

The Effects of Differential Labels, Format of Questionnaire,
Gender of Target and Gender of Respondent on Attitudes Toward
Lesbians and Gay Men

Karen E. Scheitma

University Undergraduate Fellow, 1986-1987

Texas A & M University

Department of Psychology

Running Head: Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men

APPROVED

Fellows Advisor:

Wanda Todd

Honors Director:

Linn Casfield

Table of Contents

| | |
|----------------------|----|
| Abstract | 3 |
| Introduction | 4 |
| Study - Method | 6 |
| Study - Results | 7 |
| Study - Discussion | 10 |
| Study 2 - Method | 12 |
| Study 2 - Results | 14 |
| Study 2 - Discussion | 19 |
| General Discussion | 23 |
| References | 26 |
| Appendices | 28 |
| Tables | 31 |

Abstract

Two studies were conducted in which gender of respondent, label of target (lesbian/gay or homosexual), sex of target, format of questionnaire and participants' reference groups (operationally defined by the sexual orientation of the couple in a dating scenario presented before assessing attitudes toward lesbians and gay men) were manipulated to determine their effect on attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. In the first study, depending on which scale was used, label of lesbian target, sex of target and gender of respondent were significantly related to homophobia. Attitudes toward AIDS were significantly correlated with homophobia. In the second study, gender of respondent was significant, and there was a significant gender of respondent by format of questionnaire interaction. The sexual orientation of the couple in the dating scenario did not significantly affect attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. In both studies religious involvement related significantly to homophobia. Implications of these results are discussed.

There has been little research done on attitudes toward homosexuality. Despite this, it has been consistently shown that females have more tolerant attitudes toward homosexuality than do males (Bierly, 1985; Kite, 1984; Larsen, Reed, & Hoffman, 1980; Lieblich and Friedman, 1985; Maret, 1984; Nyberg & Alston, 1977; Price, 1982).

Unfortunately, most research on attitudes toward homosexuality has not focused on attitudes toward lesbians and gay men as separate issues. What research has been done in this area has produced mixed results. Lieblich and Friedman (1985), using the Homosexual Attitudes Scale (Millham, San Miguel, & Kellogg, 1976) found that both Israelis and Americans were more tolerant of lesbianism than of male homosexuality. However, Millham et al. (1976) using the same scale were unable to find any significant differences in attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. Herek (1984), using the Attitudes Toward Homosexuality Scale, also was unable to find any significant differences in attitudes toward lesbians and gay men; however, when he modified that scale to include only items loading on what he called the Condemnation-Tolerance factor, he reported consistently more negative attitudes toward gay men, although those data were not included in the published study.

One problem with those studies, though, is that they have not applied consistent labels to the target homosexual. For example, Millham et al. (1976) interchanged the words lesbian and female homosexuality with male homosexual and male homosexuality. It is this author's

contention that the terms lesbian and male homosexual are not semantically equivalent, just as the words woman and boy are not semantically equivalent, and therefore should not be interchanged when changing the sex of the target. In one of their articles, MacDonald and Games (1974) commented that most people tend to think of males when they hear the word "homosexual." There has been no research, however, on the effects of differential labels of homosexual targets.

There has been minimal research on the relationship between religion and attitudes toward homosexuality. Maret (1984) found that fundamentalists had more negative attitudes toward homosexuality than did nonfundamentalists. Henley and Pincus (1978) found that people who were not affiliated with mainstream religions (i.e., Catholic, Protestant and Jewish) held less negative attitudes toward homosexuality than did those who were affiliated with mainstream religions. Also, Larsen et al. (1980) found that people who reported attending church "rarely" or "never" had less negative attitudes toward homosexuality than did those who reported attending church "often."

There has been little research on the relationship between attitudes toward homosexuality and contact with the lesbian/gay community. Millham et al. (1976) found that people who reported having a friend or close relative who was homosexual had lower scores of homophobia.

