

Marquette University

e-Publications@Marquette

---

Dissertations (1934 -)

Dissertations, Theses, and Professional  
Projects

---

## Heterosexual Allies' Confrontation of Sexual Prejudice: the Effect of Gender, Attitudes, and Past Allied Behavior

Kelly L. LeMaire  
*Marquette University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations\\_mu](https://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations_mu)



Part of the [Clinical Psychology Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

LeMaire, Kelly L., "Heterosexual Allies' Confrontation of Sexual Prejudice: the Effect of Gender, Attitudes, and Past Allied Behavior" (2017). *Dissertations (1934 -)*. 715.  
[https://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations\\_mu/715](https://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations_mu/715)

HETEROSEXUAL ALLIES' CONFRONTATION OF SEXUAL PREJUDICE:  
THE EFFECT OF GENDER, ATTITUDES, AND  
PAST ALLIED BEHAVIOR

by

Kelly L. LeMaire, M.S.

A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School,  
Marquette University,  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

May 2017

ABSTRACT  
HETEROSEXUAL ALLIES' CONFRONTATION OF SEXUAL PREJUDICE:  
THE EFFECT OF GENDER, ATTITUDES, AND  
PAST ALLIED BEHAVIOR

Kelly L. LeMaire, M.S.

Marquette University, 2017

Confrontation of prejudice is one method that has been demonstrated to reduce future discrimination on behalf of perpetrators and non-target witnesses in the future. The current study sought to 1) determine whether the gender of the perpetrator, target, or witness of heterosexist prejudice affects witness's reactions to prejudice, including confrontation, 2) understand if other factors including participants' attitudes about society, gender roles, and gay men and lesbian women, as well as their general level of assertiveness and previous allied behaviors were predictive of confrontation behavior and 3) examine participant's satisfaction with their responses and anticipated future responses in relation to their behavioral responses and attitudes.

A 10-condition (2x2x2, 2 controls) live experimental design was utilized to examine the participants' responses to an overtly heterosexist comment. Specifically, participants were exposed to a person (man or woman) making heterosexist comments about either a gay man or lesbian woman and their verbal and nonverbal behavioral responses were recorded and coded. Participants also completed measures about their attitudes, personality, and previous allied behaviors.

Results suggest about 25% of the sample verbally confronted the perpetrator and 25% verbally agreed. The gender of the target, non-target witness (participant), and especially the gender of the perpetrator appear to affect witnesses' responses to prejudice, including confrontation. Additionally, both attitudinal variables, including attitudes toward gay men and personal support, and previous allied behaviors, including the LGASJC action subscale and personal relationships with gay and lesbian individuals, predicted confrontation; however, gender of the perpetrator still significantly and uniquely predicted confrontation even when accounting for these variables. Overall, individuals who confronted reported being more satisfied with their responses than those who did not and anticipated engaging in confrontation again in the future.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Kelly L. LeMaire, M.S.

I would like to extend my most sincere thanks and gratitude to all of the people who have assisted and supported me not only with the completion of my dissertation, but with my entire graduate school career. First and foremost, I would like to thank my husband, Nicholas. Your love and support has made this all possible. Thank you for being there for me and for rooting for me each step of the way. I could not have done this without you. I love you endlessly.

I would also like to thank my wonderful friends and family for all you have done for both of us throughout the process. Specifically, I would like to thank my parents Patrick & Mary Patterson, Pat LeMaire & Denis Glick, and Larry LeMaire & Teri Nicholas. I would also like to thank my brothers and sisters and extended family, and especially my sister, Kristy Patterson. You have all touched my life in such meaningful ways. Thank you for building me up and encouraging me throughout this journey. Your love means so much to me. I would like to thank all of my friends, near and far, and especially Sophia Ernst and Samantha Masterman. Although it has been such a long time since we have lived in the same city or even the same state, I know you have been with me each day, just as I am with you. I could never express in words the extent of my love and gratitude for my friends and family. Each and every one of you have made me the person I am today and have truly been a blessing in my life.

I thank all of my fellow MU graduate students. I believe in each and every one of you and am honored to have been able to take this journey with you. I would like to especially thank my dear cohort mates Stephanie Potts, Kate Reiter, Leticia Vallejo, Ashley Moss, Bridget Dolan, Christina Figueroa, Indrani Thiruselvam, and Natasha Najar. You have each made me a better psychologist and a better person. I know that we are forever bonded by this experience and will be life-long friends and colleagues. I am so proud of all you have accomplished and know you will continue to do amazing things. I'll go if you go!

I would like to thank all of the faculty and staff at Marquette for providing me with an educational experience that has impacted me in more ways than I can count. I would like to especially thank my dissertation director, Dr. Debra Oswald, as well as my committee, Drs. John Grych, Stephen Franzoi, and Nicholas Heck. You have each contributed in such meaningful ways to this project and to my training. Your mentorship and guidance have helped me develop into the professional I am today and I truly thank you for all you've done for me. I would also like to thank my mentors and colleagues at the Center for Behavioral Medicine including Dr. Kim Skerven, Neal Moglowsky, Dr. Cara Raymond, Julia Psichulis, Paul Grady, Dr. Henry Boeh, Mary-Catherine Nimphius, and Dr. Rebecca Thompson. Thank you for all you have done for me, and especially for teaching me what a Team can be.

I would also like to thank all of the undergraduate research assistants who helped with the collection and coding of this project. I have been continually impressed by your dedication to this field and to making this world a better place through your work. Please know that I will continue to support you in your careers. I thank each of the people who participated in this study. Thank you for contributing your time and energy to this project. It is much appreciated. I thank the Arthur J. Schmitt Fellowship Foundation for their financial support and inspiration to grow in leadership. This community is very special to me and I am grateful to be a part of such an influential group.

I would like to thank all of my mentors and colleagues at Duke University Medical Center, and especially Drs. M. Zachary Rosenthal, Noga Zerubavel, Melissa Miller, and Andrada Neacsiu. I am so grateful for your support in completing this project as well as for all of the impeccable training and many opportunities with which you have provided me. I am looking so forward to what is to come.

Finally, I would like to thank Bapuji for your love and guidance. I have been infinitely blessed by your presence in my life and I am forever grateful. Gurudev datta!

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	i
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Sexual Prejudice.....	2
B. Consequences for Victims.....	3
C. Confrontation.....	4
D. Heterosexual Allies.....	12
E. Video Study.....	21
F. Current Study.....	22
II. METHOD.....	28
A. Participants.....	28
B. Procedure.....	31
C. Measures.....	35
III. RESULTS.....	42
A. Verbal and Nonverbal Responses.....	42
B. Perceptions of Heterosexist Comments and Perpetrator.....	49
C. Attitudinal Predictors of Confrontation.....	52
D. History of Allied Behavior.....	57
E. Gender, Attitudes, and Allied Behavior Variables.....	63
F. Satisfaction with Responses to the Comment.....	65
G. Anticipated Future Responses.....	70

IV. DISCUSSION.....	74
A. Verbal and Nonverbal Responses.....	75
B. Perceptions of Heterosexist Comments and Perpetrator.....	80
C. Attitudinal Predictors of Confrontation.....	82
D. History of Allied Behavior.....	84
E. Gender, Attitudes, and Allied Behavior Variables.....	85
F. Satisfaction with Responses to the Comment.....	86
G. Anticipated Future Responses.....	89
H. Limitations and Future Directions.....	89
I. Conclusions.....	91
V. FOOTNOTES.....	94
VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	95
VII. APPENDIXES.....	108
A. Appendix A.....	108
B. Appendix B.....	111
C. Appendix C.....	112
D. Appendix D.....	114
E. Appendix E.....	115
F. Appendix F.....	116

## LIST OF TABLES

I. NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN EACH CONDITION.....	30
II. FREQUENCIES OF BEHAVIORAL RESPONSES TO THE COMMENT.....	42
III. GENDER DYNAMICS PREDICTING CONFRONTATION.....	45
IV. GENDER DYNAMICS PREDICTING NONVERBAL DISAGREEMENT.....	46
V. GENDER DYNAMICS PREDICTING VERBAL AGREEMENT.....	47
VI. GENDER DYNAMICS PREDICTING COMMENT DISTRESS.....	50
VII. GENDER DYNAMICS PREDICTING PERPETRATOR DISLIKE.....	51
VIII. GENDER DYNAMICS PREDICTING PERCEPTIONS OF THE PERPETRATOR'S SEXIST ATTITUDES.....	53
IX. BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS.....	54
X. ATTITUDINAL VARIABLES PREDICTING CONFRONTATION.....	58
XI. FREQUENCIES BEHAVIORAL RESPONSES.....	59
XII. ROTATED COMPONENT ANALYSIS OF ALLIED BEHAVIOR.....	62
XIII. ALLIED BHEAVIORS PREDICTING CONFRONTATION.....	64
XIV. GENDER DYNAMICS, ATTITUDES, AND PREVIOUS ALLIED BEHAVIORS PREDICTING CONFRONTATION.....	66
XV. ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR PREDICTING SATISFACTION FOR LESBAIN TARGETS.....	69
XVI. ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR PREDICTING SATISFACTION FOR GAY TARGETS.....	71
XVII. ALLY IDENTITY CENTRALITY AND BEHAVIOR PREDICTING SATISFACTION FOR ALL TARGETS.....	72



## INTRODUCTION

Sexual prejudice is extremely pervasive throughout our society and manifests at the institutional, societal, group, and individual level (Adams, Bell, & Griffin, 2007; D'Augelli, 1992; Dickter, 2012; Herek, 1989; 2009; Taylor & Peter, 2012; U.S. Department of Justice, 2013; Woodford, Howell, Kulick, & Silverschanz, 2013). Experiencing blatant acts of prejudice and microaggressions has been associated with a number of negative psychological, emotional, social, and physical consequences for victims (Cowan & Mettrick, 2002; D'Augelli, 1992; Garnets, Herek, & Levy, 1990; Herek, 2007; Herek, Gillis, Cogan, 1999; Jewell, McCutcheon, Harriman, & Morrison, 2012; Nadal, 2013; Rose & Mechanic, 2002; Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2008; Taylor & Peter, 2012). Because the occurrence of sexual prejudice is so common and the consequences are so severe, there is a need for researchers to examine how to reduce it.

One avenue for reduction of prejudice and discrimination is through confrontation, which requires an individual to assert that particular remarks are prejudiced or actions are discriminatory and call for others to refrain from engaging in this practice. Although confrontation from targets of prejudice has been found to be effective (Blanchard, Crandall, & Vaughn, 1994; Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006; Fazio & Hiden, 2001), some heterosexual individuals ally with gay and lesbian individuals to take on the responsibility of making social change on behalf of this underprivileged group. In fact, allied confrontation has been found to be particularly effective (Dickter, Kittel, & Gyurovski, 2012; Gulker, Mark, & Monteith, 2013; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010).

In this way, heterosexual allies play a vital role in prejudice reduction. Nonetheless, it is difficult, for a myriad of reasons, for people to stand up on behalf of a stigmatized group such as those who identify as gay or lesbian.

The current study will utilize an experimental design in order to determine whether gender of the perpetrator, target, or witness of heterosexist prejudice play a role in witness's reactions, including confrontation, to prejudice. Additionally, participants' attitudes about society, gender roles, and gay men and lesbian women, as well as their general level of assertiveness and previous allied behaviors will be measured in order to determine which of these factors best predict confrontation behavior. Participants' satisfaction with their responses as well as their anticipated future responses will also be examined in relation to their reactions and attitudes.

### **Sexual Prejudice**

The term sexual prejudice encompasses all negative attitudes based on sexual orientation, regardless of the form of sexuality being targeted (Herek, 2007), although it most commonly refers to those with same-sex sexual attraction and orientation. It is important to recognize that the term sexual prejudice encapsulates individual and group level prejudice toward gay men and lesbian women, but devaluation of individuals with same-sex sexual orientation also prevails at the societal level. This societal inequality is described by the term heterosexism. This term is analogous to sexism and racism, and captures the sense that, at the larger, societal level, same-sex sexual orientation is viewed as inferior to heterosexuality (Herek, 2009).

Gay men and lesbian women are disadvantaged at the institutional and societal level in numerous ways (Herek, 2009). Institutional oppression takes many forms,

although it can generally be categorized into a number of important domains including family, education, workplace, health care, legal systems, and media (Adams et al., 2007). In addition, both blatant acts of violence and more subtle forms of heterosexist discrimination are extremely prevalent (D'Augelli, 1992; Dickter, 2012; Herek, 1989; 2009; Kosciw, Greytak, Diaz, & Bartkiewicz, 2010; Taylor & Peter, 2012; U.S. Department of Justice, 2013; Woodford et al., 2013).

### **Consequences for Victims**

Both blatant acts of violence and microaggressions based on sexual prejudice have been associated with a number of negative psychological, emotional, social, and physical consequences for victims (Cowan & Mettrick, 2002; D'Augelli, 1992; D'Augelli & Grossman, 2001; Garnets et al., 1990; Herek, 2007; Herek, Gillis, Cogan, & Glunt, 1997; Jewell et al., 2012; Nadal, 2013; Rose & Mechanic, 2002; Silverschanz et al., 2008; Taylor & Peter, 2012). Research has demonstrated that sexual prejudice and internalized stigma can negatively affect gay men and lesbian women's well being (Garnets et al., 1990; Gonsiorek & Rudolph, 1991; Herek, 2007; Nadal, 2013). A number of negative mental health outcomes have also been associated with experiences of heterosexist discrimination. Symptoms associated with sexual prejudice and discrimination include, but are not limited to, feelings of hopelessness, anger, fear, guilt, frustration, increased risk of depression, anxiety, suicidal ideation, and possibly even post-traumatic stress disorder (Nadal, 2013; Nadal, Issa et al., 2011; Nadal, Wong et al., 2011; Rose & Mechanic, 2002). Additionally, it is noteworthy that while experiencing violence against your person or property may be terrifying and damaging in and of itself, individuals who experience this violence because of their sexual orientation experience

higher levels of depression, traumatic stress, anxiety and anger when compared to those who experience similar crimes unrelated to their sexual orientation (Herek et al., 1999).

### **Confrontation**

Because sexual prejudice is prevalent and often results in negative consequences for victims, it is imperative to understand the way this prejudice operates and examine ways of reducing it. One commonly studied method of prejudice reduction is confrontation. In a general sense, confrontation refers to “verbally or nonverbally expressing one’s dissatisfaction with prejudicial and discriminatory treatment to the person who is responsible for the remark or behavior” (Shelton, Richeson, Salvatore, & Hill, 2006, p. 67). More commonly, definitions of confrontation describe verbal reactions. However, even verbal confrontation responses vary from expressing disagreement with the prejudiced attitudes or acts of discrimination, pointing out the inappropriateness of the comments made, explaining the bias in the person’s behavior/beliefs, and asking/commanding the perpetrator to refrain from expressing prejudiced beliefs/acting in a discriminatory fashion (Brinkman, Garcia, & Rickard, 2011; Gervais, Hillard, Vescio, 2010; Kaiser & Miller, 2001; Rattan & Dweck, 2010). Confrontation may also include nonverbal responses such as rolling eyes at the perpetrator’s remarks or making other gestures (e.g., shaking head “no”) to signal disapproval (Brinkman, Dean, Simpson, McGinley, & Rosén, 2015; Dickter, 2012; Gervais et al., 2010).

Confrontation of prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory behavior can promote tolerance and be a catalyst for social change. Previous research has demonstrated that confrontation of prejudice leads to perpetrators responding in less stereotypic and

prejudiced ways in the future (Blanchard et al., 1994; Czopp et al., 2006; Fazio & Hiden, 2001). This change in behavior may apply not only to perpetrators of prejudice but other witnesses as well (Blanchard et al., 1994). That is, others in the environment tend to change their attitudes toward being more egalitarian after witnessing confrontation of discrimination. For example, research suggests that when individuals heard someone express strongly anti-racist views they condemn racism significantly more than those who had not heard the anti-racist views (Blanchard et al., 1994). Conversely, those who heard a person condone racism were significantly less condemning of racism than those who were not exposed to racist attitudes. These responses held true regardless of the race of the person condemning or condoning racism.

Monteith's (1993) research suggests that individuals engage in a process of self-regulation when they are confronted about holding prejudicial attitudes. This process requires that the person be made aware of his or her prejudiced beliefs or actions, reflect, and engage in self-regulation of future behavior via self-monitoring. Individuals who have egalitarian beliefs will likely feel some discomfort as a result of cognitive dissonance caused by the friction between their values and behaviors (Festinger, 1957; Monteith, 1993). Usually this is associated with negative self-directed affect, self-focus, and self-thoughts for those who are low in prejudicial beliefs, as the discrepancies are ego-relevant. As a result of the dissonance created, the person with egalitarian beliefs may engage in self-monitoring and self-regulation in order to inhibit future discriminatory behavior (Monteith, 1993; Monteith, Mark, & Ashburn-Nardo, 2010).<sup>1</sup>

It is clear that self-regulation may follow for those internally motivated by their egalitarian values, but could confrontation still affect those who do not hold these values?

One may imagine that it would not be beneficial to confront those who are perceived to have no interest in changing their negative attitudes toward a group. However, it is important to understand that even in the absence of internal motivation, confrontation can still produce behavioral change in perpetrators of discrimination (Czopp et al., 2006; Monteith, 2014). Research suggests social pressure offers motivation to change even in the absence of internal motivation (Monteith, 2014; Plant & Devine, 1998). That is, when people are confronted for their prejudicial language or discriminatory actions, it will create a sense of discomfort for many individuals. As social psychologists and other researchers have demonstrated for decades, people yearn to be liked and accepted by others in their environment (e.g., Maslow, 1943). Therefore, if they are confronted or “socially punished” for discriminating or using heterosexist language, it may provide enough discomfort and pressure for them to either want to change their attitudes or, at least, not express them in this particular social context. Specifically, the perpetrator may become concerned about others’ perceptions of him or her as being a prejudiced person and in attempt to have others perceive him/her favorably, the person may reduce outward expressions of prejudice, even if he/she decides to maintain internal biases (Monteith, 2014).

While research suggests that the behavior and attitudes of those confronted and other witnesses may change after confrontation (Blanchard et al., 1994; Czopp et al., 2006; Fazio & Hiden, 2001), these reactions may differ depending on the nature of the comment/behavior (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Gulker et al., 2013; Sue & Sue, 2013). For example, if the perpetrator expresses overt prejudice (more clearly prejudicial attitudes) the person may respond differently than if their comment/behavior was more ambiguous

or subtle (microaggressions). When the expressed prejudicial attitude or discriminatory behavior is subtle, those confronted may be more likely to voice being offended and dismiss the accusation as false (Nadal, 2013; Sue & Sue, 2013). This may be amplified because well-intended individuals often perpetrate microaggressions. For example, the perpetrator may state that “they didn’t mean it that way,” tell the victim that they are being “too sensitive” and/or adamantly insist that they are not heterosexist (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Kaiser & Miller, 2001; Sue & Sue, 2013). Similarly, because microaggressions are subtle, they may be judged as “not very prejudiced,” which may make people much less likely to confront the perpetrator (Ashburn-Nardo, Morris & Goodwin, 2008). Research suggests that individuals are more likely to confront more overt, offensive comments, rather than subtle prejudice (Dickter, 2012).

**The Benefit of Allies’ Confrontation.** Often the onus is on targets of discrimination to point out and stand against it (Sue & Sue, 2013); however, there are a number of reasons that it may prove difficult for individuals to personally speak out against prejudicial attitudes and discrimination they face. Even though confrontation responses made by targets are important for changing behavior of perpetrators, some research suggests that perpetrators may be more receptive when confronted by non-target allies (Gulker et al., 2013; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). Targets are often viewed as “complainers” or as being hypersensitive and have, at times, been demonstrated to be less effective at changing perpetrators’ behavior (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Kaiser and Miller, 2001; Sue & Sue, 2013). Specifically, Czopp and Monteith (2003) found that confrontations from non-target group members elicited more guilt and

self-criticism than confrontation by a target-group member, which can be the first step in the process of self-regulation. In addition to perpetrator perceptions, reactions from onlookers are also more favorable (e.g., more guilt) when a non-target ally confronts a perpetrator of prejudice than when the target confronts the perpetrator (Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). Furthermore, confronting may even lead others to view the non-target more positively than when they say nothing in response to witnessing discrimination. Dickter and colleagues found that non-targets were rated more favorably when confronting a racist remark than when they failed to confront the perpetrator (Dickter et al., 2012).

This increased positive response to allies', rather than target's, confrontation may be related to their perceived credibility and ability to persuade perpetrators and other onlookers. Research suggests that individuals are more likely to be persuaded to change their attitudes when the persuader is viewed as being highly credible. Sexual minority status could be considered a discounting cue. This means that arguments for egalitarianism made by those of sexual minority status may be perceived as less valid because they appear to be made on behalf of the person's own self-interest. Arguments that appear to be made in the interest of others tend to be viewed as more valid (Eagly, Wood, & Chaiken, 1978; Petty, Fleming, Priester, & Feinstein, 2001; Walster, Aronson, Abrahamson, & Rottman, 1966). Furthermore, messages are processed less carefully when the source of information takes positions consistent with their group interest (Petty et al., 2001).

