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A review of the literature on homophobia indicates that negative attitudes toward homosexuals and homosexuality have been empirically related to numerous socio-demographic and attitudinal variables. Research to this date has focused on the relationship between individual variables and homophobia rather than examining multiple variables simultaneously.

The purpose of the present investigation was to identify the factors which are predictive of homophobia. One hundred and ninety-four female and 115 male participants completed a biographical information questionnaire requesting socio-demographic information, self-proclaimed religiosities, frequency of church attendance, self-proclaimed political orientation, and political party identification. Participants also completed measures of attitudes toward male homosexuality, attitudes toward lesbianism, attitudes toward women, authoritarianism, sex anxiety, sexual attitudes, and socio-economic status.
Statistical treatment of the data through principal components analysis indicated that homophobic attitudes are best predicted by a factor identified as "conservatism". Other factors were identified which predicted homophobia to a lesser extent. Male participant gender was determined to predict homophobia toward male homosexuals, but gender was not found to predict homophobic attitudes toward lesbians.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Perhaps since the earliest recognition of individual differences, prejudice against members of outgroups has plagued humankind. Definitions of prejudice may or may not consider positive as well as negative prejudgements which people make. In the present discussion, however, the term prejudice will be used to refer exclusively to negative and hostile attitudes toward members of outgroups based on their group membership.

Gordon Allport was one of the earliest and, probably, the best-known theorist to focus on prejudice as a global attitude. Allport wrote: "Perhaps the briefest of all definitions of prejudice is thinking ill of others without warrant" (1954, p. 6). Goethals and Worchel (1981) defined prejudice as "an unjustified negative attitude toward an individual, based solely on that individual's membership in a certain group" (p. 125). Other definitions, although somewhat more complex, tend to be consistent. They share certain features such as a lack of acceptance and intolerance of any individual or group which differs in any way from the prejudiced individual.

Discrimination refers to negative behavior based upon prejudiced attitudes. Although Allport (1954) noted that
one's feelings toward a particular group are not always reflected in that individual's behavior toward that group's members, discriminatory behavior is often seen as the objective parallel of prejudice or as action growing out of prejudiced attitudes (Glaser & Possorny, 1979).

The present investigation is an examination of prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals and the factors which are predictive of such attitudes. Although prejudice toward homosexuals is not always indicative of discrimination, research findings suggest that homophobic attitudes are related to restriction of social access (Millham & Weinberger, 1977) and aggression (San Miguel & Millham, 1976) toward homosexuals. Considering that homosexuals in this nation continue to be subject to legal discrimination (e.g., court martials and administrative discharge from military service, prohibition of homosexual marriage) and illegal discrimination (e.g., "queer-bashing"), the importance of understanding homophobia should not be understated.

Attitudes Toward Homosexuals

Terminology

In the relatively brief period of time during which attitudes toward homosexual behavior have been studied, numerous terms have been utilized to refer to negative attitudes. According to Weinberg (1972), these different
terms reflect the multiple theoretical assumptions and political orientation of the investigators. Among the terms coined to refer to negative attitudes toward homosexuality are homosexphobia (Levitt & Klassen, 1974), homosexism (Lehne, 1976), and heterosexism (Morin & Garfinkle, 1978). Homophobia (Smith, 1971) is clearly the most frequently used term. According to Gramick (1983, p. 137), homophobia actually means "fear of the same" and is, therefore, an inappropriate term to use in reference to negative attitudes. However, since homophobia is generally accepted by theorists, investigators, and the media, the term is used here to refer to all negative prejudices against homosexuality.

Public Opinions Toward Homosexuality

According to Byrne (1977), society's general attitudes toward sexual behaviors had changed dramatically during the previous quarter century. Nevertheless, extreme attitudes toward homosexuality persist in contemporary society. Levitt and Klassen (1974) conducted a survey of 30,018 representative non-institutionalized American adults. They found that 59% of the respondents believed that homosexual behavior should be illegal. Further, 82% believed that gay males should not be allowed to engage in professions of influence and authority, and 75% believed that homosexuals may pose a threat to children. Approximately half of the
respondents polled (Levitt & Klassen, 1974) indicated beliefs that homosexuals should not be permitted to organize for social and recreational purposes. Half of the respondents also believed that homosexuality is a corruption of society, and may eventually result in civilization's downfall.

A Gallup poll (1977) found that half of the representative American sample believed that homosexual behavior should be illegal; 44% believed that homosexuals should not have equal access to job opportunities, and approximately 70% believed that they should not be permitted to adopt children. Similarly, a public opinion survey conducted by Wilson, Strong, Clark, and Johns (1977) revealed that homosexuals were ranked as the third most dangerous population in the United States, outranked only by communists and atheists. Among college students, Nyberg and Alston (1977) found that a majority believed that homosexuality was morally wrong. Laner and Laner (1980) determined that college students ranked homosexuals lower than heterosexuals on a hierarchy of likeableness. Examining attitudes toward homosexuality and femininity in males, Storms (1978) compared college students' responses to two men who presented stereotypical feminine interests and attitudes. The subjects in this study rated the man who was introduced as a heterosexual as significantly more likeable
than the man who was introduced as engaging in homosexual behavior. Recently, Hong (1984) suggested that the traditional negative attitudes of the public toward homosexuals may be intensified by the Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) crisis. Overall, the aforementioned research suggests that the public opinion toward homosexuals remains a negative one.

**Etiology of Homophobia**

Relatively few explanations for the etiology of homophobia have appeared in the literature. Most of the existing theoretical work has been written from a psychodynamic perspective. Freud (1905/1961) theorized that all children have strong attractions to their same-sex parent, but that these feelings are generally repressed during the Oedipus complex. In cases in which Oedipal resolution is incomplete, however, homosexuality may result. Ferenczi (1914/1956) theorized that heterosexual man's feelings of aversion, hostility, and disgust toward male homosexuality are actually reaction formations, and are symptomatic of defense against the affectionate feelings toward the same sex which result from incomplete Oedipus complex resolution. While Ferenczi did not extend his analysis to female attitudes toward lesbians, a similar process may be inferred from this perspective.

More recently, the psychodynamic ego-defensive view of homophobia has been restated by Altman (1971), Cory (1951),
Herek (1984a, 1984b), MacDonald (1976), Mieli (1980), and Morin and Garfinkle (1981). Empirical support for the psychodynamic ego-defensive view has been offered by several investigators. Weis and Dain (1979) found a positive correlation between higher levels of ego development as measured by the Washington University Sentence Completion Test and tolerance toward homosexuality. San Miguel and Millham (1976) discovered that homophobic males were more likely to respond punitively toward a man labeled as homosexual if he had also been identified as similar to the subject. Punitiveness was measured by the subjects' propensity to deny confederates-targets opportunities for financial gain. Heinemann, Pelander, Vogelbusch, and Wojtek (1981) found that physiological arousal as measured by skin-resistance and reduced eye-contact was evidenced when male subjects believed that they were talking to a male homosexual.

With the exception of the psychodynamic literature, there are few theoretical explanations for the etiology of homophobia. Perhaps the best-known presentation of potential etiologies of such attitudes was made by Weinberg (1972). He identified five possible motives underlying homophobia. First, the religious motive was traced back to the Judeo-Christian stricture against "spilling the seed" as well as other biblical prohibitions. Second, the secret fear
of being a homosexual could result in a reaction formation against homosexuality. Third, the heterosexual male envies homosexuals because the latter are not constrained by the masculine ideal. Fourth, homosexuality poses a threat to heterosexuals' values because those who do not adopt society's "normal" value system may be perceived as undermining the interests and goals of the majority. Fifth, homosexuality is associated with existence without vicarious immortality. Persons who do not produce offspring may reawaken the heterosexual's fear of death. Weinberg stated that any one or any combination of these motives may result in homophobic attitudes. Similarly, Herek (1984b), Smith (1973), and Smith, Bruner, and White (1956) suggested that homophobia results from multiple causes and probably serves different functions for different individuals. As of this time, no research supporting the multiple causality of homophobia has been conducted.

While a social learning explanation for the etiology of homophobia has not appeared in the literature, such a perspective appears to be reasonable. As with other prejudices, homophobia may result from observational learning, with the attitude becoming stronger as it is reinforced. Unfortunately, no research exists linking social learning theory and research to homophobia.
Socio-demographic characteristics related to homophobia.

While theoretical literature pertaining to the etiology of homophobia is relatively scarce, there exists a substantial body of empirical research relating negative attitudes to various socio-demographic characteristics and personality traits.

Sex differences. A large body of literature has supported William James' (1900) and Weinberg's (1972) notion that individuals prejudiced toward homosexuals tend to be male (Bierly, 1985; Brown & Amoroso, 1975; Glassner & Owen, 1976; Hong, 1984; Morin, Taylor, & Kielman, 1975; Morin & Wallace, 1975; Steffensmeier & Steffensmeier, 1974; Young & Whertvine, 1982). These investigators have identified positive correlations between being male and homophobia. Similarly, males have been found to be more homophobic than females in studies examining attitudes toward sexual behavior (Aguero, Bloch, & Byrne, 1984; Cerny & Polyson, 1984; Nutt & Sedlacek, 1974; Turnbull & Brown, 1977; Weis & Dain, 1979), sexual stereotypes and prejudices (Gurwitz & Marcus, 1978; Hansen, 1982a; Price 1982), sex role attitudes (Krulwich & Nash, 1980; Lieblich & Friedman, 1985), feminism (Minnigerode, 1976), religiosity (Hong, 1983; Maret, 1984), authoritarianism (Larsen, Reed, & Hoffman, 1980), and the effects of gender of the investigator (Kite, 1984). In addition, several public opinion polls (Black &
Stevenson, 1983; Conley & O'Rourke, 1973; Dressler, 1979; Gallup, 1977; Nyberg & Alston, 1977) have suggested that males are more homophobic than are females.

