

2015

Pre-Service Teacher Candidates' Knowledge and Attitudes of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual People

<https://doi.org/10.33015/dominican.edu/2015.edu.14>

Casey M. Halcro
Dominican University of California

Survey: Let us know how this paper benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Halcro, Casey M., "Pre-Service Teacher Candidates' Knowledge and Attitudes of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual People" (2015). *Graduate Master's Theses, Capstones, and Culminating Projects*. 274.
<https://doi.org/10.33015/dominican.edu/2015.edu.14>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at Dominican Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Master's Theses, Capstones, and Culminating Projects by an authorized administrator of Dominican Scholar. For more information, please contact michael.pujals@dominican.edu.

Pre-Service Teacher Candidates' Knowledge and Attitudes of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual People

Casey M. Halcro

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science in Education

School of Education and Counseling Psychology

Dominican University of California

San Rafael, CA

May 2015

Signature Sheet

This thesis, written under the direction of the candidate's thesis advisors and approved by the Chair of the Master's program, has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty of Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science. The content and research methodologies presented in this work represent the work of the candidate alone.

Casey Halcro
Candidate

June 1, 2015
Date

Suresh Appavoo, Ed.D
Thesis Advisor

June 1, 2015
Date

Elizabeth Truesdell, Ph.D.
Program Chair

June 1, 2015
Date

Copyright 2015 by Casey Halcro.

All rights reserved.

Acknowledgments

William A Ward once said, “The mediocre teacher tells. The good teacher explains. The superior teacher demonstrates. The great teacher inspires.” During the course of the past four months, Dr. Suresh Appavoo and Dr. Madalienne Peters inspired me to find my own voice in scholarly research with their time, patience, understanding, and ever steady wisdom. They not only inspired me to find my love of learning again but also helped me find self-confidence around my abilities and skills in researching, writing, analyzing, and thinking. The process of writing this thesis has been both incredibly enthralling as well as extraordinarily frustrating. Dr. Appavoo and Dr. Peters both helped me reign in the frustration for further illumination of the exciting. My thesis would not be what it became without everything that Dr. Appavoo and Dr. Peters gifted to me throughout the past four months and I am grateful and changed, forever. Thank you Suresh and Madalienne, you have both been my light and lifeline through this process.

Being a Montana native, my heart is often drawn to the long, drawling twang of a good country song and the artist, Kenny Chesney, never seems to fail to meet my needs. Throughout the process of this thesis, the words to one of his songs became an ever-present and steady beat in my days. “I didn’t get here alone, ain’t traveled one mile on my own. The road’s just too rough and long. I might be the one the spotlight’s on. But, I didn’t get here alone.” From family to friends to colleagues and my dog, I didn’t get here alone. I’m grateful for all who have played a role in any success I may have achieved.

As long as I can remember, my mother has always pushed me to excel in my academics. Even at times when school was not in session due to holidays, summer, or teacher strikes, my mom would push me to learn as much as I could at home. Without her consistency, pushing, and

support, I do not know that I would be as excited about education as I am. I am grateful for the gift she gave me in this, thank you, Mom.

I would be remiss to not also mention my Grandpa Pat, my Grandma Marie, my Uncle Kevin, and both of my sisters, Erin and Leesa, who have consistently supported my educational journey and me over the years. I am so lucky to come from these people. They have helped and continue to help shape who I am and who I am becoming.

I must thank my friends who have been so amazing and good to me through this process. Thank you to Jo and Lori, who invited me for family dinners and gave me a safe place to always return to when needed. Thank you to Annelise, Tess, Taylor, Alana, Kora, Airen, Cristin, Christopher, Matthew, Evan, Melba, Megan, Kate, Elli, Teri, Russ, Andy, Courtney, and Blue for allowing me to give you a home in my heart.

Thank you to Patch, my best friend (befry), my brother from another mother, my secret keeper, and my North Star. Befry, without you, I would never have found my way through, out, and into reaching for something better. You've been my best partner, my sanity, and my Galileo. I love you with my whole heart and am ever grateful for the presence you play in every part of my life. Thank you to your wife, Jolene, and kids, Oakley, Fischer, and Darwin who are my other family, my other home, and a place to always know I belong.

Lastly, but most certainly not least, I cannot forget to acknowledge my number one man, Scouty Coco Marie Halcro. He is a four-legged wonder, a master snuggle bug, and always available to give me kisses on the nose. Much of this paper has been written along side my black and tan puppy pal, whether he has been lounged next to me while I type or he nudges my hand for some pets rather than allowing me to type. Thank you, Scouty Coco, for the steady and unwavering love and the lessons, always, in how unconditional looks.

Table of Contents

Title Page.....	1
Signature Sheet.....	2
Acknowledgments	4
Table of Contents	6
Abstract.....	9
Chapter 1 Introduction	10
BACKGROUND AND NEED	13
SCHOOL CLIMATE	13
INCIDENCE OF SUICIDE AND BULLYING	13
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	14
STATEMENT OF PURPOSE	15
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	16
THEORETICAL RATIONALE.....	16
SUMMARY	21
Chapter 2 Review of the Literature.....	22
INTRODUCTION	22
HISTORICAL CONTEXT	22
REVIEW OF THE ACADEMIC RESEARCH:.....	24
HETERONORMATIVITY	25
HETERO-PRIVILEGE.....	27
HETERO-OPPRESSION	28
INTERSECTIONS OF HETERONORMATIVITY, PRIVILEGE, AND OPRESSION.....	31

PRE-SERVICE TEACHER KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES	7
SUMMARY	36
Chapter 3 Method	37
RESEARCH APPROACH	37
SAMPLE AND SITE	37
ETHICAL STANDARDS, ACCESS AND PERMISSIONS	40
DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES	41
INSTRUMENTATION	42
DATA ANALYSIS APPROACH.....	44
Chapter 4 Findings	45
TABLE 2: RESPONSES TO ATTITUDE SPECIFIC ITEMS BY PERCENTAGES WITH MEANS	46
TABLE 3: RESPONSES TO KNOWLEDGE SPECIFIC ITEMS BY PERCENTAGES WITH MEANS.....	46
TABLE 4: MEANS FOR FIVE FACTORS BY GENDER	49
TABLE 5: MEANS FOR FIVE FACTORS BY RACE.....	50
TABLE 6: MEANS FOR KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES OF PARTICIPANTS	51
ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS.....	52
SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS.....	55
Chapter 5 Conclusions and Recommendations.....	56
CONCLUSIONS.....	56
COMPARISON OF FINDINGS TO THE LITERATURE.....	57
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	57
IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	60
OVERALL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	60
ABOUT THE AUTHOR	62

PRE-SERVICE TEACHER KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES	8
References	63
APPENDIX A.....	68
APPENDIX B.....	69
APPENDIX C.....	72
APPENDIX D.....	73
APPENDIX E.....	74
APPENDIX F	75

Abstract

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) mandates teachers to provide equitable access to the core curriculum by maximizing academic achievement for all students, including those who are lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB), (Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2014). Without the knowledge, support, and acceptance of their teachers, LGB youth will experience multiple challenges during their K-12 educational careers. Scholarly literature reveals that the understanding and abilities of pre-service teachers to create safe spaces for LGB youth needs to be developed if pre-service teachers are eventually to become allies for LGB youth (Kearns, Mitton-Kukner, & Tompkins, 2014). Pre-service teacher education bears the responsibility of equipping potential educators with the knowledge, awareness, and competencies to address the educational inequities of both access and success for diverse populations (Wyatt, Oswald, White, & Peterson, 2008). The following quantitative study surveyed a sample of the pre-service teacher population in California to examine their knowledge of, and attitudes toward LGB people. The results indicated that the attitudes of pre-service teacher candidates toward LGB people were not significantly different from the general population, showing that pre-service teachers do tend to hold personal biases which may affect their interaction with LGB students. Additionally, the results from this study also indicated that the knowledge of pre-service teacher candidates regarding LGB people is limited, and suggest that there may be opportunities for improvement.

Chapter 1 Introduction

In June 2015, the Supreme Court of the United States will decide whether or not same sex marriage should be legalized nation-wide. The citizens of the United States are also on the verge of what may become another historic election year with the possibility of a woman President amidst burgeoning socio-political struggles with issues of race, class, ideology, and the opportunity for structural and systemic change at a time like no other.

Within this national context, the experiences of young people of color, particularly at the hands of law enforcement, have received substantial media coverage. The intersections and the inter-relationships between education, opportunity, and the criminalization of youth have once again become part of a national conversation. The demographics of California make this prescient, and particularly significant, since education has long been perceived as the single most effective interlocutor between life and death for youth of color.

The diversity of California public school classrooms contextualize this educational future in compelling terms. The California Department of Education reports that Hispanic or Latino students of any race account for 53.25% of the student population, 0.62% of the students are American Indian or Alaskan Native, 8.70% are Asian, 0.53% are Pacific Islander, 2.43% are Filipino, 6.16% are African American, and 25% are White (California Department of Education Educational Demographics Unit, 2015, para. 1).

One aspect of this diverse population that has not attracted much attention (given the national context and the legal decisions before the Supreme Court), are the population of students who are lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB). According to Johnson (2015, para. 1), “the most widely accepted statistic is that one in every ten individuals is lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT); however some research estimates this population as being one in twenty.”

Given these statistics, it is important to examine the data on the violence experienced by this specific population within the system of education. For example, “74.1% of LGBT students were verbally harassed (e.g., called names or threatened) in the past year because of their sexual orientation and 36.2% were physically harassed (e.g., pushed or shoved) in the past year because of their sexual orientation” (Kosciw, Greytak, Palmer, & Boesen, 2014 pp. xvi-xvii).

Additionally, “LGB youth are four times more likely, and questioning youth are three times more likely to attempt suicide as their straight peers” (The Trevor Project, 2015, para. 2).

California’s population of students are predominantly in public school classrooms staffed by teachers credentialed by the State’s Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). Many of these credentialed teachers graduate from teacher preparation programs that are governed by a set of mandated standards established by the CTC. A review of the CTC standards that pertain to the requisite preparation that pre-service teachers are expected to receive indicates that:

Candidates provide all students equitable access to the core curriculum and all aspects of the school community. The program provides opportunities for candidates to learn how to maximize academic achievement for students from all ethnic, race, socio-economic, cultural, academic, and linguistic or family backgrounds; gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation; students with disabilities and advanced learners; and students with a combination of special instructional needs.

Candidates are prepared to effectively teach diverse students by increasing candidates’ knowledge and understanding of the background experiences, home languages, skills and abilities of student populations; and by teaching them to apply appropriate pedagogical practices informed by sound theory and research that provide access to the core curriculum and lead to high achievement for all students.

Candidates study and discuss the historical and cultural traditions of the cultural and ethnic groups in California society, and examine effective ways to include cultural traditions and community values and resources in the instructional program of a classroom.

