieved this stage at an accelerated rate, and therefore were able to disclose their orientation to their mothers at an earlier age than, say, those individuals who had only achieved Stage V (as the data imply). Since the possible underlying influences in this area were not specifically measured by the study, this area could be addressed more thoroughly in future research.

Only 15% of the sample described their political beliefs as either somewhat or very conservative. The remainder were somewhat evenly distributed in the categories from moderate to very liberal. This partly replicates the findings of McWhirter and Mattison (1984), but with a different twist. McWhirter and Mattison found that, as a rule, most gay men tended to rate themselves as politically liberal, but that this attribution was more closely associated with socioeconomic status than with any racial or sexual minority
status. For the sample in this study, political beliefs were found to be independent of income or race, but were instead associated with stage of gay identity development.

Individuals further along in the stages of development reported their political beliefs as being more liberal. One could therefore make the association that as an individual becomes more tolerant of both himself and others with regard to homosexuality, the individual also becomes more tolerant in the other areas that comprise political belief systems.

How generalizable may these results be to the larger gay community? First, one must consider that this sample may not be representative of the larger gay community in terms of individuals at all stages of identity development. Whether due to sampling error or measurement error, no subjects could be classified in Cass' Stage I or II, with very few subjects (n = 4) in Stage III. Unfortunately, individuals in these stages of development are least likely to identify with the gay community, and typically continue to self-identify as heterosexual (Cass, 1979). The failure to obtain subjects who could be classified into Stages I or II is certainly less dismaying when one considers that even the validation study for the GIQ (Brady & Busse, 1994) was unable to obtain sufficient numbers of subjects in these two stages to adequately measure internal consistency for the first two stages. Meyer and Dean (1998), in lamenting the limited generalizability of their findings on internalized homophobia, pointed to the recurrent problems that have become all too familiar to researchers of issues relevant to gay and bisexual men, namely many subjects' unwillingness to identify themselves as gay, unwillingness to discuss or even acknowledge their sexual behavior, and refusal to volunteer as participants in studies that focus on these
issues. It is reasonable to assume that the sampling problems in this study are attributable to some or all of these factors as well. Another recent study that focused on attitudes of gay men (Simonsen, 1999) encountered nearly identical sampling problems when attempting to utilize the GIQ to classify stage of gay identity development. Unfortunately, these problems place a considerable limitation on the generalizability of the results of this study, effectively limiting them to individuals in Cass' Stage IV, V, and VI of identity development. These latter stages do, however, appear to be the critical range of development for problems with mistrust.

Another aspect of this limitation may be related to the domain of cognitive aspects of survey methodology. Such instrument design elements as question context and social desirability may have influenced subjects' responses to the questions on the GIQ. An individual's interpretation of and response to a particular question is likely to be influenced by the items that preceded that particular question. Five of the seven questions on the GIQ that identify Cass' Stage VI of identity development are bunched together rather than being distributed among the 45 total items. How might this feature (in combination with social desirability) have influenced individuals' propensity for inaccurately identifying themselves as being in Stage VI? Schwarz (1999) identified two design elements likely influencing results of the GIQ: "... [T]he range of response alternatives may further influence subsequent comparative and noncomparative judgements. Hence, respondents may arrive at evaluative judgements that are highly context-dependent and may not reflect the assessments they would be likely to make in daily life." (p.99) Subjects may also have
engaged in social desirability by being reluctant to endorse items that seemed "deviant" in relation to the context of the scale (e.g., not endorsing as true the statement, "I am not about to stay hidden as gay for anyone.").