While the body of literature supporting the notion that males are more homophobic is impressive in its scope and volume, it should be noted that several investigators (Henley & Pincus, 1978; Herek, 1984b; Hudson & Ricketts, 1980; Irwin & Thompson, 1977; MacDonald, Huggins, Young, & Swanson, 1973; Morin, 1974; Smith, 1971) have failed to obtain significant correlations between gender and homophobia. Likewise, an absence of sex differences has been reported in experimental studies examining attitudes toward sexual behavior (MacDonald & Games, 1974), sex role attitudes (Weinberger & Millham, 1979), and personal constructs (Leitner & Cado, 1982). Several public opinion polls (Black & Stevenson, 1984; Bowman, 1979; Glenn & Weaver, 1979; Levitt & Klassen, 1974; Nyberg & Alston, 1976) have also yielded an absence of sex differences in attitudes toward homosexuals. Two polls (Crew, 1978; Rooney & Gibbons, 1966) suggested that females are actually more homophobic than are males. It should be noted, however, that the studies by Crew and by Rooney and Gibbons are completely lacking in formal statistical analysis and are methodologically weak in that they utilize extremely homogeneous samples. Thus, these findings cannot be confidently generalized to society as a whole.
Several investigators have attempted to explain the variance in findings pertaining to gender differences in extent of homophobia. Herek (1984a) suggested that studies in which no sex differences have been found have generally been based on national opinion polls and, therefore, were not as rigorous as were more scientifically-oriented studies. Herek cited several studies (Bowman, 1979; Glenn & Weaver, 1979; Irwin & Thompson, 1977; Levitt & Klassen, 1974; Nyberg & Alston, 1976) to support his hypothesis. These studies used opinion polls and based their conclusions on simple percentages rather than formal statistical analyses. However, several methodologically strong investigations in which no sex differences were found (Leitner & Cado, 1982; MacDonald & Games, 1974; Weinberger & Millham, 1979) challenge Herek's explanation. In these studies, the investigators utilized appropriate sampling techniques, used reliable and well-validated measures of homophobia, and analyzed their data through rigorous techniques of formal statistical analysis.

Kite (1984) performed a meta-analysis of 24 studies on homophobia and identified several methodological and demographic variables which may have influenced findings on sex differences. Of the variables which were discussed, only the sex of the author(s) was not significant. Sample size and year of publication, on the other hand, were
identified as important variables. Kite maintained that as sample sizes increase, sex differences tend to decrease in magnitude. This hypothesis has been disputed, however, by studies in which sample sizes have been quite large. For example, Dressler (1979) studied 528 respondents and Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier (1974) questioned 373 subjects. The results of each of these investigations nevertheless suggested that females are less homophobic than are males. Kite also maintained that year of publication was a crucial variable in determining the presence or absence of sex differences. More recent investigations tend to show larger sex differences than do older studies. However, recent investigations (Black & Stevenson, 1984; Greendlinger, 1985; Herek, 1984b) in which no sex differences were observed suggest that the literature is now actually mixed in terms of identifying sex differences.

Several investigators (Nyberg & Alston, 1977; Rushing, 1979; Steffensmeier & Steffensmeier, 1974) and literature reviews (Black & Stevenson, 1984; Morin & Garfinkle, 1978; Page & Yee, 1985) have suggested that society as a whole tends to judge male homosexuality more harshly than it judges lesbianism. A number of explanations have been offered. Simon and Gagon (1969) and Karlen (1971) argued that males are more likely to experience the consequences of homophobia than are females. They suggested that in
American society, male homosexual behavior is considered more distasteful or repulsive than lesbianism. Siegel (1981) supported this point, noting that many heterosexually-oriented pornographic films include lesbian lovemaking scenes while male homosexual lovemaking scenes are rare. Thus, the proportion of the population which has viewed pornographic films may have been desensitized, to a certain extent, to lesbian sexual behavior but not to male homosexuality.

Inequality between the sexes has also been implicated. Page and Yee (1985) proposed that male gender nonconformity is viewed more harshly than is nonconformity among females. This, they proposed, may be due to the increased visibility of "inappropriate" social or sex roles in males being more threatening. To Siegel (1981), the strongest possible explanation for differing perceptions of gay males and lesbians is the notion that lesbians are simply women attempting to be males. Such behavior is then excusable, since these women are attempting to ascend to the assumed superior position of males. Siegel also suggested that society's indifference toward lesbianism compared to its strong feelings about male homosexuality is further evidence of women's traditional second-class status. She noted that this is consistent with the tendency to discount women in matters of politics, economics, and other areas of pursuit.
Siegel's argument is not dissimilar from those made by Price (1982) and Rich (1980), who emphasized the fundamentally different socialization processes and social positions of men and women.

Kite (1984) has emphasized the importance of examining the interaction between the sex of the subject and the sex of the target. She suggested that males are more homophobic toward male homosexuals, but that there is no significant sex difference in terms of attitudes toward lesbians. In contrast, Turnbull and Brown (1977) identified a high positive correlation between attitudes toward male and female homosexuals, regardless of the subject's gender. Cuegnot and Fugita (1982) reported a greater avoidance reaction to same-sex as opposed to opposite-sex perceived homosexuals among both male and female subjects. This is consistent with San Miguel and Millham's (1976) finding that males are more homophobic toward someone who is similar rather than dissimilar to themselves. Likewise, several investigators (Herek, 1984b; Millham, San Miguel, & Kellogg, 1976; Weinberger & Millham, 1979) have determined that both males and females prefer opposite-sex over same-sex homosexuals. Opposite-sex homosexuals may also elicit less anxiety than same-sex homosexuals in both sexes (Millham et al., 1976). Such findings are consistent with the psychodynamic ego-defensive theory of homophobia which
suggests that many individuals are hostile toward homosexuals because they fear their own ego-dystonic and generally unarticulated homoerotic impulses. Overall, however, it should be noted that findings in studies examining the interaction between the sex of the subject and the sex of the target homosexual have been mixed.

Religion. Homophobia has been strongly linked to religiosity, frequent attendance of church, and subscription to a conservative religious ideology. Several investigators (Alston, 1974; Glenn & Weaver, 1979; Irwin & Thompson, 1977; Nyberg & Alston, 1976; White, 1979) have found that Jews and individuals endorsing no religion were significantly less homophobic than were Catholics or Protestants. Bierly (1985) recently reported a strong positive correlation between homophobia and self-identification as "Christian" as opposed to Catholic, Protestant, or endorsing no religion. Henley and Pincus (1978) found that Catholics, Protestants, and Jews were significantly more homophobic than were persons of non-mainstream religions (e.g., Buddhism, Hinduism) and those who did not acknowledge any religion. Bowman (1979) concluded that less homophobic respondents tended not to claim any religious affiliation. The results of a study by Hansen (1982b) indicated the existence of a positive correlation between religiosity and homophobia among females but not among males. However, the results of
numerous correlational studies (e.g., Larsen, Cate, & Reed, 1983; Larsen, Reed, & Hoffman, 1980; Leitner & Cado, 1982; Maret, 1984; Morin & Wallace, 1975) suggests that there exists a positive relationship between homophobia and religious orthodoxy and fanaticism among both sexes.

In opinion questionnaires, Cameron and Ross (1981) and White (1979) have determined that individuals who described themselves as more religiously devoted tended to be more homophobic. Questionnaire research (Hong, 1983; 1984; Irwin & Thompson, 1977; Nyberg & Alston, 1976; Snyder & Spreitzer, 1976; West, 1977) has also indicated that homophobic individuals attended church more frequently than did those with relatively positive attitudes.

Of all of the studies investigating the relationship between religiosity and attitudes toward homosexuality, only that conducted by Smith (1971) failed to identify a significant difference between homophobic and liberal subjects or respondents in terms of religious beliefs and practices. Overall, the literature suggests that devout Christians, particularly fundamentalist Protestants, are more likely to be homophobic than are members of other religious groups and individuals who endorse no religion. These findings are consistent with the religious motive suggested by Weinberg (1972) as a possible etiological factor in the development of homophobia.
Race. Several studies have examined racial differences in terms of homophobia, with mixed results. Crew's (1978) survey determined that black English department chairpersons were less homophobic than were white chairpersons. This result was consistent with polls (Gallup, 1977; Levitt & Klassen, 1974) finding that homophobic individuals tended to be white. Results of polls conducted by Glenn and Weaver (1979) and Irwin and Thompson (1977), however, suggested that there were no racial differences in terms of extent of homophobia. Additional research would be helpful in determining whether race differences in attitudes toward homosexuality exist.

Age. Numerous investigators have attempted to determine the relationship between age and homophobia. Public opinion polls (Bowman, 1979; Gallup, 1977; Hong, 1984; Hudson & Ricketts, 1980; Irwin & Thompson, 1977; Nyberg & Alston, 1976; Snyder & Spreitzer, 1976; West, 1977) have suggested that older individuals tend to be more homophobic than are younger people. Interestingly, earlier research (Levitt & Klassen, 1974; Rooney & Gibbons, 1966; Smith, 1971) yielded results inconsistent with these later findings. This inconsistency may be indicative of time-related changes in attitudes rather than change due to maturational factors.