Candidates develop the ability to recognize and eliminate bias in order to create an equitable classroom community that contributes to the physical, social, emotional, and intellectual safety of all students. The program includes a series of planned experiences in which candidates learn to identify, analyze, and minimize personal and institutional bias. (Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2014, pp. 30-31).

These standards suggest that credentialed California teachers bear a direct responsibility for the safety and well-being of all students in public school classrooms and the State's current demographics dictate that the majority of the students in such classrooms need educational spaces that assure safety and inclusive conditions for learning and achievement. It can therefore be argued that the knowledge and attitudes of credentialed teachers have a direct impact on the educational experience of students who are among the most endangered of the youth population.

While the behavior of credentialed teachers under contract is subject to employer supervised scrutiny; the knowledge, attitudes, and behavior of pre-service teachers are perhaps under the purview of the educational institutions they attend. Given the data on the experiences of LGB students in public school systems, and the signs of an increasingly accepting public ethos about LGB people, it is important to inquire into the knowledge and attitudes of pre-service teachers to ascertain if indeed they reflect and/or exceed those of the general "more" liberal population of California; especially considering they will soon be entrusted to educate all

students in their classrooms including LGB identified students who often may not be as visible or feel as safe, even in the most diverse of settings.

Background and Need

The problems facing the LGB student population in the United States (U.S.) have received increasing attention in recent decades. Kitchen and Bellini (2012) asserted, “school climate should be getting better for all students. Yet homophobia and homophobic bullying remain persistent issues in most schools” (p. 445). Kitchen and Bellini (2012) also report that “LGBTQ issues, however, are seldom addressed in initial teacher education or ongoing professional development” (p. 445). This reality suggests that something imperative to the safety and equity of LGB students is still missing.

Factors such as school climate, incidences of harassment and bullying, an increasingly diverse student population, and the inarguable need for better pre-service teacher credential candidate preparation aim at providing equitable access to education for all students, including those who are lesbian, gay, and bisexual, are all themes seen a myriad of times in the literature.

School climate. In 2013 The Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN) conducted a National School Climate Survey on the school experiences of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) youth in schools and their findings are sobering.

Below is a bulleted list of GLSEN’s findings by Kosciw, Gretyak, Palmer, and Boesen (2014):

- 55.5% of LGBT students felt unsafe at school because of their sexual orientation
- 37.8% felt unsafe at school because of their gender expression
- 30.3% of LGBT students missed at least one entire day of school in the past month because they felt unsafe or uncomfortable

- Over a tenth (10.6%) missed four or more days in the past month because they felt unsafe or uncomfortable
- 71.4% of LGBT students heard “gay” used in a negative way (e.g., “that’s so gay”) • frequently or often at school
- 90.8% reported that they felt distressed because of negative language (e.g., “that’s so gay”)
- 64.5% heard other homophobic remarks (e.g., “dyke” or “faggot”) frequently or often
- 51.4% of students reported hearing homophobic remarks from their teachers or other school staff
- 74.1% of LGBT students were verbally harassed (e.g., called names or threatened) in the past year because of their sexual orientation and 55.2% because of their gender expression
- 36.2% were physically harassed (e.g., pushed or shoved) in the past year because of their sexual orientation and 22.7% because of their gender expression
- 16.5% were physically assaulted (e.g., punched, kicked, injured with a weapon) in the past year because of their sexual orientation and 11.4% because of their gender expression
- 49.0% of LGBT students experienced electronic harassment in the past year (e.g., via text messages or postings on Facebook), often known as cyberbullying
- 56.7% of LGBT students who were harassed or assaulted in school did not report the incident to school staff, most commonly because they doubted that effective intervention would occur or the situation could become worse if reported

- 61.6% of the students who did report an incident said that school staff did nothing in response (p. 11-12).

Incidence of suicide and bullying. The Trevor Project reported facts about suicide and Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual (LGB) youth that are difficult but important to read (The Trevor Project, 2015). LGB youth are four times more likely, and questioning youth are three times more likely, to attempt suicide as compared to their straight peers. Suicide attempts by LGB youth and questioning youth are four to six times more likely to result in injury, poisoning, or overdose that requires treatment from a doctor or nurse, compared to their straight peers. Each episode of LGB victimization, such as physical or verbal harassment or abuse, increases the likelihood of self-harming behavior by 2.5 times on average.

Statement of the Problem

California has specific standards geared toward teaching all students, including those from LGB backgrounds, thus it is imperative for teachers to be prepared to teach these students. There is a significant body of research exploring pre-service teacher candidates and their preparation to work with students from many ethnically and racially diverse backgrounds. However there is a dearth of research geared toward examining the knowledge and attitudes pre-service teacher candidates have in regard to LGB people. Mathison, as cited in Wyatt, Oswald, White, and Peterson (2008) states that, “Few [pre-service teacher preparation programs] have confronted issues dealing with sexual minorities” (p. 171). It has continued to hold true in the past decade that there is a void of research specific to teacher credential candidates working with LGB students. Zacko-Smith and Smith (2010) pose important questions that problematize this space in the literature. “Are educators completely prepared to embrace the new ways that people

are relating to each other, and are they prepared to deal effectively with the issues that arise from a necessary and life-enriching full embrace of diversity?” (p. 2). Studies regarding the knowledge and attitudes of pre-service teacher candidates of LGB people are sparse. This study attempts to partially fill this “gap”.

Statement of Purpose

Existent research suggests that both the attitudes toward and knowledge of LGB people inform the teaching efficacy and equity orientations of teacher credential candidates or their lack thereof. Nespor (as cited in Murray, 2011), proposes that “Dispositions have a stronger affective and evaluative component than knowledge, and often operate independent of cognition. Thus regardless of teacher awareness or intent, personal dispositions can significantly influence classroom behavior and practice” (pp. 41-42). Murray, in her study, observes, “Interestingly, Sears research reports that the more knowledge pre-service teachers have about homosexuality, the less likely they are to harbor negative dispositions towards queer people” (p. 44). What is apparent from the existent research literature is that the knowledge of, and attitudes toward LGB people can be significant indicators of the dispositions of pre-service teacher candidates. Thus, the purpose of this study is to survey and examine the knowledge and attitudes of pre-service teacher candidates toward LGB people.

Research Questions

This study specifically inquires into the following three questions:

- What knowledge and attitudes do pre-service teacher candidates have about lesbian, gay, and bisexual people?

- Does the gender of pre-service teacher candidates affect their knowledge of, and attitudes toward lesbian, gay, and bisexual people?
- Does the race of pre-service teacher candidates affect their knowledge of, and attitudes toward lesbian, gay, and bisexual people?

Theoretical Rationale

A review of the existing academic literature regarding the attitudes and knowledge of pre-service teacher candidates toward LGB people revealed four main theoretical directions that are relevant to this study. Multicultural education, Culturally Responsive Pedagogy, Queer theory, and Intersectionality theory emerged as the foundations upon which this study is based. Each of these four main theoretical approaches is conceptualized as follows:

Multicultural education, according to Ladson-Billings (1994), is education wherein “the regular curriculum includes a range of cultural perspectives” (p. 23). Multicultural education is important to consider with regard to pre-service teacher candidates’ attitudes about, and knowledge of LGB students because of the range of cultural identities that K-12 students bring into California schools and classrooms. As Ladson-Billings (1994) goes on to say, “How teachers think about education and students makes a pronounced difference in student performance and achievement” (p. 22).

Multicultural education is an overarching practice that helps to assess and, if necessary, reframe instruction to ensure that students with diverse needs are given equitable opportunities. It is important that pre-service teacher candidates are prepared to offer equity based strategies for their increasingly diverse classrooms because “educators need processes in place that allow their learning communities to positively harness diversity to promote learning” (Cara, 2011, p. 143).

Several theorists have argued that for multicultural education to be effective, it must move beyond merely addressing the presence of plurality toward a more critical understanding of social and structural educational constructs. Goggins II and Dowcett (2011), make this point by observing that “Basic multicultural education courses do not go into the depth of specific populations [which is] required to truly gain an understanding of issues related to power, privilege, a professional practices” (p. 18). In order for educators to gain the knowledge and understanding of the diverse populations with whom they work, it is helpful to consider multicultural education theory along with culturally responsive pedagogy.

Culturally responsive pedagogy, as defined by Gay (2000) is “the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them” (p. 29). Miller and Mikulec (2014) suggest that “many of our pre-service teachers do not enter into our programs with shared values and beliefs about diversity and cultural responsiveness” (p. 19). Gay (2002) asserts, “The knowledge that teachers need to have about cultural diversity goes beyond mere awareness of, respect for, and general recognition of the fact that ethnic groups have different values or express similar values in various ways” (p. 107). Culturally responsive pedagogies, as theorized in the existing research literature, consistently links cultural differences together with ethnic differences, however, until recently, culturally responsive pedagogies did not fully consider sexual orientation, and the sexually different, as cultural populations that were distinctive. As culturally responsive pedagogical theory has evolved, it has become more inclusive in this regard, however ‘Queer theory’ provides a direct theoretical conception that also informs the rationale for this study.

“Queer theory challenges either/or, essentialist notions of homosexuality and heterosexuality within the mainstream discourse and instead posits an understanding of sexuality that emphasizes shifting boundaries, ambivalences, and cultural constructions that change depending on historical and cultural context” (Goldberg, 2007, para. 1). Simply put, queer theory comes from the need to re-contextualize queerness as normal, worthy, and natural in the same ways that heterosexuality has been seen as normal, worthy, and natural. Historically, queerness has been considered different, abnormal, and even perverse. Queer theory posits that a reframing of the ‘normal’ to include those who are queer is not only warranted, but necessary. “Queer Theory asserts that sexual “identity [is] neither fixed nor unitary, but multiple and shifting” (Kissen as cited in Zacko-Smith & Smith, 2010, p. 6). Building on the theoretical foundations of multicultural education, and culturally responsive pedagogy, queer theory provides another relevant basis for this study because students (and teachers) in the classroom may be queer themselves, and or, have peers or family members who are.

Theoretically, any claims about educating a diverse population must include queer identity within its context and practice for it to be considered fully inclusive. It therefore follows that the queer theory derives from both multicultural education and culturally responsive pedagogy in that they all share core conceptual and theoretical frames that address individual and structural differences in multiple ways. Murray (2011) affirms that “If prospective teachers are given the opportunity to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to better support queer youth and to challenge all students to think more critically, then K-12 schools can be transformed into more open, accepting institutions” (p. 2).

Intersectionality theory proposes a conceptualization of difference that represents multiple axes or identities such as race, gender, sexuality, ability, ethnicity, etc. Intersectionality

provides a more complex theoretical construct in that it enables a consideration of how multiple axes/identities intersect individually, and structurally. As Crenshaw and Harris (2009) explain,

Intersectionality is a concept that enables us to recognize the fact that perceived group membership can make people vulnerable to various forms of bias, yet because we are simultaneously members of many groups, our complex identities can shape the specific way we each experience that bias. For example, men and women can often experience racism differently, just as women of different races can experience sexism differently, and so on. As a result, an intersectional approach goes beyond conventional analysis in order to focus our attention on injuries that we otherwise might not recognize (p. 3).