Other characteristics of the sample limit the generalizability of the results. The gay sample was somewhat constricted geographically, with 75% of subjects residing in the Dallas/Ft. Worth area. The gay sample was somewhat limited by race, as 73% of respondents were White. Although a reasonable sample of minority group members was included in the study, it would be difficult to generalize the responses of such small samples to the larger population for these groups. The gay male sample was also quite well educated, with 51% being college graduates. Although there is some support for the notion that homosexual males, as a subgroup, tend to be better educated than the general population (Michaels, 1996), this finding may be the result of the bias inherent in the involvement of more cooperative research subjects, as well as the "computer literate" bias involved in recruiting subjects from the Internet, rather than indicating that high educational achievement is a defining characteristic of gay men. Also, much of the gay male sample was of a higher socioeconomic status than the general population, with 40% of subjects reporting annual incomes in excess of $36,000. Such characteristics place certain limitations on the generalizability of these findings, namely that they are more likely to be characteristic of older, highly educated, White males who are in the latter stages of sexual identity development.
In conclusion, this study achieved its stated goals, namely to investigate, in an exploratory manner, the concept of heterosexual mistrust and its relation to sexual identity development in gay men. Further investigation of this new concept is warranted. Among the areas that should be a focus of future research are the following. First, additional testing of the HMI will be necessary. For example, determination of test-retest reliability for the HMI would be prudent. Second, potential new domains of heterosexual mistrust should be identified and tested (e.g., health care and medicine), with the awareness that other domains may involve confounding issues that may bias results. Questions of relevance to any potential new domain should be developed and tested for content validity, and, if viable, added to the revised HMI. At the same time, consideration should be given to revising significantly or dropping altogether the items that comprise the IR subscale of the HMI, given the rather poor psychometric properties of this subscale discussed previously. Criterion validation of the IR subscale may prove problematic, as some areas of great importance to gay men (e.g., coming out to other people) simply do not have a parallel construct for heterosexuals. Third, certain issues that were not adequately addressed in the original study (e.g., why actual and preferred sexual behavior differed so much, what factor(s) influenced the timing of disclosure of one’s sexual orientation to one’s parents), and how they relate to the concept of heterosexual mistrust, should be investigated more directly in subsequent studies. Finally, a more comprehensive effort should be undertaken to recruit study participants at all stages of homosexual identity formation. A larger number of minority subjects, as well as greater diversity with regard to
age, education, and socioeconomic status, would improve the potential generalizability of results to the larger gay community.

Gay men experience a variety of unique issues in the course of their sexual identity development. This study has added to the continually growing body of research into those issues, and in doing so has also raised additional questions about gay identity formation. By adding to current knowledge about identity development in gay men, perhaps this study will provide information useful to those individuals who may be struggling with this often difficult transformation, and also add to the understanding of those who may be called upon to help such individuals during the course of their development.
APPENDIX A

MEASURES
Dear Reader:

I would greatly appreciate your participation in my research study. The purpose of this research is to explore the relationships among sexual orientation, trust, and social attitudes. We hope that this study will be useful in helping us to better understand sexual orientation and belief systems.

As part of your participation in this study, I am asking you to respond to the questionnaires in this packet; most people can complete these in about 30 minutes. General information about such things as your age, ethnicity, and beliefs will be collected, but no specific information that personally identifies you will be asked.

Please answer all questions based on your true feelings and beliefs. Please keep this consent form and return your questionnaires in the attached stamped and addressed envelope marked, "Questionnaires." Do not write your name anywhere on the questionnaires; we want the answers you give to be completely anonymous. The identification number on each questionnaire is for data analysis and tracking purposes only; it does not identify you in any way.

The information on the questionnaires is being collected for research purposes. There is no foreseeable personal risk or discomfort involved in participating in this research as long as you keep your answers anonymous. Your participation is completely voluntary. You may withdraw from the research at any time.

As an incentive for participation in this research, cash rewards will be given. One $50 cash reward and six $25 cash rewards will be made by lottery to individuals who provide their name, mailing address, and e-mail address (if available) on the attached reward request form. To preserve your anonymity, this form should not be mailed back with the questionnaires; rather, it should be mailed in the attached stamped and addressed envelope marked, "Reward Request." In this way, the researcher has no way of knowing who sent back the questionnaires and who entered the cash reward lottery. Even if you decide to withdraw from the research, you are still eligible for the cash reward. Since the information received from you is anonymous, and since your participation in this research is voluntary, you agree that any information obtained from this research may be used in any way thought best by the researcher for educational or research purposes. If you have any questions, concerns, or problems associated with your participation in this research study, you should contact the researcher, David Shepard, at (940) 565-2631 (e-mail “dshepard@jove.acs.unt.edu”), or the faculty sponsor, Dr. Sharon Rac Jenkins, at (940) 565-2671 (e-mail “jenkinss@unt.edu”).

Please return your questionnaires and your reward request no later than December 30th, 1998.