Educational attainment. Numerous opinion surveys (Gallup, 1977; Glenn & Weaver, 1979; Hong, 1984; Hudson &
Ricketts, 1980; Irwin & Thompson, 1977; Nyberg & Alston, 1976; Rooney & Gibbons, 1966; Snyder & Spreitzer, 1976; West, 1977) have suggested that respondents with more years of formal education were less likely to be homophobic than were less educated individuals. Similar results were obtained in a correlational study of homophobia among nurses by White (1979). A study by Bowman (1979), however, yielded no significant relationship between homophobia and level of education. It should be noted, however, that Bowman's investigation utilized respondents from New Zealand; thus, his results may have been influenced by cultural factors. Negative correlations have been found between homophobia and mothers' levels of education (Thompson, Grisanti, & Pleck, 1985) and parents' levels of education (Henley & Pincus, 1978).

Region. Opinion polls (Gallup, 1977; Irwin & Thompson, 1977; Levitt & Klassen, 1974; Nyberg & Alston, 1976) have suggested that homophobic individuals are more likely to dwell in rural settings than in urban areas. Nyberg and Alston (1976) concluded from their poll that homosexual relations were more likely to be accepted in liberal sociodemographic "pockets" of the country, which tend to be urban. Three polls (Crew, 1978; Irwin & Thompson, 1977; Levitt & Klassen, 1974) have indicated that respondents living in the northeastern or Pacific coastal areas were
less homophobic than were individuals from the midwestern or southern parts of the United States. Responses to a questionnaire administered by Glassner and Owen (1976) suggested that attitudes toward homosexuality were not influenced by the region of the country nor by the size of the locality from which an individual originated. However, the Glassner and Owen study utilized a small (n=61) sample from a single university as opposed to large, representative samples utilized in opinion polls.

**Personality characteristics and socio-political attitudes.**

**Authoritarianism and dogmatism.** One of several personality characteristics which appears to be positively correlated with homophobia is authoritarianism (Greendlinger, 1985; Karr, 1978; Larsen et al., 1980; MacDonald, 1974; MacDonald & Games, 1974; Sobel, 1976). Stokes, Fuehrer, and Childs (1980) suggested that the Anti-Homosexuality Scale (Dunbar, Brown, & Amoroso, 1973a) may measure general characteristics such as authoritarianism as well as homophobia. Hood (1973) found that a high-dogmatism group had more negative attitudes toward homosexuality than a low-dogmatism group. Morin and Wallace (1976) identified a strong positive relationship between homophobia and traditional family ideology, which is also central to the authoritarian personality syndrome (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950).
Conservatism. Henley and Pincus (1978) reported that individuals endorsing conservative/radical right or middle-of-the-road political orientations were likely to be more homophobic than were those who endorsed the liberal orientation. Individuals holding the least homophobic attitudes labeled themselves as belonging to the radical left. Irwin and Thompson (1977) discovered that respondents who were "conservative" on items addressing attitudes toward various social issues tended to be intolerant of homosexuality. In a review, Lehne (1976) concluded that homophobia was actually a part of a constellation of social and political attitudes rather than a fear of homosexuality.

Attitudes toward sex. Correlational studies (Berry & Marks, 1969; Brown & Amoroso, 1975; Dunbar et al., 1973a; Dunbar, Brown, & Vuorinen, 1973b; Morin & Wallace, 1976; Smith, 1971) and an opinion survey (Levitt & Klassen, 1974) have found a strong positive relationship between homophobia and sexual rigidity. The results of several studies (Brown & Amoroso, 1975; Dunbar et al., 1973a; MacDonald & Games, 1974; Minnigerode, 1976) have suggested that homophobia and a tendency to express conservative, restricted attitudes about sexual behavior in general are positively related. Turnbull and Brown (1977) reported that homophobic individuals were more likely to label slides of naked figures as "pornographic" than were subjects with more
liberal attitudes toward homosexuality. MacDonald et al. (1973), however, hypothesized that negative attitudes toward male homosexuals are more highly associated with support of the double standard for the sexes than with permissiveness or non-permissiveness of attitudes regarding sexual intimacy.

A number of correlational studies (Berry & Marks, 1969; Dunbar et al., 1973a; Dunbar et al., 1973b; Weis & Dain, 1979; Yarber & Yee, 1983; Yee, 1982) and an opinion survey (Levitt & Klassen, 1974) have suggested that a positive relationship exists between homophobia and sex-guilt. Mosher and O'Grady (1979) provided experimental support for these findings. They found that after viewing explicit sexual films, homophobic individuals scored higher on the Shame scale of the Adjective Checklist than did more liberal subjects. In addition, homophobia has been positively related to a general fear of sex (Berry & Marks, 1969; Yarber & Yee, 1983; Yee, 1982).

Attitudes toward women and sex roles. Several investigators have found a high positive correlation between traditional attitudes toward women and homophobia (Bierly, 1985; Henley & Pincus, 1978; MacDonald, 1974; MacDonald & Games, 1974; MacDonald et al., 1973; Minnigerode, 1976). Smith, Kilpatrick, Sutker, and Marcotte (1976) and Smith, Resick, and Kilpatrick (1980) both reported that males with
traditional attitudes toward women were more homophobic than were liberal males. Recently, Thompson et al. (1985) suggested that homophobia may actually be a specific component of a broad theme of anti-femininity within the male role.

Many investigators (Brown & Amoroso, 1975; Dunbar et al., 1973b; Laner & Laner, 1979; 1980; MacDonald, 1974; MacDonald & Games, 1974; MacDonald et al., 1973; Morin & Wallace, 1976; Thompson et al., 1985; Weinberger & Millham, 1979) have identified a positive correlation between homophobia and support of traditional sex roles. These results are consistent with a public opinion poll by Black and Stevenson (1983). Likewise, Krulewitz and Nash (1980) and Smith et al. (1980) found that subjects endorsing liberal sex-role attitudes were less homophobic than were those with traditional sex-role attitudes. In addition, homophobia has been positively related to rejection of equality between the sexes (Black & Stevenson, 1984; MacDonald, 1974; MacDonald & Games, 1974; Morin & Wallace, 1976; Smith et al., 1980; Weinberger & Millham, 1979) and to possession of extremely differentiated concepts of masculinity and femininity (Black & Stevenson, 1984; Dunbar et al., 1973a; Lieblich & Friedman, 1985; MacDonald & Games, 1974; Morin & Wallace, 1976).

Lieblich and Friedman (1985) recently found a positive relationship between the strength of gender boundaries
within a society and the extent of fear and rejection of homosexuality. MacDonald (1974) and Morin and Garfinkle (1978) have declared that homophobia should be seen as a powerful and central dynamic in the maintenance of traditional male roles. Weinberg (1972) suggested that homophobic males may feel great pressure to be the sexual aggressor. In addition, such males expect that women will be passive and conforming. MacDonald and Games (1974) have hypothesized that sex-role confusion is the crux of the relationship between homophobia and sex-role rigidity. Similarly, Marmor (1980) concluded that heterosexuals who are generally secure about their own gender identity and sexual orientation feel less threatened by homosexuals and homosexual behavior than do those individuals who are insecure.

Other related personality characteristics. Several investigators (Dunbar et al., 1973a; MacDonald, 1974; MacDonald & Games, 1974; MacDonald et al., 1973) have reported positive correlations between homophobia and intolerance of ambiguity. Thompson et al. (1985) recently found a positive correlation between Type A behavior and homophobia. Another behavior which investigators have studied in relationship to attitudes toward homosexuality is self-disclosure. Correlational studies (Edgar, 1983; Lewis, 1978; MacDonald & Games, 1974; Stokes et al., 1980) and a
literature review by Lehne (1976) suggest that homophobic individuals are less likely to self-disclose than are those who hold more positive attitudes toward homosexuals. Finally, the findings of correlational research by Hudson and Ricketts (1980) and a survey by Sobel (1976) indicated that homophobia is common among individuals with low self-esteem.

Purpose

As the review of the literature has clearly indicated, numerous socio-demographic characteristics and attitudes (e.g. religiosity, authoritarianism, political conservatism, sexual conservatism and anxiety, traditional attitudes toward women) have been linked empirically to homophobia. When these variables are considered simultaneously, a common thread of conservatism is suggested. However, investigators of negative attitudes toward homosexuality have tended to consider variables related to homophobia individually rather than simultaneously. For this reason, it is still uncertain whether there exists a factor or factors common to these variables which may serve as strong predictors of homophobic attitudes. Therein lies the purpose of the present investigation.

The identification of factors which may predict homophobia is complicated by the potential interaction between an individual’s own gender and the gender of a perceived homosexual. As has been noted in the review of
the literature, investigations examining this interaction have yielded mixed results. However, most investigators and theorists seem to believe that males and females both prefer opposite-sex homosexuals over same-sex homosexuals. Accordingly, a secondary purpose of the present investigation is to ascertain whether the notion of opposite-sex homosexual preference is supported by a model for the prediction of homophobic attitudes.

Hypotheses

In accordance with the purpose of this investigation, the following hypotheses were proposed:

1) A factor which is consistent with conservatism will be the strongest predictor of homophobic attitudes.