The experiences of students may not only be impacted by their sexual orientation but also by other simultaneous identities. For instance, a student who is both a lesbian and a female may experience the world differently than a student who is gay and male. Likewise it follows that a student who is bisexual, female, of color, and living with a disability experiences the world very differently than a student who is gay, male, and white. The necessity for using intersectionality theory as a core foundation for this study is made more obvious due to the undeniable fact that students, (and all people) encompass multiple and simultaneous identities. While it can be said that students who are LGB share a commonality of experience, due to their sexual orientation, and therefore a specific lens through which they see the world, this does not mean that all students who are LGB have monolithic, essentialized experiences. Thus, “Intersectionality not only provides a tool to render certain exclusions more visible, it also points in the direction of a reframed approach to social justice politics. Intersectionality is thus, a critical lens for bringing

awareness and capacity to the social justice industry in order to expand and deepen its interventions” (Crenshaw & Harris, 2009, p. 5).

These four theories provide a rigorous, collective rationale when intersected, rather than when positioned additively. For the purposes of this study, they provide a theoretical framework that enables an intersectional examination of the knowledge and attitudes that potential educators have about LGB people.

Assumptions

This study assumed that the anonymity of an online survey would enable a higher response rate from the sample. The study also assumed that the responses of the participants regarding the knowledge and attitudes about LGB people are subject to change over time. Lastly the study assumed that the self-awareness of the participants would increase as a natural by-product of their participation in the survey.

Definitions of Key Terms and Concepts Used

- Normative: refers to white, male, heterosexual, educated, able, and middle to upper class people.
- Non-normative: refers to a person who exists outside of the normative group.
- Underserved: refers to populations whose needs are ignored or forgotten because they are part of the non-normative community.
- Heteronormativity: refers to heterosexuality being seen as the normal and correct way in which to experience sexual desire.
- Queer: refers to a person whose sexual orientation is not straight.

- Queerness: refers to the ways in which a queer person orients in their lived experiences.
- Lesbian: refers to a female identified person who is physically and emotionally attracted to other female identified people.
- Bisexual: refers to female and male identified people who are physically and emotionally attracted to both female and male identified people.
- Gay: refers to a male identified person who is physically and emotionally attracted to other male identified people.
- Transgender: refers to people whose gender identity differs from their biologically assigned sex.
- Questioning: refers to people who are actively questioning their physical and emotional attraction to other people of the same or differing genders.
- LGB: is an acronym for lesbian, gay, and bisexual.
- LGBTQ: is an acronym for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer/questioning.
- Patriarchal: refers to the idea of a male-identified person holding status and power over female-identified people.
- Sexual minority: refers to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer sexual orientations.

Summary

This study examines the knowledge and attitudes of pre-service teacher candidates toward people who identify as lesbian, gay, and bisexual. There is a gap in the existing research regarding the attitudes and knowledge of teacher credential candidates toward lesbian, gay, and bisexual people. Four core theories are used in this study as the foundational basis for inquiry: multicultural education, culturally responsive pedagogy, queer theory, and intersectionality.

Chapter 2 Review of the Literature

Introduction

The review of literature for this study is organized into the following categories: historical context, review of the academic research, and summary. Scholarship relevant to the research questions for the study was gathered from academic library searches using online resources using the Iceberg database and ebooks. Additionally, print material from selected books and articles were sourced from the university library. Key search terms used included pre-service teachers, LGB, lesbian, gay, bisexual, attitudes, knowledge, and teacher preparedness.

Historical Context

The literature on societal attitudes toward lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) people over the last century reveals an extensive record of negative perceptions about LGB people that is shaped primarily by heteronormativity, hetero-privilege, and hetero-oppression. “From a historical perspective, our society has not only classified homosexuality as an “abnormality,” it classified it as a mental illness up until 1973” (Zacko-Smith & Smith, 2010, p. 7). Societal attitudes toward LGB people position them as ‘outsiders’ and ‘others’, and as those who are abnormally different from the heteronormative majority of society. Such pervasive negative attitudes not only shape the oppression experienced by LGB people but also mirrors some of the very same attitudes that marginalized groups have endured historically in the U.S.

In the late 1960s, when the Stonewall Riots occurred in New York City, gay rights activists started a movement toward equal rights for sexual minorities. “The event [was] largely regarded as a catalyst for the LGBT movement for civil rights in the United States. The riots inspired LGBT people throughout the country to organize in support of gay rights, and within

two years after the riots, gay rights groups had been started in nearly every major city in the United States” (The Leadership Conference, 2015, para. 1). The historical record shows that since the late 1960s, people from the LGBTQ community have fought for equality in housing, employment, marriage, and education. As a result of this sustained struggle for equal rights, both knowledge about and attitudes toward LGB people are becoming more positive. Such changing attitudes are enabling today’s educators, and have placed them in a unique position to provide equitable access to education and aid in minimizing the oppression faced by their LGB students. “One way that educators, and administrators in educational contexts can start processes that will help their students and peers redefine their understandings of sexuality, sexual orientation, and gender is by bringing the oppression that results from labeling and “categorization” to the forefront of daily classroom and school dialogue” (Zacko-Smith & Smith, 2010, p. 8). As Kearns, Mitton-Kukner, & Tompkins (2014), quoting Reis & Saewyc, (1999); Kosciw, Greytak, Diaz, & Bartkiewicz, (2010) note, “Homophobia and transphobia, locally and globally, contribute to the LGBTQ students experiencing high levels of feeling stressed and being unsafe at school” (p. 5).

Throughout history, educational systems have not only reflected societal norms, but also have served as a primary means for the cultural socialization of the younger generations. As such, schools can be described as microcosms of the society they inhabit, and therefore reflect the prevailing knowledge, values, and attitudes of that society. “Schools like other social institutions and society, can be oppressive. Oppression and domination are premised on the exclusion of others; LGBTQ youth are often marginalized, which impinges their self-expression and full participation in school” (Kearns, Mitton-Kukner, & Tompkins, 2014, p. 4).

1973 was historically significant for LGB people due to a significant change in how the intersection of homosexuality and mental health was perceived. “In 1973, the weight of empirical data, coupled with changing social norms and the development of a politically active gay community in the United States, led the Board of Directors of the American Psychiatric Association to remove *homosexuality* from the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM)” (Herek, 2012, para. 29). While important, this historic decision did not mean that LGB people were suddenly free from oppression. In the late 1970s, “gays and lesbians posed a threat to the traditional view of the nuclear family with its inscribed gender roles and patriarchal hierarchy” (Minton, 2002, p. 266). This perceived threat toward heterosexual families and heteronormativity created incredible amounts of backlash toward LGB people from a majority of the population.

The 1980s introduced the nation and the world to the incurable diseases, HIV and AIDS. These diseases were seen as something that only largely impacted the gay male population. “Lesbian and gay politics was also reshaped by the impact of the AIDS epidemic, starting in the early 1980s” (Minton, 2002, p. 266). During the 1980s and the 1990s, gay and lesbian politics were focused on fighting anti-gay ideologies as well as literally fighting to save the lives of those in the community who were impacted by the HIV and AIDS epidemic.

In the 1990s, a new anti-gay movement was born: gay conversion therapy. Both the National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality (NARTH) and Exodus International worked diligently to convince the American public that homosexual people could be converted, through therapy, to a heterosexual lifestyle. However, “there is no scientific evidence that sexual orientation can be changed and, as psychologist Douglas C. Haldeman points out, it is ethically irresponsible to promote such programs that reinforce the stigma of

homosexuality” (Minton, 2002, p. 269). Essentially, the concept of gay conversion therapy was to force LGB people to assimilate to a normative, heterosexual life because this was seen as the ‘right’ way to exist. After the Stonewall Riots, lesbian and gay people came together to work toward liberation from the normative center of heterosexuality. “Compared to the pre-Stonewall era, a much more visible, and diverse gay and lesbian community was available as a resource for self-acceptance” (Minton, 2002, p. 269).

Review of the Academic Research

Generally, pre-service teacher candidates enter teacher preparation programs with prior attitudes and knowledge about people from various cultural contexts, including those who are lesbian, gay, and bisexual. Specifically in California, teacher preparation programs are mandated to provide pre-service teacher candidates with the necessary skills and competencies to work with diverse populations of students. Murray observes that “A major challenge of teacher preparation programs is to develop in future teachers the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that will enable them to work more effectively with students from diverse social and cultural backgrounds” (Murray, 2011, p. 29).

In reviewing the current academic literature regarding the knowledge and attitudes of pre-service teacher candidates’ about LGB people, three systemic, and intersecting themes are present: heteronormativity, hetero-privilege, and hetero-oppression, emerged as the primary bases for how LGB students experience inequity in educational settings. “In addition to political and ideological motives for withholding queer issues in education, researchers demonstrated that school personnel and educators lack the awareness, sensitivity, knowledge, and skills appropriate for meeting the needs of queer youth” (Murray, 2011, p. 23). In addition to a general lack of

knowledge, awareness, sensitivity, and skills, research suggests that oppression and discrimination are learned behaviors. As such, these behaviors can also be unlearned and new, more inclusive and embracing behaviors can be learned. “Since prejudice against lesbians, bisexuals, and gays, along with the belief in the superiority of heterosexuality are learned attitudes and cultural constructions, teacher education lies at the head of combating homophobia and heterosexism” (Bedford, 2002, p. 134). LGB students experience heterocentricity in most aspects of their lives, including their school communities. “Heterosexist and gender-specific ideologies surface in kindergarten when students learn the standardized equation for what constitutes a family and when they survey social and gender norms from daily curricula and pedagogy” (DePalma & Atkinson, 2009, p. 21).

The research is clear that “many pre-service teachers enter classrooms with limited awareness of how marginalized youth experience school” (Murray, 2011, p. 28). However, there is still much opportunity to create more inclusion of LGB students in the school and classroom communities. “Although the body of literature exploring queer-inclusion in teacher education is in its infancy, there is growing evidence for its efficacy in preparing pre-service teachers to meet the needs of queer students and families” (Murray, 2011, p. 34). A closer examination of the three themes: heteronormativity, hetero-privilege, and hetero-oppression; from both systemic and intersecting points of view that emerged from the literature is below.

Heteronormativity. One of the realities of 21st century learners is that they come from diverse walks of life. In the U.S., White students account for roughly 50% of the student population, 15% are Black students, 26% are Hispanic students, 5% are Asian/Pacific Islander, and 1% are American Indian/Alaskan Native (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). In California, this diversity is even more pronounced, Hispanic or Latino students of any race

account for 53.25% of the student population, 0.62% of the students are American Indian or Alaskan Native, 8.70% are Asian, 0.53% are Pacific Islander, 2.43% are Filipino, 6.16% are African American, and 25% are White (California Department of Education Educational Demographics Unit, 2015, para. 1).