This project has been reviewed and approved by The University of North Texas Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects, (940) 565-3940.
Demographic Questionnaire

1. Age _____
   0) Male
   1) Female

2. Sex
   ___ 0) Male
   ___ 1) Female

3. Race/Ethnicity
   ___ 1) Asian/Pacific Islander
   ___ 2) Black
   ___ 3) Hispanic
   ___ 4) Native American
   ___ 5) White
   ___ 6) Biracial/Multiracial

4. Which of the following best describes you?
   ___ 1) Heterosexual
   ___ 2) Bisexual
   ___ 3) Homosexual
   ___ 4) Unsure/Questioning
   ___ 5) Other ________________

5. Why does the answer you chose for Question 4 best describe you?

6. Occupation
   ___ 1) Administrative Support/Clerical
   ___ 2) Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing
   ___ 3) Construction Trade
   ___ 4) Executive/Administrative/Managerial
   ___ 5) Marketing/Sales
   ___ 6) Mechanic/Installer/Repairer
   ___ 7) Production
   ___ 8) Professional
   ___ 9) Self-employed
   ____ 10) Service
   ____ 11) Student (full-time)
   ____ 12) Technical/Technical Support
   ____ 13) Transportation/Material Moving

7. Education (highest level)
   ___ 1) Some high school
   ___ 2) High school graduate
   ___ 3) Technical/trade school
   ___ 4) Some college/2 yr. degree
   ___ 5) Bachelor’s degree
   ___ 6) Master’s degree
   ___ 7) Doctoral degree

8. Annual Income
   ___ 1) Less than $12,000
   ___ 2) $12,000 to $24,000
   ___ 3) $24,001 to $36,000
   ___ 4) $36,001 to $48,000
   ___ 5) $48,001 to $60,000
   ___ 6) more than $60,000

9. Religion
   ___ 1) Catholic
   ___ 2) Jewish
   ___ 3) Protestant
   ___ 4) Other ________________
   ___ 5) None

10. My religious beliefs are:
    ___ 1) Very important to me
        ___ 2) Somewhat important to
        ___ 3) Slightly important to me
        ___ 4) Not at all important to me
Demographic Questionnaire (continued)

11. My political beliefs overall are:
   _1) Very conservative
   _2) Somewhat conservative
   _3) Moderate
   _4) Somewhat liberal
   _5) Very liberal

12. I currently live in a:
   _1) Rural community
   _2) Suburban community
   _3) Urban community

13. State of residence ___

14. How many siblings do you have? (write number in blank)
   I have ____ siblings.

15. If you have siblings, in what order were you born? (for example, if you have two older siblings and one younger sibling, you would answer: I was born 3rd of 4 children)
   I was born ____ of ____ children.

16. What is your current relationship status?
   _1) Single and dating
   _2) Single and not dating
   _3) In a monogamous relationship
   _4) In a non-monogamous relationship

17. If you are in a relationship, how long have you and your partner been together?
   ____ years and ____ months

18. Have you ever been in a heterosexual marriage?
   _1) No
   _2) Yes, but no longer
   _3) Yes, and I’m still married

(please answer Questions 19 - 25 only if you identify yourself as homosexual or bisexual; otherwise, please skip to the Sexual Behavior History on the next page)

19. What age were you when your father learned your sexual orientation?
   _1) Under 13
   _2) 13-17
   _3) 18-21
   _4) 22-25
   _5) Over 25
   _6) He doesn’t know my sexual orientation

20. What age were you when your mother learned your sexual orientation?
   _1) Under 13
   _2) 13-17
   _3) 18-21
   _4) 22-25
   _5) Over 25
   _6) She doesn’t know my sexual orientation
Demographic Questionnaire (continued)

21. Have you ever received counseling or treatment that was specifically related to your sexual orientation (e.g., coming out, same-sex relationship problems, “conversion therapy”)?
   ___ 0) Yes
   ___ 1) No

22. If yes, whom did you see?
   ___ 1) Psychologist/therapist
   ___ 2) Family physician
   ___ 3) Clergy/Spiritual
   ___ 4) Psychiatrist
   ___ 5) Other ______________

23. What are your feelings about the origin of homosexuality?
   ___ 1) It is genetically/biologically determined
   ___ 2) It is learned from early childhood
   ___ 3) It is learned after childhood
   ___ 4) It is a combination of 1) and 2) or of 1) and 3)
   ___ 5) It is a chosen behavior
   ___ 6) Other ________________