Currently, there has been no published research on the relationship between attitudes towards AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome)

and attitudes toward homosexuality, although this area is becoming of increased interest to psychologists. At a symposium on the effects of AIDS on the individual, Hirsch and Enlow (1984) speculated that there was a direct relationship between attitudes towards AIDS and homophobia. Clearly more research needs to be done in this area.

The purpose of the first study, therefore, was to examine three major variables and their relationship to attitudes toward homosexuality. The gender of the respondent, the gender of the target homosexual (male, female, or unspecified), and the label (lesbian/gay or homosexual) of the target homosexual were manipulated to see how these variables influenced attitudes toward homosexuality. Also, attitudes toward AIDS, contact with the lesbian/gay community, and various indicators of religious involvement were examined in order to determine how they related to attitudes toward homosexuality.

Study 1

Method

Scales used to assess attitudes toward homosexuality were items that were found to load by Herek (1984) on the Condemnation-Tolerance factor of a scale that was developed in that study, and a small scale developed by the author (see Appendix A) that asked each question twice, once with a male target and once with a female target. An

Attitudes Toward AIDS scale was developed by the author (see Appendix B) and reliability was examined ($\alpha = .78$). All scales used were answered on a four-point continuum. In addition, items assessing religious involvement were adapted from a scale developed by Strunk (1951).

There were 295 participants, 141 male and 154 female, who were part of an introductory psychology student pool. Participants signed up for an "attitude survey" experiment and received experimental credit for their participation.

Participants were initially randomly assigned to one of six conditions, with an approximately equal number of males and females in each, according to the 3 x 2 design of sex of target (male, female, or unspecified) by label (gay/lesbian or homosexual) of target. Within each cell, participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions for the second scale assessing attitudes toward homosexuality. The second scale manipulated the labels of both the female and the male target (lesbian/gay or female/male homosexual), thus making it a 2 x 2 design. It was expected that the assignment to conditions for the first scale would be independent of the assignment to conditions for the second scale.

Results

All scales were coded such that a higher score indicated more negative attitudes toward homosexuality.

Results for the second scale were obtained by subtracting the score for the male target from the score for the female target, and subsequent analyses were done on the difference scores. Results indicated that females did not differ on their attitudes toward lesbians and gay men ($M = .01$), but males had more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians ($M = -1.2$) ($F(1, 257) = 57.73, p < .001$). There was also a significant main effect for the label of the lesbian target ($F(1, 257) = 5.64, p < .05$). Participants responded more favorably when the female target was labeled lesbian rather than female homosexual. There was not a significant main effect for the label of the male target ($F(1, 257) = 2.56, p = n.s.$). Manipulations on Herek's (1984) scale assessing attitudes toward homosexuality were not significant ($F(4, 203) = .83, p = n.s.$).

For Herek's (1984) scale, there were several variables that related significantly to it. Scores on the Attitudes Toward AIDS scale were found to correlate with the homophobia scale ($r = .61, p < .001$); those who had greater fear of AIDS showed greater homophobia. Religious denominations were categorized into three groups; the first group was Catholics, the second group was Methodists, Presbyterians, and Lutherans, and the third group was Baptists and members of Assembly of God, Church of Christ, or other independent Protestant churches. When categorized this way, religious denomination was also significant ($F(2, 189) = 5.79, p < .005$), with Catholics, Methodists, Presbyterians and Lutherans having less negative attitudes toward homosexuality than

Baptists or members of Church of Christ, Assembly of God or other independent Protestant churches. Church attendance was also significant ($F(3, 204) = 7.79, p < .001$); those who went to church more often had more negative attitudes toward homosexuality. Time devoted to the church was significant ($F(3, 203) = 6.98, p < .001$), with those who reported sometimes devoting time to the church having more negative attitudes toward homosexuality than those who regularly, rarely or never devoted time to church. The frequency of reading devotional literature was also significant ($F(3, 203) = 8.10, p < .001$), with those who read devotional literature more often having more negative attitudes toward homosexuality. When asked how they thought their religious beliefs compared with others their age, people who responded "stronger than average" had the most negative attitudes toward homosexuality, while those who responded "less than average" had the most favorable attitudes toward homosexuality ($F(2, 205) = 5.32, p < .001$). The scores of those who responded "average" were approximately midway between those who responded "stronger than average" and those who responded "less than average." When asked about whether they felt they needed some sort of religious belief in order to have a mature outlook on life, those who responded "yes" or "unsure" had more negative attitudes toward homosexuality than those who responded "no" ($F(2, 206) = 5.64, p < .001$).