This idea suggests that allies may be particularly important in confronting prejudice. Because heterosexual allies, theoretically, do not have "anything personal to



gain” by persuading another person to be less sexually prejudiced, they may be perceived as more credible. In a study conducted by Czopp & Monteith (2003), non-target allies were viewed as not promoting self-interest; in contrast, when targets confronted, they were perceived as rude and a higher number of non-target witnesses were likely to agree with the perpetrator’s prejudicial attitude. Similarly, research conducted by Rasinski & Czopp (2010) suggests that non-target allies’ confrontation was rated as more persuasive and was more effective at highlighting the perpetrator’s level of bias than target’s confrontation.

**Barriers to Confrontation.** Although confrontation has largely been found to be effective in changing prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory behavior both in perpetrators and observers (Blanchard et al., 1994; Czopp et al., 2006; Fazio & Hiden, 2001; Gulker et al., 2013; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010), it is essential to recognize that confrontation is not without its challenges. Even when individuals consider or prefer confrontation, they do not always engage in the behavior (Brinkman et al., 2011; Shelton & Stewart, 2004; Swim & Hyers, 1999). In fact, research suggests that typically around 30% of targets and non-targets report confronting racist, sexist, and heterosexist remarks (Ayres, Friedman & Leaper, 2009; Dickter, 2012; Dickter & Newton, 2013; Shelton & Stewart, 2004; Swim & Hyers, 1999).

There are a number of substantial barriers that may impede a person from confronting a perpetrator of prejudice. One such barrier is the fear of negative social evaluation. Research suggests that even individuals who value and contemplate confrontation of prejudicial attitudes or discrimination may opt not to confront for fear of negative social feedback (Brinkman et al., 2011; Kaiser & Miller, 2001; Shelton &

Stewart, 2004; Swim & Hyers, 1999). Negative social feedback may come in the form of criticism, further hate speech and discrimination, or ostracism. Some research suggests that non-targets may sometimes also be viewed as “complainers” and being “too sensitive,” which may be especially true for women non-targets who are perceived as “activists” (Eliezer & Major, 2012). Assuredly this negative social evaluation is not ideal, but may not hold true in all instances of prejudice confrontation. At least some research suggests that perpetrators respond equally well to confrontation of sexism as they do neutral confrontation and furthermore, that the social outcomes of confrontation are not as negative as anticipated (Mallet & Wagner, 2011).

Social interaction theory can offer some insight into barriers to confrontation (Goffman, 1959). Goffman’s theory illustrates that human interactions can be viewed as performances, in which people attempt to portray themselves in an appropriate and competent light. Additionally, from an early age individuals are taught to accept others and to keep their private opinions to themselves in order to maintain the smooth flow of social interaction and to not embarrass themselves or others (Goffman, 1959).

Confrontation is an unnatural interaction style as it disrupts the flow of the performance and may lead to embarrassment of one or more people involved. That is, confronting prejudiced individuals will be difficult for most people, even if they disagree with the perpetrator internally. For these reasons, individuals may opt not to confront the perpetrator of sexual prejudice or discrimination and instead change the subject to a more neutral, pleasant topic of conversation. In this sense, many may value maintaining pleasant social interaction more than challenging an ideology with which they disagree. Not confronting allows for the benefits consistent with maintaining positive social

relationships, but may be viewed by others as passive agreement with prejudiced statements, which will likely not foster social change with regard to prejudice reduction.

Additionally, while research supports the idea that many individuals who are confronted may engage in the process of self-regulation after experiencing cognitive dissonance (Monteith, 1993), some studies suggest that cognitive dissonance may lead others away from confrontation (Rasinski, Geers, & Czopp, 2013). Specifically, individuals who view confrontation as important may have cognitive dissonance when they do not confront. They may resolve this dissonance by changing their negative rating of the perpetrator's comments (Rasinski et al., 2013). In this situation, they may "talk themselves out" of confronting by explaining that the prejudicial attitudes or discrimination perpetrated were "not that bad." The cognitive dissonance literature suggests that it is possible that this could lead to more acceptance of prejudicial attitudes as well as less confrontation in the future (Festinger, 1957).

In many ways, confrontation of sexual prejudice is related to minority influence. Minority influence generally refers to the ability of minority opinion holders to change opinions of the majority (Moscovici, 1980). Because, unfortunately, the dominant view in society is that individuals who identify as gay or lesbian are lesser than heterosexuals, when individuals confront this view in others, they are attempting to change the opinion of the majority. Generally, it is believed that the majority opinion is true, as people believe that there is truth in numbers (Martin, Hewstone, & Martin, 2008) and dissenters are often viewed very negatively by the majority (Bassili & Provencal, 1988; Mugny & Pérez, 1991). Furthermore, people usually adopt the majority viewpoint without much critical analysis. Because individuals tend to accept the status quo—or majority

opinion—as the most valid, minority opinions are generally subjected to more critical analysis before they are adopted by majority members. Additionally, those who ascribe to the minority opinion are slower to express their opinion than those who hold the views of the majority (Bassili, 2003). This process is known as minority slowness and may be another barrier to confrontation.

It is noteworthy that allies face a number of additional challenges by engaging in this work. Goffman (1963) noted that those associated with a stigmatized group are “obliged to share some of the discredit of the stigmatized person to whom they are related” (p. 30). In Western society, those who identify as gay and lesbian have lower social status and the dominant culture oppresses them as part of the status quo. Allies take on the responsibility to “raise” gay and lesbian individuals’ social status; however, their association with gay men and lesbian women may cause them to lose some of their own social status. That is, because as a whole, society values individuals who identify as gay and lesbian less than those of the majority (i.e., heterosexuals), allies sometimes face some of the same degradation that many gay men and lesbian women face. This is referred to as courtesy stigma (Goffman, 1963). Research suggests it is not uncommon for allies to suffer this stigma by association (Neuberg, Smith, Hoffman & Russell, 1994). Fear of this stigma and potential loss of social power could also be a barrier to confrontation.

### **Heterosexual Allies**

Heterosexual individuals who ally with gay men and lesbian women play a vital role in prejudice reduction through their support, friendship, and activism. For this reason, it is important to understand who heterosexual allies are, and furthermore, what

factors might lead them to engage in allied behavior when witnessing sexual prejudice. That is, it is essential to recognize that individuals bring their own characteristics with them to a situation. Because the current study will examine confrontation by heterosexual allies, it is imperative to explore what aspects of their identity—including gender, attitudes, personality characteristics, and previous behavior—may lead them to be more or less likely to confront heterosexist prejudice.

The term heterosexual ally has been defined in numerous ways throughout the literature; however, many of the definitions have common components (Broido, 2000; DiStefano, Croteau, Anderson, Kampa-Kokesch, & Bullard, 2000; Getz & Kirkley, 2003). The first component is that the individual is part of a dominant or majority group. Second, the person works toward discrimination and oppression reduction within one or more domains of his/her life. One of the most commonly cited definitions that includes both of these components states that an ally is a person of the majority group who works in his/her personal or professional life to end oppression of a particular oppressed group (Asta & Vacha-Haase, 2012; Washington & Evans, 1991). Thus, the identity “heterosexual ally” would apply to a person of heterosexual sexual orientation who advocates for equality and rights for individuals who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or other non-heterosexual sexual orientations.

Allies also tend to value and have favorable attitudes toward the group they advocate for, and research suggests heterosexual allies tend to have positive attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women overall (Fingerhut, 2011; Herek, 2007). Interpersonal contact with gay men has been demonstrated to be one of the best predictors of heterosexual’s attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women (Herek & Capitanio, 1996;

Herek & Glunt, 1993). Not surprisingly, allies also tend to have significantly more friends and family members who identify as gay men and lesbian women than those who have less favorable views of the group (Fingerhut, 2011; Herek, 2007). Similarly, heterosexual allies are likely to have higher levels of allophilia. Allophilia is defined as “liking or loving of the other” and signifies positive attitudes toward an out-group (Pittinsky, Rosenthal, & Montoya, 2011<sup>b</sup>). Individuals who are low in prejudice but also high in allophilia are more likely to take action on behalf of the LGBT community (Fingerhut, 2011).

The ways in which a person tries to reduce oppression as well as what types of behaviors are defined as allied behavior varies widely from study to study (e.g., Fingerhut, 2011; Goldstein & Davis, 2010). One way allies have been conceptualized as engaging in allied behavior is through being a member of a gay-straight alliance or similar group advocating for equality for gay men and lesbian women (Goldstein & Davis, 2010). Other allied activities may include attending Gay Pride or other celebrations of the gay and lesbian community. Similarly, an ally may demonstrate his/her ally identity by volunteering time or money to charities that advocate for the rights of gay men and lesbian women (Fingerhut, 2011). Another common domain includes political engagement. Specifically, allies may vote, sign petitions, or contact city and state officials to support equal rights for sexual minorities. They may also encourage others to do so through their advocacy work. Allies may show their support for the gay and lesbian community by participating in diversity courses or prejudice reduction training programs, such as Safe Zone (Dillon et al., 2004). In addition, allies may try to reduce prejudice in others by participating and initiating conversations promoting rights

of gay men and lesbian women (Fingerhut, 2011) and challenging sexually prejudiced language or discrimination (e.g., Dickter, 2012). This may take the form of drawing attention to a heterosexist joke or microaggressive comment when they witness it. In total, allied behavior encompasses a wide variety of behaviors, with the common thread being advocating for equal treatment of gay men and lesbian women.

**The Role of Gender.** A person's identified (or ascribed) gender can influence their attitudes and behavior, including their attitudes regarding gay men and lesbian women. A consistent finding throughout the literature is that heterosexual women have more favorable attitudes toward and are less likely to hold stereotypical beliefs about gay men and lesbians than heterosexual men (Collier, Bos, & Sandfort, 2012; Fingerhut, 2011; Herek, 1988; 2000; 2002; Herek & Capitano, 1999; Kite, 1984). In general, heterosexual women's views of gay men and lesbians do not differ significantly; however, heterosexual men tend to hold more negative views of gay men than they do of lesbian women (Herek, 1988; 2000; 2002). Furthermore, research suggests that men tend to be more accepting of anti-gay hate speech than women (Cowan, Heiple, Marquez, Khatchadourian, & McNevin, 2005; Cowan & Hodge, 1996; Cowan & Mettrick, 2002) and that men perpetrate much of the hate crime violence based on sexual orientation (Herek, Cogan, & Gillis, 2002).

Gender role expectations and adherence also meaningfully contribute to the person's attitudes. In the United States, people have been socialized to conceive of gender as being purely dichotomous (i.e., masculine versus feminine), and that a person's gender comes with a specific set of expectations for a person's personality, behavior, and role in life (e.g., Barnett & Hyde, 2001). This traditional cultural view is simplistic from a

social scientific perspective because it ignores the broad diversity of gender and gender identity that people can possess, as well as the fact that meta-analytic research suggests very few meaningful differences between men and women (Hyde, 2005). Despite the fact that these scientific findings are widely taught at the university level, strong cultural beliefs persist regarding the inherent differences between the sexes and the value of traditional gender roles (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick et al., 2004).

Historically in Western culture, men have dominated and devalued women. Additionally, as a society, masculinity has been viewed as superior to femininity (Bem, 1993; Johnson, 2001). This value and belief system colors the way gay men and lesbian women are perceived. For example, gay men are devalued as they are associated with femininity (lower status) (Herek, 1986; Kite & Whitley, 1996). Although lesbian women are also devalued, to some degree, they may be judged less harshly than gay men because their “gender non-conforming” behaviors are consistent with traditionally valued, masculine traits (Bem, 1993). Women’s traditional gender roles are generally centered on being caregivers for children and their partners. Specifically, women are praised for being nurturing, pure, and submissive. Men, on the other hand, are valued for being strong, independent, and dominant. They are to be masculine, protectors, and providers of resources (Lipman-Blumen, 1984).

Albeit unintentionally, gay men and lesbian women challenge traditional gender roles (Kite & Whitley, 1998). First, by having a partner of the same biological sex they inherently push up against the value of heterosexuality as being the innate and necessary form of romantic partnership. Secondly, because gay men and lesbian women exist outside of heteronormativity, traditional gender roles can be called into question. Some



individuals adhere more strongly to traditional gender role beliefs than others, which may affect their attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women. Research suggests individuals with more traditional gender role attitudes tend to have more prejudiced attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women (Kite & Whitley, 1996; 1998). Gender roles may be particularly salient for men when it comes to evaluating gay men. In Western culture, there is an emphasis on heterosexuality within the traditional male gender role (Jellison, McConnell, & Gabriel, 2004). Inherent within heterosexual masculinity is the idea that men who violate this norm (e.g., gay men) should be socially punished and rejected, which is likely related to men's more negative attitudes toward the group when compared to women.

Furthermore, just as gender and gender role beliefs are associated with allied attitudes and identity, it should be noted that they also play a role in confrontation, especially with confrontation of sexual prejudice. For example, theories of ambivalent sexism suggest that men are motivated to maintain their masculinity, as they are socially praised for embracing masculine characteristics and reprimanded for characteristics aligned with femininity (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick et al., 2004). These norms of masculinity are often connected to degradation of male homosexuality and strongly reinforced in western culture (Potrat, Kimmel, & Wilchins, 2011). Because of this, men may choose not to confront in order maintain their sense of masculinity, distance themselves from gay men, and keep from being called derogatory terms such as "faggot" (Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015; Carlson, 2008; Falomir-Pichastor & Mugny, 2009; Kite & Whitley, 1998; Kroeper, Sanchez, & Himmelstein, 2014; Whitley, 2001). Although maintaining masculinity may drive men to not confront sexual prejudice, gender norms

related to engaging in chivalrous behavior and defending women who are being attacked may prompt men to confront prejudice against lesbian women (Glick & Fiske, 1999, Glick et al., 2004). Thus, it may be that men are less willing to confront sexual prejudice on behalf of a gay man, especially in the presence of another man (i.e., the perpetrator of prejudice), but could be more willing to confront on behalf of a lesbian women.

Women may be more likely to confront sexual prejudice as they are, in general, less accepting of anti-gay hate speech and tend to have more positive attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women (Cowan et al., 2005; Cowan & Hodge, 1996; Cowan & Mettrick, 2002; Fingerhut, 2011; Herek, 1988; 2000; 2002; Herek & Capitano, 1999; Kite, 1984). One study found that female high school students were more likely to engage in confrontation and defending behaviors on behalf of gay and lesbian classmates than their male counterparts (Poteat & Vecho, 2015). Nonetheless, confrontation violates gender role norms of submissiveness for women, which may be a barrier to confrontation (Swim, Cohen, & Hyers, 1998). Theories of ambivalent sexism suggest that women may be less likely to confront as women are reinforced for being nurturing and submissive, and punished for being too assertive (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick et al., 2004). Research suggests that some women hold back from confronting for fear of being perceived as overly assertive or a “bitch” (Hyers, 2007, p. 8).

Because woman are generally perceived as less threatening than men (Glick & Fiske, 1996; 1999), heterosexist comments made by women may not be taken as seriously, which may, in turn, reduce witnesses’ confrontation and distress in response to the comment. Furthermore, people perceive victims to be most afraid of bodily injury when women are assaulted by men—in comparison to men victimizing other men, or

women victimizing either other women or men (Russell, Kraus, Chapleau, & Oswald, 2016). Thus, when men make heterosexist remarks they may also be viewed as more intimidating and threatening than women, especially when the prejudicial comments are made toward a lesbian woman rather than a gay man. This may result in more distress and confrontation, especially when the target is a lesbian woman.

When considering gender differences in attitudes towards gay men and lesbian women, as well as gender role expectations (both of targets of prejudice and witnesses), it is likely that the gender of the target, non-target witness, and perpetrator of sexual prejudice may play an important role in non-target witnesses' responses to heterosexist speech. The current study will investigate how these different gender pairings affect witnesses' reactions, including confrontation.

**Societal Attitudes.** In addition to attitudes about gender roles, individuals' attitudes toward society at large may also play an important role in their views toward gay men and lesbian women, and possibly their decision to confront heterosexist prejudice. For example, attitudes related to one's view of the hierarchical nature of social groups and their inherent equality or inequality may be relevant. One such attitude is right-wing authoritarianism—a measure of an individual's strong adherence to social conventions and perceived authority figures, as well as hostile attitudes toward those who do not adhere to social norms (Altemeyer, 1981). As previously discussed, gay men and lesbian women challenge the status quo of mandated heterosexuality. Therefore, if a person is high in right-wing authoritarian beliefs, he/she may have negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women, because they directly or indirectly challenge the societal status quo. Research has demonstrated that right-wing authoritarianism has been

linked to both self-reported and outward expressions of prejudice (Tsang & Rowatt, 2007).

Right-wing authoritarianism has also been linked with social dominance orientation—a measure of an individual’s belief in a necessary social hierarchy in which some groups should inherently be dominant and hold more privilege than others. This attitudinal variable is associated with blatant, self-expressed prejudice (Van Hiel & Mervielde, 2005); thus, those with more egalitarian attitudes may be more likely to be allies and engage in allied behavior, including confrontation. While some researchers have questioned whether right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation are two aspects of a larger “conservatism” concept; a meta-analysis supports the idea that right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation are two distinct concepts as they have different personality bases, thus predicting prejudiced attitudes for very different reasons (Sibley & Duckitt, 2008). Specifically, right-wing authoritarianism is associated with low openness to experience and high conscientiousness and social dominance orientation associated with low agreeableness.

Religious fundamentalism is also related to sexual prejudice and may have a negative relationship with allied behavior. Religious fundamentalism is a term generally used to describe the belief that there is one set of religious teachings that signifies the essential truth that must be followed (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). Fundamentalism is strongly and positively related to sexual orientation prejudice and discrimination (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Kirkpatrick, 1993; McFarland, 1989). Specifically, religious fundamentalists tend to have relatively high levels of hostile attitudes toward

gay men and lesbians. Those endorsing high levels of religious fundamentalism beliefs may be less likely to engage in allied behavior on behalf of gay men and lesbian women.

Intimately tied to a person's beliefs about societal equality is his/her sense of social justice. Social justice encompasses the distribution of wealth, opportunities, and privileges within a society as well as ending discrimination and prejudicial attitudes (Aldarondo, 2007; Constantine, Hage, Kindaichi, & Bryant, 2007). Not only are attitudes of social justice associated with heterosexual allies, but beliefs in social justice have been demonstrated to provide a pathway for developing heterosexual ally identity (Vernaglia, 1999). Research suggests that some allies are motivated not specifically by their positive attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women, but rather their greater sense of social justice (Russell, 2011). Additionally, heterosexual allies also tend to engage in anti-sexism and anti-racism-related activism (Goldstein & Davis, 2010). Thus, it may be that the individual seeks to further justice for all people and acts as a heterosexual ally to gay men and lesbian women because they are oppressed as a group. Moral outrage is an attitudinal variable that measures the strength of a person's belief in general social justice issues, and may therefore also be related to engaging in allied behavior, including confrontation.

### **Video Study**

Altogether, previous research suggests that gender dynamics, previous allied behavior, and attitudes may all play a role in response to heterosexism, although, to the author's knowledge, these factors have not been directly examined in conjunction with another using a live experimental design. The author and her co-author conducted a 10-condition experimental study in which perpetrator, target, and participant gender was

manipulated (LeMaire & Oswald, in press). The video study examined what participants believed they would do when confronted with heterosexist prejudice in a similar interpersonal context. Almost 63% reported that they intended to confront the perpetrator of prejudice. Results generally revealed that men were more likely to believe they would intervene on behalf of lesbian women rather than gay men, while women were equally likely to confront on behalf of gay men and lesbian women. Additionally, women tended to have equally negative reactions to heterosexist prejudice regardless of the gender of the perpetrator. Men, however, endorsed less negative reactions and less confrontation when the perpetrator was a woman rather than a man. Attitudes toward gay men also significantly and uniquely (when included in a model with other attitudinal variables) predicted intended confrontation behavior. This video study was expanded upon to create the current study. Where the video study was concerned with how individuals believed they would respond when confronted with heterosexist prejudice, the current study investigated how individuals actually responded.

### **Current Study**

Because sexual prejudice is pervasive and detrimental to gay men and lesbian women, there is a need to examine ways of reducing outward expressions of prejudice beliefs and discrimination. One commonly utilized method of prejudice reduction is confrontation of perpetrators of prejudice. Previous research suggests that confrontation of prejudice is effective in reducing future discriminatory behavior and prejudicial speech in both perpetrators and other witnesses (Blanchard et al., 1994; Czopp et al., 2006; Fazio & Hiden, 2001). However, it is important to recognize that targets experience a number of challenges when confronting perpetrators. Heterosexual allies may face fewer social

consequences and may even be more successful than gay men and lesbian women when they confront perpetrators (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Gulker et al., 2013; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). In this sense, heterosexual allies play a vital role in sexual prejudice reduction. However, not all people who identify as heterosexual allies confront perpetrators of prejudice when they witness the behavior.