There is inconsistent and unreliable data regarding the percentage of US teachers who identify as LGB but it is widely accepted that this percentage of the population is significantly smaller than the percentage of straight identified educators. As of 2011, 84% of U.S. teachers were reported to be female and 84% are reported to be white (Feistritz, 2011). Per the literature, the majority of the population of teachers in the U.S. can be described as a normative and homogenous group, and stands in stark contrast to the student population, a very heterogeneous group as the demographics cited above indicate.

“Positive approaches to anti-homophobia recognize that heterosexism is systemic and equity is needed not only for youth but also for all LGBTQ community members, including employees and parents. Changes in curriculum, policy, hiring, and school-community relationships are integral” (Kearns, Mitton-Kukner, & Tompkins, 2014, p. 6). It is important to recognize the inherent heteronormativity of educational systems because the very system in which students spend their days is inequitable. “Schools spaces are heteronormative, which is why a spectrum of sexual expression is hard to discuss in class (Kearns, Mitton-Kukner, & Tompkins, 2014, p. 20).

In this inherently inequitable system, interrupting the actualized inequities and oppressions continues to be difficult. “Certainly, challenging heteronormativity is no easy task, as schools are shaped by a culture and history of homophobia” (Bellini, 2012). While difficult, it is imperative, to counteract the heteronormativity in educational settings. As Murray (2011)

points out, “Education does not occur in a vacuum and prospective teachers should be prepared to encounter and orient to the complex ways gender and sexuality influence the social and academic schooling experience” (pp. 1-2). Both attitudes and knowledge regarding LGB individuals impact future educators’ ability to create classroom settings wherein students are allowed to critically think about sexuality and dismantle the ongoing hetero-norming of students. As Zacko-Smith and Smith (2010) state, “Our schools are at least partially responsible for cementing societal norms and for defining what is considered normal” (p. 3).

Hetero-privilege. The classroom becomes a home away from home for students. They spend a considerable amount of time in their classrooms and educational institutions daily. Considering this reality, educators have the unique privilege of offering students an opportunity to grow, expand, learn, and think critically beyond what may be taught in their communities, families, cultures, and society. “Greater awareness and training are essential parts of efforts to systemically challenge heterosexual privilege and address homophobic harassment and gender violence in school spaces (Adams, Cox, & Dunstan, 2004; Chaub, Laub, & Wall, 2004; Kitchen & Bellini, 2012; Walton, 2004 as cited by Kearns, Mitton-Kukner, & Tompkins, 2014, p. 6).

With more positive attitudes and better knowledge, educators can help students recognize that everyone, regardless of sexual orientation, ought to be afforded the same rights for receiving an equitable education without fear of oppression in the form of bullying and harassment. Educators have the distinct privilege to move beyond simply tolerating students who are sexual minorities and toward authentic inclusion instead. “While awareness and recognition are important, a discourse of tolerance depoliticizes heterosexual privilege and conflates queer issues with private matters of sexuality” (Kearns, Mitton-Kukner, & Tompkins, 2014, p. 6). When educators continue to use their hetero-privilege that permits homophobic slurs, comments, and

remarks to go unnoticed, they are reinforcing oppression toward LGB students rather than using their privilege to interrupt it. “As a matter of social justice, which is based on the concepts of human rights and equality, it is important to consider how homophobia benefits some people in society while causing others to suffer” (Murray, 2011, p. 1).

Pre-service teacher candidates are well served by anti-oppressive pedagogy with regard to LGB students. Kumashiro (2002) concurs that anti-oppressive pedagogy needs to do more than simply fill the heads of pre-service teachers with knowledge about LGBTQ lives and realities; it must interrupt heterosexism (p. 19). It is significant to note from the literature that mindful reflection on the part of both credentialed educators and pre-service teacher candidates can help interrupt the possibility of LGB students falling victim to the individual and structural hetero-privileges that play out in classrooms.

Hetero-oppression. As noted above, the mere presence of heteronormativity and even unintentional exercises of hetero-privilege results in harassment and bullying toward LGB students and remains prevalent in California schools. “Harassment and bullying based on sexual orientation remains persistent in schools in California despite an anti-harassment law that took effect in 2000” (Zacko-Smith & Smith, 2010, p. 4). The harassment and bullying that LGB students are often subjected to due to their sexual orientation is thought to be part of the larger context of ongoing hetero-oppressive conditions that exist in society. “Educators can make a positive difference, but only if they take the initiative to address the problem” (Kitchen & Bellini, 2012, p. 445).

Depending on their attitudes and knowledge of LGB people, educators have the opportunity to interrupt this oppression by challenging the heteronormativity that is rampant in schools.

Queering moments and queering pedagogical practices may be categorized by the recognition of interlocking forms of oppression that are constantly shifting and changing, and practices that challenge heteronormativity. The ability to interrupt overt incidents of homophobia and transphobia in classrooms and hallways is a key starting point in anti-oppressive pedagogy” (Kearns, Mitton-Kukner, & Tompkins, 2014, p. 16).

The research literature is rife with the importance of interrupting hetero-oppression and homophobic incidents in order to create a safe environment for LGB students in schools. “A failure to acknowledge queer issues and interrupt heterosexism in early grades can perpetuate the homophobia witnessed in middle and high school” (Murray, 2011, p. 26). Educators, both those who are credentialed, and pre-service teacher candidates are not only particularly well located, but also have a responsible opportunity to create an equitable playing field for LGB students among their straight peers. “When homophobia is tolerated in schools, it not only has immediate and negative effects, but we see those effects ripple outward, contaminating the whole school, community and the larger society” (Zacko-Smith & Smith, 2010, p. 4).

Intersections of heteronormativity, privilege, and oppression. A significant part of the research literature presents heteronormativity, hetero-privilege, and hetero-oppression typically as additive propositions or jeopardies. However, the scholarship on intersectionality has provided a more complete construct wherein these intersect as a system of oppression faced by LGB people. As Katz (2007) points out, “The heterosexual belief, with its metaphysical claim to eternity, has a particular, pivotal place in the social universe of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries that it did not inhabit earlier” (p. 69). This points not only to oppression faced by LGB people individually, but also to the beginnings of systemic oppression felt by LGB people that dates back to late nineteenth century.

Since this time, sex and sexuality has been positioned in a privileged and oppressive context. “Analysts of sex, gay and straight, have continued to privilege the “normal” and “natural” at the expense of the “abnormal” and “unnatural.” Such privileging of the norm accedes to its domination, protecting it from questions” (Katz, 2007, p. 69). Within this structure, hetero-normativity is created and heterosexuality as a normative behavior is privileged at the center of the larger social structure. Thus, anyone who behaves in a homosexual manner is seen as deviant from the hetero-normative center. This both others and oppresses homosexuality in a social context and normalizes the oppression of LGB people because they are seen as deviant.

Many groups whose experiences have been vital in the formation of American society and culture have been silenced in the construction of knowledge about this society. The result is that “what we know – about the experiences of both these silenced groups and the dominant culture – is distorted and incomplete” (Rothenberg, 2014, p. 11). This partiality of knowledge, however, is not the problem. The societal structures that insist this partial knowledge is actually complete knowledge creates the silencing and oppression faced by marginalized groups like LGB people. As Kumashiro (2002), stated, “ironically, our efforts to challenge one form of oppression often unintentionally contribute to other forms of oppression, and our efforts to embrace one form of difference often exclude and silence others” (p. 1). This suggests an intersecting context for hetero-privilege, hetero-normativity, and hetero-oppression. It is therefore useful for scholars and educators to analyze information as a whole, rather than partially.

Heterosexuality placed as the normative center in our society, coupled with the partiality of knowledge that exists, creates hetero-privilege. When accompanied by legal power and societal customs these translate into certain normative rights for heterosexual people that

privilege them differently from LGB people. Such an intersection of the partiality of knowledge, heteronormativity, and hetero-privilege has resulted in unjust and inequitable laws, policies, and shaped attitudes about LGB people. “Having misleading and incorrect knowledge gives us a poor social analysis and leads to the formation of bad social policy – policy that reproduces, rather than solves, social problems” (Rothenberg, 2014, p. 13).

The intersecting categories of privilege (in the context of this study, hetero-privilege) and normativity (in the context of this study, heteronormativity) can lead to further oppression (in the context of this study, hetero-oppression). “Oppression and domination are premised on the exclusion of others; LGBTQ youth are often marginalized which impinges their self-expression and full participation in school” (Kearns, Mitton-Kukner, & Tompkins, 2014, p. 4). Some scholars and educators are confronting the intersections of individual and systemic norms, privileges, and oppressions. One way that these intersections are being identified is through increased knowledge. “Exclusionary thinking is increasingly being challenged by scholars and teachers who want to include the diversity of human experience in the construction and transmission of knowledge” (Rothenberg, 2014, p. 13).

As Kearns, Mitton-Kukner, and Tompkins (2014) found in their research, knowledge is necessary to change attitudes. “Knowledge is not just about content and information; it provides an orientation to the world” (Rothenberg, 2014, p. 13). Additionally, Wyatt, Oswalt, White, & Peterson (2008) assert that “teacher preparation is needed on all sexuality issues, particularly issues specific to homosexuality and sexual minority students to better ensure a greater appreciation for the challenges that lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth face” (p. 181).

While knowledge is instrumental in eliminating bias and creating the possibility of change in a society permeated by heteronormativity, hetero-privilege, and hetero-oppression,

attitudes are also imperative in order to further education and knowledge transmission. As (Rothenberg, 2014) points out, “Resisting systems of oppression means revising the ideas about ourselves and others that have been created as part of a system of social control” (p. 17). Further, “Teacher reports about learning to advocate for equity included a theme that was not specific to pedagogy but related to developing knowledge and dispositions about cultural diversity that could *inform* their practice” (Athanases & Martin, 2006, p. 635).

Heteronormativity, hetero-privilege, and hetero-oppression not only intersect each other, but also other axes like race, class, and gender. Race, class, and gender affect all students, those who are LGB and those who identify in other ways. It is noteworthy that such intersecting oppressions are more obviously exemplified by LGB populations who are more visibly identifiable on the basis of race. Pre-service teacher candidates are asked to learn the skills necessary to “provide all students equitable access to the core curriculum and all aspects of the school community” (Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2014, standard 9, para. 2), and as such, it is important to consider race, class, and gender as well as sexual orientation. “Studying diversity is not simply a matter of learning about other people’s cultures, values, and ways of being; it involves discovering how race, class, and gender – along with factors like age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and religion – frame people’s lives” (Rothenberg, 2014, pp. 2-3).