24. Who among the following knows about your sexual orientation? (check all that apply)
   ___ 1) Parents
   ___ 2) Siblings
   ___ 3) Your own children
   ___ 4) Family other than parents, siblings, and children
   ___ 5) Employer
   ___ 6) Work colleagues
   ___ 7) Heterosexual friends
   ___ 8) Gay friends
   ___ 9) None of the above

25. When I socialize, I spend:
   ___ 1) Almost all my time with gay people
   ___ 2) A lot of my time with gay people
   ___ 3) Half my time with gay people, half my time with straight people
   ___ 4) A lot of my time with straight people
   ___ 5) Almost all my time with straight people
Kinsey Scale of Actual Sexual Orientation

Following are descriptions of different types of sexual behavior. Please read all the descriptions, in order from 0 to 6. Then, please circle the number of the description that you feel most closely describes the way your sexual behavior has been in the past, up to and including today.

0. I've had sex only with women. I've never had sex with other men.

1. I've almost always had sex with women, and I've only occasionally had sex with other men.

2. I've usually had sex with women, but I've had sex with other men more than just occasionally.

3. I've had sex equally as often with women as with men.

4. I've usually had sex with other men, but I've had sex with women more than just occasionally.

5. I've almost always had sex with other men, and I've only occasionally had sex with women.

6. I've had sex only with other men. I've never had sex with women.
Gay Identity Questionnaire

Please read each of the following statements carefully and then indicate whether you feel the statement is true or false for you at this point in time. A statement is answered as true if the entire statement is true, otherwise it is answered as false. Please use the following numbers to indicate your answer to each question:

1 = true  0 = false

Please write your answer in the space the precedes the question.

1. ___ I probably am sexually attracted equally to men and women.
2. ___ I live a homosexual lifestyle at home, while at work/school I do not want others to know about my lifestyle.
3. ___ My homosexuality is a valid private identity that I do not want made public.
4. ___ I have feelings I would label as homosexual.
5. ___ I have little desire to be around most heterosexuals.
6. ___ I doubt that I am homosexual, but still am confused about who I am sexually.
7. ___ I do not want most heterosexuals to know that I am definitely homosexual.
8. ___ I am very proud to be gay and make it known to everyone around me.
9. ___ I don't have much contact with heterosexuals and can't say that I miss it.
10. ___ I generally feel comfortable being the only gay person in a group of heterosexuals.
11. ___ I'm probably homosexual, even though I maintain a heterosexual image in both my personal and public life.
12. ___ I have disclosed to 1 or 2 people (very few) that I have homosexual feelings, although I'm not sure I'm homosexual.
13. ___ I am not as angry about society's treatment of gays because even though I've told everyone about my gayness, they have responded well.
14. ___ I am definitely homosexual but I do not share that knowledge with most people.
15. ___ I don't mind if homosexuals know that I have homosexual thoughts and feelings, but I don't want others to know.
16. ___ More than likely I'm homosexual, although I'm not positive about it.
17. ___ I don't act like most homosexuals do, so I doubt that I'm homosexual.
18. ___ I'm probably homosexual, but I'm not sure yet.
19. ___ I am openly gay and fully integrated into heterosexual society.
20. ___ I don't think that I'm homosexual.
21. ___ I don't feel I'm heterosexual or homosexual.
22. ___ I have thoughts I would label as homosexual.
23. ___ I don't want people to know that I may be homosexual, although I'm not sure if I am homosexual or not.
24. ___ I may be homosexual and I am upset at the thought of it.
Gay Identity Questionnaire (continued)

25. ___ The topic of homosexuality does not relate to me personally.
26. ___ I frequently confront people about their irrational homophobic (fear of homosexuality) feelings.
27. ___ Getting in touch with homosexuals is something I feel I need to do, even though I’m not sure I want to.
28. ___ I have homosexual thoughts and feelings but I doubt that I’m homosexual.
29. ___ I dread having to deal with the fact that I may be homosexual.
30. ___ I am proud and open with everyone about being gay, but it isn’t the major focus of my life.
31. ___ I probably am heterosexual or non-sexual.
32. ___ I’m experimenting with my same sex, because I don’t know what my sexual preference is.
33. ___ I feel accepted by homosexual friends and acquaintances, even though I’m not sure I’m homosexual.
34. ___ I frequently express to others, anger over heterosexuals’ oppression of me and other gays.
35. ___ I have not told most of the people at work that I am definitely homosexual.
36. ___ I accept but would not say I am proud of the fact that I am definitely homosexual.
37. ___ I cannot imagine sharing my homosexual feelings with anyone.
38. ___ Most heterosexuals are not credible sources of help for me.
39. ___ I am openly gay around gays and heterosexuals.
40. ___ I engage in sexual behavior I would label as homosexual.
41. ___ I am not about to stay hidden as gay for anyone.
42. ___ I tolerate rather than accept my homosexual thoughts and feelings.
43. ___ My heterosexual friends, family, and associates think of me as a person who happens to be gay, rather than a gay person.
44. ___ Even though I am definitely homosexual, I have not told my family.
45. ___ I am openly gay with everyone, but it doesn’t make me feel all that different from heterosexuals.
Heterosexual Mistrust Inventory