**Study Objectives.** The current study sought to answer the question, “What factors predict confrontation behavior?” Previous research examining attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women and gender role expectations supports the idea that gender may influence allies’ responses to witnessing heterosexist prejudice. It is likely that the gender of the target and non-target witness as well as the perpetrator of heterosexist hate speech may affect witnesses’ reactions. Additionally, other characteristics a person brings to the situation, such as their general level of assertiveness, attitudes about social hierarchy and social justice, gay men and lesbian women, and gender roles, as well as their previous behaviors may also influence their decision to confront.

The current study had four major goals. The first goal was to investigate the role that gender plays in reactions to heterosexist prejudice. Research suggest that gender and sexual orientation prejudice are related (Appleby, 1995; Kilianski, 2003) and that gender and gender roles may affect attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women (e.g., Fingerhut, 2011; Herek, 1988; 2000; 2002; Kite, 1984). Gender may also affect how men and women respond to witnessing heterosexist prejudice (e.g., Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015; Hyers, 2007; LeMaire & Oswald, in press; Kite & Whitley, 1998). Additionally, there is reason to believe that men and women may react differently depending on the

gender of the perpetrator (Carlson, 2008; Falomir-Pichastor & Mugny, 2009; Russell et al., 2016).

Secondly, this study examined other factors that may be related to confrontation of heterosexist prejudice including attitudes regarding social hierarchy and social justice, gender, and gay men and lesbian women, dispositional factors, as well as previous engagement in allied behaviors. Third, the study investigated whether accounting for attitudinal variables will change possible differences in behavior observed within the different gender combinations of target, witness, and perpetrator. Finally, the current study explored participants' satisfaction with their responses and their perceived responses to future interactions of a similar nature.

In order to achieve these goals, a 10-condition (2x2x2, 2 controls) experimental design was utilized. Specifically, participants (men and women) in this study witnessed a perpetrator (either a man or woman) make a heterosexist comment about a target (a gay man or lesbian woman). Participants' responses to this comment were video recorded and coded. After this interaction took place, participants completed a number of survey measures examining their attitudes toward the perpetrator, right-wing authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, social dominance orientation, moral outrage, assertiveness, ambivalent sexism towards men and women, allophilia, attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women, social justice for gay men and lesbians, previous allied behavior, ally identity centrality, personal support and demographic variables. Additionally, two control conditions (men and women), in which no heterosexist slur was made, was used in order to determine if attitudinal measure means shifted as a result of participants being exposed to the experimental manipulation. Control conditions included all partner (perpetrator



role in the experimental conditions) and target pairings in order to mitigate any gender effects. That is, one control condition included only women who, as a group, were exposed to all of the different gender pairings (1. male partner, male target, 2. male partner, female target, 3. female partner, male target, 4. female partner, female target). The other condition included only men, who as a group, were exposed to all of the different gender pairings.

An experimental design was used in order to allow for direct comparison between groups and gender power dynamics. Other researchers have investigated confrontation utilizing diary studies (e.g., Dickter, 2012; Hyers, 2007) or procedures in which participants are asked to recall particular experiences (e.g., Brinkman et al., 2015; Poteat et al., 2011). Although these studies offer unique and ecologically valid information, direct comparison between groups is difficult, if not impossible, because factors that can impact responses to heterosexist speech such as comment severity, situational circumstances, and number and type of bystanders cannot be controlled in the outside world. An experimental design, although in some ways reducing ecological validity, offers the best way to examine gender dynamics while holding as many other variables constant as possible. Furthermore, the live design offers an alternative to self-report measures that are typically utilized. To the best of the author's knowledge, no other published study has used a live experimental design to investigate the way perpetrator, target, and non-target witness gender affect responses to heterosexist prejudice.

**Hypotheses.** The first four hypotheses are interrelated and detail the way in which the gender of the participant, target, and perpetrator were expected to affect the reactions and responses to the heterosexist comment. A number of main effects and interactions are

hypothesized for the gender of the target, perpetrator, and participant for 1) verbal confrontation, 2) nonverbal disagreement with the comment, 3) degree of distress felt due to comment, and 4) ratings of the perpetrator (degree of “dislike” and perceived level of sexism).

Because heterosexual women tend to have more positive attitudes toward gay men and women and are less accepting of anti-gay discrimination than heterosexual men (Herek, 1988; 2000; 2002; Kite, 1984), it is hypothesized that women will 1) verbally confront, 2) express nonverbal disagreement, 3) endorse distress related to the comment, and 4) report negative attitudes toward the perpetrator (dislike and perceived sexism) equally for lesbian and gay targets, and more than men overall. However, due to norms of chivalry (Glick & Fiske, 1999) and because men tend to have more positive attitudes toward lesbian women (Herek, 1988; 2000; 2002; Kite, 1984), it is hypothesized that men will confront and express nonverbal disagreement more often and report higher levels of comment distress and negative attitudes toward the perpetrator when the target is a lesbian woman, rather than a gay man.

Because men may be perceived as more threatening and powerful (Glick & Fiske, 1999; Russell et al., 2016), it is hypothesized that participants will endorse higher levels of comment distress and negative views of the perpetrator when the perpetrator is a man than when the perpetrator is a woman. Additionally, based on previous research indicating that participants intend to confront men when they perpetrate heterosexist prejudice more than women (LeMaire & Oswald, in press), it is hypothesized that participants will confront and express nonverbal disagreement more when the perpetrator is a man rather than a woman. Furthermore, it is hypothesized that participants will

verbally confront and express nonverbal disagreement more and endorse higher levels of comment distress and negative attitudes toward the perpetrator when men (perpetrator) make heterosexist comments against a lesbian woman than when men or women make heterosexist comments against a gay man and when women make comments against a lesbian woman.

Hypothesis 5: Attitudes and behaviors will predict participants' confrontation behavior. Specifically, (a) assertiveness, (b) moral outrage, (c) allophilia, (d) gay and lesbian social justice beliefs, (e) ally identity centrality, (f) personal support, and (g) previous allied behavior will positively predict confrontation behavior. Social dominance orientation (h), (i) religious fundamentalism, (j) sexism towards women, (k) sexism toward men, and (l) negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women will be negatively associated with confrontation behavior.

Hypothesis 6: Exploratory analyses will also be conducted to examine whether controlling for attitudinal variables and allied behavior variables that significantly and uniquely predicted confrontation (identified in Hypothesis 5) will change or eliminate possible differences in confrontation behavior noted in the experimental conditions.

Hypothesis 7: Participants will report greater levels of satisfaction with their responses to the comment when their responses are congruent with their explicit attitudes. That is, an interaction of attitudes (toward gay men and lesbian women and allied identity) and their behavior will predict participants' satisfaction with their responses to witnessing the heterosexist comment over and above their behaviors or attitudes individually.

Finally, an exploratory question regarding participant's anticipated future behavior will also be analyzed. Specifically, participants' predictions of their future behavior with regard to witnessing heterosexist hate speech will be investigated in relation to the behavior they exhibited in the current study. In order to test this question, participants will be divided into groups based on their exhibited behavior and differences in their anticipated future behavior will be examined. These analyses will be exploratory; no direct hypotheses are being made.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

G\*Power version 3.1 was used in order to calculate the necessary sample size (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009). The sample size was determined using a priori estimates of an effect size of .1 and 95% power for MANOVA tests with the number of groups used in the study. This estimated effect size was in part based on a previous study using a similar design and comment utilizing a video instead of a live manipulation (LeMaire & Oswald, in press). Effect sizes in that study ranged from .01 to .05. It was anticipated that using a live design in which the participant was actually exposed to heterosexist comments rather than a video would have a greater effect. Power analyses indicated that a total sample of 270 was necessary to observe significant differences between groups, if in fact, there are differences among the groups. Given this estimate it was anticipated that about 370 participants would need to be recruited to account for participants who would be excluded from data analysis due to incomplete data, experimenter error, and sexual minority status. After monitoring data and running

preliminary analyses, it was determined that a larger sample was necessary to account for these factors.

A total of 435 participants were recruited using the psychology department's participant pool. See Table 1. A total of 330 (75.9%) participants reported that they identified as "completely heterosexual" when using a scale from 1 (*completely heterosexual*) to 7 (*completely homosexual*) (adapted from Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948). As this study is primarily focused on confrontation by heterosexual allies, individuals who indicated that their sexual orientation fell between 2-7 when using this scale ( $n = 105$ , 24.1%) were excluded from analysis. Additionally, 22 (6.7%) participants were excluded from analysis for failing the manipulation check by correctly identifying that the perpetrator was an actor/researcher and/or identifying that the researchers were interested in their reactions to the comment. Of the remaining 308 participants, 143 were (46.4%) were men and 165 were women (53.6%). The participants' mean age was 18.94 ( $SD = 1.13$ ) years (range: 18-24). The majority of participants ( $n = 230$ , 74.7%) identified as Caucasian, 12 (3.9%) as African American/Black, 19 (6.2%) as Asian American, 15 (4.9%) as Latino/a, 23 (7.5%) were biracial, and 6 (1.9%) endorsed other identities. One hundred seventy five (56.8%) participants identified as Catholic, 46 (14.9%) as Christian, 30 (9.7%) as having no religion, 19 (6.2%) as Lutheran, 9 (2.9%) as spiritual not religious, 7 (2.3%) as Protestant, 5 (1.6%) as Muslim, and 17 (5.5%) as belonging to another religion.

Table 1

*Number of Participants in Each Condition*

Condition	All Participants	Completely Heterosexual	Failed Manipulation Check	Total
<b>Men</b>				
1. MPMT	37	34	1	33
2. MPFT	45	31	1	30
3. FPMT	44	32	7	25
4. FPFT	42	32	3	29
5. No Video	33	26	N/A	26
Total	201	155	12	143
<b>Women</b>				
1. MPMT	46	34	3	31
2. MPFT	52	35	2	33
3. FPMT	50	38	2	36
4. FPFT	48	35	3	32
5. No Video	38	33	N/A	33
Total	234	175	10	165
Grand Total	435	330	22	308

*Note:* MP = Male Perpetrator, FP = Female Perpetrator, MT = Male Target, FT = Female

Target. For example, MPMT equates to a condition with a male perpetrator and a male

target

## Procedure

**Pilot Testing.** The script used in the video study (i.e., LeMaire & Oswald, in press) was first piloted in the live version of the study. After pilot testing, it became evident that the comments used in the first study were too long, so the script was shortened. Almost half (48.8%) of the current sample reported hearing similar comments on campus previously. Undergraduate research assistants were trained to play the role of experimenter, perpetrator, and target. In order to ensure that they were able to deliver the script with consistency, undergraduate theater majors provided acting training to each of the research assistants. They were trained to control their facial expressions and tone to minimize variability in the manipulation between participants, despite differences in participants' reactions to the comments. Research assistants appeared generally "gender typical," but efforts were not made to have research assistants appear hyper masculine or feminine (e.g., women did not wear much make-up, neither men nor women wore clothes to emphasize their bodies). Research assistants were instructed to dress in neutral clothing (i.e., a plain shirt and pants without writing).

**Current Study.** Participants were randomly assigned to 1 of the 4 experimental conditions (male perpetrator and male target, male perpetrator and female target, female perpetrator and male target, or female perpetrator and female target) or the control condition (no heterosexist comment).<sup>2</sup> Individuals who participated in the study were seated in a waiting room in a clinic setting. When the experimenter entered, the participant was notified that the study was a "partner study" and that there would be another person there to complete the study with him or her. The experimenter then proceeded to check another waiting room where they found the confederate perpetrator.

The experimenter then led both the confederate and participant to a private research room with a camera. The participant and confederate perpetrator were given a consent form indicating that they would be asked to participate in a study that required them to complete a puzzle task with a partner and then fill out a number of questionnaires. After further explanation from the experimenter, they were asked to give consent verbally. At this time the experimenter turned on the video camera and exited the room to get the materials necessary for completing the puzzle task.

Once the experimenter exited, the perpetrator struck up a benign conversation with the participant about extra credit and classes. After about 10 seconds, the confederate target “accidentally” entered the room and said, “Oops! Sorry, wrong room!” and closed the door behind him or her. At that time the perpetrator turned to the participant with a disgruntled look on his or her face and said, “Did you see that guy (girl) that just walked in? Well, he’s gay (a lesbian). I saw him (her) outside with his (her) boyfriend (girlfriend). Seriously, it’s disgusting. Two guys (girls) should not be together!” After the comment was said, the participant was given approximately 15 seconds to respond to the comment. The perpetrator was trained to respond only with a small smile and shrug regardless of how the participant responded. This was decided as the response could serve to answer a statement, question, or silence without leading to further conversation, which could change the experimental manipulation. The only exception to this was if the participant completely changed the subject to a new topic (e.g., back to extra credit or classes, etc.). In this case, the perpetrator responded minimally in a neutral manner as to not make it readily apparent that the comment was part of the experimental manipulation.



Similarly, in the control condition, the perpetrator struck up a benign conversation about classes and extra credit and the target entered the room after about 10 seconds. After the perpetrator left, the perpetrator did not continue the conversation with the participant. This was decided in order to reduce the chances of participants and perpetrators having a conversation that would greatly affect participant's attitudes toward the perpetrator. The exception to this rule was if the participant asked a question to the perpetrator, then the perpetrator responded with a neutral, short response in order to not create suspicions about the nature of the experiment.

After 15 seconds elapsed, the experimenter returned to the room with the puzzle materials. The puzzle was a 48-piece jigsaw puzzle of a neutral picture of fish. The experimenter presented the puzzle and explained that it was required that the two attempt to complete the puzzle with each other without talking. This was done to prevent further conversation relating to the heterosexist comment or other conversation that may impact the participants' perceptions of the perpetrator. Participants and perpetrators were allotted 3 minutes to complete as much of the puzzle as possible without talking. The perpetrator was trained to complete the puzzle at the same speed as the participant (making roughly one connection for every connection the participant completed). Furthermore, the perpetrator was instructed not to reach over or trade pieces with the participant unless the participant initiated this type of behavior. After the 3 minutes elapsed, the experimenter instructed the participant and perpetrator to stop working on the task and counted the number of puzzle pieces successfully connected.

The participant and perpetrator were then instructed that the next part of the study required them to respond to survey questions about the task as well as their attitudes and

that in order to give them privacy, they would complete the survey questions in separate, private research rooms. The perpetrator was selected to move into another room, to which the experimenter escorted him or her. After the experimenter returned to the room, he or she presented the participant with a laptop computer and gave brief instructions for filling out the survey measures. Before completing other survey measures, all participants were first asked to respond to the open-ended question “What do you think this study is about,” as a manipulation check and to ensure that participants were not privy to the fact that the comment was staged or that the researcher was truly interested in their reactions to the comment. Those who correctly guessed these aspects of the study ( $n = 22$ , 7.1%) were excluded from data analysis.

Surveys were presented such that questionnaires which were seemingly “less related” to the heterosexist comment were at the beginning in order to keep participants from guessing that the comment was indeed part of the experiment for as long as possible. Questionnaires related specifically to attitudes and behaviors toward gay men and lesbian women were presented near the end of the battery for this reason. Finally, after completing the demographic questions, participants were alerted that the researchers were aware that the heterosexist comment was made. Questions relating to the participants’ perceptions of the comment, their satisfaction with their reactions, and anticipation of future responses were then measured.

Once the participant indicated that they had finished the survey measures, the experimenter returned to the room, debriefed them, gave them their extra credit, and thanked them for their participation. Experimenters also provided participants with information regarding free counseling services.

## Measures

**Verbal and Nonverbal Responses to Comment.** Participants' verbal and nonverbal behavior was video-recorded and later coded into nonverbal and verbal agreement, disagreement, neutral, and other responses. See Appendix A for a list of verbal and nonverbal behaviors coded. Only verbal disagreement, responses pointing out the prejudice nature of the comment, and asking the perpetrator to stop making similar comments, were coded as confrontation. When participants rolled their eyes, gave a look of disagreement/dirty look, shook their head "no," or used their hand to signal disagreement (e.g., slamming down their hands, etc.), their behavior was coded as engaging in nonverbal disagreement. Behaviors such as nodding "yes," laughing, smiling, and positive gesturing was coded as engaging in nonverbal agreement. It should be noted that some behaviors such as smiling and laughing may be observed in participants even if they do not "agree." For example, participants may smile in order to maintain rapport with the perpetrator or laugh because they are nervous, shocked, or even because they are critically laughing *at* the perpetrator. However, these behaviors, if used in isolation of verbal disagreement—or nonverbal disagreement indicative of criticizing the perpetrator, such as pointing—would most often function as passive agreement in the "real world." The coding scheme used for verbal and nonverbal behavior attempts to mirror real-world effects and situations in that doing/saying nothing, laughing, or shrugging off the comment may be perceived as passive agreement or neutral reactions. For analyses requiring one behavioral reaction per participant, participant behavior was coded such that verbal behavior will "over-ride" nonverbal behavior and was used as their primary response to the heterosexual comment (e.g., if a participant engaged in confrontation and

nonverbal responses, they would be included in the group of participants who verbally confronted).

Video recordings of each participant were coded by two independent coders who were blind to the hypotheses of the study. The two coders were undergraduate psychology research assistants who were trained by the author using a random sampling of 40 videos of study participant's interactions with the perpetrator. Coders identified verbal and nonverbal responses to the comment for each participant in each of the videos. When disagreement occurred the two coders re-watched the video clip and together reached a consensus. Inter-rater reliability was calculated for the total video coding scheme (i.e., if researchers' codes were exactly the same for the entire video, both verbal and nonverbal, they were considered a match). Inter-rater reliability was 89.8%. Coders also coded adherence to the study procedure and script in order to identify any data that may not be usable due to inconsistencies in procedure. When coders identified participants who were not given the experimental manipulation to fidelity (e.g., given too little time to respond, incorrect comment), the video was excluded from analysis.

**Perpetrator Evaluation.** Participants responded to 6 questions rating the degree to which they liked the perpetrator (See Appendix B). Items include "How much of do you approve of your partner?" and "How likely is it that you would be friends with your partner in the future" (1 = *not at all*, 7 = *very much*). Items were averaged to create a total "liking" of the perpetrator score, where higher scores will indicate more liking of the perpetrator. The coefficient alpha for this scale was .87. Later participants were also asked to rate the degree to which they believe their partner was sexist (1 = *not at all*, 7 = *very much*).

**Rathus Assertiveness Schedule.** The Rathus Assertiveness Schedule is a 30-item scale that assesses general assertiveness and was completed by participants (Rathus, 1973). Example items include “If a salesperson has gone to considerable trouble to show me merchandise that is not quite suitable, I have a difficult time saying ‘No.’” (reverse scored) and “I am open and frank about my feelings” (1 = *very much unlike me*, 6 = *very much like me*). Higher numbers indicate higher levels of assertiveness. The coefficient alpha was .86.

**Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale (RWA).** Altemeyer’s (1981) 22-item scale was completed by participants to measure their attitudes about obeying authority and maintaining the status quo. Items include, “The ‘old-fashioned ways’ and the ‘old-fashioned values’ still show the best way to live” and “Women should have to promise to obey their husbands when they get married” (-4 = *very strongly disagree*, 4 = *very strongly agree*), with higher mean scores indicating stronger beliefs in tradition and obeying authority. The coefficient alpha was .91.

**The Revised 12-Item Religious Fundamentalism Scale.** Participants completed Altemeyer and Hunsberger’s (2009) revised religious fundamentalism scale. Items include “God has given humanity a complete, unfailing guide to happiness and salvation, which must be totally followed” and “To lead the best, most meaningful life, one must belong to the one, fundamentally true religion” (-4 = *strongly disagree*, 4 = *strongly agree*), with higher mean scores indicating higher levels of religious fundamentalism. The coefficient alpha was .91.

**Social Dominance Orientation (SDO).** Participants completed a 16-item social dominance orientation scale (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle 1994). This scale

measures the degree to which participants feel that some individuals are superior to others and that it is acceptable for those “on top” to assert their dominance. Items include “In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups” and “Inferior groups should stay in their place” (1 = *very negative*, 7 = *very positive*), with higher mean scores indicating more acceptance of social dominance. The coefficient alpha was .92.

**Moral Outrage.** A 10-item scale (Montada, Schmitt, & Dalbert, 1986) measuring participants’ level of outrage toward injustice was completed by participants. Items include ‘I feel morally outraged by social injustice’ and “I resent the fact that people have to suffer unjustly the consequences of unemployment” (1 = *disagree strongly*, 6 = *agree strongly*), with higher scores indicating more outrage toward injustice. The coefficient alpha was .88.

**Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI).** Participants completed Glick and Fiske’s (1996) 22-item scale (0 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*) to assess levels of benevolent and hostile sexism toward women, in which higher scores indicate higher levels of sexism toward women. Benevolent sexism items include “Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess,” while hostile sexism is measured by items such as “When women lose to men in fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.” The coefficient alpha for benevolent sexism was .77 and hostile sexism was .86.

**Ambivalence Toward Men Inventory (AMI).** Glick and Fiske’s (1999) 20-item scale (0 = *disagree strongly*, 5 = *strongly agree*) was used to measure benevolent and hostile sexism toward men, with higher scores denoting more sexist attitudes toward men.

Benevolent sexism items include “Women are incomplete without men” and hostile sexism include items such as “When it comes down to it, most men are really more like children.” The coefficient alpha for benevolent sexism toward men was .87 and hostile sexism toward men was .81.

**Allophilia Scale.** Pittinsky et al.’s (2011<sup>b</sup>) 17-item allophilia scale measures participants’ level of “liking for individuals who are homosexual.” The scale was used to create a mean allophilia score. Items include “I feel positively toward people who are homosexual” and “I am truly interested in understanding the points of view of people who are homosexual” (1 = *strongly disagree*, 6 = *strongly agree*). Higher scores indicate more liking of individuals who identify as gay and lesbian. The coefficient alpha for the total scale was .96.

**Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Attitudes Toward Gay men—Revised scales (ATGL-R).** Herek’s (1988) scale measures attitudes toward gay men and lesbians independently. Items include, “Female homosexuality is a sin,” “Female homosexuality is a threat to many of our basic social institutions,” “I think male homosexuals are disgusting,” and “Sex between two men is just plain wrong” (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*), with higher scores indicating stronger negative attitudes toward gay men or lesbian women. The coefficient alpha for attitudes toward lesbian women was .86 and attitudes toward gay men was .90.

**Personal Support Scale.** Pittinsky and colleagues’ (2011<sup>a</sup>) 8-item scale was completed by participants to measure the degree to which they support individuals who are homosexual. Items include “In the last year, I have volunteered my time to benefit people who are homosexual” and “I get upset when people perpetuate stereotypes about

people who are homosexual” (1 = *strongly disagree*, 6 = *strongly agree*), with higher mean scores indicating stronger personal support for gay and lesbian individuals. The coefficient alpha was .92.

**Lesbian and Gay Affirming Social Justice Competency Scale (LGASJC-S).**

The LGASJC-S is a 28-item measure (Kizer, 2011) that examines attitudes and actions specific to social justice for gay men and lesbian women. It is comprised of four subscales including self-efficacy, attitudes, actions, and awareness. Items include “If I heard a family member making homophobic remarks, I would be confident in my ability to confront that family member” (self-efficacy), “One’s ability to adopt should not be based on one’s sexual orientation” (attitudes), “There is privilege associated with being heterosexual in this society” (awareness), and “I have sought out training about lesbian and gay social justice issues” (action), (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). Higher scores indicate higher levels of competency in each area. The coefficient alphas were as follows: awareness = .66; attitudes = .90; self efficacy = .88; action = .85; LGASJC total = .92.

**Past Allied Behavior.** Participants were asked to indicate the number of times over the past two years they participated in events that support gay men and lesbian women. Items include “How many times over the past two years have you attended a Gay-Straight Alliance meeting?” and “How many times over the past two years have you called, emailed, or mailed letters to politicians in support of gay and lesbian rights?” Participants were also asked to indicate the number of friends and family members they have who are gay or lesbian. See Appendix C for a full list of items.



**Ally Identity Centrality.** Participants completed a 4-item scale measuring how fundamental being a heterosexual ally is to their identity. This measure was adapted from the Centrality sub-scale on the Revised Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1997) and includes items such as “In general, being a straight ally is an important part of my self-image” and “Being a straight ally is an important reflection of who I am” (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). See Appendix D for a full list of items. The coefficient alpha was .82.

**Reactions to Heterosexist Comment.** Participants were also asked to respond to 7 items about the comment made by the perpetrator (See Appendix E). Participants rated how distressing, funny, appropriate, and offensive they believed the comment to be (1 = *not at all*, 7 = *very much*). Additionally, they were asked how much they agreed with the comments made by their partner (1 = *not at all*, 7 = *very much*). The coefficient alpha for this scale, named Comment Distress, was .78. Participants were asked, “Have you heard similar comments made by others on campus before?” (“yes” or “no”) in order to assess whether the expressed attitudes are commonly heard. Finally, participants were asked the degree to which they are satisfied with their response to the comments (1 = *not at all*, 7 = *very much*).

**Anticipated Future Responses.** Participants were asked to respond to eleven questions indicating what they believe they would do in the future if they witnessed someone making similar comments to those the perpetrator made at the beginning of the study. See Appendix F. For example, items included “How likely would you be to tell the person that you agree?,” “How likely would you be to ask the person to stop making similar comments?,” and “How likely would you be to roll your eyes/give a look of

disapproval?" (1= *not at all likely*, 7 = *extremely likely*), where higher scores indicated a greater likelihood of engaging in the behavior. Items were used individually, except for verbal confrontation (coefficient alpha = .76)

Demographic variables including age, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and religion, were also measured.

## Results

### Verbal and Nonverbal Responses

First, frequencies of verbal and nonverbal behaviors were examined. See Table 2 for a full list of frequencies. More than half (62.9%) of the sample smiled after the comment was said and 43.3% laughed, although as previously discussed, there are a number of different reasons for these responses (e.g., discomfort, agreement, and/or maintaining rapport). Few engaged in non-verbal behavior (i.e., less than 10% per behavior). It became evident in watching the videos that a previously unidentified behavior of “shrugging” was common (14.6% engaged in the behavior), so this response was added into the coding scheme. Overall, 24.6% of the sample verbally agreed with the perpetrator or said something that would likely be interpreted as agreement such as “Yep” or “mmhmm” (sound of affirmative acknowledgement). Similarly, 25.8% of the participants engaged in confrontation of prejudice by stating that they disagreed, explaining the prejudice nature of the comments, or asking the perpetrator to refrain from making similar comments. Thirty five percent of the sample asked a neutral question (e.g., “Why is that?”) or made a neutral comment (e.g., “I don’t know”). More than forty percent (41.8%) changed the subject—sometimes after agreement ( $n = 35$ , 14.6%),

Table 2

*Frequencies of Behavioral Responses to the Comment (n = 240)*

Behavior	Frequency	Percent
Nonverbal		
1. Nod head “yes”	34	14.2%
2. Laugh	104	43.3%
3. Smile	151	62.9%
4. Agreement with hands (thumbs up, high five, clap)	2	.8%
5. Roll eyes	1	.4%
6. Dirty look/look of disagreement	21	8.4%
7. Shake head “no”	17	7.1%
8. Disagreement with hands (slam hands down, wave hands no”	6	2.5%
9. Other nonverbal disagreement	1	.4%
10. Distraction	5	2.1%
11. Shrug	35	14.6%
Verbal		
12. Continued negative conversation about the target	27	11.3%
13. Said they agreed	27	11.3%
14. Other Agreement	5	2.1%
15. Said they disagreed	58	24.2%
16. Asked perpetrator to stop making similar comments	1	.4%
17. Other disagreement	3	1.3%
18. Neutral Question (e.g., What do you mean/Why do you think that?)	45	18.8%
19. Neutral Statement (e.g., I don’t know)	47	19.6%
20. Changed the subject	100	41.8%
21. Said nothing	37	15.5%
22. Used sarcasm	3	1.3%
23. Intent of comment unclear	3	1.3%

*Note:* Verbal and nonverbal behaviors were not mutually exclusive (i.e., a person could receive multiple verbal and nonverbal codes), therefore percentages are not equal to 100%

confrontation ( $n = 14$ , 5.8%), or neutral comments ( $n = 30$ , 12.5%)—and 15.5% remained silent after the comment.

In order to test hypothesis 1 and 2, two logistic regressions were conducted to examine main effects and interactions of participant, perpetrator, and target gender in predicting verbal confrontation and nonverbal disagreement. For verbal confrontation, the model as a whole was significant,  $\chi^2(7, n = 240) = 16.03, p = .03$ , explaining between 6.5% (Cox & Snell  $R^2$ ) and 9.5% (Nagelkerke  $R^2$ ) of the variance in confrontation behavior and correctly classifying 74.2% of cases (0% of confrontation responses and 100% of non-confrontation responses). Perpetrator gender was the only significant unique predictor. Participants were 6.44 times more likely to confront the perpetrators who were women in comparison to men. See Table 3. The model for nonverbal disagreement including the gender of the target, perpetrator, and participant and interaction terms was not significant,  $\chi^2(7, n = 240) = 5.86, p = .56$ . See Table 4. Similarly, the model for verbal agreement was not significant,  $\chi^2(7, n = 240) = 8.41, p = .30$ . See Table 5.

Chi-Square tests of independence were utilized to further test the association between the dichotomous verbal confrontation variable and the independent variables of participant, perpetrator, and target gender. Results were largely similar to logistic regression tests. A difference in participants' verbal confrontation behavior related to perpetrator gender was noted such that women were confronted (36.1%) more often than men (15.7% confronted),  $\chi^2(1, n = 240) = 13.07, p < .001$ . Both men,  $\chi^2(1, n = 116) = 9.48, p = .002$ , and women,  $\chi^2(1, n = 124) = 4.13, p = .04$ , confronted perpetrators who were women more often than perpetrators who were men. Contrary to hypotheses, there

Table 3

*Gender Dynamics Predicting Confrontation (n = 240)*

Independent Variable	B	Wald Chi- Square	Sig.	Exp (B) Odds Ratio	95% CI for Odds Ratio	
					Lower	Upper
1. Perpetrator Gender	1.86	6.50	.01	6.44	1.54	27.01
2. Target Gender	.40	.24	.62	1.49	.30	7.28
3. Participant Gender	.93	1.48	.22	2.52	.57	11.19
4. Perpetrator Gender x Target Gender	-.79	.63	.43	.45	.07	3.17
5. Participant Gender x Perpetrator Gender	-1.00	1.15	.28	.37	.06	2.29
6. Participant Gender x Target Gender	-.44	.18	.67	.64	.08	4.92
7. Participant Gender x Perpetrator Gender x Target Gender	.71	.31	.58	2.04	.16	25.68
Constant	-2.27	13.99	.00	.10	-	-

Table 4

*Gender Dynamics Predicting Nonverbal Disagreement (n = 240)*

Independent Variable	<i>B</i>	Wald Chi- Square	Sig.	Exp (B) Odds Ratio	95% CI for Odds Ratio	
					Lower	Upper
1. Perpetrator Gender	.12	.04	.85	1.13	.33	3.91
2. Target Gender	-.60	.76	.38	.55	.14	2.11
3. Participant Gender	-.07	.01	.91	.93	.27	3.18
4. Perpetrator Gender x Target Gender	.18	.04	.85	1.20	.18	7.97
5. Participant Gender x Perpetrator Gender	-1.11	1.26	.26	.33	.05	2.29
6. Participant Gender x Target Gender	-.26	.06	.80	.78	.10	5.79
7. Participant Gender x Perpetrator Gender x Target Gender	.77	.27	.61	2.17	.12	40.88
Constant	-1.27	8.86	.003	.28	-	-

Table 5

*Gender Dynamics Predicting Verbal Agreement (n = 240)*

Independent Variable	<i>B</i>	Wald Chi- Square	Sig.	Exp (B) Odds Ratio	95% CI for Odds Ratio	
					Lower	Upper
1. Perpetrator Gender	-.36	.36	.55	.70	.21	2.27
2. Target Gender	.38	.52	.47	1.47	.52	4.17
3. Participant Gender	-.56	.87	.35	.57	.18	1.85
4. Perpetrator Gender x Target Gender	-.03	.001	.97	.97	.20	4.80
5. Participant Gender x Perpetrator Gender	.17	.04	.85	1.18	.21	6.66
6. Participant Gender x Target Gender	-.65	.57	.45	.52	.10	2.80
7. Participant Gender x Perpetrator Gender x Target Gender	.19	.02	.88	1.21	.11	13.89
Constant	-.79	4.27	.04	.46	-	-

was no difference in verbal confrontation behavior related to target,  $\chi^2(1, n = 240) = 0.87, p = .77$ , or participant gender  $\chi^2(1, n = 240) = 1.37, p = .24$ .

Furthermore, chi-square analyses revealed no significant differences in participant's nonverbal behavior based on perpetrator gender  $\chi^2(1, n = 240) = .23, p = .72$ , participant gender,  $\chi^2(1, n = 240) = 2.17, p = .16$ , or target gender  $\chi^2(1, n = 240) = 1.57, p = .28$ .

However, chi-square analyses suggest differences in participants' verbal agreement behavior based on participant gender. Specifically, men verbally agreed (31.9%) with the heterosexist comments more often than women (17.7% agreed),  $\chi^2(1, n = 240) = 6.48, p = .02$ . Although there was no overall difference in participant's agreement behavior depending on perpetrator gender,  $\chi^2(1, n = 240) = .95, p = .37$ ; there appeared to be an interaction of participant and perpetrator gender such that there was no significant difference in verbal agreement for men (27.8% verbally agreed) and women (16.9% verbally agreed) when the perpetrator was a woman,  $\chi^2(1, n = 119) = 2.04, p = .18$ . However, when the perpetrator was a man, men (35.5%) were more likely to verbally agree with him than women (18.6%),  $\chi^2(1, n = 121) = 4.32, p = .04$ . There was no significant difference in participants' verbal agreement depending on target's gender,  $\chi^2(1, n = 240) = .20, p = .76$ ; however, analyses suggested another interaction such that when the target was a lesbian woman, men (35.6%) were more likely to verbally agree with the heterosexist comments than were women (16.4%),  $\chi^2(1, n = 120) = 5.77, p = .02$ . There were no differences when the target was a gay man,  $\chi^2(1, n = 120) = 1.36, p = .17$ , between men (28.1% agreed) and women (19.0% agreed).



## Perceptions of Heterosexist Comments and Perpetrator

A series of 2x2x2 factorial ANOVAs were conducted to examine main effects and interactions predicting participants' comment distress, perpetrator liking, and perpetrator's perceived level of sexism. Perpetrator, participant, and target gender, as well as all of the interaction gender terms, were used as independent variables for these analyses.

Results of the first ANOVA examining comment distress revealed a significant main effect of participant gender, such that women reported more distress ( $M = 5.41$ ,  $SD = 1.21$ ) than men ( $M = 5.05$ ,  $SD = 1.36$ ),  $F(7, 238) = 5.20$ ,  $p = .02$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .02$ . See Table 6. No significant other main effects or interactions were revealed.

In contrast with Hypothesis 4, no significant main effects or interactions were revealed for perpetrator liking. Participants endorsed generally neutral opinions ( $M = 4.23$ ,  $SD = 1.16$ ) of the perpetrator overall. See Table 7.

A main effect of perpetrator gender was revealed for perceived sexism level of the perpetrator,  $F(7, 238) = 7.62$ ,  $p = .006$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .03$ . Specifically, men ( $M = 4.91$ ,  $SD = 1.77$ ) were perceived as more sexist overall than women ( $M = 4.34$ ,  $SD = 2.04$ ). A second main effect was noted for target gender, such that perpetrators were rated as more sexist when the target was a lesbian woman ( $M = 4.95$ ,  $SD = 1.81$ ) than a gay man ( $M = 4.31$ ,  $SD = 2.00$ ),  $F(7, 238) = 8.90$ ,  $p = .003$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .04$ . There were no other significant main effects or interactions; however, two marginally significant interactions were noted. A marginally significant interaction of perpetrator and participant gender emerged,  $F(7, 238) = 3.36$ ,  $p = .07$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .01$ . Simple main effects tests suggest that men rated male perpetrators ( $M = 4.97$ ,  $SD = 1.77$ ) as significantly more sexist than female perpetrators

Table 6

*Gender Dynamics Predicting Comment Distress (n = 244)*

Independent Variable	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
1. Perpetrator Gender	.04	.85	< .001	.05
2. Target Gender	.63	.43	.003	.12
3. Participant Gender	5.20	.02	.02	.62
4. Perpetrator Gender x Target Gender	.92	.34	.004	.16
5. Participant Gender x Perpetrator Gender	1.47	.23	.006	.23
6. Participant Gender x Target Gender	.15	.70	.001	.07
7. Participant Gender x Perpetrator Gender x Target Gender	.23	.63	.001	.08
Constant	.04	.85	<.001	.05

Table 7

*Gender Dynamics Predicting Perpetrator Dislike (n = 244)*

Independent Variable	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
1. Perpetrator Gender	1.67	.20	.01	.25
2. Target Gender	.02	.90	< .001	.05
3. Participant Gender	< .001	1.00	< .001	.05
4. Perpetrator Gender x Target Gender	.16	.69	.001	.07
5. Participant Gender x Perpetrator Gender	.97	.33	.004	.17
6. Participant Gender x Target Gender	.56	.46	.002	.12
7. Participant Gender x Perpetrator Gender x Target Gender	.02	.90	< .001	.05
Constant	1.67	.20	.01	.25

( $M = 3.88$ ,  $SD = 2.09$ ),  $F(1, 238) = 9.94$ ,  $p = .002$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .04$ . Women rated male ( $M = 4.88$ ,  $SD = 1.82$ ) and female ( $M = 4.66$ ,  $SD = 1.96$ ) perpetrators as equally sexist,  $F(1, 238) = .46$ ,  $p = .50$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .002$ . Similarly, a marginally significant interaction of target and participant gender was revealed,  $F(7, 238) = 3.38$ ,  $p = .07$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .01$ . Simple main effects suggest men rated the perpetrator as more sexist when the target was a lesbian ( $M = 5.00$ ,  $SD = 1.76$ ) than a gay man ( $M = 3.86$ ,  $SD = 2.04$ ),  $F(1, 238) = 10.96$ ,  $p = .001$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .04$ . Women rated the perpetrator as equally sexist when the target was a lesbian woman ( $M = 4.91$ ,  $SD = 1.87$ ) and a gay man ( $M = 4.64$ ,  $SD = 1.91$ ),  $F(1, 238) = .70$ ,  $p = .40$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .003$ . See Table 8.

### **Attitudinal Predictors of Confrontation**

Bivariate correlations between attitudinal variables including right-wing authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, social dominance orientation, moral outrage, assertiveness, sexism toward men and women, allophilia, attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women, personal support, gay and lesbian social justice beliefs, and ally identity centrality were examined. See Table 9 for full correlation results. As anticipated, a number of attitudinal variables were highly correlated with each other. The gay and lesbian social justice scale attitudes subscale and allophilia were removed from the regression analysis as they measured similar concepts as attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women and were highly correlated with many other variables, raising concerns about multicollinearity. Although attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women, personal support, and right-wing authoritarianism were also highly correlated with each other, they were included in analyses as they measure distinct theoretical concepts. Additionally, the attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women as well as personal support scales were

Table 8

*Gender Dynamics Predicting Perceptions of the Perpetrator's Sexist Attitudes (n = 244)*

Independent Variable	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
1. Perpetrator Gender	7.62	.006	.03	.79
2. Target Gender	8.90	.003	.04	.84
3. Participant Gender	2.08	.15	.01	.30
4. Perpetrator Gender x Target Gender	2.81	.10	.01	.39
5. Participant Gender x Perpetrator Gender	3.36	.07	.01	.45
6. Participant Gender x Target Gender	3.38	.07	.01	.45
7. Participant Gender x Perpetrator Gender x Target Gender	2.60	.11	.01	.36
Constant	7.62	.006	.03	.79

Table 9

*Bivariate Correlations*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
	RWA	RF	SDO	MO	RA	ASI- Ben	ASI- Hos	AMI- Ben	AMI- Hos	ALL	ATL	ATG	PS	SJS- Awa	SJS- Att	SJS- SE
1. Right Wing Authoritarianism	1															
2. Religious Fundamentalism	.58**	1														
3. Social Dominance Orientation	.53**	.14*	1													
4. Moral Outrage	-.36**	-0.05	-.62**	1												
5. Rathus Assertiveness Composite	-0.01	0.02	0.02	0.05	1											
6. Benevolent Sexism	.50**	.36**	.21**	-0.12	0.09	1										
7. Hostile Sexism	.57**	.23**	.47**	-.40**	-0.01	.48**	1									
8. Ambivalent Sexism Toward Men-Benevolent Sexism	.57**	.33**	.36**	-.26**	-0.03	.75**	.61**	1								
9. Ambivalent Sexism Toward Men-Hostile Sexism	.34**	.22**	.23**	-0.06	-0.01	.49**	.33**	.53**	1							
10. Alloghilia Total Mean	-.73**	-.42**	-.49**	.40**	-0.05	-.40**	-.47**	-.47**	-.18**	1						

11. Attitudes Toward Lesbians Mean	1 RWA	2 RF	3 SDO	4 MO	5 RA	6 ASI-Ben	7 ASI-Hos	8 AMI-Ben	9 AMI-Hos	10 ALL	11 ATL	12 ATG	13 PS	14 SJS-Awa	15 SJS-Att	16 SJS-SE
	.75**	.62**	.46**	-.31**	0.04	.41**	.50**	.47**	.24**	-.74**	1	1	1			
12. Attitudes Toward Gay Men Mean	.75**	.63**	.41**	-.32**	0.08	.43**	.49**	.47**	.23**	-.80**	.86**	1	1			
13. Personal Support Mean	-.63**	-.39**	-.51**	.53**	-0.05	-.30**	-.47**	-.40**	-.15*	.82**	-.66**	-.68**	1			
14. Lesbian and Gay Social Justice Awareness subscale	-.47**	-.15*	-.48**	.46**	-0.04	-.33**	-.49**	-.37**	-0.01	.55**	-.42**	-.46**	.60**	1		
15. Lesbian and Gay Social Justice Attitudes subscale	-.76**	-.60**	-.48**	.35**	-0.09	-.38**	-.51**	-.51**	-.22**	-.78**	-.81**	-.86**	.67**	.44**	1	
16. Lesbian and Gay Social Justice Self-efficacy subscale	-.52**	-.30**	-.43**	.46**	.17*	-.22**	-.43**	-.34**	-0.11	.69**	-.54**	-.56**	.76**	.45**	.56**	1
17. Ally Identity Centrality	.26**	.21**	.15*	.01	.14*	.18**	.27**	.27*	.15*	-.22**	.34**	.25**	-.18**	-.15*	-.26**	-.05

Note: \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$

significant predictors of intended confrontation in the video-study (LeMaire & Oswald, in press).