When asked if the terms lesbian and female homosexual connoted

different meanings to them, 28% of the respondents said yes, whereas 20% of the respondents indicated that the terms gay man and male homosexual connoted different meanings to them. Using McNemar's (1969) z-test for nonindependent proportions, this difference was found to be significant ($z = 7.93, p < .001$).

Discussion

An outcome of primary interest in the first study is understanding why no significant effects for the gender of the respondent, for the gender of the target homosexual, or for the label of the target homosexual were obtained using Herek's (1984) scale, yet significant effects were obtained using a shorter scale.

It could be possible that the gender of respondent, and the label and the gender of the target homosexual are genuinely unimportant as suggested by Herek's (1984) scale since multiple measures are usually considered to be more reliable. This was suggested by Herek (personal communication, October 9, 1986). However, this may not be the case for two reasons. The first is that there was a very noticeable effect ($F(1, 257) = 57.73, p < .001$) of sex differences in the smaller scale. The second is that 28% of the respondents felt that the terms lesbian and female homosexual had different connotations, while a smaller percentage indicated that the terms gay man and male homosexual had different connotations, thus indicating that the significance of the manipulation of

the terms lesbian and female homosexual in the smaller scale was a real difference.

A more probable reason for the significance of manipulations in the smaller scale and the lack of significance of manipulations in Herek's (1984) scale has to do with the reference groups used in each scale. In Herek's (1984) scale respondents answered a set of questions about only one homosexual target, whereas in the second scale, respondents answered identical questions about two homosexual targets. It is quite probable that in Herek's (1984) scale respondents were using heterosexuals as their reference group, thus making intergroup comparisons, whereas in the second scale they were comparing lesbians and gay men, thus making intragroup comparisons. Because there is such disparity between attitudes toward homosexuality and attitudes toward heterosexuality, a four-point scale does not allow for much variability, particularly with respect to subtle manipulations of a homosexual target. However, if one is making intragroup comparisons, there is much more opportunity for variability. This hypothesis is supported by social judgment theory, which states that when the anchor point for comparison is far away from the target point, there is little variability in responses and responses tend to load close around the anchor, and when the anchor point is close to the target point, there is much more variability in responses (Sherif, Taub, & Hovland, 1958). Clearly there needs to be more research on the topic of reference groups when assessing attitudes

toward homosexuality.

To address the questions that this study raised concerning the effects of the format of the questionnaire and which reference group participants used, a second study was devised. In this study, the format of the questionnaire and participants' reference groups were manipulated. The reference group was operationally defined as a dating scenario presented before the scale assessing attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. To avoid complicating the design any further, the label of the target homosexual was not included as an independent variable.

Study 2

Method

There were a total of 260 participants, 129 male and 131 female, who were part of an introductory psychology student pool. Participants signed up for an "attitude survey" experiment and received experimental credit for their participation. There were three males and no females who indicated they were homosexual or bisexual; their data was not included in the analysis.

Participants initially read a story which depicted a dating scene in which a couple went to the movies and held hands. Following the scenario presentation participants were asked to respond to questions about their attitudes towards the subjects in the scenario, and then

responded to questions assessing their attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. Questions assessing attitudes toward lesbians and gay men were presented twice, once with a lesbian target and with a gay male target. Following the completion of the questionnaire, participants were debriefed.