2) Gender will be a significant predictor of homophobic attitudes, with male participant gender being predictive of homophobia toward male homosexuals and female participant gender being predictive of homophobia toward lesbians.
Chapter II

METHOD

Participants

Participants in this investigation were 351 undergraduate college students at a large state university in Texas who were recruited from undergraduate classes in psychology and philosophy. Because participation in this study was restricted to college students of traditional college age, and because some of the participants did not complete the questionnaires, the final sample was comprised of 309 college students. Of the 309 participants whose data were appropriate for analysis, 194 were female and 115 were male, with an average age of 20.07 years. In terms of race, 87% of the participants were white, 8% black, 3% Hispanic, 1% Asian, and 1% designated themselves as not belonging to any of the above racial groups. Forty-one per cent of the participants indicated that they were Protestants, 22% Catholics, 1% Jewish, and 36% identified themselves as "Other". In terms of geographic background, 23% of the final sample indicated that they were raised in a rural area, with 57% indicating suburban backgrounds and 19% identifying themselves as having been raised in inner-city or urban environments.
Materials

Biographical Information Questionnaire

A questionnaire requesting biographical information and background data (see Appendix A) was devised by the author of the present investigation.

Attitudes Toward Male Homosexuality Scale (ATHSM) and Attitudes Toward Female Homosexuality Scale (ATHSF)

For the purpose of this study, attitudes toward male homosexuality were measured by the ATHSM and attitudes toward lesbianism were measured by the ATHSF (MacDonald & Games, 1974) (see Appendices B and C). These scales are modified forms of the original non-sex-specific Attitudes Toward Homosexuality Scale (ATHS) (MacDonald et al., 1973). The difference between these scales is that the words "male", "female", "male homosexual", and "lesbian" have been substituted where appropriate. The ATHSM and ATHSF consist respectively of 28 statements about homosexuals and 28 about lesbians. Each item is scored on a nine-point Likert scale, with a score of one assigned to the least homophobic response and nine signifying the most homophobic response (other than on items 3, 8, 13, and 18, on which the scoring is reversed). Thus, total scores may range from 28 to 252. In MacDonald and Games' (1974) normative sample of 94 male and 103 female college undergraduate sociology students, ATHSM scores ranged from 37 to 239 and ATHSF scores ranged
from 37 to 230. The authors reported internal consistency alpha coefficients of .934 and .931 for males and females respectively on the ATHSM. Alpha coefficients of .940 and .918 were obtained for males and females respectively on the ATHSF. More recently, Goldberg (1982) reported a test-retest reliability coefficient of .890.

The validity of the ATHS has been supported by two investigations. MacDonald et al. (1973) administered the ATHS to members of a homophile organization. Homosexuals were found to be less homophobic than were heterosexuals. The results of that study have more recently been replicated by Weis and Dain (1979). Support for the construct validity of the ATHS could be gained through correlating it with some of the other measures of homophobia which have appeared in the literature. It should be noted that compared to these other measures of homophobia, the reliability and validity of the ATHS have been well-substantiated. In addition, the ATHS is the only scale which allows for the distinction between attitudes toward male homosexuals and attitudes toward lesbians.

**Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS), Shortened Version**

For the purpose of this study, attitudes toward the role of women were measure by the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, Shortened Version (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973) (see Appendix D), which, as the name implies, is a shortened
version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (Spence & Helmreich, 1972).

The original AWS items may be categorized into six independent groups on the basis of their content: (1) vocational, educational, and intellectual roles, (2) freedom and independence, (3) dating, courtship, and etiquette, (4) drinking, swearing, and dirty jokes, (5) sexual behavior, and (6) marital relationships and obligations. Items consist of 55 statements, to which the subject responds either "agree strongly", "agree mildly", "disagree mildly", or "disagree strongly". Each item is scored from zero to three, with zero representing the most traditional response and three representing the most liberal response. Total score may range from zero to 165, with zero signifying the ultimate degree of traditionality and 165 signifying the ultimate degree of liberality of attitudes toward women.

Spence and Helmreich's normative sample consisted of 713 male and 768 female introductory psychology students at the University of Texas, along with 292 of the mothers and 232 of the fathers of these students. The average score for the female student sample was 98.211, with scores ranging from 35 to 161. Male students endorsed less liberal attitudes toward women, with an average score of 89.261 with scores ranging from 37 to 156. The average scores of the mothers in the normative sample was 86.500, while fathers' average score was 81.358.
The test-retest reliability of the AWS was found by Collins (1974) to be .95. Stein and Weston (1982) reported the scale's split-half reliability to be .92. Smith and Bradley (1980) determined a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .93 for the AWS. Although Goldberg, Katz, and Rappeport (1979) criticized the AWS as being vulnerable to falsification, Ward's (1978) investigation suggested otherwise. Ward used what is referred to as the "bogus pipeline paradigm". In her investigation, half of the sample completed the AWS while being monitored through EMG biofeedback apparatus. The rest of the sample was administered the scale in a non-controlled situation. Ward found no difference in attitudes between females in the condition in which the subjects believed they could control for response distortion and those in the non-controlled situation. The author interpreted this finding to suggest that social approval does not play a significant role in the measurement of attitudes toward women. The replication of Ward's study with male subjects would be useful in determining whether a social desirability factor influences responses to the AWS among males.

Studies supporting the validity of the AWS are abundant in the literature, with support for the construct validity occurring most frequently. Early investigations include that by Collins (1974), who found that females active in
women's rights scored significantly higher on the AWS than did females not active in the women's movement. Results of Collins' study have been replicated in subsequent investigations by Kilpatrick and Smith (1974), Trail (1976), Leidig (1977), Volgy (1976), and Baucom and Sanders (1978). Seemingly related to these studies are two investigations by Jacobson and Insko (1984;1985). In their initial study, the authors determined that females who preferred the title "Ms." scored higher on the AWS than did females who preferred either the term "Miss" or "Mrs.". In the second study, the authors identified a positive correlation between subjects' scores on the AWS and a tendency to use non-sexist pronouns.

The construct validity of the AWS has also been supported in investigations of perceived attractiveness of feminists (Johnson, Doiron, Brooks, & Dickinson, 1978; Johnson, Holborn, & Turcotte, 1979), attitudes toward sex roles in advertising (Lammers & Wilkinson, 1980; Rossi & Rossi, 1985), perceived competence of females (Holahan & Stephan, 1981; Leventhal & Matturo, 1981), attitudes toward women in sports (Hoferek, 1978; Michael, Gilroy, & Sherman, 1984), and preferred body type (Maier & Lavrakas, 1984).

Construct validity data on the AWS have also been supported adequately through several correlational investigations. Doyle (1975) reported a positive
correlation of .87 between the AWS and Kirkpatrick's Feminist-Anti-Feminist Belief-Pattern Scale. Benson and Vincent (1980) obtained a positive correlation of .63 between the AWS and their Sexist Attitudes Toward Women Scale. Two investigations (Harren, 1979; Tinsley, Kass, Moreland, & Harren, 1983) have identified positive correlations between the AWS and the Attitudes Toward Male Transcendence Scale. Downs and Engleson (1982) obtained strong positive correlations (males, $r = .84$; females, $r = .57$) between the AWS and traditional attitudes toward males as measured by the Attitudes Toward Males Scale. Most recently, King and King (1986) reported a positive correlation of .73 between the AWS and the Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale.

Subsequently, Spence et al. (1973) produced a shortened version of the AWS in order to expedite research on attitudes toward women. The authors composed the 25-item shortened version from items on the original AWS. The shortened version is scored identically to the longer version, with a total score of zero signifying the ultimate degree of traditionality and a total of 75 signifying the ultimate degree of liberality of attitudes toward women. The shortened version's items were selected through a process involving item analysis on data obtained from 241 female and 286 male introductory psychology students, using
biserial correlations. The shortened AWS was cross-validated on the mothers and fathers of the students, as well as on the students themselves. Cross-validation coefficients ranged from .956 to .969 among these groups. Correlations were also obtained between total scores on the shortened version and its individual items. All part-whole correlations were significant at the $p < .001$ level, ranging from .31 to .73 among the students and .14 to .70 among the parents.

The shortened version of the AWS has generally replaced the original form of the test in research on attitudes toward women. Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1975) determined the correlation between the original and the shortened versions of the AWS to be .97 for both males and females. More recently, Smith and Bradley (1980) reported a correlation coefficient of .99 between the long and shortened forms of the AWS. In terms of reliability of the shortened version, Smith and Bradley obtained Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .90 for males and .87 for females. They also determined that a factor analysis yielded only one major factor, accounting for 22% of the variance. Smith and Bradley called this factor "traditionality-nontraditionality". Finally, Korth (1978) noted that the 25-item version of the AWS has removed items from the original form which are extraneous to sexism. For this reason, Korth judged the shortened version
of the AWS to be a superior measure of traditional attitudes toward women when compared to the original.

**Balanced F Scale (BFS)**

For the purpose of this study, authoritarianism was measured by the Balanced F Scale (Ray, 1979) (see Appendix E). The Balanced F Scale was modeled after the original California F Scale (Adorno et al., 1950), with the primary difference being that the more recent scale is composed of both positively-worded and negatively-worded statements. Each of the 20 items is scored on a five-point Likert-type scale, with a score of five representing strong disagreement and one representing strong agreement with the statement. Thus, total scores may range from 20 to 100, with an adjusted score of 100 representing the highest degree of authoritarianism. The advantage of the BFS over the original is that the reversal of twelve of the scale's items reduces the probability of response bias.

Ray (1979) normed his measure of authoritarianism on 200 randomly selected responses from a representative national sample of more than 4000 individuals. He obtained a coefficient alpha correlation of .80, suggesting satisfactory reliability. The construct validity of the BFS was strongly supported by correlations which Ray (1979) obtained with his measure. Ray obtained significant positive correlations between the BFS and social
conservatism, economic conservatism, patriotism, frugality, family-orientedness, and self-identification as conservative. In addition, he found that the BFS correlated significantly in the negative direction with consumer agitation, environmentalism, experience-seeking, hedonism, and impulsivity.