Following are some statements concerning beliefs, opinions, and attitudes about heterosexuals. Please read each statement carefully and give your honest feelings about the beliefs and attitudes expressed. Indicate the extent to which you agree by using the following scale:

1 = strongly disagree
2 = moderately disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = agree and disagree equally
5 = slightly agree
6 = moderately agree
7 = strongly agree

There are no right or wrong answers, only what is right for you. If in doubt, write the number which seems most nearly to express your present feelings about the statement. Please answer all items. Please write your answer in the space that precedes the question.

1. ___ Heterosexual people are usually fair to all people regardless of sexual orientation.
2. ___ There is no need for a homosexual person to work hard to get ahead financially because heterosexual people will take what they earn anyway.
3. ___ Homosexual people can rely on heterosexual lawyers to defend them to the best of their ability.
4. ___ Heterosexual politicians will promise homosexual people a lot but deliver little.
5. ___ Heterosexual policemen will slant a story to make homosexual people appear guilty.
6. ___ Heterosexual politicians usually can be relied on to keep the promises they make to homosexual people.
7. ___ Homosexual people should be suspicious of a heterosexual person who tries to be friendly.
8. ___ Whether you should trust a person or not is based on his or her sexual orientation.
9. ___ Probably the biggest reason heterosexual people want to be friendly with homosexual people is so they can take advantage of them.
10. ___ A homosexual person can usually trust his or her heterosexual co-workers.
11. ___ If a heterosexual person is honest in dealing with homosexual people, it is because of fear of negative consequences.
12. ___ A homosexual person cannot trust a heterosexual judge to evaluate him or her fairly.
13. ___ A homosexual person can feel comfortable making a deal with a heterosexual person simply by a handshake.
14. ___ Heterosexuals deliberately pass laws designed to block the progress of homosexual people.
15. ___ There are some heterosexuals who are trustworthy enough to have as friends.
Heterosexual Mistrust Inventory (continued)

16. ___ Homosexuals should not have anything to do with heterosexuals since they cannot be trusted.
17. ___ It is best for homosexuals to be on their guard when among heterosexuals.
18. ___ Heterosexual friends are least likely to break their promise.
19. ___ Homosexuals should be cautious about what they say in the presence of heterosexuals since heterosexuals will try to use the information against them.
20. ___ Heterosexuals can rarely be counted on to do what they say.
21. ___ Heterosexuals are usually honest with homosexual people.
22. ___ Heterosexuals are as trustworthy as members of any sexual orientation.
23. ___ Heterosexuals will say one thing and do another.
24. ___ Heterosexual politicians will take advantage of homosexuals every chance they get.
25. ___ Heterosexual police officers can be relied on to exert an effort to apprehend those who commit crimes against homosexuals.
26. ___ Heterosexuals will usually keep their word.
27. ___ Heterosexual police officers usually do not try to trick homosexuals into admitting they committed a crime which they didn't.
28. ___ There is no need for homosexuals to be more cautious with heterosexual businesspeople than with anyone else.
29. ___ There are some heterosexual businesspeople who are honest in business transactions with homosexuals.
30. ___ Heterosexual store owners, salespeople, and other heterosexual businesspeople tend to discriminate against homosexuals whenever they can.
31. ___ Heterosexuals who establish businesses in homosexual neighborhoods do so only so that they can take advantage of homosexuals.
32. ___ Homosexuals have often been deceived by heterosexual politicians.
33. ___ Heterosexual politicians are equally honest with homosexuals and heterosexuals.
34. ___ Homosexuals should not confide in heterosexuals because heterosexuals will use the information against them.
35. ___ A homosexual person can loan money to a heterosexual person feel confident it will be repaid.
36. ___ Heterosexual businesspeople usually will not try to cheat homosexuals.
37. ___ Heterosexual business executives will steal the ideas of their homosexual employees.
38. ___ Homosexuals should be suspicious of advice given by heterosexual politicians.
Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

Using the numbers given below, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Please write your answer in the space that precedes the question.