Furthermore, a planned comparison was conducted with all of the attitudinal variables as dependent variables in order to examine if the experimental manipulation shifted the attitudinal means from the control condition (dichotomous independent variable, experimental vs. control).

A significant difference was noted for social dominance orientation,  $F(1, 304) = 3.96, p = .05$  and hostile sexism toward men,  $F(1, 305) = 5.44, p = .02$ . Specifically, the experimental conditions ( $M = 2.42, SD = 1.01$ ) had a lower social dominance orientation mean than the control conditions ( $M = 2.72, SD = 1.18$ ). The experimental conditions' mean hostile sexism toward men mean score ( $M = 1.77, SD = .77$ ) was lower than the control conditions ( $M = 2.03, SD = .80$ ). Because the means differed for these two variables, they were excluded from the regression analyses.

A binary logistic regression was conducted using right-wing authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, moral outrage, assertiveness, benevolent and hostile sexism toward women, benevolent sexism toward men, attitudes toward gay men, attitudes toward lesbian women, personal support, LGASJC awareness, and LGASJC self-efficacy, and ally identity centrality to predict confrontation behavior. The model as a whole was significant,  $\chi^2(7, n = 200) = 32.99, p = .002$ , explaining between 15.2% (Cox & Snell  $R^2$ ) and 22.8% (Nagelkerke  $R^2$ ) of the variance in confrontation behavior and correctly classifying 76.5% of cases (18.8% of confrontation responses and 94.1% of non-confrontation responses). Two significant unique predictors were identified: attitudes toward gay men and personal support. Participants were 2.72 times more likely to



confront the perpetrator for every one-unit decrease in their negative attitudes toward gay men score. Additionally, participants were 2.02 times more likely to confront for every one-unit increase in their score of personal support (more personal support). See Table 10.

Furthermore, a series of independent sample t-tests were conducted to examine the difference in attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women between confronters and those who did not confront, as well as those who agreed in comparison to those who did not. Results suggest confronters had significantly more positive attitudes toward gay men ( $M = 1.77$ ,  $SD = .63$ ) than those who didn't confront ( $M = 2.16$ ,  $SD = .93$ ),  $t(237) = 3.10$ ,  $p < .001$ . Confronters had more positive attitudes toward lesbian women ( $M = 1.57$ ,  $SD = .54$ ) than those who didn't confront ( $M = 2.03$ ,  $SD = .79$ ,  $t(237) = 4.20$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

Similarly, those who agreed endorsed significantly more negative attitudes toward gay men ( $M = 2.45$ ,  $SD = 1.03$ ),  $t(237) = -4.00$ ,  $p = .002$ , and lesbian women ( $M = 2.18$ ,  $SD = .82$ ),  $t(237) = -3.15$ ,  $p = .04$ , in comparison to those who did not verbally agree (gay men  $M = 1.93$ ,  $SD = .79$ ; lesbian women  $M = 1.82$ ,  $SD = .72$ ).

### **History of Allied Behavior**

Only a small percentage (2 to 14%) of study participants engaged in the various allied behaviors. More frequent behaviors included voting and signing petitions in support of gay and lesbian rights. Less frequent behaviors included attending rallies and contacting politicians and representatives on behalf of gay and lesbian rights. Full frequencies of allied behaviors are presented in Table 11. Around 20% of the sample did

Table 10

*Attitudinal Variables Predicting Confrontation (n = 240)*

Independent Variable	<i>B</i>	Wald Chi- Square	Sig.	Exp (B) Odds Ratio	95% CI for Odds Ratio	
					Lower	Upper
1. Right-wing authoritarianism	-.17	.29	.59	.84	.46	1.57
2. Religious Fundamentalism	-.03	.02	.89	.97	.68	1.40
3. Moral Outrage	-.20	.44	.51	.82	.46	1.46
4. Assertiveness	.01	2.82	.09	1.01	1.00	1.03
5. Benevolent Sexism	.02	.003	.96	1.02	.52	2.02
6. Hostile Sexism	-.39	1.68	.19	.67	.37	1.22
7. Benevolent Sexism Toward Men	.04	.02	.90	1.05	.53	2.05
8. Attitudes Toward Lesbian Women	-.95	2.92	.08	.39	.13	1.15
9. Attitudes Toward Gay Men	-1.00	3.89	.05	2.72	1.01	7.33
10. Personal Support	.70	3.92	.05	2.02	1.00	4.05
11. LGASJC Awareness	-.03	.32	.58	.98	.89	1.07
12. LGASJC Self- Efficacy	.01	.18	.67	1.01	.95	1.08
13. Ally Identity Centrality	-.01	.15	.69	.99	.94	1.04
Constant	-2.08	.88	.38	.13	-	-

*Note:* LGASJC = Lesbian and Gay Affirming Social Justice Competency Scale

Table 11

*Frequencies Behavioral Responses (n = 240)*

Behavior	0	1	2	3	4	5	6-9	10-14	15-19	20+
How many times in the past two years have you....										
1. Attended a Gay Pride event?	227, 91.2%	15, 6.0%	5, 2.0%	-	1, .4%	-	-	-	-	-
2. Attended a Gay-Straight Alliance meeting?	234, 94.4%	10, 4.0%	2, .8%	1, .4%	-	-	-	1, .4%	-	-
3. Made a monetary donation to a gay and lesbian charity group?	237, 95.2%	6, 2.4%	5, 2.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. Donated your time to a gay and lesbian charity group	236, 95.2%	9, 3.6%	1, .4%	-	-	-	-	1, .4%	-	1, .4%
5. Promoted gay and lesbian rights supportive clubs or events?	224, 90.3%	13, 5.2%	4, 1.6%	4, 1.6%	-	5, 2.0%	-	1, .4%	-	1, .4%
6. Attended political rallies in support of gay marriage	239, 96.0%	5, 2.0%	1, .4%	-	2, .8%	-	-	-	-	-
7. Called/emailed/mailed letters to politicians in support of gay and lesbian rights	244, 98.0%	4, 1.6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Signed petitions in support of gay and lesbian rights	216, 86.7%	17, 6.9%	8, 3.2%	2, .8%	1, .4%	3, 1.2%	-	1, .4%	-	-

9. Wore pins or posted bumper stickers on your personal property	225, 90.7%	9, 3.6%	6, 2.4%	1, .4%	2, .8%	3, 1.2%	1, .4%	-	-	1, .4%
10. Voted in support of gay and lesbian rights	210, 84.3%	29, 11.7%	7, 2.8%	1, .4%	-	-	1, .4%	-	-	-
11. How many clubs or groups that are supportive of gay and lesbian rights are you a part of?	236, 94.8%	8, 3.2%	4, 1.6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Relationships										
12. How many gay or lesbian family members do you have?	164, 66.7%	45, 18.3%	23, 9.3%	13, 5.3%	1, .4%	-	-	-	-	-
13. How many gay or lesbian friends do you have?	50, 20.1%	47, 19.5%	45, 18.7%	31, 12.9%	18, 11.6%	28, 11.6%	17, 7.1%	3, 1.2%	1, .4%	1, .4%

*Note:* Responses were fill-in-the-blank

not have gay or lesbian friends, however, over 60% of the sample had 2 or more friends who identify as gay or lesbian. Almost 67% did not have gay or lesbian family members; no one reported having more than 4 family members who identify as gay or lesbian.

A principal component analysis (PCA) of the allied behavior items was conducted with orthogonal rotation (varimax) in order to identify possible themes in the allied behavior scale that should be analyzed separately. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure verified the sampling adequacy for the analysis,  $KMO = .75$ . Bartlett's test of sphericity  $\chi^2(78) = 1793.06, p < .001$ , indicated that correlations between items were sufficiently large for PCA. An initial analysis was conducted to obtain eigenvalues for each component. Four components had eigenvalues over Kaiser's criterion of 1 and in combination explained 70.81% of the variance. Table 12 shows the factor loadings after rotation. Although the components were not entirely clear based on the items that clustered together, those that emerged were named Political Engagement (Component 1, 4 items, coefficient alpha = .83), Club Membership (Component 2, 3 items, coefficient alpha = .82), Personal relationships and involvement (Component 3, 4 items, coefficient alpha = .67), Outward support (Component 4, 2 items, coefficient alpha = .93).

Finally, a binary logistic regression was conducted using the 4 factors scores for each participant as well as the Lesbian and Gay Affirming Social Justice Competency Action subscale to predict confrontation behavior. The model as a whole was significant,  $\chi^2(7, n = 240) = 19.97, p = .001$ , explaining between 9.8% (Cox & Snell  $R^2$ ) and 14.6% (Nagelkerke  $R^2$ ) of the variance in confrontation behavior and correctly classifying 77.3% of cases (17.0% of confrontation responses and 96.6% of non-confrontation). Two significant unique predictors were identified, LGASJC Action subscale and personal

Table 12

*Rotated Component Analysis of Allied Behavior (n = 240)*

Behavior	1	2	3	4
1. Attended a Gay Pride event?	<b>.771</b>			
2. Called/emailed/mailed letters to politicians in support of gay and lesbian rights	<b>.747</b>			
3. Attended political rallies in support of gay marriage	<b>.746</b>		.401	
4. Voted in support of gay and lesbian rights	<b>.681</b>			
5. Attended a Gay-Straight Alliance meeting?		<b>.944</b>		
6. Promoted gay and lesbian rights supportive clubs or events?		<b>.801</b>		
7. How many clubs or groups that are supportive of gay and lesbian rights are you a part of?	.409	<b>.722</b>		
8. How many gay or lesbian family members do you have?			<b>.677</b>	
9. Signed petitions in support of gay and lesbian rights	.576		<b>.617</b>	
10. Made a monetary donation to a gay and lesbian charity group?			<b>.583</b>	
11. How many gay or lesbian friends do you have?			<b>.507</b>	
12. Donated your time to a gay and lesbian charity group				<b>.973</b>
13. Wore pins or posted bumper stickers on your personal property				<b>.956</b>
Coefficient Alpha	.83	.82	.67	.93

*Note:* Names for the components are as follows: Component 1: Political Engagement

Component, 2: Club Membership, Component 3: Personal Relationships and

Involvement, Component 4: Outward Support

relationships and involvement (component 3). Specifically, participants were 1.26 times more likely to confront the perpetrator for every one-unit increase in their LGASJC Action score, which encompassed a wide range of behaviors including seeking training and political engagement. Additionally, participants were 1.52 times more likely to engage in confrontation for every one-unit increase in their personal relationships and involvement factor score, which included number of family and friend relationships as well as donation of money and petition signing. See Table 13.

### **Gender, Attitudes, and Allied Behavior Variables**

Hypothesis 6 proposed to examine whether accounting for significant attitudinal variables and allied behavior would change or eliminate possible differences in confrontation behavior noted in the experimental conditions. To test this hypothesis, a hierarchical logistic regression was utilized by entering the two uniquely significant attitudinal (personal support and attitudes toward gay men) and allied behavior (LGASJC action subscale and personal relationships and involvement factor) variables in the first step of the equation and entering the gender of the perpetrator, target, participant and interaction terms in the second step of the equation. Results of the first step of the equation revealed a significant model,  $\chi^2(4, n = 194) = 23.81, p < .001$ , explaining between 11.5% (Cox & Snell  $R^2$ ) and 17.2% (Nagelkerke  $R^2$ ) of the variance in confrontation behavior and correctly classifying 74.2% of cases (10.6% of confrontation responses and 94.6% of non-confrontation responses). Personal support was identified as a significant unique predictor. Participants were 2.02 times more likely to confront the perpetrator for every one-unit increase in their personal support score. No other variables were statistically significant unique predictors.

Table 13

*Allied Behaviors Predicting Confrontation (n = 240)*

Independent Variable	<i>B</i>	Wald Chi- Square	Sig.	Exp (B)  Odds Ratio	95% CI for Odds Ratio	
					Lower	Upper
1. LGASJC Action subscale	.12	8.55	.003	1.13	1.04	1.22
2. Political Engagement	-.68	3.07	.08	.51	.24	1.08
3. Club Membership	-.04	.01	.91	.96	.50	1.85
4. Personal Relationships and Involvement	.42	4.89	.03	1.52	1.05	2.19
5. Outward support	-.25	.67	.41	.78	.43	1.41
Constant	-2.54	24.67	< .001	.08	-	-



The second step of the regression revealed a significant model,  $\chi^2(7, n = 194) = 39.64, p < .001$ , explaining between 18.5% (Cox & Snell  $R^2$ ) and 27.6% (Nagelkerke  $R^2$ ) of the variance in confrontation behavior and correctly classifying 77.3% of cases (23.4% of confrontation responses and 94.6% of non-confrontation responses). Perpetrator gender and personal support were significant unique predictors. Specifically, participants were 7.65 times more likely to confront the perpetrators who were women than those who were men. Additionally, participants were 2.42 times more likely to confront the perpetrator of heterosexist remarks for every one-unit increase in their personal support score (more personal support). See Table 14.

### **Satisfaction with Responses to the Comment**

First, frequencies were conducted to examine participant's satisfaction with their responses to the heterosexist comment. Overall, participants' satisfaction with their responses varied significantly. The average level of satisfaction with responses was 4.26 ( $SD = 1.96$ , range = 1-7). A factorial ANOVA was conducted to examine differences in satisfaction given participant's verbal responses (said nothing, changed the subject, neutral comment, agree, and confront). Results suggest a significant difference in participants' satisfaction level given their verbal responses,  $F(4, 229) = 7.49, p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .12$ . Tukey's post hoc test analyses ( $p < .01$ ) suggest that those who confronted ( $M = 5.23, SD = 1.57$ ) prejudice were significantly more satisfied than those who said nothing ( $M = 3.43, SD = 1.91$ ), changed the subject ( $M = 3.53, SD = 1.90$ ), said something neutral ( $M = 4.06, SD = 2.03$ ), and verbally agreed, ( $M = 4.27, SD = 1.88, p = .05$ ). There were no other significant differences between the other responses.

Table 14

*Gender Dynamics, Attitudes, and Previous Allied Behaviors Predicting Confrontation*  
(*n* = 240)

Independent Variable	<i>B</i>	Wald Chi- Square	Sig.	Exp (B)  Odds Ratio	95% CI for Odds Ratio	
					Lower	Upper
Step 1						
1. Attitudes toward Gay Men	.07	.06	.80	1.07	.62	1.86
2. Personal support	.70	7.23	.01	2.02	1.21	3.38
3. LGASJC Action Subscale	.01	.14	.71	1.01	.94	1.10
4. Personal Relationships and Involvement	.33	2.95	.09	1.40	.95	2.04
Constant	-4.12	8.71	.003	.02	-	-
Step 2						
1. Attitudes toward Gay Men	.20	.40	.53	1.22	.66	2.24
2. Personal support	.88	8.43	.004	2.42	1.33	4.38
3. LGASJC Action Subscale	.01	.04	.85	1.01	.93	1.20
4. Personal Relationships and Involvement	.35	3.09	.08	1.43	.96	2.12
5. Perpetrator Gender	2.03	6.24	.01	7.64	1.55	37.63
6. Target Gender	.65	.54	.46	1.92	.34	10.90
7. Participant Gender	.89	1.12	.29	2.43	.47	12.56

8. Perpetrator Gender x Target Gender	-.20	.03	.87	.82	.08	8.06
9. Participant Gender x Perpetrator Gender	-1.39	1.75	.19	.25	.03	1.95
10. Participant Gender x Target Gender	-1.02	.76	.38	.36	.04	3.55
11. Participant Gender x Perpetrator Gender x Target Gender	-.32	.04	.85	.73	.03	19.73
Constant	-6.11	11.13	.001	.002	-	-

---

*Note:* LGASJC = Lesbian and Gay Affirming Social Justice Competency Scale

Second, a multiple regression was conducted to examine Hypothesis 7, which held that participants would report greater levels of satisfaction with their responses to the comment when their responses are congruent with their explicit attitudes towards gay men/lesbian women. First the data file was split by the gender of the target. Then participants' attitudes toward gay men or attitudes toward lesbian women (continuous variable, scored so that higher numbers indicate more negative attitudes), their categorical verbal behavior variable (e.g., confront vs. other response) was entered into the first step of a hierarchical regression. An interaction term (attitudes x behavior) was entered into the second step to examine whether the interaction term predicted significant variance in satisfaction (continuous variable) above and beyond what was explained by attitudes and behavior on their own.

When the target was a lesbian woman, step one of the hierarchical regression, consisting of participant's behavior and attitudes toward lesbian women, significantly predicted participant's satisfaction with their behavior,  $R^2 = .10$ ,  $F(2, 116) = 6.47$ ,  $p = .002$ . Confrontation was identified as a significant unique predictor,  $b = .33$ ,  $t(116) = 3.59$ ,  $p < .001$ . Step 2 of the model remained significant in predicting satisfaction,  $R^2 = .10$ ,  $F(3, 115) = 4.28$ ,  $p = .007$ ; however, none of the variables, including the interaction term were identified as significant unique predictors. See Table 15.

When the target was a gay man, step one of the hierarchical regression significantly predicted satisfaction,  $R^2 = .12$ ,  $F(2, 117) = 7.71$ ,  $p = .001$ . Both attitudes toward gay men,  $b = .20$ ,  $t(117) = 2.25$ ,  $p < .03$ , and behavior,  $b = .33$ ,  $t(117) = 3.70$ ,  $p < .001$ , were identified as significant unique predictors. The second step of the regression also significantly predicted satisfaction,  $R^2 = .13$ ,  $F(3, 116) = 5.54$ ,  $p = .001$ . Similar to

Table 15

*Attitudes and Behavior Predicting Satisfaction for Lesbian Targets (n = 118)*

Predictor	Beta	<i>t</i>	Sig.
<b>Step 1</b>			
1. Attitudes toward Lesbian Women	.09	1.02	.31
2. Verbal Confrontation	.33	3.59	< .001
Constant	-	6.75	< .001
<b>Step 2</b>			
1. Attitudes toward Lesbian Women	.90	.91	.36
2. Verbal Confrontation	.31	1.22	.22
3. ConfrontationxATL	.01	.05	.96
Constant	-	6.26	< .001

*Note:* Step 1:  $R^2 = .10$ ,  $F(2, 116) = 6.47$ ,  $p = .002$ ; Step 2:  $R^2 = .10$ ,  $F(3, 115) = 4.28$ ,  $p =$

ATL = Attitudes toward Lesbian Women

when the target was a lesbian, none of the variables were significant unique predictors. See Table 16.

Additionally, another hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with participants' ally identity centrality (continuous variable), their categorical behavior variable, and an interaction term (ally identity centrality x behavior) to predict satisfaction with their behavioral response to the comment. The file was not split by target gender for this analysis. Step one of the hierarchical regression significantly predicted satisfaction,  $R^2 = .09$ ,  $F(2, 236) = 11.84$ ,  $p < .001$ . The behavior variable (confrontation vs. other behavior) was identified as a significant unique predictor,  $b = .30$ ,  $t(236) = 4.83$ ,  $p < .001$ . The second step of the model remained significant,  $R^2 = .09$ ,  $F(3, 235) = 8.01$ ,  $p < .001$ . Confrontation was revealed as a marginally significant unique predictor of satisfaction  $b = .46$ ,  $t(235) = 1.82$ ,  $p = .07$ . Neither ally identity centrality nor the interaction term uniquely predicted satisfaction. See Table 17.