More recently, Duckitt (1983) obtained an alpha reliability coefficient for the BFS of only .68. Nevertheless, Duckitt suggested that this alpha coefficient was "reasonably acceptable" (p. 194). Ray and Lovejoy's (1983) reported alpha reliability coefficient of .78 was more consistent with that originally obtained by Ray (1979). In an evaluation of measures of authoritarianism, Heaven (1983) stated that Ray's BFS was superior to other balanced F scales. Heaven suggested that the BFS's construct validity is supported in that its positive half correlated highly in the negative direction (−.5) with its negative half.

Sex Anxiety Inventory

For the purpose of this study, sex guilt and erotophobia were measured by the Sex Anxiety Inventory (Janda & O'Grady, 1980) (see Appendix F). This scale was designed as a measure of generalized expectancy for punishment for the violation of perceived normative standards of acceptable sexual attitudes and behaviors. According to the authors, the expectancy for punishment need not necessarily be rational.
The SAI consists of 25 forced-choice items. Each item includes a stem word or phrase and two possible phrases which complete the statement about feelings and attitudes related to sex. Scoring of the SAI is accomplished through a present-absent system, with one point awarded each time the respondent chooses the completing phrase which is associated with anxiety. Thus, total scores may range from zero to 25, with 25 representing the highest possible level of fear related to sex.

Janda and O'Grady (1980) administered the SAI to 66 male and 72 female college students, obtaining test-retest reliability coefficients after 10-14 days of .85 for males and .84 for females. The authors also administered the SAI to an independent sample of 95 male and 135 female college students, using the Kuder-Richardson formula to obtain an internal consistency coefficient of .86. Mean score on the SAI for males was 8.09, with a standard deviation of 5.19. Among the female sample, the authors obtained a mean score of 11.76 with a standard deviation of 5.19. Construct validity of the SAI was supported through an obtained positive correlation of .67 with the Mosher Sex Guilt subscale. Janda and O'Grady noted that although sex guilt and sex anxiety are similar, they may not be considered identical constructs. Concurrent validity of the SAI was supported by the finding that individuals high in sex
anxiety were likely to have had fewer sexual experiences as measured by the Sexual Experiences Inventory.

**Sexual Attitudes Scale**

For the purpose of this study, sexual liberalism-conservatism was measured by the Sexual Attitudes Scale (Hudson, Murphy, & Nurius, 1983) (see Appendix G). The SAS is a 25-item scale designed to measure the extent to which one's attitudes toward sex are liberal or conservative. Each item is scored on a one to five Likert-type scale, with one representing strong disagreement and five representing strong agreement with the statement. High scores represent a more conservative orientation on all items other than numbers 21 and 22, on which the scoring is reversed. Scoring the SAS involves subtracting 25 from the total score. Thus, scores may range from zero to 100, with 100 representing the strongest possible conservatism of ideas about sex.

The reliability and validity of the SAS have been investigated among three separate samples. The first group was an ethnically representative sample of 378 individuals in Hawaii with a mean age of 55.2 years (Murphy, Hudson, & Cheung, 1980). A second group was an ethnically representative sample of 689 persons in Hawaii with a mean age of 25.0 years (Nurius, 1983). The final sample of 109 persons involved in a study of the discriminant validity of
the SAS (Hudson et al., 1983) was primarily Caucasian, with a mean age of 28.8 years.

Internal consistency as determined through the computation of coefficient alpha was .92 for the first two samples. Standard errors of measurement for these two groups were found to be 4.55 and 4.04 respectively, suggesting that more than 95% of the time an individual's score will fall within eight or nine points of his/her "true" score.

Discriminant validity was determined to be acceptable through comparisons of scores of graduate students to those of members of strongly fundamentalist churches (Hudson et al., 1983). A difference in total score between these two groups of 26.4 points was statistically significant at the .001 level, and a discriminant validity coefficient of .73 was obtained using a point-biserial correlation. Factorial validity of the SAS was determined to be good in that each of the 25 items made a statistically significant contribution to the total SAS score, with correlations ranging from .34 to .78. Additionally, each of the SAS items correlated moderately with a measure of sexual discord and minimally with a measure of depression (Hudson et al., 1983). Construct validity of the SAS was determined to be adequate in that liberal sexual attitudes were negatively correlated with age and positively correlated with education and income.
Home Index

For the purpose of the present study, socioeconomic status was measured by the Home Index (Gough, 1974). The Index was based on Gough's (1949) original brief measure of socioeconomic status. It was designed as a measure of the standing of an individual or family within a community, particularly in terms of material wealth, education, and residential advantages.

The Home Index consists of 22 statements about SES which are answered either "true" or "false". The scoring of the Index is performed through a present-absent system, with one point awarded each time a response is chosen which is associated with higher socioeconomic status. Thus, scores may range from zero to 22, with 22 representing the highest possible level of SES.

Gough (1974) utilized a sample of 100 males and 100 females in determining the internal consistency of the Home Index. Using a split-half analysis, Gough obtained a corrected reliability coefficient of .89. In assessing the validity of the Index, several correlational investigations have been conducted. Gough (1971a) obtained significant positive correlations between scores on the Index and college attendance. Mann (1959) also supported the construct validity of the Home Index, obtaining correlations of .41 with socio-civic involvement, .23 with salary,
and .19 with level of cultural and aesthetic interests. Gough (1971b) provided additional support for the criterion-related validity of the Index, obtaining correlations of .14 with high school grade-point average, .21 with intellectual ability as measured by aptitude test scores, and .54 with fathers' occupational status as measured by the Minnesota Scale for Paternal Occupations. More recently, Serow (1980) obtained a significant positive correlation of .25 between scores on the Home Index and participation in extracurricular activities among high school students. These validity coefficients are relatively strong when compared to the validity coefficients which have been obtained for other commonly utilized measures of socioeconomic status.

Procedure

College student participants were recruited from undergraduate courses in psychology and philosophy. Data were collected from these volunteers in groups in the classrooms from which they were recruited. As an incentive to participate in the study, each of the participants received the number of extra credit points to which their respective instructors agreed in advance. The volunteers were informed that the questionnaires which they would be asked to complete included numerous items pertaining to sexual attitudes.
Each participant was given a packet containing the General Instructions and Consent Form (see Appendix I), the Biographical Information Questionnaire, the Attitudes Toward Male Homosexuality Scale (ATHSM), the Attitudes Toward Female Homosexuality Scale (ATHSF), the shortened version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS), the Balanced F Scale (BFS), the Sex Anxiety Inventory (SAI), the Sexual Attitudes Scale (SAS), and the Home Index (HI). The participants were instructed to read the General Instructions and Consent Form, and to then complete the enclosed measures if they consented to participate in the study.

All data were gathered in accordance with the guidelines of the North Texas State University Institutional Review Board and the American Psychological Association Ethical Principles for Psychologists.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The mean scores and standard deviations of the dependent variables (Table 5) and independent variables (Table 6) and Pearson correlations between the variables considered in the present investigation (Table 7) may be found in Appendix J.

As can be seen in Table 7, the majority of the variables which have been empirically related to homophobia are highly intercorrelated. Due to the multicollinearity of the independent variables, the use of traditional multiple regression analysis for the prediction of negative attitudes toward homosexuals was inappropriate. Consequently, the data in the present investigation were analyzed through the technique of principal components analysis (PCA) (Hotelling, 1933). PCA is a multivariate technique which may be used to summarize data in examining relationships among several variables. When used for the purpose of prediction, PCA allows for the reduction of a number of predictor variables to a smaller number of orthogonal factors which subsequently serve as predictors of dependent variables. In the present investigation, scores on the Attitudes Toward Male Homosexuality Scale (ATHSM) and the Attitudes Toward Female
Homosexuality Scale (ATHSF) served as dependent variables. Scores on the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS), Balanced F Scale (BFS), Sex Anxiety Inventory (SAI), Sexual Attitudes Scale (SAS), and Home Index (HI), and self-reported frequency of church attendance (FRCA), religiosity (SPR), academic classification (ACCLAS), parents' annual income (PINCOM), political orientation (SPPOL), and political party identification (POLPAR) served as independent variables.

Factor Analysis

The initial step in analyzing the data through PCA was the reduction of the independent variables to orthogonal factors. Table 1 summarizes the factor analysis.

The number of orthogonal factors retained in the PCA was determined on the basis of scree. "Scree" refers to the point on the scree graph (see Figure 1) at which the slope of the lines joining the plotted eigenvalues is no longer steep. The amount of information contained by factors beyond this point is considered marginal. Therefore, factors beyond the point of scree are not retained for further analysis. As visual inspection of the scree graph of eigenvalues indicates that substantial scree occurred between the fifth and sixth factors, only factors 1 through 5 were retained. Together, these five factors accounted for approximately 71% of the co-variation in the original 11 independent variables.
### Table 1

**Factor Analysis of Independent Variables: Principal Components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eigenvalue</strong></td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of Covariation</strong></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Proportion</strong></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eigenvalue</strong></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of Covariation</strong></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Proportion</strong></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The factor loadings of the independent variables on the five orthogonal factors were determined by computing their correlations with the retained factors (see Table 2). Factor 1 correlated significantly with self-proclaimed political conservatism, traditional attitudes toward women as measured by the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, high levels of authoritarianism as measured by the Balanced F Scale,
Republican party identification, and conservative attitudes regarding sex as measured by the Sexual Attitudes Scale. Based on these correlations, factor 1 was identified as "conservatism". Factor 2 correlated significantly with high parental income and high socioeconomic status as measured by the Home Index, and was accordingly identified as "high socioeconomic status". Factor 3 was found to correlate significantly with self-proclaimed religiosity and frequent church attendance, and was identified as "religiosity". Factor 4 correlated significantly with high levels of sexual anxiety as measured by the Sex Anxiety Inventory and conservative attitudes regarding sex as measured by the Sexual Attitudes Scale, and was accordingly identified as
"sexual discomfort". Finally, factor 5 correlated significantly only with advanced academic classification, and was therefore identified as "advanced class standing".