Groups who have previously been marginalized, including people of color, gays, lesbians, the aged, and immigrants are now in some ways more visible. While a wider continuum of diversity is becoming more commonly recognized, many of these same groups continue to bear the mark of the “other”; that is, they are still perceived through the lens of normative dominant group values, and therefore treated in exclusionary ways, and subjected to social

injustice and economic inequality. Rothenberg (2014) illustrates this issue, observing that “Moreover, dominant ways of thinking remain centered in the experiences of a few” (p. 1).

Summary

Many factors impact the lived experiences of LGB students: school climate, bullying and harassment, and increasingly diverse classrooms. Educators are responsible for providing equitable access to core curriculum to maximize academic achievement for all students, including those who are from lesbian, gay, bisexual and other diverse backgrounds. In order to provide equitable access and maximize achievement, educators must consider the whole student, which includes their sexual orientation. A review of the existing academic research documents numerous studies that have found the knowledge and attitudes of credentialed teachers, and in a few cases pre-service teachers, mirror those of the larger society as a whole. The review also identifies heteronormativity, privilege, and oppression as systemic and intersecting processes that affect the lived experiences of LGB people in the U.S.

Chapter 3 Method

Research Approach

The methodology for this study used a quantitative, descriptive, non-experimental approach, which included the use of a reliable, validated survey instrument. Quantitative methodology is defined by Aliaga & Gunderson (2000) as “Explaining phenomena by collecting numerical data that are analysed using mathematically based methods (in particular statistics)” (p. 3). Wyatt, Oswald, White, and Peterson (2008), Herek (1994), and Negy and Eisenman (2005) are other studies that have used validated survey instrumentation employing the same methodological research design. In other pre and post studies sourcing sample populations in the professions, validated survey instrumentation was used to gain a better understanding of the knowledge and attitudes held by people in professions such as education, psychotherapy, medicine etc. The survey used in this study was selected because it “provides increasing precision of range and dimensionality [of knowledge and attitudes regarding LGB individuals]” and because it is a “psychometrically sound instrument [used] to measure them [knowledge and attitudes]” (Worthington & Dillon, 2005, p. 104).

Sample and Site

This study selected a sample of pre-service teacher candidates because the review of the academic literature indicated a gap in the research focused on the knowledge and attitudes of this specific population. Multiple studies sampling attitudes and or knowledge of credentialed teacher and other professional populations, such as psychosocial and business professionals, exist in the literature. Groggins and Ryan (2013) focused their study on diversity in the global business community and found that “diversity rhetoric and initiatives do not necessarily lead to positive

climates” (p. 265). Their study points to a need not only for a diverse community, but also for an effective plan regarding how to achieve a truly embracing diverse community. Psychotherapists and counselors struggle to find efficacy regarding their diverse community as well. Graham, Carney, and Kluck (2012) found that “many counselors may not be adequately prepared to meet the specific needs of this [LGB] population. The limits in preparation may include little training and ill-defined competencies” (p. 4). In educational settings, students continue to both enact and experience oppression based on the actual and perceived differences that are found in diverse learning communities as well. As such oppression persists and reflects the larger macro context of society, educators continue to struggle with how to address these problems.

Teachers are perceived to not intervene when victims [of oppression] are LGBTQ/GN [lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, gender non-conforming] and attributed this lack of intervention to teachers’ (a) lack of knowledge about how to intervene, (b) normalizing the victimization behaviors, (c) believing the victimization experience is a means of learning resiliency and self-confidence, and (d) acting out their own aggressive feelings toward certain minority groups. (Perez, Schanding, & Dao, 2013, p. 68).

The scholarly literature reveals that educational settings, business settings, professional settings, and therapeutic settings encounter difficulties in providing LGB people the necessary equity to allow this specific population to thrive. While the psychology, business, and current educator communities have been researched in myriad ways regarding attitudes and knowledge about LGB people, there is a scarcity of research about pre-service teacher candidates regarding their attitudes and knowledge of LGB people.

The sample for this study included seventy-seven pre-service teacher candidates currently enrolled in a teacher preparation program at a small, private university in Northern California.

This university has approximately 2,000 students that make up its undergraduate and graduate student body, a ten-to-one student-faculty ratio, and costs over \$40,000 annually to attend full-time. This study attempted to learn about the knowledge and attitudes of pre-service teacher candidates toward LGB people. Table 1 below, profiles the sample for this study with relevant demographic information:

Table 1.

Sample and Site

Sample Size	77
Total Number of Participants (N)	54
Response Rate	70%
Male Participants	17%
Female Participants	83%
Asian Indian	2%
Chinese	2%
Filipino	2%
White and of Hispanic or Latina/o Origin	2%
White and not of Hispanic or Latina/o Origin	78%
White and of Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano Origin	9%
Do not want to disclose race and not of Hispanic or Latina/o	4%
Do not want to disclose race and of Hispanic or Latina/o Origin	2%
Do not want to disclose race and of Mexican, Mexican American,	2%

Ethical Standards, Access and Permissions

This paper adheres to the ethical standards for protection of human subjects of the American Psychological Association (2010). Additionally, a research proposal was submitted and reviewed by the Dominican University of California Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS), approved and assigned number 10346. A copy of the approval is included in *Appendix E*.

Written consent and permission from the author of the survey instrument used in this study was requested, received, and documented (See *Appendix A*). Written permission was sought and granted, by the Acting Dean of The School of Education and Counseling Psychology to solicit participants during regularly scheduled class sessions on-campus for this study (See *Appendix C*). Additionally, each individual instructor from in-session, pre-service teacher preparation classes was contacted to receive permission to solicit participants from their respective classrooms. Permission to solicit participants was received from ten instructors verbally or via e-mail.

The researcher for this study visited classrooms to request volunteers, provided a brief outline of the study, and obtained written consent via a signed consent form from each participant (see *Appendix D*). All participants were advised of the non-paid, voluntary nature and anonymity of their participation. All protocols detailed in the approved IRB application and research proposal were strictly adhered to in maintaining participant anonymity and confidentiality.

Data Collection Procedures

The researcher visited ten in-session teacher preparation classes during the Spring 2015 semester to solicit participants for the study. Potential participants were provided with three

options: 1) to sign the consent form and return it to the researcher immediately, 2) email a scan of the signed consent form to the researcher, or 3) mail the signed consent form to the researcher using an addressed, stamped envelope provided for this purpose. Upon receipt of the consent forms, the researcher maintained an email list in a password-protected file on a personal computer. No one other than the researcher had access to the computer or any password protected files. The survey instrument entitled Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Knowledge and Attitudes Scale (Dillon & Worthington, 2013) was uploaded using 'Google polls' which masks all incoming and outgoing identity information including IP addresses. Each participant received an e-mail link for anonymous access to the survey. The survey contained 28 Likert scale items and can be completed in 15-20 minutes. Aggregated, raw, response data were tabulated into an Excel spreadsheet generated by 'Google polls' for further analysis. Per the anonymous protocols maintained by 'Google polls', the raw, response data included in the spreadsheet does not include any identifying information from the participants.

Instrumentation

The Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Knowledge and Attitudes Scale (LGB-KAS) was developed by Frank Dillon and Roger Worthington to "measure attitudes and knowledge levels regarding LGB individuals" (Fisher, Davis, Yarber, & Davis, 2013, p. 407). The LGB-KAS scale consists of 28 items designed to collect responses regarding attitudes and knowledge about LGB people and their issues. The creators of the scale identified five distinct factors found in the 28 questions. All 28 items operate on a six-point Likert scale ranging from 'very characteristic' coded with a value of 6, to 'very uncharacteristic' coded with a value of 1. Dillon and

Worthington did not specify what 2, 3, 4, or 5 meant on their likert scale. For the purposes of this study, the researcher understood the following regarding each number of the likert scale:

- 1 – very uncharacteristic
- 2 – uncharacteristic
- 3 – slightly uncharacteristic
- 4 – slightly characteristic
- 5 – characteristic
- 6 – very characteristic

Of the 28 items on the scale, knowledge was examined through items 1, 5, 10, 16, and 20 and attitudes were examined through items 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28.

Dillon and Worthington's explanation of the five factors by the LGB-KAS is below:

(a) Internalized Affirmativeness: a willingness to engage in proactive social activism for LGB issues and internalized sense of comfort with same-sex attractions, (b) Civil Rights Attitudes: beliefs about the civil rights of LGB individuals with respect to marriage, child rearing, healthcare, and insurance benefits, (c) Knowledge: basic knowledge about the history, symbols, and organizations related to the LGB community, (d) Religious Conflict: conflictual beliefs and ambivalent homonegativity with respect to LGB individuals, often of a religious nature, and (e) Hate: attitudes about avoidance, self-consciousness, hatred, and violence toward LGB individuals. (Fisher, Davis, Yarber, & Davis, 2013, p. 407).

Questions 1, 5, 10, 16, and 20 pertain to the knowledge factor and were clustered as such into one category. The remaining 23 items consisting of four factors, namely hate, civil rights, religious conflict, and internalized affirmativeness pertain to attitudes and were collectively clustered into a second category. Items 4, 8, 9, 14, 18, and 24 all pertain to hate. Items 11, 23, 25, 27, and 28 pertain to civil rights. Items 2, 3, 7, 12, 13, 22, and 26 pertain to religious conflict. Items 5, 15, 17, 19, and 21 pertain to internalized affirmativeness. The possible responses range from ‘very characteristic’ on one end, and ‘very uncharacteristic’ on the other end of the scale. The LGB-KAS scale was developed and validated through four studies (Worthington, Dillon, & Becker-Schutte, 2005). The instrument “has evidenced adequate internal consistency (Cronbach’s $\alpha > .70$) in past studies” (Worthington, Dillon, & Becker-Schutte, 2005). Test-retest reliability estimates indicated LGB-KAS subscale scores as “highly stable over a 2-week time period” (Fisher, Davis, Yarber, & Davis, 2013, p. 408).

Data Analysis Approach

Raw data from the Excel spreadsheet generated by ‘Google polls’ were imported into Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) software to calculate percentages, means, standard deviations, and analyzed, then tabulated and graphically represented. The data were organized into six tables as follows:

- Table 1: Full Results of LGB-KAS Survey
- Table 2: Responses to Attitude specific Items by percentage with Means
- Table 3: Responses to Knowledge specific Items by percentage with Means
- Table 4: Means for Five Factors by Gender
- Table 5: Means for Five Factors by Race

- Table 6: Means for Knowledge and Attitudes of participants

Chapter 4 Findings

The participant data were examined and the frequencies and means are reported in Table 1: Full Results of the LGB-KAS scale (*Appendix F*). The mean score, incorporating all 28 items regarding both attitudes and knowledge of LGB people, for the 54 out of 77 participants was 3.03 (SD = 1.74). The participants of this study indicated that their combined attitudes and knowledge were midrange on the likert scale, which is to say the participants' attitudes and knowledge about LGB people were neither highly characteristic nor highly uncharacteristic. Consistent with the research literature, these midrange results can be perceived as problematic because there has been "a gradual trend over the past 25 years toward increasingly more positive attitudes among the general population, [but] there has also been a corresponding increase in highly publicized violence" (Lacayo, 1998, as cited by Worthington, Dillon, & Becker-Schutte, 2005, p. 104).