The variables of interest were the sexual orientation of the couple in the scenario, the format of the questionnaire (discussed below), and the gender of the respondent. In the scenario, either a lesbian, gay male, or heterosexual couple was presented. For control purposes, in one condition, a story was not presented. Thus, there were four manipulations of the scenario presented. In addition, the format of the questionnaire was manipulated. In one format, referred to as the "separate" format, all questions about one target sex were asked prior to those questions about the other target sex. In the other format, referred to as the "paired" format, questions about each target sex were alternated. For example, the statement "Lesbians are sick" would be immediately followed by the statement "Gay men are sick." It was hoped that the paired format would elicit greater contrast in attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. In both formats the order in which each target sex was presented was counterbalanced, i.e., in half of the questionnaires, the lesbian target was presented first and the gay male target was presented second, and in the other half of the questionnaires, the gay male target was presented first and the lesbian target was presented

second. Thus the design of the experiment was a 4 (type of scenario) x 2 (format of scale) x 2 (gender of respondent) factorial.

Herek's (1987) ATLG (Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay men) scale was used to assess attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. Herek divided the ATLG into two subscales of ten items each, the ATL (Attitudes Toward Lesbians) and the ATG (Attitudes Toward Gay men). These subscales were composed of entirely different items, thus making it impossible to directly compare one subscale with the other. Therefore, for this study, the ATL and the ATG each consisted of all 20 items from the ATLG modified, as necessary, to have the appropriate target sex. This was done so as to allow direct comparison between the two subscales.

As in the previous study, items assessing religious involvement were adapted from a scale developed by Strunk (1951).

Results

All questions on the ATLG were answered on an eight-point continuum and were recoded such that the highest scoring response was the most homophobic.

The ATL had good internal reliability ($\alpha = .9545$), as did the ATG ($\alpha = .9550$). In addition reliability analyses were done on Herek's original subscales. On Herek's original ATL subscale, the α value was .9156. When those same questions were asked about gay men, the α value was .9157.

On Herek's original ATG subscale, the α value was .9194. When those same questions were asked about lesbians, the α value was .9149.

Analyses of covariance were done on the ATL and the ATG to determine if males and females differed in their attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. ATG was covaried with ATL; ATL was a significant covariate ($F(1, 224) = 1467.738, p < .001$). In addition, ATL was covaried with ATG; ATG was a significant covariate ($F(1, 224) = 1472.01, p < .001$). On the ATG there was a significant sex difference ($F(1, 224) = 39.623, p < .001$), with males having more homophobic scores than did females. Similarly, on the ATL there was also a significant sex difference ($F(1, 224) = 31.976, p < .001$), with males having more homophobic attitudes than did females. Paired means t-tests comparing the ATL to the ATG for males and females were done (see Table 1). For males, there was a significant difference between their ATL scores and their ATG scores ($t(126) = 5.633, p < .001$). For females, there were no significant differences between their ATL and their ATG scores ($t(130) = -1.892, p = n.s.$). In addition, a paired means t-test was done to test the overall difference between the ATL and the ATG scores, and that was found to be significant ($t(260) = 4.339, p < .001$), with people having more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians.

Recalling that the format of the ATLG was modified to make the implied comparison group more or less salient and that a dating scenario was presented before the ATLG to manipulate participants' reference

groups, analyses of covariance were done using the other independent variables. There was a significant interaction effect of gender of respondent and format of questionnaire on the ATL ($F(1, 224) = 0.735, p < .001$) (see Table 2), with males having more homophobic responses on the paired format than on the separate format, and females having more homophobic responses on the separate format than on the paired format. The type of story presented before the ATLG was not significant (for the ATL ($F(3, 224) = .57, p = n.s.$); for the ATG ($F(3, 224) = .683, p = n.s.$)).