### **Anticipated Future Responses**

Participants were separated into groups using their behavioral response (confront, agree, neutral comment, changed the subject, and said nothing) to the comments. A factorial MANOVA was conducted to examine differences in participants' perceived future responses (agree, neutral comment, confront, change the subject, remain silent) to witnessing similar heterosexist comments (likelihood of engaging in a behavior) using their categorical behavior variable as an independent variable. Multivariate tests indicate that there were significant differences in participant's perceived future behaviors based on their behavioral response to the heterosexist comment, Wilks'  $\lambda = .52$ ,  $F(4, 229) = 8.19$   $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2_p = .15$ . Between-subjects univariate tests revealed significant

Table 16

*Attitudes and Behavior Predicting Satisfaction for Gay Targets (n = 119)*

Predictor	Beta	<i>t</i>	Sig.
<b>Step 1</b>			
1. Attitudes toward Gay Men	.20	2.25	.03
2. Verbal Confrontation	.33	3.70	< .001
Constant	-	6.12	< .001
<b>Step 2</b>			
1. Attitudes toward Gay Men	.16	1.67	.10
2. Verbal Confrontation	.09	.35	.73
3. ConfrontationxATG	.26	1.09	.28
Constant	-	6.11	< .001

*Note:* Step 1:  $R^2 = .12$ ,  $F(2, 117) = 7.71$ ,  $p = .001$ ; Step 2:  $R^2 = .13$ ,  $F(3, 116) = 5.54$ ,  $p =$

ATL = Attitudes toward Gay Men

Table 17

*Ally Identity Centrality and Behavior Predicting Satisfaction for All Targets (n = 238)*

Predictor	Beta	<i>t</i>	Sig.
<b>Step 1</b>			
1. Ally Identity Centrality	.08	1.26	.21
2. Verbal Confrontation	.30	4.83	< .001
Constant	-	7.14	< .001
<b>Step 2</b>			
1. Ally Identity Centrality	.10	1.41	.16
2. Verbal Confrontation	.46	1.82	.07
3. ConfrontationxAllyID	-.26	-.64	.52
Constant	-	6.22	< .001

*Note:* Step 1:  $R^2 = .09$ ,  $F(2, 236) = 11.84$ ,  $p < .001$ ; Step 2:  $R^2 = .09$ ,  $F(3, 235) = 8.01$ ,  $p < .001$ .

AllyID = Ally Identity Centrality



differences based on behavioral responses to the comment for anticipated future confrontation,  $F(4, 229) = 19.57, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .26$ , anticipated agreement,  $F(4, 229) = 5.90, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .09$ , anticipated silence in response to a comment,  $F(4, 229) = 24.02, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .30$ , and making a neutral comment,  $F(4, 229) = 5.17, p = .001, \eta^2_p = .08$ .

Post hoc analyses suggest that those who confronted ( $M = 5.00, SD = 1.28$ ) were significantly more likely to endorse that they would confront in the future than those who agreed ( $M = 3.27, SD = 1.46$ ),  $p < .001$ , said nothing ( $M = 3.09, SD = 1.18$ ),  $p < .001$ , changed the subject ( $M = 3.03, SD = 1.12$ ),  $p < .001$ , and made a neutral comment ( $M = 3.80, SD = 1.52$ ),  $p < .001$ . There were no other significant differences between groups.

Those who verbally agreed were significantly more likely to indicate that they would agree in the future in comparison to those who confronted ( $M = 1.63, SD = 1.11$ ),  $p < .001$  and those who made a neutral comment, ( $M = 1.98, SD = 1.48$ ),  $p = .008$ . There were no other significant differences between groups.

Post hoc analyses also revealed that participants who said nothing in response to the heterosexist comments were significantly more likely than all of the other groups to indicate that they would say nothing ( $M = 6.05, SD = 1.27$ ) in the future; change subject ( $M = 4.97, SD = 1.47$ ),  $p < .04$ , neutral ( $M = 4.20, SD = 1.64$ ),  $p < .001$ , agree ( $M = 4.79, SD = 1.85$ ),  $p = .002$ , confront ( $M = 3.02, SD = 1.51$ ),  $p < .001$ . Additionally, those who confronted were significantly less likely to indicate that they would say nothing in the future than those who changed the subject  $p < .001$ , said something neutral,  $p = .001$ , and agreed,  $p < .001$ .

Finally, those who confronted ( $M = 4.11$ ,  $SD = 1.74$ ) were significantly less likely to say they would say something neutral in the future when compared to those who said something neutral ( $M = 5.31$ ,  $SD = 1.48$ ),  $p = .001$  or changed the subject ( $M = 5.38$ ,  $SD = 1.16$ ),  $p = .005$ .

## Discussion

The current study had four major goals centered on understanding responses to heterosexist prejudice. The current study investigated 1) how gender affects responses to witnessing heterosexist prejudice, 2) how attitudinal variables and previous allied behaviors are related to responses to prejudice, 3) whether accounting for attitudinal variables and allied behaviors changes the way in which gender dynamics impact responses to prejudice, and finally, 4) participant's satisfaction with their responses and anticipated future responses to witnessing prejudice.

Understanding individuals' responses to prejudice are important as they can affect perpetrators' and other witnesses' behavior and attitudes in the future (e.g., Monteith, 1993; Monteith et al., 2010). This study was focused on confrontation of prejudice in particular as it has been linked to reduction in future discriminatory behavior (Blanchard et al., 1994; Czopp et al., 2006; Fazio & Hiden, 2001). Additionally, confrontation is important to understand as it may have consequences for confronters, including feelings of self-efficacy, as well as the potential for both positive and negative feedback from others (Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015; Dickter, 2012; Gervais et al., 2010; Haslett & Lipman, 1997; Hyers, 2007; Kaiser & Miller, 2001, Shelton & Stewart, 2004).

## Verbal and Nonverbal Responses

Participants were exposed to the heterosexist comment, “[H]e’s gay (a lesbian). I saw him (her) outside with his (her) boyfriend (girlfriend). Seriously, it’s disgusting. Two guys (girls) should not be together!” Just under half (48.8%) of participants reported hearing similar comments on campus in the past. This is concerning given the severity of the comments made by the perpetrator and the young age of the participants. However, these results are similar to other studies examining prevalence of heterosexist comments on college campuses (Woodford et al., 2013). One quarter of participants (25.8%) engaged in confrontation when they witnessed the perpetrator making overtly heterosexist comments, which is generally consistent with rates observed in the confrontation literature regarding heterosexism, sexism, and racism (Ayres et al., 2009; Dickter, 2012; Dickter & Newton, 2013; Shelton & Stewart, 2004; Swim & Hyers, 1999). It is noteworthy that the previous video-based study (LeMaire & Oswald, in press) examining intended responses to witnessing heterosexist prejudice revealed that 63% of participants intended to confront. It is likely that participants overestimated the degree to which they would be distressed by the comments and the likelihood that they would take action as Kawakami and colleagues demonstrated in a study examining responses to racism (Kawakami, Dunn, Karmali, & Dovidio, 2009). Another possibility may be that participants were in fact distressed by the comments but did not confront—due to lack of skills (Washington & Evans, 1991) or fear of negative social repercussions (Brinkman et al., 2011; Kaiser & Miller, 2001; Shelton & Stewart, 2004; Swim & Hyers, 1999). Furthermore, research suggests that people are socialized to not delegitimize another person’s presented self (Goffman, 1959). It is important to consider that many more

individuals may intend to or want to confront than actually do (Brinkman et al., 2011; Shelton & Stewart, 2004; Swim & Hyers, 1999). Research suggests that individuals are often uncomfortable when faced with prejudice and fear negative social feedback, which impedes their confrontation behavior even if they prefer it (Brinkman et al., 2011; Shelton & Stewart, 2004; Swim & Hyers, 1999). It may also be that they lack the skills to confront (Washington & Evans, 1991). Additionally, only a small percentage of the sample (between 0.4-8.4% varying by specific behavior) engaged in nonverbal disagreement such as rolling their eyes or giving a look of disapproval. Although some researchers have defined confrontation to include these behaviors (Brinkman et al., 2015; Dickter, 2012; Gervais et al., 2010), it is unclear whether they are tied to changing perpetrator's behavior.

Nearly a quarter (24.7%) of participants verbally agreed with the perpetrator of prejudice. While those who agreed, as a group, held more negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women than those who responded otherwise, a number of those who agreed held positive attitudes, and verbally agreed for reasons other than behaving consistent with their beliefs. These reasons likely included being cautious of receiving negative social feedback from the perpetrator (Brinkman et al., 2011; Kaiser & Miller, 2001; Shelton & Stewart, 2004; Swim & Hyers, 1999). Additionally, a significant percentage of the sample changed the subject, remained silent, laughed, smiled, and shrugged. All together, these responses are problematic from a prejudice reduction standpoint, as agreement has been linked to an increase in prejudice attitudes in other witnesses (Blanchard et al., 1994) and the absence of confrontation (e.g., remaining silent

or laughing) may be interpreted as passive agreement and will likely not reduce discrimination in the future.

Consistent with study hypotheses, the gender of the perpetrator appears to impact non-target witness' (participant's) responses to heterosexist prejudice. However, contrary to hypothesis 1, both men and women were significantly more likely to confront women who made heterosexist comments when compared to men. This is inconsistent with previous research indicating that participants, and especially men, intended to confront men more than women (LeMaire & Oswald, in press). There are a number of possible explanations for this difference in results, including links to theories of ambivalent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996). The video design drew upon participant's beliefs about how they would respond to a situation in which they encountered heterosexist prejudice. Their responses in that situation are likely tied and highly correlated with their outwardly expressed attitudes, including those toward gay men and lesbian women. When the scenario was live, participants did not have much time to stop and reflect on how they would prefer to respond. It is possible that participants would anticipate confronting men but in the moment feel uncomfortable doing so. Gender dynamics may play a role such that men may try to distance themselves from homosexuality, in general, in the presence of another man, leading to less confrontation. Previous research suggests men distance themselves from male homosexuality in the presence of other men (Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015; Carlson, 2008; Falomir-Pichastor & Mugny, 2009; Glick et al., 2004; Poteat et al., 2011) because at least in the moment, they may be socially disapproved of for disagreeing and fall victim to courtesy stigma (Goffman, 1963). It is possible that when men speak negatively of lesbian women, men may also seek to distance themselves.

Furthermore, women may feel more threatened or uncomfortable confronting men (Glick & Fiske, 1999; Russell et al., 2016), as they hold more social power, when compared to women, thus leading to less confrontation. Additionally, female perpetrators are likely perceived to be acting outside of the normative feminine gender role (Whitley, 2001) by blatantly expressing such a negative opinion. If this is the case, participants' confrontation would "put her in her place." Participants may have also assumed that the female perpetrator would be more apt to change her opinion, as previous research has demonstrated that individuals are more likely to confront when they believe it has the possibility of changing the perpetrator's opinion (Rattan & Dweck, 2010). Altogether, results suggest that even if men and women both intend to confront men who perpetrate prejudice more often than women, it is possible that in the moment, negative social feedback and other factors such as gender power dynamics affect their responses such that they confront women more often.

Contrary to study hypotheses, no other main effects or interactions of the gender of the target, perpetrator, and participant were revealed for confrontation behavior. Again, given previous research, these results are surprising. Studies examining gender differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women (e.g., Fingerhut, 2011; Herek, 2007), factors affecting confrontation (e.g., Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015), as well as results of the video study (LeMaire & Oswald, in press) indicate that gender and gender dynamics would likely affect confrontation of prejudice. This is especially surprising given results suggesting main effects and interactions of perpetrator, target, and participant gender in agreement. It is possible that gender and gender dynamics could impact the way a person perceives they would react, and specifically confrontation, when

witnessing heterosexist prejudice, but when witnessing it in daily life, gender dynamics may not impact their responses as much as anticipated. That is, attitudes and previous behaviors, as well as the gender of the perpetrator, may account for more of the variance in responses than gender dynamics between the perpetrator, target, and participant.

In line with Hypothesis 1, some analyses suggested main effects and interactions of the gender of the target, perpetrator, and participant for verbal agreement. Specifically, chi-square analyses, but not logistic regressions, indicated that men agreed with the comment more often than women overall. Additionally, although men and women agreed with similar frequency when the perpetrator was a woman, men were more likely to agree with the perpetrator when he was a man rather than a woman. These findings are in line with previous research that holds that men seek to hold up their masculinity and to distance themselves from homosexuality, especially in the presence of other men (Cadieux & Chasteen, 2015; Carlson, 2008; Falomir-Pichastor & Mugny, 2009; Glick et al., 2004; Poteat et al., 2011). An interaction of target and participant gender also illustrated that when the target was a lesbian woman, men were more likely to verbally agree with the perpetrator than were women. No differences were found when the target was a gay man. It is important to distinguish that men were not more likely to agree with the comments when the target was a lesbian than a gay man, but were more likely to agree than women overall when the target was a lesbian. Although heterosexual men tend to have more accepting views toward lesbian women when compared to gay men, these attitudes are typically less accepting than heterosexual women overall (e.g., Fingerhut, 2011; Herek, 2007). The current results may highlight this difference. It is surprising, however, that the interaction was not statistically significant when the target was a gay

man as men's attitudes toward gay men tend to be significantly less positive than women's, and less accepting when compared to their attitudes about lesbian women.

### **Perceptions of Heterosexist Comments and Perpetrator**

As anticipated, women reported being more distressed by the heterosexist comment overall than men. This result supports previous research that women are less accepting of anti-gay hate speech than heterosexual men (Cowan et al., 2005; Cowan & Hodge, 1996; Cowan & Mettrick, 2002). Contrary to hypotheses, no other main effects or interactions were found for comment distress, nor perpetrator dislike. Previous research indicated that when a man perpetrated heterosexist prejudice, participants rated him less favorably than when a woman perpetrated prejudice (LeMaire & Oswald, in press). This was not replicated in the current study. Overall, participants endorsed generally neutral ratings of the perpetrator. Perhaps participants were able to separate their feelings about the comment from the perpetrator, as ratings of the comment were rated as generally more negative than ratings of the perpetrator. This may have been easier for participants in the current study as they personally met and worked with the perpetrator, albeit for a very limited time. Attitudes toward the perpetrator in the video study may have been more negative because the exposure to the perpetrator was limited to a 45-second video in comparison to an in person meeting and shared working experience.

Significant differences were revealed for participants' perception of the perpetrator's sexist attitudes. Specifically, men who made heterosexist comments were rated as more sexist than women who made the comments. This finding falls in line with previous research and study hypotheses. In general, people view men as being more sexist than women, although research shows that both men and women can have sexist



attitudes (e.g., Glick et al., 2004). Because the comment was the same (both made about gay men and lesbian women), participants' perceptions of the perpetrators level of sexism must be based on the perpetrator's gender. Consistent with hypotheses, perpetrators were also rated as being more sexist when the target was a lesbian woman in comparison to a gay target. Although scholars have demonstrated how sexist attitudes limit both men and women (Glick & Fiske, 1996; 1999; Glick et al., 2004), individuals tend to view women as being the target of sexist viewpoints more so than men. This is problematic as gay men may be devalued more than lesbian women in part due to their perceived "femininity," which is associated with lower social status in Western culture (Bem, 1993; Johnson, 2001).

Additionally, two marginally significant interactions were noted. Specifically, women rated both men and women who made heterosexist comments as being equally sexist; however, men rated male perpetrators as more sexist than female perpetrators. It could be that men were operating under the impression that men are more sexist than women. Perhaps this finding is related to research suggesting that women are more rejecting of hostile sexism, relative to men (Glick et al., 2000). Because the comments made were overt and hostile in nature, women may have been more attuned to and apt to label them as hostile sexism in relation to the target's gender. Furthermore, men rated the perpetrator as holding more sexist attitudes when the target was a lesbian woman, rather than a gay man. No significant difference was found in women's rating of the perpetrator depending on target gender. Because women are less accepting of these comments (Cowan et al., 2005; Glick et al., 2000) in general, when compared to men, they may be able to identify and label it regardless of the gender of the perpetrator and target. It is

possible that men are more likely to label it when the target of prejudice is a woman when it better fits the “script” for sexism.

### **Attitudinal Predictors of Confrontation**

As anticipated, many of the variables were highly correlated with one another. Because the allophilia subscales and LGASJC attitudes subscale were both highly correlated and theoretically similar to attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women, they were removed from the regression analysis. Although there were a number of other variables that were highly correlated (e.g., right-wing authoritarianism and attitudes toward gay men), the variables that remained all represented theoretically distinct constructs. It is noteworthy, that because some of the variables were highly correlated, the results of the regression analysis may have been affected. Specifically, it is likely that fewer variables would be distinguished as being significant unique predictors due to concerns of multicollinearity, even if the variables would have accounted for significant variance if tested independently.

Planned comparisons were also conducted to ensure that the experimental manipulation did not shift the attitudinal variables from the control condition. Overall, results suggested two differences in attitudinal measures between the experimental and control conditions. Specifically, the experimental conditions had lower mean scores for social dominance orientation and hostile sexism toward men than the control conditions. Interestingly, neither of these variables is an overt measure of attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women. However, social dominance orientation has been linked to prejudicial and social justice attitudes (Van Hiel & Mervielde, 2005). Sexism may have been affected because gender and sexual orientation prejudice are linked (Appleby, 1995;

Kilianski, 2003). It is unclear why hostile sexism toward men but not women was affected because both men and women played the role of perpetrator in the current study.

As hypothesized, as a group, right-wing authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, moral outrage, assertiveness, benevolent and hostile sexism toward women, benevolent sexism toward men, attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women, personal support, lesbian and gay affirming social justice competency scales, and ally identity centrality predicted confrontation behavior. All together the predictors explained between 15.2% and 22.8% of the variance in confrontation behavior. Additionally, and similar to the previous video study, both attitudes toward gay men and personal support were significant, unique predictors. Individuals who endorsed more positive attitudes toward gay men and personal support of gay men and lesbian women, were significantly more likely to engage in confrontation.

Almost all of the variables predicted confrontation in the direction hypothesized; however, moral outrage and LGASJC awareness subscale were associated with confrontation in the opposite direction that was hypothesized. Specifically, moral outrage and the LGASJC awareness subscale were negatively related to confrontation. Moral outrage was also tested independently as a predictor of confrontation and was positively associated with confrontation. It's likely that one or more variables in the model served as a suppressor variable. It is unclear why the awareness subscale was negatively associated with confrontation; however, it is noteworthy that this particular subscale's coefficient alpha was lower than desired, which may have affected results. It is also possible that awareness of heterosexual privilege and discrimination of gay men and lesbian women is not necessarily associated with confrontation. Awareness of the

prevalence of this privilege and discrimination may actually be disheartening and contribute to a belief that confrontation would not likely change perpetrator's attitudes and behavior. When individuals believe there is a low chance of the perpetrator changing in the future, they are less likely to confront (Rattan & Dweck, 2010).

### **History of Allied Behavior**

Participants were asked to report on a number of different allied behaviors that they may have engaged in over the past two years. In general, between 2 to 14% of the sample engaged in these behaviors, depending on the particular behavior. Some of these behaviors may have had low levels of engagement because they would be particularly difficult for the current sample to engage in due to their age, such as voting and donating money to charities, although it is noteworthy that voting in support of gay and lesbian rights was one of the more frequently engaged in behaviors. However, the majority of the current sample (approximately 80%) reported having at least one friend who identified as gay or lesbian and around 33% of the sample reported having at least one family member who identified as gay or lesbian. Because, in general, a small portion of the sample endorsed engaging in the behaviors, the reduced variability in responses and sample size of people who engaged in the behavior may have affected the make-up of the components identified in the principal component analysis. This limitation and others associated with this scale are discussed in more detail in the limitations and future directions section.

A principal component analysis revealed four factors 1) political engagement, 2) club membership, 3) personal relationships and involvement, and 4) outward support. These factors along with the LGASJC action subscale significantly predicted confrontation behavior. Furthermore, the LGASJC action subscale and the personal

relationships and involvement component (which encompassed friend and family relationship with gay and lesbian individuals, petition signing, and monetary donations) were both identified as significant unique predictors of confrontation behavior. These results support previous literature (Ouellette & Wood, 1998) and study hypotheses that previous allied behavior would be predictive of future allied behavior. The fact that the personal relationships and involvement component (component 3) predicted behavior also provides support for interpersonal contact theory. Specifically, interpersonal contact with an outgroup has been demonstrated to enhance knowledge and reduce anxiety about the outgroup (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). Furthermore, interpersonal contact with gay men has been demonstrated to be one of the best predictors of heterosexual's attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women (Herek & Capitano, 1996; Herek & Glunt, 1993). This contact may also increase other allied behaviors directly, or through the process of changing attitudes to be more positive toward gay men and lesbian women. Results of the current study suggest that engaging in various allied behaviors in the past may contribute to a person engaging in confrontation behavior. It is possible that increasing allied behaviors of many different kinds may increase confrontation behavior. Furthermore, it may be that when individuals engage in confrontation behavior they are more likely to engage in other allied behaviors in the future.