Table 2 presents the response means for each item on the survey related to the 'attitude' items. Additionally, an aggregate mean for all 23 items related to 'attitude' and the standard deviation were calculated. The aggregate mean of the data related to 'attitude' was 3.10 and the standard deviation was 1.90. These findings indicate that survey participants, again were midrange on the likert scale, which is to say when all of survey items pertinent to attitude were aggregated, participants were somewhere between slightly characteristic and slightly uncharacteristic. The participants of the study held neither positive nor negative attitudes toward LGB people when all attitude questions were aggregated. The results do indicate that the participants considered themselves to be slightly closer to very characteristic than very uncharacteristic regarding their attitudes about LGB people. Scholarly research has questioned

Feeling attracted to another person of the same sex would not make me uncomfortable.	7.4%	11.1%	9.3%	18.5%	9.3%	44.4%	4.4
I would display a symbol of gay pride (pink triangle, rainbow, etc.) to show my support of the LBG community.	5.6%	7.4%	9.3%	7.4%	22.2%	48.1%	4.8
I would feel self-conscious greeting a known LGB person in a public place.	94.4%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	1.1
I have had sexual fantasies about members of my same sex.	37.0%	18.5%	11.1%	13.0%	7.4%	13.0%	2.7
I would attend a demonstration to promote LGB civil rights.	7.4%	5.6%	13.0%	20.4%	18.5%	35.2%	4.4
I try not to let my negative beliefs about LGB people harm my relationships with the lesbian, gay, or bisexual individuals I know.	57.4%	7.4%	3.7%	3.7%	7.4%	20.4%	2.6
Hospitals should acknowledge same sex partners equally to any other next of kin.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	94.4%	5.6
LGB people deserve the hatred they receive.	96.3%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	1.1
It is important to teach children positive attitudes toward LGB people.	0.0%	1.9%	3.7%	0.0%	7.4%	87.0%	5.7
I conceal my positive attitudes toward LGB people when I am with someone who is homophobic.	55.6%	16.7%	9.3%	11.1%	7.4%	0.0%	2
Health benefits should be available equally to same sex partners as to any other couple.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	98.1%	6
It is wrong for courts to make child custody decisions based on a parent's sexual orientation.	3.7%	0.0%	1.9%	5.6%	3.7%	85.2%	5.6

Table 3 presents the response means for each item on the survey related to the ‘knowledge’ items. Additionally an aggregate mean for all five items related to ‘knowledge’ and standard deviation were calculated. The aggregate mean of the data related to ‘knowledge’ was 2.84 and the standard deviation was 0.75.

Table 3.

Responses to Knowledge specific Items by percentage with Means

KNOWLEDGE ITEMS	1 N %	2 N %	3 N %	4 N %	5 N %	6 N %	Mean
I feel qualified to educate others about how to be affirmative regarding LGB issues.	1.9%	9.3%	16.7%	46.3%	13.0%	13.0%	4
I could educate others about the history and symbolism behind the "pink triangle."	29.6%	18.5%	20.4%	11.1%	14.8%	5.6%	2.8
I am knowledgeable about the significance of the Stonewall Riot to the Gay Liberation Movement.	29.6%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	11.1%	9.3%	3
I am familiar with the work of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.	37.0%	24.1%	16.7%	11.1%	3.7%	7.4%	2.4
I am knowledgeable about the history and mission of the PFLAG organization.	57.4%	11.1%	18.5%	7.4%	1.9%	3.7%	2

These findings indicate that the responses of the participants from this study vary inversely from the ‘knowledge’ related patterns found from similar studies in the research literature. Rather than resembling the patterns of increasing knowledge correlated to the increasing visibility of LGB people in mainstream media, this survey’s participant data related to ‘knowledge’ produced a mean that centered around the more uncharacteristic position on the scale when the responses specific only to the ‘knowledge’ items were aggregated. Data from other studies that sampled the general population have found that “as LGB individuals become

more visible in the mainstream of United States culture, heterosexuals' knowledge of LGB history, symbols, and community are likely to evidence corresponding increases" (Worthington, Dillon, & Becker-Schutte, 2005, p. 104).

Table 4 presents the mean for the five factors (hate, knowledge, civil rights, religious conflict, and internalized affirmativeness) of the LGB-KAS scale disaggregated by gender.

Table 4.

Means for Five Factors by Gender

GENDER	Hate	Knowledge	Civil Rights	Religious Conflict	Internalized Affirmativeness	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Valid N
Female	1.11	2.90	5.80	1.94	4.41	45
Male	1.31	2.38	5.62	1.95	3.53	9
Total	1.15	2.81	5.77	1.94	4.27	54

In terms of the five factors and the gender of the survey participants, the mean gender differences were only apparent in one of the factors, internalized affirmativeness. Women's attitudes fell slightly closer to the very characteristic side of the scale than the very uncharacteristic regarding internalized affirmativeness than men. Women's attitudes fell slightly closer to the very characteristic side of the scale than the very uncharacteristic regarding civil rights than men, were slightly more knowledgeable than men, scored very similarly to men with regard to religious conflict, and held slightly less hatred toward LGB people than men among the participants.

Table 5 presents the means for the five factors (hate, knowledge, civil rights, religious conflict, and internalized affirmativeness) of the LGB-KAS scale disaggregated by race. The participants who identified by race were all combined into a single group labeled 'People of

Color (POC). This combination was necessary to make the data more amenable to analysis due to the very small number of participants in each racial category respectively. Participants who identified as ‘White’ were labeled non-people of color (Non-POC) and participants who did not identify their race were labeled ‘Non-Noted’. The mean scores for each of the five factors, disaggregated on this basis is below.

Table 5.

Means for Five Factors by Race

RACE	Hate	Knowledge	Civil Rights	Religious Conflict	Internalized Affirmativeness	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Valid N
POC	1.20	2.42	5.84	2.16	4.05	11
Non-POC	1.14	2.93	5.74	1.91	4.37	41
Not Stated	1.00	2.60	5.90	1.43	3.40	2

When the data were examined in terms of the five factors, participants showed means that centered around ‘slightly characteristic’ attitudes regarding internalized affirmativeness, ‘very characteristic’ attitudes regarding civil rights, ‘slightly uncharacteristic’ attitudes regarding religious conflict, slightly uncharacteristic levels of knowledge regarding LGB people, and ‘very uncharacteristic’ attitudes toward LGB people regarding hate.

Non-POC participants had slightly more characteristic attitudes regarding internalized affirmativeness than participants who were POC, participants who were non-POC had slightly less characteristic attitudes regarding civil rights than participants who were POC, participants who were non- POC were slightly more knowledgeable regarding LGB people than participants

who were POC, participants who were non-POC had slightly less uncharacteristic attitudes regarding religious conflict toward LGB people than participants who were POC, and participants who were non-POC scored very slightly less uncharacteristic attitudes regarding hate toward LGB people than POC participants.

Table 6 presents the combined means for the items related to knowledge and attitudes on the LGB-KAS scale organized by gender and race as it pertains to the three research questions for this study.

Table 6.

Means for Knowledge and Attitudes of Participants

Knowledge and Attitudes by Gender and Race	Knowledge	Attitudes
	Mean	Mean
Female	2.90	3.31
Male	2.38	3.11
Total	2.81	3.28
POC	2.42	3.31
Non-POC	2.93	3.29
Not Stated	2.60	2.93

Women also scored slightly more characteristic than men regarding their attitudes of LGB people, however both women and men scored being slightly more characteristic regarding their attitudes toward LGB people. That being said, it remains true that these scores signify a mid-range or slightly ambivalent results. Participants who were POC had slightly less knowledge toward LGB people than participants who were non-POC and the difference in attitudes between POC participants and non-POC participants was insignificant.

Analysis and Discussions of the Findings

In order to address the three specific research questions in this study, the researcher took the five factors identified by Dillon and Worthington and simplified those five factors into two primary categories: knowledge and attitudes. The researcher combined the factors of internalized affirmativeness, civil rights, religious conflict, and hate into ‘attitudes’ as they are more subjective in their nature. The fifth factor identified by Dillon and Worthington was knowledge and because this factor is less subjective in nature, the researcher did not combine it with any other factors, leaving it to stand-alone. As seen in Table 6 above, the findings of the data when disaggregated by gender, show that there is not very much of a difference between women and men when it comes to their attitudes toward LGB people. Women did have a slightly higher mean regarding their attitudes toward LGB people, meaning that they determined themselves to be slightly more characteristic than men in their attitudes.

However, this researcher found, consistent with the existing research, that with the difference being only 0.2, it was not significant enough to determine that gender impacts one’s attitudes toward LGB people. Worthington, Dillon, and Becker-Schutte (2005) found similar results with the LGB-KAS scale. “Gender (men or women) was cross-tabulated with source of participants (Internet or university e-mail solicitation), and the resulting chi-square statistic was nonsignificant” (p. 108). While there is not a significant difference in the attitudes held by women and men, it is important to point out that all participants in this study scored close to mid-range regarding their attitudes toward LGB people. This is both consistent with the existing research and consistent with the problematic nature of educators’ attitudes toward LGB people. “Awareness of attitudes can help a teacher overcome unconscious or subtle ways they create an unsupportive environment for LGB youth” (Wyatt, Oswald, White & Peterson, 2008 p. 181). The

researcher is hopeful that the illumination of existing attitudes will offer awareness to teacher preparation programs. “A better understanding of teacher candidates’ attitudes toward gay men and lesbians can help inform and structure programs that will be the most effective” (Mathison, 1998 as cited in Wyatt, Oswalt, White & Peterson, 2008 p. 174).

Similarly to gender, race did not seem to impact participants’ attitudes toward LGB individuals because there was only a .02 difference between POC and non-POC participants. This finding was also consistent with the existing research. “In order to conduct a cross-tabulation for race-ethnicity, we collapsed the eight categories into two (White and People of Color) and eliminated international and “other” groups from the analysis. The resulting chi-square was non-significant” (Worthington, Dillon & Becker-Schutte, 2005, p. 108).

The most significant findings in this study, in terms of instituting possible change are the findings regarding knowledge. Regardless of gender or race, knowledge is lacking for participants who are currently enrolled in a pre-service teacher preparation program. As discussed in the literature review, equipped with more knowledge, future educators have the opportunity to create meaningful change for LGB people in their school communities. Knowledge and competency is needed with regard to the diversity seen in contemporary classrooms because the student population is increasingly diverse. “We are connected to other cultures, ideas, beliefs, values, and practices in unprecedented ways and with never before seen speed, and the relational complexities created by these connections multiplies rapidly, blurring boundaries, contravening established frameworks, and often creating confusion and misunderstanding” (Zacko-Smith & Smith, 2010, p. 2). Teacher preparation programs can seek more opportunities to provide knowledge, which may also impact attitudes, to pre-service teacher candidates.