Analyses of variance were done to determine how religious involvement related to attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. Church attendance was significantly related to attitudes toward lesbians ($F(3, 250) = 7.197, p < .001$) and gay men ($F(3, 250) = 4.794, p < .005$). The more often people reported attending church, the more negative their attitudes were towards lesbians and gay men. The amount of time devoted to church was also a significant factor, with those who reported never devoting time to church having more favorable attitudes toward lesbians ($F(3, 249) = 8.272, p < .001$) and gay men ($F(3, 249) = 7.292, p < .001$) than those who reported devoting any time to church. The frequency of reading devotional literature also related significantly to attitudes toward lesbians ($F(3, 249) = 3.637, p < .05$) and gay men ($F(3, 249) = 3.512, p < .05$). The more often someone reported reading devotional literature, the more negative his or her attitudes were toward

lesbians and gay men. Frequency of prayer was also significantly related to attitudes toward lesbians ($F(3, 250) = 0.928, p < .001$) and gay men ($F(3, 250) = 7.051, p < .001$). The more often people reported praying, the more negative their attitudes toward lesbians and gay men were likely to be. Participants' beliefs about how their religious attitudes compared to others their own age also related significantly to attitudes toward lesbians ($F(2, 252) = 6.48, p < .001$) and gay men ($F(2, 252) = 5.230, p < .001$). Those who reported that their religious beliefs were "stronger than average" had the most homophobic attitudes, and those who reported that their religious beliefs were "less than average" had the least homophobic attitudes. The scores of those who reported their religious beliefs were "average" compared to others their own age were approximately midway between the scores of those who reported stronger than average religious beliefs and the scores of those who reported less than average religious beliefs. Participants' beliefs about the need for religious faith were also significantly related to their attitudes about lesbians ($F(2, 251) = 3.66, p < .001$) and gay men ($F(2, 251) = 2.986, p < .001$). Those who felt that a religious belief was necessary in order to have a mature outlook on life had more homophobic scores than those who felt that a religious belief was unnecessary. The scores of those who were unsure as to whether or not a religious belief was necessary were approximately midway between the scores of those who felt that a religious belief was necessary and the scores of those who felt that a

religious belief was unnecessary. Religious denomination was also significantly related (see Table 3) to attitudes toward lesbians ($F(9, 237) = 3.79, p < .001$) and gay men ($F(9, 237) = 2.834, p < .005$). When religious denominations were grouped as they were in Study 1 into three categories, the first being Baptists, the second being Catholics, Methodists, Presbyterians and Lutherans, and the third being members of Church of Christ, Assembly of God or other independent Protestant churches, religious denomination was significantly related to the ATL ($F(2, 222) = 4.518, p < .05$) and approached significance for the ATG ($F(2, 222) = 2.815, p < .10$).

In addition, there were several other factors that related significantly to attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. Knowing a gay man was significantly related to attitudes toward lesbians ($F(1, 246) = 5.162, p < .05$) and gay men ($F(1, 246) = 5.187, p < .05$), while knowing a lesbian was not significantly related to attitudes toward lesbians ($F(1, 246) = 3.318, p = n.s.$) and gay men ($F(1, 246) = 1.965, p = n.s.$). Those who reported knowing a gay man had significantly less homophobic attitudes than did those who reported not knowing a gay man. Similarly, being friends with a gay man was significantly related to attitudes toward lesbians ($F(1, 248) = 31.302, p < .001$) and gay men ($F(1, 248) = 28.742, p < .001$), while being friends with a lesbian was not significantly related to attitudes toward lesbians ($F(1, 248) = 3.789, p = n.s.$) and gay men ($F(1, 248) = 3.688, p = n.s.$). People who reported having gay male

friends were significantly less homophobic than those who reported not having any gay male friends.

Analyses were also done comparing Herek's subscales. For convenience purposes Herek's original ATL subscale was called ATL1, while Herek's original ATG subscale, when modified to have lesbian targets, was called ATL2. Similarly, Herek's original ATG subscale was called ATG1, while Herek's original ATL subscale, when modified to have gay male targets, was called ATG2. A paired means t-test was done on each of the pairs of subscales to see if the the ATL subscales and the ATG subscales differed. Scores on ATL1 were significantly less homophobic ($t(268) = 2.290, p < .001$) than scores on ATL2. Conversely, scores on ATG1 were significantly more homophobic ($t(267) = -0.86, p < .001$) than scores on ATG2.