1 = strongly disagree  
2 = disagree  
3 = agree  
4 = strongly agree

1. ___ I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.

2. ___ I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

3. ___ All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

4. ___ I am able to do things as well as most other people.

5. ___ I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

6. ___ I take a positive attitude toward myself.

7. ___ On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

8. ___ I wish I could have more respect for myself.

9. ___ I certainly feel useless at times.

10. ___ At times I think I am no good at all.
Interpersonal Trust Scale

Please Indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement by using the following scale:

1 = strongly agree
2 = mildly agree
3 = agree and disagree equally
4 = mildly disagree
5 = strongly disagree

Please write your answer in the space that precedes the question.

1. ___ Hypocrisy is on the increase in our society.
2. ___ In dealing with strangers one is better off to be cautious until they have provided evidence that they are trustworthy.
3. ___ This country has a dark future unless we can attract better people into politics.
4. ___ Fear and social disgrace or punishment rather than conscience prevents most people from breaking the law.
5. ___ Using the honor system of not having a teacher present during exams would probably result in increased cheating.
6. ___ Parents usually can be relied on to keep their promises.
7. ___ The United Nations will never be an effective force in keeping world peace.
8. ___ The judiciary is a place where we can all get unbiased treatment.
9. ___ Most people would be horrified if they knew how much news that the public hears and sees is distorted.
10. ___ It is safe to believe that in spite of what people say most people are primarily interested in their own welfare.
11. ___ Even thought we have reports in newspapers, radio, and TV, it is hard to get objective accounts of public events.
12. ___ The future seems very promising.
13. ___ If we really knew what was going on in international politics, the public would have reason to be more frightened than they now seem to be.
14. ___ Most elected officials are really sincere in their campaign promises.
15. ___ Many major national sports contests are fixed in one way or another.
16. ___ Most experts can be relied upon to tell the truth about the limits of their knowledge.
17. ___ Most parents can be relied upon to carry out their threats of punishments.
18. ___ Most people can be counted on to do what they say they will do.
19. ___ In these competitive times one has to be alert or someone is likely to take advantage of you.
20. ___ Most idealists are sincere and usually practice what they preach.
21. ___ Most salesmen are honest in describing their products.
Interpersonal Trust Scale (continued)

22. ___ Most students in school would not cheat even if they were sure of getting away with it.
23. ___ Most repairmen will not overcharge even if they think you are ignorant of their speciality.
24. ___ A large share of accident claims filed against insurance companies are phony.
25. ___ Most people answer public opinion polls honestly.
Kinsey Scale of Preferred Sexual Orientation

Following are descriptions of different types of sexual behavior. Please read all the descriptions, in order from 0 to 6. Then, please circle the number of the description that you feel most closely describes the way you would prefer your sexual behavior to be in the future.

0. I'd have sex only with women. I'd never have sex with other men.

1. I'd almost always have sex with women, and I'd only occasionally have sex with other men.

2. I'd usually have sex with women, but I'd have sex with other men more than just occasionally.

3. I'd have sex equally as often with women as with men.

4. I'd usually have sex with other men, but I'd have sex with women more than just occasionally.

5. I'd almost always have sex with other men, and I'd only occasionally have sex with women.

6. I'd have sex only with other men. I'd never have sex with women.
APPENDIX B

TABLES
Table 1

Demographic Frequency Data for Gay Male Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial/Multiracial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Identification</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure/Questioning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/trade school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Income</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $12,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 to $24,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$24,001 to $36,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$36,001 to $48,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$48,001 to $60,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $60,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feelings About the Origin of Homosexuality</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genetic or biological determination</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned (early childhood)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned (after childhood)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of genetics or biology and learning</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chosen behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

**Sexual Identity and Sexual Orientation Frequencies for Gay Male Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cass' Model of Homosexual Identity Formation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage VI (Identity Synthesis)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage V (Identity Pride)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IV (Identity Acceptance)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage III (Identity Tolerance)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage II (Identity Comparison)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage I (Identity Confusion)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinsey Category of Actual Sexual Behavior*</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kinsey 6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsey 5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsey 4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsey 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsey 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsey 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinsey Category of Preferred Sexual Behavior*</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kinsey 6</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsey 5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsey 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsey 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsey 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsey 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aIndicates data missing from 5 subjects.*

*bIndicates data missing from 1 subject.*
### Table 3

**Pairwise Comparison of ITS Scores by Race for Gay Male Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean ITS Score</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>78.78</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>87.08</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93.57</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Higher ITS scores are indicative of greater levels of general trust.