### **Gender, Attitudes, and Allied Behavior Variables**

One aim of this study was to examine how gender of the perpetrator, target, and non-target witness, as well as attitudes and allied behaviors, predicted participants' responses to witnessing heterosexist prejudice. As discussed, these factors did in fact predict confrontation behavior. Analyses were also conducted to examine whether the

gender of the target, participant, and perpetrator accounted for significant variance above and beyond the variance accounted for by the significant unique attitudinal and allied behavior variables. In line with study hypotheses, results suggested that the gender of the target, perpetrator, and participant accounted for a significant portion of the variance in confrontation behavior above the attitudinal and allied behavior variables. The gender of the perpetrator also uniquely predicted confrontation behavior such that participants were more likely to confront women than men. Multiple factors, including witnesses' attitudes, previous allied behaviors, and the gender of the individuals involved, and particularly the perpetrator, play a role in witnesses' responses to witnessing heterosexist prejudice. These results may be particularly important for those providing education about prejudice and confrontation. Specifically, because gender, attitudes, and behavior all appear to account for unique variance in confrontation, it is important to highlight all of the areas in the context of prejudice reduction training.

### **Satisfaction with Responses to the Comment**

In examining satisfaction with responses to the heterosexist comment, those who confronted reported being significantly more satisfied with their responses than individuals who engaged in any other behavior (i.e., verbally agreed, changed the subject, said something neutral, or remained silent). Other studies have demonstrated similar results such that individuals reported being more satisfied with their behavior and being able to emotionally move past the situation easier when they confront perpetrators, although these studies examined target's confrontation (e.g., Dickter, 2012; Hyers, 2007). It is important to highlight this satisfaction, as one of the significant barriers that can keep a person from confronting is fear of social punishment from the perpetrator. As research

demonstrates both social benefits (e.g., Dickter et al., 2012) and negative repercussions (e.g., Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Eliezer & Major, 2012; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Kaiser & Miller, 2001) of confrontation, emphasizing that people tend to endorse more satisfaction with their behavior when they confront, is likely to help motivate individuals to confront. Perhaps knowing that they may be more satisfied when behaving in a particular way could help motivate people to be more likely to engage in that particular behavior.

Furthermore, it was hypothesized that an interaction of attitudes and behavior would predict confrontation over and above behavior or attitudes individually. This hypothesis was not supported by the current analyses. Although the overall model of behavior (confrontation), attitudes, and the interaction of attitudes and behavior predicted satisfaction, the interaction term was not a unique predictor in any of the models. For gay targets, both attitudes and behavior predicted satisfaction, but the interaction term did not account for a significant portion of variance above and beyond attitudes and behavior individually. Attitudes toward lesbian women did not uniquely predict satisfaction when the target was a lesbian woman, nor did ally identity centrality predict satisfaction for the overall sample. In fact, confrontation was the only variable that was a unique predictor in all of the regression analyses. These results are somewhat surprising as cognitive dissonance theory would suggest that if individuals did not act in accordance to their attitudes, they would experience discomfort from the incongruence of attitudes and behavior (Festinger, 1957; Monteith, 1993). It is unclear why attitudes did not predict satisfaction in all of the models. Because participants' satisfaction was measured at the end of the survey, it may be that any discomfort could have been resolved before answering that question.

As for why satisfaction is greater for confrontation behavior, it is possible that there is something inherently satisfying about engaging in confrontation of prejudice. It could also be that this particular sample, as they were derived from a psychology department participant pool at a university, had more positive attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women (means were 2.05 and 1.90, respectively) than other samples (Fingerhut, 2011; Henry, 2008), which may have contributed to greater satisfaction with confrontation behavior.

It also cannot be wholly ruled out that greater satisfaction could be at least partially attributed to participants' assuming that confrontation behavior may have been the researcher's preferred response to the situation. Previous research suggests that participants do attempt to please experimenters when they participate in studies and attempt to confirm researcher's hypotheses (Nichols & Maner, 2008). Although the participants did not guess the hypotheses or purpose of the study prior to filling out survey measures (as evidenced by the experimental manipulation check), nor were hypotheses, expectations, or preferences of the researchers explicitly stated at any point in the study, participants may have made the assumption that confrontation would be preferred by the end of the study after filling out measures related to allied attitudes and behavior. If participants did in fact guess that the researchers were interested in confrontation behavior, they may have endorsed more satisfaction if they engaged in that behavior and less satisfaction if they did not, which could have contributed to the difference in satisfaction between behaviors.



### **Anticipated Future Responses**

Overall, results of the current study suggest that individuals anticipate acting in similar ways in the future as they did in the experimental manipulation. Specifically, those who confronted in the current situation endorsed that they would engage in confrontation in the future more than any other group. Those who agreed and remained silent were also more likely to endorse that they would act similarly in the future. This is not entirely surprising as previous research has demonstrated that both attitudes (Kraus, 1995) and previous behavior (Ouellette & Wood, 1998) predict future behavior. However, it is interesting that participants anticipated engaging in similar behavior in the future even though those who confronted reported significantly higher levels of satisfaction. One explanation is that participants were able to resolve any discomfort or cognitive dissonance created by a discrepancy in attitudes and behavior by reporting that they would act similarly in the future. From a prejudice reduction point of view, this finding is important. If people anticipate acting in similar ways in the future, their current behavior holds implications beyond the consequences of the current situation. It may also have consequences for them and others (targets, other witnesses, and perpetrators) in the future.

### **Limitations and Future Directions**

There are a number of limitations to the generalizability of the results of the current study that should be considered. The sample consisted of college students who attended a private, Jesuit university. It is possible that the students who participated may have been more politically conservative or religious than samples of college students who

attended a public university. Furthermore, previous research suggests that college student samples may not be representative of populations of older adults or those who did not attend college (Arnett, 2000; Henry, 2008; Sidanius, Levin, van Laar & Sears, 2008). The current sample, while representative of students at this particular institution, were also less ethnically and racially diverse than the general population. The research assistants who served as the target, perpetrator and experimenter in the current study were primarily Caucasian, which does not account for how race and sexual orientation minority status could interact and impact results.

Additionally, the allied behavior scale used in the current study had a number of limitations. First, the items did not capture the full range of allied behaviors such as engaging in prejudice reduction training workshops, such as SafeZone, or classes that teach about prejudice. Although the LGASJC action subscale accounted for these types of allied behaviors, the allied behavior scale could have been improved by including them. It would be beneficial for future research to develop and test a scale including these and other allied behaviors, as there is no current allied behavior measure that encompasses a wide range of behaviors. Additionally, the personal relationships and involvement component (component 3) had a lower alpha than desired. Furthermore, the scale allowed for participants to fill in the blank with the number of times they engaged in the behavior. Because of this a few of the participants filled in the blank with words rather than numerical data. On six occasions, these responses were too ambiguous to be converted to numerical data (e.g., “too many to count” and “I don’t know”) and these variables were treated as missing data. Therefore the frequencies of behaviors may be slightly skewed in the direction of less engagement in allied behaviors.

Future research could expand on the current study by examining how race could impact confrontation of prejudice. Additionally, it would be interesting to manipulate the gender presentation of the target and perpetrator of prejudice and to vary the severity of the comment. Future studies could also prime egalitarian beliefs before conducting the manipulation or provide some education or training on the topic of confrontation to examine possible increases in confrontation behavior. Finally, it would be beneficial for researchers to examine differences in individuals who intend to confront prejudice and those who actually do. This research would likely yield important information that could be applied to prejudice reduction trainings to increase confrontation behavior.

### **Conclusions**

Sexual prejudice and heterosexism are prevalent (e.g., Adams et al., 2007; D'Augelli, 1992; Dickter, 2012; Herek, 1989; 2009) and hold negative psychological, emotional, social, and physical consequences for victims (e.g., Cowan & Mettrick, 2002; D'Augelli 1992; Garnets et al., 1990). One identified method of prejudice reduction is confrontation of the perpetrators (Monteith, 1993). Research suggests that confrontation by both targets of prejudice and bystanders reduces discriminatory behavior on behalf of the perpetrator and other witnesses in the future (Blanchard et al., 1994; Brinkman et al., 2011; Gervais et al., 2010; Kaiser & Miller, 2001; Rattan & Dweck, 2010). Heterosexual allies may be particularly successful in decreasing prejudice as their arguments are deemed as more credible (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Eagly et al., 1978; Petty et al., 2001), more persuasive (Rasinski & Czopp, 2010), and perpetrators may be more receptive when confronted by them when compared to targets (Gulker et al., 2013; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010).

The current study sought to examine heterosexual individuals' responses to witnessing heterosexist prejudice. Specifically, this study investigated 1) the role that gender of the target, perpetrator, and participant in the situation plays in reactions to heterosexist prejudice, 2) other factors, including attitudes regarding society, gender, and gay men and lesbian women, dispositional factors as well as previous engagement in allied behaviors and how they might predict confrontation, 3) whether attitudinal and behavior variables accounted for the effects of the gender of the target, perpetrator, and participant, and 4) participants' satisfaction with their responses and their anticipated future behavior in similar situations.

This study adds uniquely to the growing body of literature on the topic of confrontation of prejudice. While other studies have examined confrontation, most have used diary (e.g., Dickter, 2012; Hyers, 2007) and recall studies (e.g., Brinkman et al., 2015; Poteat et al., 2011). The experimental nature of the current study allowed for direct comparison of the gender of the target, perpetrator, and participant, and how they affected reactions to prejudice, while keeping other variables such as the environment, severity of the comment, and number of bystanders constant. To the author's knowledge, only one other study (i.e., LeMaire & Oswald, in press) has examined the way in which gender impacts confrontation. That study used an experimental design utilizing videos and measured anticipated responses and heavily influenced the current study, which examined actual responses with a live experimental design.

Overall, results suggest about 25% of the sample verbally confronted the perpetrator and 25% verbally agreed. The gender of the target, non-target witness (participant), and particularly the gender of the perpetrator appear to affect witnesses'

responses to prejudice, including confrontation. Additionally, both attitudinal variables, including attitudes toward gay men and personal support, and previous allied behaviors, including the LGASJC action subscale and personal relationships with gay and lesbian individuals, predicted confrontation. Even after accounting for significant attitudinal and behavior variables, the gender of the perpetrator still predicted confrontation.

Specifically, participants were significantly more likely to confront women rather than men. Importantly, individuals who confronted reported being more satisfied with their responses than those who did not and many individuals, including those who confronted, anticipated engaging in similar behavior as they did in the present study again in the future.

These results hold important implications about the way gender and sexual orientation prejudice may be related and how situational, attitudinal, and previous behavior variables impact responses to prejudice. It is hoped that results of the current study can inform individuals about how these variables may impact their responses to witnessing prejudice in the moment and empower them to examine their biases.

Furthermore, this information can be useful when developing programs and classes that aim to reduce prejudice and provide training for intervening when witnessing it. Along with other research, it is hoped that this study can help individuals to reshape the social climate and reduce sexual prejudice.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Although less examined in the confrontation literature, it is possible that if individuals who hold egalitarian attitudes do not confront prejudice when they witness it, they may resolve their cognitive dissonance by changing their attitudes instead of their behavior (Festinger, 1957; Rasinski, Geers, & Czopp, 2013).

<sup>2</sup>It is noteworthy that research assistants who played the role of the experimenter, perpetrator, and target sometimes knew the participants personally. Before the participants arrived, the research assistants examined the sign-up list and if one of them recognized a participant's name, that person took the role of the experimenter. If multiple people recognized the participant, the research assistants took the role of the target and experimenter and the participant was assigned to the control condition.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, M., Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (2007). *Teaching for diversity and social justice*. Routledge.
- Aldarondo, E. (2007). Rekindling the reformist spirit in the mental health professions. In E. Aldarondo (Ed.), *Advancing social justice through clinical practice* (pp. 3-18). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg, Ontario, Canada: University of Manitoba Press.
- Altemeyer, B. & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest, and prejudice. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 2, 113-133. doi:10.1207/s15327582ijpr0202\_5
- Altemeyer, B. & Hunsberger, B. (2009). A revised religious fundamentalism scale: The short and sweet of it. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 14(1), 47-54. doi:10.1207/s15327582ijpr1401\_4
- Appleby, G. A. (1995). AIDS and homophobia/heterosexism. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services*, 2, 1-23. doi:10.1300/J041v02n03\_01
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55, 469-480. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.469
- Ashburn-Nardo, L., Morris, K. A., & Goodwin, S. A. (2008). The confronting prejudiced responses (CPR) model: Applying CPR in organizations. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7(3), 332-342. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2008.34251671
- Asta, E. L. & Vacha-Hasse, T. (2012) Heterosexual ally development in counseling psychologists: Experiences, training, and advocacy. *Counseling Psychologists*, 41(4), 493-529. doi:10.1177/0011000012453174
- Ayres, M. M., Friedman, C. K., & Leaper, C. (2009). Individual and situational factors related to young women's likelihood of confronting sexism in their everyday lives. *Sex Roles*, 61(7-8), 449-460. doi:10.1007/s11199-009-9635-3
- Barnett, R. C. & Hyde, J. S. (2001). Women, men, work, and family. *American psychologist*, 56(10), 781. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.56.10.781
- Bassili, J. N. (2003). The minority slowness effect: subtle inhibitions in the expression of views not shared by others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(2), 261. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.84.2.261

- Bassili, J. N. & Provencal, A. (1988). Perceiving minorities: A factor-analytic approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *14*(1), 5-15. doi:10.1177/0146167288141001
- Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: Transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Blanchard, F. A., Crandall, C. S., Brigham, J. C., & Vaughn, L. A. (1994). Condemning and condoning racism: A social context approach to interracial settings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79*, 993-997. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.79.6.993
- Brinkman, B. G., Dean, A. M., Simpson, C. K., McGinley, M., & Rosén, L. A. (2015). Bystander intervention during college women's experiences of gender prejudice. *Sex Roles*, *72*, 485-498. doi:10.1007/s11199-015-0485-x
- Brinkman, B. G., Garcia, K., & Rickard, K. M. (2011). "What I wanted to do was..." Discrepancies between college women's desired and reported responses to gender prejudice. *Sex Roles*, *65*, 344-355. doi:10.1007/s11199-011-0020-7
- Broido, E. M. (2000). The development of social justice allies during college: A phenomenological investigation. *Journal of College Student Development*, *41*(1), 3-18. Retrieved from <http://charitycapstone.yolasite.com/resources/Broido2000.pdf>
- Cadieux, J. & Chasteen, A. L. (2015). You gay, bro? Social costs faced by male confronters of antigay prejudice. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, *2*, 436-446. doi:10.1037/sgd0000134
- Carlson, M. (2008). I'd rather go along and be considered a man: Masculinity and bystander intervention. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, *16*, 3-17. doi:10.3149/jms.1601.3
- Collier, K. L., Bos, H. M. W., & Sandfort, T. G. M. (2012). Intergroup contact, attitudes toward homosexuality, and the role of acceptance of gender non-conformity in young adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, *35*(4), 899-907. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2011.12.010
- Constantine, M. G., Hage, S. M., Kindaichi, M. M., & Bryant, R. M. (2007). Social justice and multicultural issues: Implications for the practice and training of counselors and counseling psychologists. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *85*(1), 24-29. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2007.tb00440.x
- Cowan, G., Heiple, B., Marquez, C., Khatchadourian, D., & McNevin, M. (2005). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward hate crimes and hate speech against gays and lesbians: Old-fashioned and modern heterosexism. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *49*(2), 67-82. doi:10.1300/J082v49n02\_04



- Cowan, G. & Hodge, C. (1996). Judgments of hate speech: The effects of target group, publicness, and behavioral responses of the target. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26*(4), 355-374. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1996.tb01854.x
- Cowan, G. & Mettrick, J. (2002). The effects of target variables and setting on perceptions of hate speech. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*(2), 277-299. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2002.tb00213.x
- Czopp, A. M. & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 532-544. doi:10.1177/0146167202250923
- Czopp, A. M., Monteith, M. J., & Mark, A. Y. (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 784-803. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.784
- D'Augelli, A. R. (1992). Lesbian and gay male undergraduates' experiences of harassment and fear on campus. *Journal of Interpersonal violence, 7*(3), 383-395. doi:10.1177/088626092007003007
- D'Augelli, A. R., & Grossman, A. H. (2001). Disclosure of sexual orientation, victimization, and mental health among lesbian, gay, and bisexual older adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*(10), 1008-1027. doi:10.1177/088626001016010003
- Dickter, C. L. (2012). Confronting hate: Heterosexuals' responses to anti-gay comments. *Journal of Homosexuality, 59*(8), 1113-1130. doi:10.1080/00918369.2012.712817
- Dickter, C. L., Kittel, J. A., & Gyurovski, I. I. (2012). Perceptions of non-target confronters in response to racist and heterosexist remarks. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 42*(1), 112-119. doi:10.1002/ejsp.855
- Dickter, C. L. & Newton, V. A. (2013). To confront or not to confront: Non-targets' evaluations and responses to racist comments. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 43*, E262- E275, doi:10.1111/jasp.12022
- Dillon, F. R., Worthington, R. L., Savoy, H. B., Rooney, S. C., Becker-Schutte, A., & Guerra, R. M. (2004) On becoming allies: A qualitative study of lesbian-, gay-, and bisexual-affirmative counselor training. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 43*, 162-178. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2004.tb01840.x
- DiStefano, T. M., Croteau, J. M., Anderson, M. Z., Kampa-Kokesch, S., & Bullard, M. A. (2000). Experiences of being heterosexual allies to lesbian, gay, and bisexual people: A qualitative exploration. *Journal of College Counseling, 3*(2), 131-141. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1882.2000.tb00173.x

- Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Chaiken, S. (1978). Causal inferences about communicators and their effect on opinion change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36(4), 424. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.36.4.424
- Eliezer, D. & Major, B. (2012). It's not your fault: The social costs of claiming discrimination on behalf of someone else. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 15(4), 487-502. doi:10.1177/1368430211432894
- Falomir-Pichastor, J. M., & Mugny, G. (2009). "I'm not gay.... I'm a real man!": Heterosexual men's gender self-esteem and sexual prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35, 1233-1243. doi:10.1177/0146167209338072
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G\*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41, 1149-1160. doi:10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149
- Fazio, R. H. & Hilden, L. E. (2001). Emotional reactions to a seemingly prejudiced response: The role of automatically activated racial attitudes and motivation to control prejudiced reactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 538-549. doi:10.1177/0146167201275003
- Feagin, J. R. & Sikes, M. P. (1994). *Living with racism: The black middle-class experience*. Beacon Press.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford University Press.
- Fingerhut, A. W. (2011). Straight allies: What predicts heterosexuals' alliance with the LGBT community? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41(9), 2230-2248. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00807.x
- Garnets, L., Herek, G. M., & Levy, B. (1990). Violence and victimization of lesbians and gay men: Mental health consequences. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5(3), 366-383. doi:10.1177/088626090005003010
- Gervais, S. J., Hillard, A. L., & Vescio, T. K. (2010). Confronting sexism: The role of relationship orientation and gender. *Sex roles*, 63(7-8), 463-474. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9838-7
- Getz, C. & Kirkley, E. A. (2003). Identity development models: One size fits all? Heterosexual identity development and the search for "allies" in higher education. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (84th, Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003). ED479168.