Discussion

This study confirmed other findings (e.g., Kite, 1984) in finding that males were more homophobic than females. It also confirmed Lieblich and Friedman's (1985) study in which they found that respondents had more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians. A very interesting finding in this study was that females did not differ significantly in their attitudes toward gay men compared to lesbians, but males had much more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians. These findings support Herek's (1986) argument that

heterosexual males reaffirm their male identity by being homophobic and hostile toward gay men. In addition, gay men are often perceived as giving up their masculinity, which, given this patriarchal society, is seen as incomprehensible and undesirable, while lesbians are often perceived as trying to gain masculinity, which, while not condoned, is at least understandable. Thus gay men are seen as committing a much more severe transgression of sex role boundaries than are lesbians, and this may account, in part, for the more negative attitudes people have toward gay men compared to lesbians.

One issue that was of importance in this study was trying to manipulate the reference groups participants used to determine its impact on measured attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. There were two ways this study attempted to manipulate participants' reference groups. The first was by manipulating the format of the questionnaire. It was hoped that the paired format would encourage participants to make intragroup comparisons, and thus have homosexuals as their reference group, and that in the separate format participants would be making intergroup comparisons and use heterosexuals as their reference group. A second way that this study attempted to manipulate participants' reference groups was by varying the sexual orientation of the couple in the dating scenario. It was hypothesized that participants would use the sexual orientation of the couple in the scenario as their reference group, and that if there was no scenario presented, participants would use

heterosexuals as their reference group.

In the first attempted manipulation of participants' reference groups, varying the format of the questionnaire produced significant differences in measured attitudes toward lesbians, but the direction of the effect was different for each gender. Males had more negative attitudes toward lesbians when the paired format was used, while females had more negative attitudes toward lesbians when the separate format was used. Clearly there needs to be some type of standardization in assessing attitudes toward lesbians and gay men, particularly so that comparisons across studies can be made.

The second attempted manipulation of participants' reference groups, varying the sexual orientation of the couple in the dating scenario, did not significantly affect participants' homophobia. This indicates that either that the desired manipulation of participants' reference groups was not achieved or that participants' reference groups do not significantly affect their attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. Future studies should attempt to determine if there are more effective ways of manipulating participants' reference groups, and then determine their subsequent influence on attitudes toward lesbians and gay men.

This study also replicated previous studies (e.g., Larsen et al., 1980) and indicated that increased religious involvement (on every measure used) correlated with increased homophobia. In addition, it would also appear that one's religious denomination significantly relates to one's

attitudes toward lesbians and gay men.

This study partially supported Millham et al.'s (1976) finding that having a male or female homosexual friend was associated with decreased homophobia. In this study, knowing or being friends with a gay male was associated with more positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men, but knowing or being friends with a lesbian did not significantly affect measured attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. This may be due to the fact that gay men are more disliked than lesbians; therefore a gay man could make a larger relative impact on people's attitudes toward homosexuality than could a lesbian. In addition, lesbians are much less visible. Therefore, the lack of a significant decrease in homophobia when the participant knows or is friends with a lesbian could be due to the small number who actually know or are friends with a lesbian. In this study 88 reported knowing a lesbian and 14 reported being friends with a lesbian, while 141 reported knowing a gay man and 22 reported being friends with a gay man.

In addition, the findings of this study have major implications for the validity of Herek's (1987) ATL and ATG subscales as he currently employs them. This study found that the means for ATL1 and ATL2 and the means for ATG1 and ATG2 differed significantly. ATL2 had a higher mean than did ATL1, and ATG1 had a higher mean than did ATG2. Recalling that the questions in ATG2 are the same as the questions in ATL1, but with a different target sex, and that the questions in ATL2

are the same as the question in ATG1, but with a different target sex, this would seem to indicate that the questions in Herek's (1987) ATG subscale produce more homophobic responses, regardless of the target sex, than the question in Herek's (1987) ATL subscale. These results and the fact that Herek's (1987) ATL and ATG subscales can not be directly compared would seem to argue for the combining of Herek's (1987) ATL and ATG subscales so that each ATL and ATG subscale have all twenty items, modified as necessary with the appropriate target sex. This would reduce the confound of the bias in Herek's (1987) subscales and would allow for direct comparison of the ATL and the ATG subscales.