Table 2

Principal Components Factor Structure: Correlations Between Retained Factors and Independent Variables. Harris-Kaiser Rotation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Proclaimed Pol. Orientation</td>
<td>.75*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Women Scale</td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced F Scale</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. Party Identification</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' Annual Income</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.87*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Index</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.85*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Proclaimed Religiosity</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.90*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Church Attendance</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.79*</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Anxiety Inventory</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Attitudes Scale</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.74*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Classification</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communality (tot. retained=.71)</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
Multiple Regression

The final step in the analysis of the data was to conduct a multiple regression analysis of the five retained orthogonal factors and participant gender on the dependent variables, homophobia toward males and homophobia toward lesbians. The factors were entered in a stepwise procedure, with the order in which they were entered determined by the magnitude of their partial correlation with the dependent variable. Stepwise multiple regression was utilized because it allowed for the isolation of those variables which were most likely to predict the dependent variables significantly. The multiple regression procedures are summarized in Tables 3 and 4.

The results of the multiple regression analysis summarized in Table 3 indicate that factor 1 (conservatism), factor 4 (sexual discomfort), participant gender, factor 5 (advanced class standing), and factor 3 (religiosity) were all significant predictors of negative attitudes toward male homosexuals. Factor 1 accounted for 39.09% of the variance, factor 4 accounted for 5.43% of the variance, participant gender accounted for 2.73% of the variance, factor 5 accounted for .77% of the variance, and factor 3 accounted for .79% of the variance in the dependent variable ATHSM. Together, the four retained factors and gender accounted for 48.81% of the variance in attitudes toward male homosexuals.
Table 3

**Stepwise Multiple Regression Predicting Homophobia Toward Male Homosexuals from Orthogonal Factors and Participant Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Entered</th>
<th>Partial R Square</th>
<th>Model R Square</th>
<th>Prob &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>0.3909</td>
<td>0.3909</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>0.0543</td>
<td>0.4452</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.0273</td>
<td>0.4725</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Factor 5</td>
<td>0.0077</td>
<td>0.4802</td>
<td>0.0345*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>0.0079</td>
<td>0.4881</td>
<td>0.0315*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. The SAS program did not include Factor 2 in the stepwise regression procedure as its partial correlation with the ATHSM did not reach the p < .15 criterion level. *p < .05

Table 4

**Stepwise Multiple Regression Predicting Homophobia Toward Lesbians from Orthogonal Factors and Participant Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Entered</th>
<th>Partial R Square</th>
<th>Model R Square</th>
<th>Prob &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>0.3499</td>
<td>0.3499</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>0.0815</td>
<td>0.4314</td>
<td>0.0287*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>0.0084</td>
<td>0.4398</td>
<td>0.0338*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Factor 5</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>0.4478</td>
<td>0.0358*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. The SAS program did not enter factor 2 nor participant gender in the stepwise regression procedure as their partial correlations with the ATHSF did not reach the p < .15 criterion level. *p < .05
The results of the multiple regression analysis for homophobia toward lesbians summarized in Table 4 indicate that factor 1 (conservatism), factor 4 (sexual discomfort), factor 3 (religiosity), and factor 5 (advanced class standing) were all significant predictors of negative attitudes toward lesbians. Factor 1 accounted for 34.99% of the variance, factor 4 accounted for 8.15% of the variance, factor 3 accounted for .84% of the variance, and factor 5 accounted for .81% of the variance in the dependent variable ATHSP. Together, the four retained factors accounted for 44.78% of the variance in attitudes toward lesbians.
The primary hypothesis of the present investigation was that a factor consistent with conservatism would be identified as a strong significant predictor of homophobic attitudes. This hypothesis has clearly been supported, as a factor identified as "conservatism" accounts for 39.09% of the variance in attitudes toward male homosexuals and 34.99% of the variance in attitudes toward lesbians.

The factor referred to as "conservatism" is characterized by significant correlations with variables measuring conservative political orientation, traditional attitudes toward women, authoritarianism, conservative sexual attitudes, and Republican party identification. Such findings are not surprising, as the review of the literature has indicated that homophobia is significantly related to political conservatism (e.g. Henley & Pincus, 1978), traditional attitudes toward women (e.g. Bierly, 1985), authoritarianism (e.g. Larsen et al., 1980), and conservative, restricted attitudes about sexual behavior (e.g., Minnigerode, 1976). Although earlier research has not examined the relationship between homophobic attitudes and political party identification, results of the present
investigation indicate that Republican party support is the variable which correlates most strongly with "conservatism". A possible explanation for this finding may be found by considering contemporary political issues. Republican party support has come in recent years to be associated with moralism and traditional values, while Democratic party support has become associated with permissiveness and support of individual freedoms.

The second hypothesis of the present investigation was that gender would be a significant predictor of homophobic attitudes, with male participant gender being predictive of homophobia toward male homosexuals and female participant gender being predictive of homophobia toward lesbians. This hypothesis is partially supported by the findings of the present study. Male participant gender is a significant predictor of homophobic attitudes toward male homosexuals, accounting for 2.73% of the variance. However, gender is not a significant predictor of homophobic attitudes toward lesbians.

The finding that male participant gender is predictive of homophobia toward male homosexuals is consistent with the reports of Herek (1984b), Millham et al. (1976), and Weinberger and Millham (1979). Each of these investigators determined that males prefer lesbians over male homosexuals. However, findings by these investigators also suggest that
females are likely to be more homophobic toward lesbians than toward male homosexuals. Examination of the means of ATHSM and ATHSF items broken down by participant gender (see Table 5 in Appendix J) indicate that the present findings do not completely support those of Herek (1984b), Millham et al. (1976), and Weinberger and Millham (1979). To the contrary, the present data support Kite's (1984) assertion that males are more negative in their attitudes toward male homosexuals while no sex differences exist in attitudes toward lesbians. Perhaps Kite's (1984) statistical treatment of her data through the use of a sophisticated meta-analytic technique yielded more valid results than those obtained in the investigations which she criticized.

Results of the present study indicate that a factor identified as "sexual discomfort" is also predictive of homophobic attitudes, accounting for 5.43% of the variance in attitudes toward male homosexuals and 8.15% of the variance in attitudes toward lesbians. This finding is consistent with numerous reports relating homophobia to sexual rigidity (e.g. Morin & Wallace, 1976) and sexual conservatism (e.g. MacDonald & Games, 1974). Although generally conservative attitudes may be thought to be held by individuals who are uncomfortable with sexual matters, "conservatism" and "sexual discomfort" are clearly orthogonal factors. However, each of these factors is
highly correlated with sexual conservatism. Interestingly, the direct relationships between the Sexual Attitudes Scale and the measures of homophobia are less substantial than might be expected. Table 7 (see Appendix J) indicates that the SAS correlates at only .14 with the ATHSM and .18 with the ATHSF.

The essence of the present investigation is that it entails the first attempt to consider several variables simultaneously in the prediction of homophobia. From more accurate prediction of homophobic attitudes, populations likely to be homophobic may be more easily identified. As discriminatory behavior may grow out of prejudiced attitudes (Glaser & Possony, 1979), it is likely that homophobia is a precursor of the destructive discrimination with which homosexuals are faced. Results of studies such as those by Goldberg (1982) and Cerny and Polyson (1984) indicate that educational intervention may be effective in reducing homophobia. Based on the findings of the present investigation, agencies choosing to offer programs aimed toward the reduction of homophobic attitudes and subsequent discrimination against homosexuals should consider targeting individuals who present with generally conservative attitudes. It should be considered, however, that the conservatism which is predictive of homophobia may also reduce the likelihood that a homophobic individual will be motivated to alter his or her attitudes.
There are several limitations of the present study which merit discussion. One area in which problems are evident is instrumentation. While some of the independent variables which are considered in this investigation (attitudes toward women, authoritarianism, sex anxiety, and sexual conservatism) are measured by reliable, well-validated scales, a lack of adequate tools for the assessment of variables such as political orientation and religiosity has resulted in the necessity of relying on behavioral measures or questionnaires lacking appropriate psychometric properties. The development of psychometrically-sound measures of these variables which may or may not be related to homophobia would perhaps serve to increase the accuracy with which negative attitudes toward homosexuality may be predicted. For example, religiosity would perhaps account for more than .79% and .84% of the variance in attitudes toward male homosexuals and lesbians respectively if it could be measured more accurately.

Another limitation of the present investigation may be found in its selection of participants. In order to satisfy the criteria for informed consent, it was necessary to inform the participants that some of the questionnaire items pertain to sexual attitudes. By doing so, it is possible that the investigator discouraged some of the individuals who were more uncomfortable with sexual matters from
completing the questionnaires. If so, the data upon which the results are based may be somewhat skewed.

A third serious limitation of the present investigation is the lack of generalizability of its results. Participants in this study were students of traditional college age recruited from undergraduate classes in psychology and philosophy at a large, public university in the southwestern United States. Although the obtained results provide information about homophobic attitudes among such students, the findings may not necessarily generalize to individuals who do not meet the criteria for participation in this study. Thus, the conclusions which may be drawn based on the results of the present investigation may not be applicable to populations younger than 17 years or older than 25 years of age.