Paulo Freire (1993) wrote his seminal work, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, in which he suggested that the way the educational system has been set up historically is inherently inequitably. The teacher has the power, that is, knowledge, and will deposit that knowledge and information onto the students and as such, this is not a mutual exchange. The teacher is the teacher and the student is the learner. Freire (1993) wrote of a society where dialogic and liberatory communication and education are at the forefront, a society where teachers and students work in community and learning with each other, a society where we humanize each other by the oppressed working together with oppressors to reframe and liberate each other. Freire suggests that “knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry, human beings pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other” (p. 72). Were pre-service teacher candidates to learn the applicable skills and knowledge necessary to work with LGB people, they could be more apt to equitably include and align themselves with this population in their learning and classroom community. In community with their future students, pre-service teacher candidates have the opportunity to become better allies to LGB people and instill ally ideals in their future students. As Freire said, “while no one liberates [themselves] himself by [their] his own efforts alone, neither [are they] he liberated by others” (p. 53).

As previously mentioned, the data in this study revealed that knowledge is lacking for pre-service teacher candidates preparing to enter learning communities. This presents teacher preparation programs with a distinct opportunity to impact the lives both of future educators as well as future students. Pre-service teachers, equipped with proper knowledge of LGB people, can create more equitable, safe, and open environments for learning, growing, achieving, and success. Freire, along with other scholars, suggests a new framework for understanding

oppression through knowledge. This new framework suggests that shared knowledge and understanding of that which is different from the self, can help transform oppression into liberation through education. “Education affirms us as beings in the process of becoming. We are unfinished, and so is our reality, and we affect the world around us through our conscious transformations of it and of our consciousness of it” (Freire, 1993, p. 72). Knowledge of others and attitudes about them impact oppression both in and out of the classroom. It is especially significant to this study examining the knowledge and attitudes of pre-service teacher candidates toward lesbian, gay, and bisexual people.

Summary of Major Findings

The results of this study reveal that pre-service teachers have both slightly uncharacteristic and slightly characteristic attitudes and knowledge about LGB people when considering all 28 questions of the LGB-KAS scale in entirety. This is to say, pre-service teachers hold neither positive nor negative attitudes toward LGB people, overall. The mean of pre-service teachers in this study fell right in the middle of the likert scale proving that the pre-service teachers in this study were neither very characteristic nor very uncharacteristic regarding both their attitudes and knowledge of LGB people. The participant data revealed that pre-service teachers are not hateful toward LGB people and are opposed to discrimination and homophobia; however pre-service teachers generally lack the requisite knowledge regarding LGB populations that could assist them in combating discrimination and homophobia when it presents and impacting positive changes for LGB people, some of whom will be their students. Pre-service teachers’ attitudes appear to be slightly higher than midrange in this study, but also are not accepting and embracing of LGB people to the point that they will stand up for and act as allies

to LGB people. Pre-service teachers expressed a minimal desire to support LGB people through affirmation and fostering of healthy identity development. The CTC mandates that pre-service teachers obtain the skills and competencies needed to offer equitable education to diverse students and help eliminate any existent or persistent bias. Hetero-oppression, heteronormativity, and hetero-privilege permeate the general population, thus it is important that pre-service teachers actively combat what is seen in the general population so as to offer truly equitable educational opportunities. However, the findings of this study suggest that pre-service teachers' knowledge and attitudes do not differ greatly from that of the general population.

Chapter 5 Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

Educational institutions and classrooms are microcosms of the larger society, generally mirroring the over-arching beliefs and ideals of the larger society. This meant that in the late 60s and the 70s, LGB people fought for visibility in educational communities and the larger society due to the increasing violence and hostility faced during and after the Stonewall Riots. In the 80s, LGB people were faced with the realities of the HIV/AIDS crisis both in educational communities as well as the larger society. In the 90s, LGB people combated gay conversion therapy attempts both in educational settings as well as in the larger society. The general population throughout the aforementioned history lacked both positive and embracing attitudes toward LGB people as well as necessary knowledge of the LGB community. The society is now faced with the realities of the 21st century, which include more collaborative work with people from many walks of life. As such, it is more imperative than ever before that teachers and students alike possess the necessary skills and competencies to work with people who may come from a variety of diverse backgrounds, including the LGB community.

Arming pre-service teachers with more knowledge about LGB people could lead to them also having more positive attitudes toward LGB people. Similarly, if pre-service teachers had more positive attitudes toward LGB people, it could lead them to seek out more knowledge about that specific population. The results of this study conclude that pre-service teacher candidates have slightly higher than mid-range attitudes about LGB people (their attitudes are neither positive nor negative). This is consistent with the national climate regarding LGB people. One can therefore conclude that pre-service teachers seem to exhibit similar attitudes to that of the general population, confirming that the microcosm of educational communities mirrors that of

the larger society. Consistent with the research, “women hold more affirmative attitudes than men” (Worthington, Dillon & Becker-Schutte, 2005, p. 115). In this study, the attitudes of women were slightly higher than those of men. Additionally, as previously stated, race does not bare a significant impact on attitudes of LGB people.

Conclusions can also be drawn regarding pre-service teachers’ knowledge of LGB people per this study. Pre-service teacher participants in this study are lacking in knowledge of LGB people regardless of gender or race. This is, again, consistent with the knowledge of LGB people held by the general populous as well. Thus, it can be concluded that pre-service teachers exhibit similarly lacking knowledge to that of the general population regarding LGB individuals. Mirroring the hetero-normativity, hetero-oppression, and hetero-privilege of the larger society, these future teachers may be both profiting from normativity, oppression, and privilege as well as potentially exercising them. At the intersection of hetero-normativity, oppression, and privilege, pre-service teachers are not being given the compulsory skills to interrupt normativity, privilege and oppression and Standard 9 of the CTC mandates that future educators are able to both offer equitable education for all students as well as eliminate bias. If future educators are participating in bias, it is impossible for them to eliminate it. As previously mentioned, the general population seems to have “increasingly more positive attitudes” toward LGB people; however, there is also an “increase in violence” toward this population (Worthington, Dillon, & Becker-Schutte, 2005, p. 104).

Comparison of Findings to the Literature

The findings of this study reveal that the attitudes and knowledge that pre-service teachers have regarding LGB people is similar to that of the general population. In the review of the academic literature, numerous studies were conducted on teachers who were already

credentialed as well as other professionals who work with LGB people. As discussed during the review of the literature, credentialed teachers lacked the necessary attitudes and knowledge about LGB people that could help them in creating a safe and supportive learning environment.

“Veteran teachers should also examine their beliefs and misconceptions. A common misconception is that only adults are gay. Teachers need to be aware of the number of LGBTQ students that are potentially sitting in their classrooms” (Stufft & Graff, 2011, p. 12). This study found that the pre-service teachers who participated also lack the necessary attitudes and knowledge about LGB people that could assist them in providing LGB students equitable access to education.

Additionally, heteronormativity, hetero-oppression, hetero-privilege and the intersections of those three are found throughout the scholarly literature. Just 10 years ago, GLSEN found that “although most schools have anti-bullying policies in place, less than fifty percent of those policies include sexual orientation” (Stufft & Graff, 2011, p.6). As the finding of this study showed, pre-service teacher candidates’ attitudes and knowledge mirror that of the general population. As such, it is reflective of a strong heterosexual and heteronormative bias, which reinforces that LGB people and students are seen as abnormal or are all together invisible. This invisibility due to heteronormativity leads to silencing, which further privileges heterosexual students and teachers. Silence and invisibility are not the only ways in which heteronormativity is seen in educational communities. “Schools teach heteronormativity through the curriculum, and teachers, administrators, school boards, and parents reinforce gender expectations and dominant group values of sexuality” (Vega, Crawford, & Van Pelt, 2012, p. 253). Additionally, “given the stigma of homosexuality and the potential for controversy, many teachers and school

officials may not know where to begin [and] homophobia is still largely ignored as bias” (Stufft & Graff, 2011, p. 9).

The general population, pre-service teachers, and credentialed teachers seem to exhibit similar levels of attitudes and knowledge about LGB people. Given this information, teacher preparation programs have an incredible opportunity to impact the lived experiences of LGB students by helping pre-service teachers become better equipped with the necessary knowledge to provide more equitable educational opportunities. “Research indicates that educators should first work on themselves, examining their own prejudices and misconceptions” (Stufft & Graff, 2011, p.10). Thus, pre-service teacher preparation programs can offer opportunities for future educators to enter into the necessary self-reflection and examination to truly assess their preconceived feelings regarding LGB people. Wyatt, Oswald, White, & Peterson (2008) believed that attitudes about LGB people impact classroom and learning communities. The researchers recommended that pre-service teachers participate in courses about sexuality in order to help understand the needs of LGB students. Based on the data of this study, it still holds true the training, education, and reflection of future educators’ knowledge and attitudes toward LGB people is necessary in order to provide inclusive and equitable classroom and educational communities for all students. “When respecting difference is essential to everyday functioning, interpersonal competence and openness to others is promoted” (Groggins & Ryan, 2013, p. 264).

Limitations of the Study

The results of this study are not generalizable to all pre-service teacher candidates due to the limited number of participants and the small overall sample. Only a limited statistical analysis could be performed for comparisons based on race for this study due to the small number of participants who were of color and as such were not significant. This study only

describes the level of knowledge and the attitudes toward LGB people, that pre-service teachers from this specific site have at one fixed point in time, so no correlations to actual behavior are made.

Implications for Future Research

An expanded study with a larger sample of pre-service teachers would yield more statistically significant results; using a comparison of pre-service teachers and credentialed teachers research design. More detailed statistical analysis for a larger sample of pre-service teachers, including correlation, on the basis of race, gender, and other variable could yield further insights into pre-service teachers' attitudes and knowledge of LGB people.

Overall Significance of the Study

This study provided a limited snapshot of the knowledge and attitudes of pre-service teachers toward LGB people. The most significant aspect of this study was its focus on a sample of pre-service teachers, which is a population that has not been studied extensively in terms of their knowledge and attitudes toward LGB people. If pre-service teachers, through their teacher preparation programs, are able to become more knowledgeable about LGB people and their history of struggle for equal rights, and or develop more positive, inclusive, and supportive attitudes towards LGB people, then they may consider all of that when teaching LGB students. If pre-service teachers are equipped with the necessary attitudes and knowledge to best support their LGB students, they can offer those students truly equitable educational experiences.

Moreover, these future educators have the opportunity to start eliminating the existing implicit bias faced by LGB students as it pertains to heteronormativity, hetero-privilege, and hetero-oppression. LGB students will have the opportunity to feel more included, better seen, and more embraced by their classmates as well as by their teachers. The results from this study

can help pre-service teacher preparation programs in evaluating how knowledge about LGB people and students is included in their curricula, and how teachers are prepared to meet the mandated CTC standards of California as it relates to the LGB population along the range of the diversity continuum. If one future educator is able to positively impact a classroom of thirty students and those thirty students go on to positively impact other people, this cycle can continue to grow exponentially and create a more accepting, inclusive, and equitable society for all people.