General Discussion

Both studies found that males have more negative attitudes toward gay men compared to lesbians than do females. In addition both studies raised important questions, namely, how does one assess attitudes toward lesbians and gay men in such a way that allows maximum variability in already polarized responses, and how can this variability in responses be manipulated. Both studies indicate that researchers should exercise caution when comparing attitudes toward lesbians and gay men across studies.

In addition, the finding from the first study that the label (gay/lesbian or homosexual) of the female target affected responses on the shorter scale indicate that researchers need to be aware of the

potential connotations of the labels they use for their homosexual targets. More research, however, need to be done on this effect.

The finding that attitudes toward AIDS were highly correlated with attitudes toward homosexuality was as expected. In light of this finding, AIDS educators should consider including education about homosexuality in their teachings.

The findings that religious involvement correlated highly with homophobic attitudes was as expected. The finding in the first study that those people who reported devoting some time to church were more homophobic than those who reported regularly, rarely or never devoting time to church was not replicated. Instead, in the second study, the those who reported regularly devoting time to church had the most homophobic attitudes, which is consistent with the other measures of religious involvement. It should be noted, however, that correlations between religious involvement and homophobia do not necessarily imply that religious involvement causes homophobia; it could be equally likely that those who are already homophobic are more likely to become religiously involved. Also, a more detailed investigation should be done into the relationship between the denomination one belongs to and one's attitudes toward lesbians and gay men.

In both studies it was found that knowing or being friends with a gay man was significantly related to more positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men, while knowing or being friends with a lesbian was

not significantly related to attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. As mentioned previously, this may be due to the relative invisibility of lesbians. Laboratory or field research, as opposed to psychometric evaluation, could possibly shed light on this effect to determine if these results are a function of the instruments used, or if in "real life" knowing or being friends with a lesbian is related to less homophobic attitudes.

Social psychological studies of attitudes toward a group of individuals must acknowledge that there will always be a comparison made between the measured group and some reference group. If the comparison is not explicit, it will be inferred by the respondent. Differences between studies may result, in part, in methodological differences that produced different implied comparison groups, as was demonstrated in the present research. Both studies clearly demonstrate the need for standardized assessment of attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. Until this is done, research on attitudes toward lesbians and gay men will remain in its infancy.

References

- Bierly, M. (1935). Prejudice toward contemporary outgroups as a generalized attitude. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 15, 189-199.
- Henley, N. and Pincus, F. (1978). Interrelationship of sexist, racist, and antihomosexual attitudes. Psychological Reports, 42, 83-90.
- Herek, G. M. (1984). Attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: a factor-analytic study. Journal of Homosexuality, 10, 39-5 .
- Herek, G. M. (1986). On Heterosexual Masculinity. American Behavioral Scientist, 29, 563-577.
- Herek, G. M. (1987). Religious orientation and prejudice: A comparison of racial and sexual attitudes. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 13, 34-44.
- Hirsch, D. and Enlow, K. (1934). The effects of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome on gay lifestyle and the gay individual. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 437, 273-28 .
- Kite, M. E. (1984). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexuals: A meta-analytic review. Journal of Homosexuality, 10, 69-81.
- Larsen, K. S., Reed, M., & Hoffman, S. (1980). Attitudes of heterosexuals toward homosexuality: A Likert-type scale and construct validity. The Journal of Sex Research, 16, 245-257.
- Lieblich, A. and Friedman, G. (1985). Attitudes toward male and female homosexuality and sex-role stereotypes in Israeli and American