Similarly, it is quite possible that the results of such a study conducted in other regions of the United States or in different countries would not match the obtained findings. It should be noted that at the time at which the data were collected, Texas was one of only five states in which homosexual sodomy specifically was illegal (Cockburn, 1986). The illegality of homosexual behavior in Texas may be considered, therefore, to provide legal sanction for homophobia.
It is also likely that the results of the present investigation would differ if the participants were not college students, as results of opinionnaire research (e.g. Rooney & Gibbons, 1966; Gallup, 1977; Hong, 1984) have suggested that respondents with more years of formal education are less likely to be homophobic than less educated individuals. Even the generalizability of the obtained findings to college student populations other than psychology and philosophy students is questionable, as the attitudes of students outside of the humanities may differ.

Future investigators concerning themselves with the prediction of homophobic attitudes may wish to consider additional potential directions in duplicating the present investigation among alternate populations. For example, the role of race could be considered in the prediction of homophobia. As has been noted in the introduction of this study, there is a paucity of research examining racial differences in attitudes toward homosexuality, with the results being mixed. The relatively small proportion of black (8%), Hispanic (3%), and Asian (1%) participants in this investigation and the limited sample size precluded the use of race as an independent variable which may predict homophobia. Future investigators may wish to consider utilizing more racially heterogeneous samples to clarify this issue.
A final note regarding possible future directions for research on homophobia pertains to the Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) crisis. At the time at which the data of the present investigation were collected, the influence of AIDS on attitudes toward homosexuals had not been addressed empirically. Since that time, three studies have addressed the interaction of the AIDS epidemic and homophobia. O'Donnell, O'Donnell, Pleck, Snarey, & Rose (1987) and Bouton, Gallaher, Garlinghouse, Leal, Rosenstein, and Young (1977) each identified strong positive correlations between homophobia and fear of AIDS. Similarly, Goodwin and Roscoe (1988) determined that subjects who were more homophobic were also more frightened of contracting AIDS. Given these findings, it would probably be worthwhile to consider attitudes relating to AIDS in future efforts in predicting homophobia.
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Appendix A

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions

Please supply the information requested by placing the appropriate number in the space provided.

Age (in years):

(1-3) ________ Assigned respondent number

(4) ________ Gender: 1=male, 2=female

(5) ________ Race: 1=Caucasian, 2=Black, 3=Hispanic

4=Asian, 5=Other

(6) ________ Religion: 1=Protestant, 2=Catholic,

3=Jewish, 4=Other

(7) ________ How religious do you consider yourself to be?

MOST RELIGIOUS 1 2 3 4 5 NOT AT ALL RELIGIOUS

(8) ________ In general, how often do you attend church?

1=Never or Rarely

2=On Special Occasions

3=Monthly

4=Weekly

5=More than once a week

(9) ________ Academic Classification:

1=Freshman

2=Sophomore

3=Junior

4=Senior

5=Graduate Student

(10) ________ Parents' Annual Income:

1=Less than $20,000 per year

2=$20,000 - $30,000 per year

3=$30,000 - $40,000 per year

4=$40,000 - $50,000 per year

5=More than $50,000 per year

(11) ________ Describe the area in which you were brought up:

1=Rural

2=Suburban

3=Inner City or Urban

(12) ________ Describe your political views:

1=Very Conservative or On the Right

2=Conservative

3= Moderate or Middle of the Road

4=Liberal

5=Very Liberal or On the Left

(13) ________ If you were to vote, how likely would you vote:

DEMOCRATIC 1 2 3 4 5 REPUBLICAN
APPENDIX B

ATTITUDES TOWARD MALE HOMOSEXUALITY SCALE (ATHSM)
ATTITUDES TOWARD MALE HOMOSEXUALITY SCALE (ATHSM)

Instructions

The statements listed below describe attitudes toward male homosexuals. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your opinion about each statement by indicating the extent to which you agree or disagree, according to the following scale:

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 STRONGLY DISAGREE

Please indicate your opinion by writing the appropriate number on the line to the left of each statement.

(14) _____ Male homosexuals should not be permitted to raise children.

(15) _____ Male homosexuals should not be allowed to hold responsible positions.

(16) _____ Male homosexual marriage should be made legal.

(17) _____ I believe that all male homosexuals should be confined and not released until cured.

(18) _____ I would be upset if I found that my son were homosexual.

(19) _____ Male homosexuality should be a criminal offense.

(20) _____ Male homosexuality is a sin.

(21) _____ The number of children seduced by male homosexuals is greatly exaggerated.

(22) _____ Male homosexuality is unnatural.

(23) _____ The thought of male homosexuality is repulsive to me.

(24) _____ Male homosexuals are sick.

(25) _____ If male homosexuality is allowed to increase, it will destroy our society.
(26) _____ Apart from their sex lives, there is little
difference between male homosexuals and male
heterosexuals.

(27) _____ Male homosexuality tends to corrupt the entire
personality.

(28) _____ I find it hard to believe that male homosexuals
can really love each other.

(29) _____ It would be a mistake to ever have male
homosexuals for foremen and leaders over
heterosexuals.

(30) _____ Homosexual males are generally more feminine
than heterosexual males.

(31) _____ A male homosexual relationship can be as
fulfilling as a heterosexual relationship.

(32) _____ Male homosexuals should never be allowed to
teach school or supervise children.

(33) _____ I can hardly imagine myself having a close
friendship with a male homosexual.

(34) _____ Because of its perverse nature, sex between male
homosexuals can only be animalistic pleasure.

(35) _____ I would not wish for male homosexuals to live
near me.

(36) _____ Male homosexuality is just a different kind of
life style, and therefore should not be condemned.

(37) _____ Male homosexuals are very unhappy men who wish
they could be heterosexual.

(38) _____ Male homosexuals simply cannot be trusted.

(39) _____ There may be a few exceptions, but in general
male homosexuals are pretty much alike.

(40) _____ Male homosexuality is a perversion which should
be erased for the good of society.
STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 STRONGLY DISAGREE

(41) I cannot see what male homosexuals are complaining about; if they would just leave heterosexuals alone there would not be any problems.
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ATTITUDES TOWARD FEMALE HOMOSEXUALITY SCALE (ATHSF)

Instructions

The statements listed below describe attitudes toward lesbians. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your opinion about each statement by indicating the extent to which you agree or disagree, according to the following scale:

STRONGLY AGREE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 STRONGLY DISAGREE

Please indicate your opinion by writing the appropriate number on the line to the left of each statement.

(42) _____Lesbians should not be permitted to raise children.

(43) _____Lesbians should not be allowed to hold responsible positions.

(44) _____Lesbian marriage should be made legal.

(45) _____I believe that all lesbians should be confined and not released until cured.

(46) _____I would be upset if I found that my daughter were a lesbian.

(47) _____Female homosexuality should be a criminal offense.

(48) _____Female homosexuality is a sin.

(49) _____The number of children seduced by lesbians is greatly exaggerated.

(50) _____Female homosexuality is unnatural.

(51) _____The thought of female homosexuality is repulsive to me.

(52) _____Lesbians are sick.

(53) _____If female homosexuality is allowed to increase, it will destroy our society.
(54) ____ Apart from their sex lives, there is little difference between lesbians and female heterosexuals.

(55) ____ Female homosexuality tends to corrupt the entire personality.

(56) ____ I find it hard to believe that lesbians can really love each other.

(57) ____ It would be a mistake to ever have lesbians for foremen and leaders over heterosexuals.

(58) ____ Lesbians are generally more masculine than heterosexual females.

(59) ____ A lesbian relationship can be as fulfilling as a heterosexual relationship.

(60) ____ Lesbians should never be allowed to teach school or supervise children.

(61) ____ I can hardly imagine myself having a close friendship with a lesbian.

(62) ____ Because of its perverse nature, sex between lesbians can only be animalistic pleasure.

(63) ____ I would not wish for lesbians to live near me.

(64) ____ Female homosexuality is just a different kind of lifestyle, and therefore should not be condemned.

(65) ____ Lesbians are very unhappy women who wish they could be heterosexual.

(66) ____ Lesbians simply cannot be trusted.

(67) ____ There may be a few exceptions, but in general lesbians are pretty much alike.

(68) ____ Female homosexuality is a perversion which should be erased for the good of society.

(69) ____ I cannot see what lesbians are complaining about; if they would just leave heterosexuals alone there would not be any problems.
APPENDIX D

ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN SCALE (AWS), SHORTENED VERSION
ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN SCALE (AWS), SHORTENED VERSION

Instructions

The statements listed below describe attitudes toward the role of women in society that different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your feeling about each statement by indicating whether you (1) agree strongly, (2) agree mildly, (3) disagree mildly, or (4) disagree strongly. Please indicate your opinion by writing either 1, 2, 3, or 4 next to each statement.

AGREE STRONGLY 1  2  3  4 DISAGREE STRONGLY

(4) ______Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than of a man.

(5) ______Women should take increasing responsibility for leadership in solving the intellectual and social problems of the day.

(6) ______Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce.

(7) ______Telling dirty jokes should be mostly a masculine prerogative.

(8) ______Intoxication among women is worse than intoxication among men.

(9) ______Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.

(10) _____It is insulting to women to have the "obey" clause remain in the marriage service.

(11) _____There should be a strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex.

(12) _____A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.

(13) _____Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.
(14) ____ Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together.

(15) ____ Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.

(16) ____ A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.

(17) ____ Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.

(18) ____ It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks.

(19) ____ In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in bringing up of children.

(20) ____ Women should be encouraged not to become sexually intimate with anyone before marriage, even their fiances.

(21) ____ The husband should not be favored by law over the wife in the disposal of family property or income.