- Glick, P. & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiation hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 491-512. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S. T. (1999). The ambivalence toward men inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent beliefs about men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23, 519–536. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1999.tb00379.x
- Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., ... & Annetje, B. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 79(5), 763. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.763
- Glick, P., Lameiras, M., Fiske, S. T., Eckes, T., Masser, B., Volpato, C., ... & Wells, R. (2004). Bad but bold: Ambivalent attitudes toward men predict gender inequality in 16 nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(5), 713. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.86.5.713
- Goffman, E. (1959) *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday Anchor.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Goldstein, S. B. & Davis, D. S. (2010) Heterosexual allies: A descriptive profile. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 43(4), 478-494. doi:10.1080/10665684.2010.505464
- Gonsiorek, J. C. & Rudolph, J. R. (1991). Homosexual identity: Coming out and other developmental events. In J. C. Gonsiorek & J. R. Weinrich (Eds.), *Sexuality/research implications for public policy* (pp. 161–176). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gulker, J. E., Mark, A. Y., & Monteith, M. J. (2013). Confronting prejudice: The who, what, and why of confrontation effectiveness. *Social Influence*, 8(4), 280-293. doi:10.1080/15534510.2012.736879
- Haslett, B. B. & Lipman, S. (1997). Micro inequities: Up close and personal. In N. V. Benokraitis (Ed.), *Subtle sexism: Current practice and prospects for change* (pp. 34-53). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Henry, P. J. (2008). College sophomores in the laboratory redux: Influences of a narrow data base on social psychology's view of the nature of prejudice. *Psychological Inquiry*, 19, 49-71. doi:10.1080/10478400802049936

- Herek, G. M. (1986). On heterosexual masculinity: Some psychical consequences of the social construction of gender and sexuality. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 29, 563-577. doi:10.1177/000276486029005005
- Herek, G. M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 25(4), 451-477. doi:10.1080/00224498809551476
- Herek, G. M. (1989). Hate crimes against lesbians and gay men: Issues for research and policy. *American Psychologist*, 44(6), 948. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.44.6.948
- Herek, G. M. (2000). Sexual prejudice and gender: Do attitudes toward lesbians and gay men differ? *Journal of Social Issues*, 56(2), 251-266. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00164
- Herek, G. M. (2002). Gender gaps in public opinion about lesbians and gay men. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 66, 40-66. doi:10.1086/338409
- Herek, G. M. (2007). Confronting sexual stigma and prejudice: Theory and practice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63(4), 905-925. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2007.00544.x
- Herek, G. M. (2009). Hate crimes and stigma-related experiences among sexual minority adults in the United States prevalence estimates from a national probability sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(1), 54-74. doi:10.1177/0886260508316477
- Herek, G. M. & Capitanio, J. P. (1996). "Some of my best friends": Intergroup contact, concealable stigma, and heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(4), 412-424. doi:10.1177/0146167296224007
- Herek, G. M. & Capitanio, J. P. (1999). Sex differences in how heterosexuals think about lesbians and gay men: Evidence from survey context effects. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 36(4), 348-360. doi:10.1080/00224499909552007
- Herek, G. M., Cogan, J. C., & Gillis, R. J. (2002). Victim experiences in hate crimes based on sexual orientation. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58(2), 319-339. doi:10.1111/1540-4560.00263
- Herek, G. M., Gillis, J. R., & Cogan, J. C. (1999). Psychological sequelae of hate-crime victimization among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67(6), 945. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.67.6.945
- Herek, G. M., Gillis, J. R., Cogan, J. C., & Glunt, E. K. (1997). Hate crime victimization among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults prevalence, psychological correlates, and methodological issues. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12(2), 195-215. doi:10.1177/088626097012002003

- Herek, G. M. & Glunt, E. K. (1993). Interpersonal contact and heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men: Results from a national survey. *Journal of Sex Research, 30*(3), 239-244. doi:10.1080/00224499309551707
- Hyde, J. S. (2005). The gender similarities hypothesis. *American Psychologist, 60*(6), 581. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.60.6.581
- Hyers, L. L. (2007). Resisting prejudice every day: Exploring women's assertive responses to anti-black racism, anti-Semitism, heterosexism, and sexism. *Sex Roles, 56*, 1-12. doi:10.1007/s11199-006-9142-8
- Jellison, W. A., McConnell, A. R., & Gabriel, S. (2004). Implicit and explicit measures of sexual orientation attitudes: In group preferences and related behaviors and beliefs among gay and straight men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(5), 629-642. doi:10.1177/0146167203262076
- Jewell, L. M., McCutcheon, J. M., Harriman, R. L., Morrison, M. A. (2012). "It's like a bunch of mosquitoes coming at you..." Exploring the ubiquitous nature of subtle discrimination and its implications for the everyday experiences of LGB individuals. In T. G. Morrison, M. A. Morrison, M. A. Carrigan, D. T. McDermott (Eds.), *Sexual Minority Research in the New Millennium* (pp. 157-185). New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Johnson, A. (2001). *The gender knot: Unraveling our patriarchal legacy*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Kaiser, C. R. & Miller, C. T. (2001). Stop complaining! The social costs of making attributions to discrimination. *Society for Personality and Social Psychology, 47*(2), 254-263. doi:10.1177/0146167201272010
- Kawakami, K., Dunn, E., Karmali, F., & Dovidio, J. F. (2009). Mispredicting affective and behavioral responses to racism. *Science, 323*(5911), 276-278. doi:10.1126/science.1164951
- Kilianski, S. E. (2003). Explaining heterosexual men's attitudes toward women and gay men: The theory of exclusively masculine identity. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 4*, 37. doi:10.1037/1524-9220.4.1.37
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, L. (1993). Fundamentalism, Christian orthodoxy, and intrinsic religious orientation as predictors of discriminatory attitudes. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 32*, 256-268. doi:10.2307/1386664

- Kite, M. E. (1984). Sex difference in attitudes toward homosexuals: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *10*(1-2), 69-81. doi:10.1300/J082v10n01\_05
- Kite, M. E. & Whitley Jr., B. E. (1996). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexual persons, behaviors, and civil rights: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *22*(4), 336-353. doi:10.1177/0146167296224002
- Kite, M. E. & Whitley Jr., B. E. (1998). Do heterosexual women and men differ in their attitudes toward homosexuality? A conceptual and methodological analysis. In G. M. Herek (Ed.), *Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals* (pp. 39–61). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kizer, B. (2011). Construction of the Lesbian and Gay Affirming Social Justice Competency Scale. Retrieved from <https://mospace.umsystem.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10355/11362/KizerConLesGay.pdf;sequence=1>
- Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Diaz, E. M., & Bartkiewicz, M. J. (2010). *The 2009 national school climate survey*. New York: Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network.
- Kraus, S. J. (1995). Attitudes and the prediction of behavior: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, *21*(1), 58-75. doi:10.1177/0146167295211007
- Kroeper, K. M., Sanchez, D. T., & Himmelstein, M. S. (2014). Heterosexual men's confrontation of sexual prejudice: The role of precarious manhood. *Sex Roles*, *70*(1-2), 1-13. doi:10.1007/s11199-013-0306-z
- LeMaire, K. L. & Oswald, D. L. (in press). How gender affects heterosexual allies' intentions of confronting sexual prejudice. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*. doi:10.1037/sgd0000190
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (1984). *Gender roles and power*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Mallett, R. K. & Wagner, D. E. (2011). The unexpectedly positive consequences of confronting sexism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *47*, 215-220. doi:10.1016/j.jeso.2010.1Q001
- Martin, R., Hewstone, M., & Martin, P. Y. (2008). Majority versus minority influence: The role of message processing in determining resistance to counter-persuasion. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *38*(1), 16-34. doi:10.1002/ejsp.426
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, *50*(4), 370. doi:10.1037/h0054346

- McFarland, S. (1989). Religious orientation and the targets of discrimination. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 28, 324-336. doi:10.2307/1386743
- Montada, L., Schmitt, M., & Dalbert, C. (1986). Thinking about justice and dealing with one's own privileges: A study of existential guilt. In H.W. Bierhoff, R. L. Cohen, & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Justice in social relations* (pp.125-143). New York: Plenum Press.
- Monteith, M. J. (1993). Self-regulation of prejudiced responses: Implications for progress in prejudice-reduction efforts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(3), 469. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.65.3.469
- Monteith, M. J. (May 2, 2014) Midwestern Psychological Association annual convention, presidential address. Presentation conducted from Chicago, IL.
- Monteith, M. J., Mark, A. Y. & Ashburn-Nardo, L. (2010). The self-regulation of prejudice: Toward understanding its lived character. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 13(2), 183-200. doi:10.1177/1368430209353633
- Moscovici, S. (1980). Toward a theory of conversion behavior. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 13, 209-239. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60133-1
- Mugny, G., & Pérez, J. A. (1991). *The social psychology of minority influence*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nadal, K. L. (2013). *That's so gay! Microaggressions and the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Nadal, K. L., Issa, M., Leon, J., Meterko, V., Wideman, M., & Wong, Y. (2011). Sexual orientation microaggression: "Death by a thousand cuts" for lesbian, gay, bisexual youth. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 8, 234-259. doi:10.1080/19361653.2011.584204
- Nadal, K. L., Wong, Y. Issa, M., Meterko, V., Leon, J., & Wideman, M. (2011). Sexual orientation microaggressions: Processes and coping mechanisms for lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling*, 5, 21-46. doi:10.1080/15538605.2011.1.554606
- Neuberg, S. L., Smith, D. M., Hoffman, J. C., & Russell, F. J. (1994). When we observe stigmatized and "normal" individuals interacting: Stigma by association. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(2), 196-209. doi:10.1177/0146167294202007
- Nichols, A. L. & Maner, J. K. (2008). The good-subject effect: Investigating participant demand characteristics. *The Journal of general psychology*, 135(2), 151-166. doi:10.3200/GENP.135.2.151-166

- Ouellette, J. A. & Wood, W. (1998). Habit and intention in everyday life: the multiple processes by which past behavior predicts future behavior. *Psychological bulletin*, *124*(1), 54. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.124.1.54
- Pettigrew, T. F. & Tropp, L. R. (2006). Meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*(5), 751-783. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.
- Petty, R. E., Fleming, M. A., Priester, J. R., & Feinstein, A. H. (2001). Individual versus group interest violation: Surprise as a determinant of argument scrutiny and persuasion. *Social Cognition*, *19*(4), 418-442. doi:10.1521/soco.19.4.418.20758
- Pittinsky, T. L., Rosenthal, S. A., & Montoya, R. M. (2011)<sup>a</sup>. Liking is not the opposite of disliking: The functional separability of positive and negative attitudes toward minority groups. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *17*(2), 134-143. doi:10.1037/a0023806
- Pittinsky, T. L., Rosenthal, S. A., & Montoya, R. M. (2011)<sup>b</sup>. Measuring positive attitudes toward outgroups: Development and validation of the Allophilia Scale. In L. R. Tropp & R. K. Mallett (Eds.), *Moving beyond prejudice reduction: Pathways to positive intergroup relations* (pp. 41–60). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Plant, E. A. & Devine, P. G. (1998). Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*(3), 811. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.75.3.811
- Poteat, V. P., Kimmel, M. S., & Wilchins, R. (2011). The moderating effects of support for violence beliefs on masculine norms, aggression, and homophobic behavior during adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *21*, 434-447. doi:10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00682.x
- Poteat, V. P. & Vecho, O. (2015). Who intervenes against homophobic behavior? Attributes that distinguish active bystanders. *Journal of School Psychology*, *54*, 17-28. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2015.10.002
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*(4), 741-763. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741
- Rasinski, H. M. & Czopp, A. M. (2010). The effect of target status on witnesses' reactions to confrontations of bias. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *32*(1), 8-16. doi:10.1080/01973530903539754



- Rasinski, H. M., Geers, A. L., & Czopp, A. M. (2013). "I guess what he said wasn't that bad" Dissonance in nonconfronting targets of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 0146167213484769. doi:10.1177/0146167213484769
- Rathus, S. A. (1973). A 30-item schedule for assessing assertive behavior. *Behavior Therapy*, 4(3), 398-406. doi:10.1016/S0005-7894(73)80120-0
- Rattan, A. & Dweck, C. S. (2010). Who confronts prejudice? The role of implicit theories in the motivation to confront prejudice. *Psychological Science*, 21(7), 952-959. doi:10.1177/0956797610374740
- Rose, S. M. & Mechanic, M. B. (2002). Psychological distress, crime features, and help-seeking behaviors related to homophobic bias incidents. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 46(1), 14-26. doi:10.1177/0002764202046001003
- Russell, B., Kraus, S. W., Chapleau, K. M., & Oswald, D. (2016). Perceptions of blame in intimate partner violence: The role of the perpetrator's ability to arouse fear of injury in the victim. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Advance online publication. doi:0886260516646999
- Russell, G. M. (2011). Motives of heterosexual allies in collective action for equality. *Journal of Social Issues*, 67(2), 376-393. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01703.x
- Sellers, R. M., Rowley, S. A. J., Chavous, T. M., Shelton, J. N., & Smith, M. A., (1997). Multidimensional inventory of black identity: A preliminary investigation of reliability and construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(4), 805-815. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.73.4.805
- Shelton, J. N., Richeson, J. A., Salvatore, J., & Hill, D. M. (2006). Silence is not golden: The intrapersonal consequences of not confronting prejudice. In S. Levin & C. Van Laar (Eds.), *Social Stigma and Group Inequality: Social Psychological Perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Shelton, J. N. & Stewart, R. E. (2004). Confronting perpetrators of prejudice: The inhibitory effects of social costs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28(3), 215-223. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00138.x
- Sibley, C. G. & Duckitt, J. (2008). Personality and prejudice: A meta-analysis and theoretical review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12(3), 248-279. doi:10.1177/1088868308319226
- Sidanius, J., Levin, S., Van Laar, C., & Sears, D. O. (2008). *The diversity challenge: Social identity and intergroup relations on the college campus*. Russell Sage Foundation.

- Silverschanz, P., Cortina, L. M., Konik, J., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Slurs, snubs, and queer jokes: Incidence and impacts of heterosexist harassment in academia. *Sex Roles, 58*, 179-191. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9329-7
- Swim, J. K., Cohen, L. L., & Hyers, L. L. (1998). Experiencing everyday prejudice and discrimination. In Swim, J. K. & Stangor, C., *Prejudice: The Target's Perspective*, pp. 37-60. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Swim, J. K. & Hyers, L. L. (1999). Excuse me—What did you just say?!: Women's public and private responses to sexist remarks. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 35*(1), 68-88. doi:10.1006/jesp.1998.1370
- Sue, D. W. & Sue, D. (2013). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Taylor, C. & Peter, T. (2012). Left behind: Sexual and gender minority students in Canadian high schools in the new millennium. In T. G. Morrison, M. A. Morrison, M. A. Carrigan, D. T. McDermott (Eds.), *Sexual Minority Research in the New Millennium* (pp. 127-155). New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Tsang, J. A. & Rowatt, W. C. (2007). The relationship between religious orientation, right-wing authoritarianism, and implicit sexual prejudice. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 17*(2), 99-120. doi:10.1080/10508610701244122
- U. S. Department of Justice—Federal Bureau of Investigation (2013). *Hate crime statistics. Uniform Crime Report*. Retrieved from: [http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/hate-crime/2012/topic-pages/victims/victims\\_final.pdf](http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/hate-crime/2012/topic-pages/victims/victims_final.pdf)
- Van Hiel, A. & Mervielde, I. (2005). Authoritarianism and social dominance orientation: Relationships with various forms of racism. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35*(11), 2323-2344. doi:10.1111/j.15591816.2005.tb02105.x
- Vernaglia, E. R. (1999). Parents as straight allies: A qualitative study of the experiences of heterosexual parents in the gay rights movement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston College, Boston, MA.
- Walster, E., Aronson, V., Abrahams, D., & Rottman, L. (1966). Importance of physical attractiveness in dating behavior. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 4*(5), 508. doi:10.1037/h0021188
- Washington, J. & Evans, N. J. (1991). Becoming an ally. In N. J. Evans & V. A. Wall (Eds.), *Beyond tolerance: Gays, lesbians, and bisexuals on campus* (pp. 195–204). Alexandria, VA: American College Personnel Association.

Whitley Jr, B. E. (2001). Gender-role variables and attitudes toward homosexuality. *Sex Roles, 45*(11-12), 691-721. doi:10.1023/A:1015640318045

Woodford, M. R., Howell, M. L., Kulick, A., & Silverschanz, P. (2013). "That's so gay": Heterosexual male undergraduates and the perpetuation of sexual orientation microaggressions on campus. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28*(2), 416-435. doi:10.1177/0886260512454719

## Appendix A

### Verbal and Nonverbal Responses to Comment

Coders will check all of the behaviors and verbal responses that apply.

#### **Nonverbal Responses**

##### Nonverbal Agreement

1. Nod head in agreement
2. Laugh
3. Smile
4. Thumbs up/high five/clap (agreement with hands)
5. Other nonverbal agreement

##### Nonverbal Disagreement

6. Roll eyes
7. Dirty look/look of disagreement
8. Shake head in disagreement
9. Slammed hands down (disagreement with hands)
10. Other nonverbal disagreement

##### Other Responses

11. Distracted
12. Shrug

#### **Verbal Responses**

##### Verbal Agreement

1. Continued negative conversation about target
2. Said they agreed

3. Other Agreement comment

Confrontation/Verbal Disagreement

4. Said they disagreed
5. Asked to stop making similar comments/said "its not ok to say that"
6. Drew attention to prejudicial nature of comment
7. Other Disagreement comment

Other Verbal Responses/Codes

8. Neutral Question (ex: What do you mean?/why do you think that?)
9. Neutral Statement
10. Changed the subject
11. Said nothing
12. Used sarcasm

<b>CALICO CAT LIVE STUDY CODING</b>			
<b>Participant ID:</b>		<b>Participant gender:</b> male or female	
<b>Experimenter:</b> male or female		<b>Perpetrator:</b> male or female	
<b>Time between target exit and experimenter enter:</b> _____ seconds			
<b>Perpetrator comments:</b>  “Did you see that girl (guy) who just walked in? Well, she’s a lesbian (gay). I saw her (him) outside with her girlfriend (his boyfriend). Seriously, it’s disgusting. Two girls (guys) should not be together!”  Place an X here if perfect:		<b>Verbatim transcription of participant’s comments:</b>	
<b><u>Non-verbal Responses:</u></b> Check all that apply		<b><u>Verbal Responses:</u></b> Check all that apply	
1) Nod head in agreement		11) Continued negative conversation about target	
2) Laugh		12) Said they agreed	
3) Smile		13) Other Agreement comment (Specify)	
4) Thumbs up/high five/clap (agreement with hands)		14) Said they disagreed	
5) Other non-verbal agreement (Specify)		15) Asked to stop making similar comments	
6) Roll eyes		16) Said “its not ok to say that”	
7) Dirty look/Look of disagreement		17) Other Disagreement comment (Specify)	
8) Shake head in disagreement		18) Neutral Question (ex: What do you mean?/why do you think that?)	
9) Slammed hands down (disagreement with hands)		19) Neutral Statement	
10) Other non-verbal disagreement (Specify)		20) Changed the subject	
23) Distracted		21) Said nothing	
24) Shrug		22) Used sarcasm	
<b>****PLEASE USE THE BACK OF THIS FORM FOR NOTES IF NECESSARY****</b>			

## Appendix B

## Perpetrator Evaluation

Please answer the following questions about your partner for the puzzle task using a scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*).

1. How much did you like your partner?
2. How much do you approve of your partner?
3. How likely is it that you would be friends with your partner in the future?
4. How likely is it that you would avoid your partner in the future?
5. How friendly was your partner?
6. How aggressive was your partner?
7. How sexist did you feel your partner was?\*

\*Note: This item was presented at the end of the survey after the participant was made aware of the fact that the researchers knew the heterosexist comment was made.

## Appendix C

## Allied Behavior Scale

1. How many times in the past 2 years have you attended a Gay Pride event?
2. How many times in the past 2 years have you attended a Gay-Straight Alliance (or a similar group) meeting?
3. How many times in the past 2 years have you made a monetary donation to a gay and lesbian charity group?
4. How many times in the past 2 years have you donated your time to a gay and lesbian charity group?
5. How many times in the past 2 years have you promoted gay and lesbian rights supportive clubs or events?
6. How many times in the past 2 years have you attended political rallies in support of gay marriage, civil unions, same-sex rights, or another sexual minority cause?
7. How many times in the past 2 years have you called/emailed/mailed letters to politicians in support of gay and lesbian rights?
8. How many times in the past 2 years have you signed petitions in support of gay and lesbian rights?
9. How many times in the past 2 years have you wore pins or posted bumper stickers on your personal property in support of gay and lesbian rights?
10. How many times in the past 2 years have you voted in support of gay and lesbian rights?
11. How many clubs or groups that are supportive of gay and lesbian rights (i.e., Gay-Straight Alliance) are you a part of?



12. How many gay or lesbian family members do you have?
13. How many gay or lesbian friends do you have?

## Appendix D

## Ally Identity Centrality

Please indicate on scale of 1-7 how much you agree or disagree with the following statements (1= strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree).

1. Overall being a straight ally has very little to do with how I feel about myself.
2. In general, being a straight ally is an important part of my self-image.
3. Being a straight ally is unimportant to my sense of what kind of person I am.
4. Being a straight ally is an important reflection of who I am.

## Appendix E

### Responses to Heterosexist Comments

Before the puzzle task began, your partner made some comments about a person that came into the room. Please answer the following questions about what your partner said before you began the puzzle task on a scale of 1-7 (1 = not at all, 7 = very much).

1. How distressing were those comments?
2. How funny did you feel the comments were?
3. How appropriate did you feel the comments were?
4. How much do you agree with what was said?
5. How offensive did you feel the comments were?
6. How satisfied are you with your response to what was said?
7. Have you heard similar comments made by others on campus before?

## Appendix F

## Anticipated Future Responses

Please respond to the following questions using a scale from 1-7 (1= not at all likely, 7=extremely likely). In the future if you witnessed someone making similar comments, how likely would you be to...

1. How likely would you be to tell the person that you agree?
2. How likely would you be to not your head in agreement?
3. How likely would you be to laugh/smile?
4. How likely would you be to roll your eyes/give a look of disapproval?
5. How likely would you be to tell the person that you disagree?
6. How likely would you be to ask the person to stop making similar comments?
7. How likely would you be to change the subject?
8. How likely would you be to say nothing?
9. How likely would you be to walk away?
10. How likely would you be to say something neutral?
11. How likely would you be to ask them why they felt that way?