* * p < .05
** ** p < .01
Table 4

Correlation Matrix of Self-Report Measures for Gay Male Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>measure</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>HMI</th>
<th>RSE</th>
<th>ITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subject age</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual Mistrust Inventory (HMI)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Trust Scale (ITS)</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Higher RSE scores are indicative of greater levels of self-esteem/well-being; higher ITS scores are indicative of greater levels of general trust.

* $p < .055$.

** $p < .01$. 
### Table 5

**Descriptive Statistics of Between-Groups Differences for HMI and Subscales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Homosexual Sample (n=128)</th>
<th>Heterosexual Sample (n=125)</th>
<th>( t^a )</th>
<th>prob(^b )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>range</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual Mistrust Inventory (HMI)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>122.15</td>
<td>29.29</td>
<td>53-204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Work Subscale (BW)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.59</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>13-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations Subscale (IR)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.82</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>21-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics and Law Subscale (PL)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48.73</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>16-60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) t-score obtained on difference between mean scores for each sample (df=251)

\(^b\) probability level
Table 6

Pairwise Contrasts of Mean Heterosexual Mistrust Scores by Stage of HIF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cass Stage</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>HMI mean</th>
<th>HMI SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>126.63</td>
<td>25.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>151.20</td>
<td>25.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>108.14</td>
<td>24.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>contrast</th>
<th>diff*</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV vs. V</td>
<td>24.57</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV vs. VI</td>
<td>18.49</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V vs. VI</td>
<td>43.06</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>6.76**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* difference between means
* * p < .01
** ** p < .001
Table 7

Factor Loadings and Items for Revised Heterosexual Mistrust Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.75</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1. Heterosexual businesspeople usually will not try to cheat homosexuals. (BW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>2. Heterosexual business executives will steal the ideas of their homosexual employees. (BW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.71</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3. Heterosexual police officers usually do not try to trick homosexuals into admitting they committed a crime which they didn't. (PL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>4. Homosexuals should not confide in heterosexuals because heterosexuals will use the information against them. (IR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.55</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>5. Heterosexual police officers can be relied on to exert an effort to apprehend those who commit crimes against homosexuals. (PL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.63</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6. Heterosexuals are usually honest with homosexual people. (IR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>7. Probably the biggest reason heterosexual people want to be friendly with homosexual people is so they can take advantage of them. (BW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.61</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>8. Heterosexuals will usually keep their word. (IR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>9. A homosexual person cannot trust a heterosexual judge to evaluate him or her fairly. (PL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>10. It is best for homosexuals to be on their guard when among heterosexuals. (IR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.68</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>11. There is no need for homosexuals to be more cautious with heterosexual businesspeople than with anyone else. (BW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>12. Heterosexual politicians will take advantage of homosexuals every chance they get. (PL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>13. Homosexual people should be suspicious of a heterosexual person who tries to be friendly. (IR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.66</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>14. A homosexual person can loan money to a heterosexual person and feel confident it will be repaid. (BW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>15. Homosexuals should be suspicious of advice given by heterosexual politicians. (PL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>16. A homosexual person can usually trust his or her heterosexual co-workers. (BW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>17. Heterosexuals are as trustworthy as members of any sexual orientation. (IR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: BW=Business and Work subscale; IR=Interpersonal Relations subscale; PL=Politics and Law Subscale

**factor loading < .25
Table 8

Visual Representation of Heterosexual Mistrust Factors and Quadrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistrust</td>
<td>Pervasive Mistrust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervasive Trust</td>
<td>Ambivalent Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Mistrust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalent Mistrust</td>
<td>Pervasive Mistrust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervasive Trust</td>
<td>Ambivalent Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Positively worded statements that suggest heterosexuals are trustworthy.

<sup>b</sup>Negatively worded statements that suggest heterosexuals are not trustworthy.
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