(22) ____ Women should be concerned with their duties of childbearing and house tending rather than with desires for professional and business careers.

(23) ____ The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.

(24) ____ Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men.

(25) ____ On the average, women should be regarded as less capable of contributing to economic production than are men.

(26) ____ There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.

(27) ____ Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.
(28) The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy.
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BALANCED F SCALE (BFS)

Instructions

The statements listed below describe attitudes which an individual may hold. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your opinion about each statement by indicating the extent to which you agree or disagree, according to the following scale.

STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY AGREE

Please indicate your opinion by writing the appropriate number on the line to the left of each statement.

(29) ____ Homosexuality between consenting adults may be distasteful, but it should not be regarded as a crime.

(30) ____ Many of the radical ideas of today will be the accepted practices of tomorrow.

(31) ____ People who want to whip or imprison sex criminals are themselves sick.

(32) ____ It is alright for people to raise questions about even the most personal and private matters.

(33) ____ Insults to our honor are not always important enough to bother about.

(34) ____ Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, are signs of mental illness; such people belong in hospitals rather than prisons.

(35) ____ Most honest people admit to themselves that they have sometimes hated their parents.

(36) ____ No sane, normal, decent person would ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.

(37) ____ Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas but as they grow up, they ought to get over them and settle down.

(38) ____ School children should have plenty of discipline.
STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY AGREE

(39) _____ People should be guided more by their feelings and less by the rules.

(40) _____ People should be made to be punctual.

(41) _____ Efficiency and speed are not as important as letting everyone have their say in making decisions.

(42) _____ There is far too much regimentation of people nowadays.

(43) _____ You know where you are going when you have an order to obey.

(44) _____ People should not be expected to conform as much as they are today.

(45) _____ People who say we don't have enough freedom don't know what they are talking about.

(46) _____ I don't mind if other people decide what I am to do, or advise me how to do it.

(47) _____ It would be much better if we could do without politics altogether.

(48) _____ You can be sure that Army procedures will be good, because they have been tried and tested.
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SEX ANXIETY INVENTORY (SAI)

Instructions

The statement stems and conclusions below describe possible feelings which you may have about sexual behaviors. Finish the following sentences by writing the number of the statement completion which most accurately represents your feelings on the line to the left of the sentence stem.

(49) ____ Extramarital sex
    (1) is OK if everyone agrees to it.
    (2) can break up families.

(50) ____ Sex
    (1) can cause as much anxiety as pleasure.
    (2) on the whole is good and enjoyable.

(51) ____ Masturbation
    (1) causes me to worry.
    (2) can be a useful substitute.

(52) ____ After having sexual thoughts
    (1) I feel aroused.
    (2) I feel jittery.

(53) ____ When I engage in petting
    (1) I feel scared at first.
    (2) I thoroughly enjoy it.

(54) ____ Initiating sexual relationships
    (1) is a very stressful experience.
    (2) causes me no problem at all.

(55) ____ Oral sex
    (1) would arouse me.
    (2) would terrify me.

(56) ____ I feel nervous
    (1) about initiating sexual relationships.
    (2) about nothing when it comes to the opposite sex.

(57) ____ When I meet someone I'm attracted to
    (1) I get to know him or her.
    (2) I feel nervous.
(58) When I was younger
   (1) I was looking forward to having sex.
   (2) I felt nervous.

(59) When others flirt with me
   (1) I don't know what to do.
   (2) I flirt back.

(60) Group sex
   (1) would scare me to death.
   (2) might be interesting.

(61) If in the future I committed adultery
   (1) I would probably get caught.
   (2) I wouldn't feel bad about it.

(62) I would
   (1) feel too nervous to tell a dirty joke in mixed company.
   (2) tell a dirty joke if it were funny.

(63) Dirty jokes
   (1) make me feel uncomfortable.
   (2) often make me laugh.

(64) When I awake from sexual dreams
   (1) I feel pleasant and relaxed.
   (2) I feel tense.

(65) When I have sexual desires
   (1) I worry about what I should do.
   (2) I do something to satisfy them.

(66) If in the future I committed adultery
   (1) it would be nobody's business but my own.
   (2) I would worry about my spouse's finding out.

(67) Buying a pornographic book
   (1) wouldn't bother me.
   (2) would make me nervous.

(68) Casual sex
   (1) is better than no sex at all.
   (2) can hurt many people.

(69) Extramarital sex
   (1) is sometimes necessary.
   (2) can damage one's career.
(70) _____ Sexual advances  
(1) leave me feeling tense.  
(2) are welcomed.

(71) _____ When I have sexual relations  
(1) I feel satisfied.  
(2) I worry about being discovered.

(72) _____ When talking about sex in mixed company  
(1) I feel nervous.  
(2) I sometimes get excited.

(73) _____ If I were to flirt with someone  
(1) I would worry about his or her reaction.  
(2) I would enjoy it.
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SEXUAL ATTITUDE SCALE (SAS)
SEXUAL ATTITUDE SCALE (SAS)

Instructions

This questionnaire is designed to measure the way you feel about sexual behavior. It is not a test, so there are no right or wrong answers. Answer each item as carefully and accurately as you can by placing the appropriate number to the left of each statement.

1=Strongly Disagree
2=Disagree
3=Neither Agree nor Disagree
4=Agree
5=Strongly Agree

(4) _____I think there is too much sexual freedom given to adults these days.

(5) _____I think that the increased sexual freedom seen in the past several years has done much to undermine the American family.

(6) _____I think that young people have been given too much information about sex.

(7) _____Sex education should be restricted to the home.

(8) _____Older people do not need to have sex.

(9) _____Sex education should be given only when people are ready for marriage.

(10) _____Premarital sex may be a sign of a decaying social order.

(11) _____Extramarital sex is never excuseable.

(12) _____I think there is too much sexual freedom given to teenagers these days.

(13) _____I think there is not enough sexual restraint among young people.

(14) _____I think people indulge in sex too much.

(15) _____I think the only proper way to have sex is through intercourse.
STRONGLY DISAGREE 1 2 3 4 5 STRONGLY AGREE

(16) _____ I think sex should be reserved for marriage.
(17) _____ Sex should be only for the young.
(18) _____ Too much social approval has been given to homosexuals.
(19) _____ Sex should be devoted to the business of procreation.
(20) _____ People should not masturbate.
(21) _____ Heavy sexual petting should be discouraged.
(22) _____ People should not discuss their sexual affairs or business with others.
(23) _____ Severely handicapped (physically and mentally) people should not have sex.
(24) _____ There should be no laws prohibiting sexual acts between consenting adults.
(25) _____ What two consenting adults do together sexually is their own business.
(26) _____ There is too much sex on television.
(27) _____ Movies today are too sexually explicit.
(28) _____ Pornography should be totally banned from our bookstores.
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HOME INDEX (HI)
HOME INDEX (HI)

Instructions

Answer each question in terms of the present living conditions in your parents' household. Please place the appropriate number to the left of each question:

1=Yes, 2=No

(29) ____ Did your mother go to high school?

(30) ____ Did your mother go to a college or university?

(31) ____ Did your father go to high school?

(32) ____ Did your father go to a college or university?

(33) ____ Do you have a fireplace in your home?

(34) ____ Does your family have any servants, such as a cook or a maid?

(35) ____ Does your family leave town every year for a vacation?

(36) ____ Does your family have more than 500 books?

(37) ____ Is there an electric or gas refrigerator in your home?

(38) ____ Is there a telephone in your home?

(39) ____ Do you have a bathtub in your home?

(40) ____ Is your home heated with a central system such as by a furnace in the basement?

(41) ____ Does your family have a car?

(42) ____ Does your family have a record player?

(43) ____ Do you have your own room at home?

(44) ____ Does your family own its home?

(45) ____ Does your mother belong to any clubs or organizations such as a study, art, or civic club?
1=YES, 2=NO

(46) Does your father belong to any civic, study, service, or political club such as the Chamber of Commerce, the Lions Club, etc.?

(47) Do you belong to any clubs where you have to pay dues?

(48) Does your family subscribe to a daily newspaper?

(49) Do you have a piano in your home?

(50) Have you ever had private lessons in music, dancing, etc. outside of school?
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GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND CONSENT FORM
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND CONSENT FORM

The questionnaires which you are requested to complete will supply the data for a study being conducted as part of the requirement for a graduate degree. Participation in this study will involve completing questionnaires pertaining to homosexuality and sexual attitudes and behaviors in an explicit manner. Complete confidentiality of each participant's responses will be guaranteed by the experimenter. Participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you may choose not to complete the questionnaires at any time without penalty. If you choose to consent to participate in this study, please sign your name on the line provided at the bottom of this page before completing the questionnaires.

There is no time limit for the completion of these questionnaires. Take as much time as you need to complete them, but try not to dwell on any item.

If, after completing the questionnaires, you would like to learn about the study, its rationale and expectations, please feel free to contact the experimenter after September 15th, 1987, at:

Michael Schatman
4400-L Banbury Lane
Roanoke, Virginia 24018
(703) 989-0168

Thank you very much for your participation and cooperation.

Subject's signature:
### Table 5

**Means and Standard Deviations of Dependent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATHSM</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHSF</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6

**Means and Standard Deviations of Independent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFS</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAI</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

**Pearson R Correlations Between Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>06</th>
<th>07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 ATHSM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 ATHSF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 AWS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 BFS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 SAI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 SAS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 HI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 ATHSM</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 ATHSF</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 AWS</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 BFS</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 SAI</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 SAS</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 HI</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 POLPAR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 SPPOL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 FRCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 SPR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 PINCOM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 ACCLAS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
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