- students. Sex Roles, 2, 561-570.
- MacDonald, A. P., Jr. and Games, R. (1974). Some characteristics of those who hold negative attitudes toward homosexuals. Journal of Homosexuality, 1, 9-27.
- Maret, S. (1984). Attitudes of fundamentalists toward homosexuality. Psychological Reports, 55, 205-206.
- McNemar, Q. Psychological Statistics. New York: John P. Wiley & Sons, 1969.
- Millham, J., San Miguel, C. L., and Kellogg, R. (1976). A factor-analytic conception of attitudes toward male and female homosexuals. Journal of Homosexuality, 2, 3-10.
- Nyberg, K. and Alston, J. (1977). Homosexual labeling by university youths. Adolescence, 12, 541-547.
- Price, J. (1982). High school students' attitudes toward homosexuality. The Journal of School Health, 52, 469-474.
- Sherif, M., Taub, D., and Hovland, C. (1958). Assimilation and contrast effects of anchoring stimuli on judgments. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 55, 150-155.
- Strunk, O., Jr. (1958). Relationship between self-reports and adolescent religiosity. Psychological Reports, 4, 683-686.

Appendix A

Modified Items from Herek's (1984) Scale

1. I would not mind having a lesbian sister.
2. I would not mind having a gay brother.
3. Lesbians are revolting.
4. Gay men are revolting.
5. I find the idea of sex between gay men to be erotic.
6. I find the idea of sex between lesbians to be erotic.

Appendix B

Attitudes Toward AIDS Scale

1. If I were to donate blood, I would not be worried about contracting AIDS.
2. I believe that AIDS is definitely spread not only by the transmission of body fluids, but by casual contact as well.
3. I would not be worried if I were talking with someone homosexual about getting AIDS from that person.
4. If a male acquaintance of mine contracted AIDS, I would feel certain he was gay.
5. If a female acquaintance of mine contracted AIDS, I would feel certain she was a lesbian.
6. I would not be worried about contracting AIDS if I went to visit someone who had AIDS.
7. AIDS is God's punishment to homosexuals for their behavior.
8. I believe that lesbians are just as likely to get AIDS as gay men are.
9. Any homosexual person with AIDS should be quarantined immediately upon diagnosis.
10. Any child or other non-homosexual person who has contracted AIDS should be quarantined immediately upon diagnosis.
11. Landlords should not be allowed to evict someone or deny someone housing just because that person has AIDS.
12. All homosexuals should be tested for the HTLV-3 (AIDS) virus.

13. If someone tests positive for the HTLV-3 (AIDS) virus, that person should be reported to a health agency.

Table

Mean Scores on ATL and ATG in Study 2

| | PARTICIPANTS | |
|-----|--------------|--------|
| | Male | Female |
| ATL | 118.63 | 117.58 |
| ATG | 127.22 | 115.48 |

Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men

32

Mean Scores on ATL Broken Down by Format of Scale and Gender of Participant

| | | FORMAT OF SCALE | |
|-------------|--------|-----------------|--------|
| | | Separate | Paired |
| GENDER OF | Male | 111.17 | 125.00 |
| PARTICIPANT | Female | 119.95 | 113.55 |

Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men

33

Mean Scores on ATL and ATG Broken Down by Religious Denomination

| | | ATL | ATG |
|--------------|-----------------------------|--------|--------|
| | | <hr/> | |
| | None | 97.24 | 104.2 |
| | Catholic | 121.78 | 123.03 |
| | Methodist | 109.79 | 113.49 |
| | Baptist | 126.25 | 128.96 |
| | Lutheran | 122.75 | 132.25 |
| RELIGIOUS | Presbyterian, Episcopalian | 108.83 | 113.04 |
| DENOMINATION | Church of Christ | 126.08 | 129.25 |
| | Pentecostal and independent | | |
| | Protestant | 140.22 | 143.39 |
| | Other Christian | 101.29 | 109.86 |
| | NonChristian religion | 85.20 | 94.00 |
| | | <hr/> | |