About the Author

Casey is the youngest of three, a brat among many in her family, and completely in love and obsessed with her dog. She speaks multiple languages; English, French, love, and sarcasm. Her favorite past-times include spontaneous or planned travel, singing off key and having solo dance parties in her car, bugging her dog when he's trying to sleep, taking photos, building things with her own two hands, staying up way past anyone's bedtime to have inspiring conversations with intelligent folks late into the early morning hours, and making an art out of very poorly wrapped gifts for people she loves. She often grapples with living in a place of privilege while also wanting to create opportunities for all people to thrive and succeed equitably.

In her teens, Casey started questioning her own sexual orientation and at 21, she came out to most of her friends and family as queer. Luckily, she had very supportive and loving friends and family who accepted her unconditionally. Casey went on to work with and support LGBTQ youth and adults in Washington State and California. In doing this work, she learned that not all LGBTQ folks were lucky enough to have and experience the unwavering love and support from their friends and family. From that point forward Casey tried, as best as she could, to give back to this fabulous community that had given her so much, including a place to belong. If, through scholarly research or otherwise, Casey can find ways to provide more opportunities to give educators more tools to create a more accepting society for LGBTQ youth, she believes she'll have done something worthwhile with her time.

References

- Aliaga, M., & Gunderson, B. (2000). *Interactive statistics*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Athanases, S. Z., & Martin, K. J. (2006). *Learning to advocate for educational equity in a teacher credential program* Elsevier Ltd. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.03.008
- Bedford, T. (2002). Queer Developments in Teacher Education: Addressing Sexual Diversity. *Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity in the classroom*, 133.
- Bellini, C. (2012). The pink lesson plan: Addressing the emotional needs of gay and lesbian students in Canadian teacher education programs. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 9(4), 373–396.
- Cara, C. (2011). Embracing diversity through open doors: Using social competency processes to build effective teaching and learning communities. *International Journal of Diversity in Organizations, Communities & Nations*, 11(1), 143-158. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com>
- California Department of Education Educational Demographics Unit. (2015). *Statewide enrollment by ethnicity*. Retrieved April 15, 2015 from: <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/EnrollEthState.asp?Level=State&TheYear=2014-15&cChoice=EnrollEth1&p=2>
- Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (February, 2014). SB 2042 multiple subject and single subject preliminary credential program standards. Retrieved from <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/AdoptedPreparationStandards-2014.pdf>

- Crenshaw, K., & Harris, L. (2009). A primer on intersectionality. Paper presented at the *White Privilege Conference*, Memphis, Tennessee. Retrieved from http://www.whiteprivilegeconference.com/pdf/intersectionality_primer.pdf
- DePalma, R., & Atkinson, E. (2009). *Interrogating heteronormativity in primary schools: The No Outsiders project*. Institute of Education Press.
- Dillon, F. R., & Worthington, R. L. (2013). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual knowledge and attitudes scale. In T. D. Fisher, C. M. Davis, W. L. Yarber & S. L. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of sexuality-related measures* (pp. 407-410). New York: Routledge.
- Feistritzer, C. (2011). *Profile of teachers in the U.S. 2011*. National Center for Education Information. Retrieved April 15, 2015 from <http://www.edweek.org/media/pot2011final-blog.pdf>
- Fisher, T. D., Davis, C. M., Yarber, W. L., & Davis, S. L. (2013). *Handbook of Sexuality-Related Measures*. Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching : Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2), 106-116. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com>
- Goldberg, M. (2007). Queer Theory. Retrieved April 1, 2015, from <https://faculty.washington.edu/mlg/courses/definitions/queer.htm>
- Goggins II, L., & Dowcett, E. (2011). Beyond Introduction: The Need for Competency in Diversity Training. *International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities & Nations*, 11(2).

- Graff, C. & Stufft, D. (2011). Increasing visibility for LGBTQ students: What schools can do to create inclusive classroom communities, *Current Issues in Education*, 14(1). Retrieved from <http://cie.asu.edu/ojs/index.php/cieatasu/article/view/636>
- Groggins, A., & Ryan, A. M. (2013). Embracing uniqueness: The underpinnings of a positive climate for diversity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 86(2), 264-282. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.dominican.edu>
- Herek, G. M. (1998). Attitudes toward lesbians and gay men scale. *Handbook of sexuality-related measures*, 392-394.
- Herek, G.M. (2012). *Facts about Homosexuality and Mental Health*. Retrieved April 3, 2015, from http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/faculty_sites/rainbow/html/facts_mental_health.html
- Johnson, R. (2015). *Gay population statistics*. About Relationships. Retrieved May 5, 2015 from <http://gaylife.about.com/od/comingout/a/population.htm>
- Katz, J. (2007). *The invention of heterosexuality*. University of Chicago Press.
- Kearns, L., Mitton-Kukner, J., & Tompkins, J. (2014). LGBTQ awareness and allies: Building capacity in a bachelor of education program. (French). *Canadian Journal of Education*, 37(4), 1-26. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com>
- Kitchen, J., & Bellini, C. (2012). Addressing lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) issues in teacher education: Teacher candidates' perceptions. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 58(3), 444-460. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com>
- Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Palmer, N. & Boesen, M. (2014). The 2013 national school climate survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth in our nation's schools. Retrieved March 15, 2015, from

http://www.glsen.org/sites/default/files/2013%20National%20School%20Climate%20Survey%20Full%20Report_0.pdf

Kumashiro, K. (2002). *Troubling education: Queer activism and anti-oppressive pedagogy*. New York, NY: Routledge-Falmer.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). What we can learn from multicultural education research. *Educational Leadership*, 51(8), 22. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com>

Miller, P. C., & Mikulec, E. A. 2. (2014). Pre-service teachers confronting issues of diversity though a radical field experience. *Multicultural Education*, 21(2), 18-24. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com>

Minton, H. L. (2002). *Departing from deviance: A history of homosexual rights and emancipatory science in America*. University of Chicago Press.

Murray, Olivia Jo., Portland State University. Department of Educational Leadership and Policy, (2011). "Outing" queer issues in teacher preparation programs how pre-service teachers experience sexual and gender diversity in their field placements.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). *Fast facts*. Retrieved April 3, 2015 from <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=372>

Negy, C., & Eisenman, R. (2005). A comparison of African American and White college students' affective and attitudinal reactions to lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals: An exploratory study. *Journal of Sex Research*, 42(4), 291-298.

Perez, E. R., Schanding, G. T., & Dao, T. K. (2013). Educators' perceptions in addressing bullying of LGBTQ/Gender nonconforming youth. *Journal of School Violence*, 12(1), 64-79. doi:10.1080/15388220.2012.731663

Rothenberg, P. S. (Ed.). (2004). *Race, class, and gender in the United States: An integrated study*. Macmillan.

The Leadership Conference. (2015, June). *Stonewall Riots: The Beginning of the LGBT Movement*. Retrieved from: <http://www.civilrights.org/archives/2009/06/449-stonewall.html>

The Trevor Project. (2015). *Facts about suicide*. Retrieved April 1, 2015 from <http://www.thetrevorproject.org/pages/facts-about-suicide>

Vega, S., Crawford, H. G., & Van Pelt, J. (2012). Safe schools for LGBTQI students: How do teachers view their role in promoting safe schools? *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 45(2), 250-260. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com>

Worthington, R. L., Dillon, F. R., & Becker-Schutte, A. M. (2005). Development, Reliability, and Validity of the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Knowledge and Attitudes Scale for Heterosexuals (LGB-KASH). *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(1), 104.

Wyatt, T. J., Oswald, S. B., White, C., & Peterson, F. L. (2008). Are tomorrow's teachers ready to deal with diverse students? Teacher candidates' attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 35(2), 171-185. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com>

Zacko-Smith, J., & Smith, G. P. (2010). Recognizing and utilizing queer pedagogy. *Multicultural Education*, 18(1), 2-9. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com>

*Appendix A***Permission to Use Copyrighted Materials**

From: Casey Halcro

Date: Saturday, February 14, 2015 at 5:14 PM

To: Roger Worthington

Subject: Permission request to use LGB-KAS scale

Dear Dr. Worthington,

With your permission, I would like to utilize the LGB-KAS scale as a means for anonymously surveying pre-service teacher credential candidates. Will you let me know if you will permit me to use the LGB-KAS scale as the main instrument for collecting data in my research study, please?

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Casey M. Halcro

Dominican University of California

50 Acacia Ave.

San Rafael, CA 94901

From: Roger L. Worthington

Date: Sat, Feb 14, 2015 at 2:25 PM

To: Casey Halcro

Here you go!!

Roger L. Worthington, Ph.D.

Professor and Chair

Department of Counseling, Higher Education, and Special Education

Contact Information:

3214 Benjamin Building

University of Maryland

College Park, MD 20742

Attached: LGB-KAS Scale

Appendix B

Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Knowledge and Attitudes Scale

Instructions: Please use the scale below to respond to the following items. Circle the number that indicates the extent to which each statement is characteristic or uncharacteristic of you or your views. Please try to respond to every item.

1
2
3
4
5
6
Very uncharacteristic
Very characteristic
of me or my views
of me or my views

NOTE: LGB = Lesbian, Gay, or Bisexual.

Please consider the ENTIRE statement when making your rating, as some statements contain two parts.

1. I feel qualified to educate others about how to be affirmative regarding LGB issues.

|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. I have conflicting attitudes or beliefs about LGB people.

|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. I can accept LGB people even though I condemn their behavior.

|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

4. It is important to me to avoid LGB individuals.

|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

5. I could educate others about the history and symbolism behind the "pink triangle."

|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

6. I have close friends who are LGB.

|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

7. I have difficulty reconciling my religious views with my interest in being accepting of LGB people.

|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

8. I would be unsure what to do or say if I met someone who is openly lesbian, gay or bisexual.

|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

9. Hearing about a hate crime against a LGB person would not bother me.

|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

10. I am knowledgeable about the significance of the Stonewall Riot to the Gay Liberation Movement.

|----|----|----|----|----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

11. I think marriage should be legal for same sex couples.

|----|----|----|----|----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

12. I keep my religious views to myself in order to accept LGB people.

|----|----|----|----|----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

13. I conceal my negative views toward LGB people when I am with someone who doesn't share my views.

|----|----|----|----|----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

14. I sometimes think about being violent toward LGB people.

|----|----|----|----|----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

15. Feeling attracted to another person of the same sex would not make me uncomfortable.

|----|----|----|----|----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

16. I am familiar with the work of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.

|----|----|----|----|----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

17. I would display a symbol of gay pride (pink triangle, rainbow, etc.) to show my support of the LBG community.

|----|----|----|----|----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

18. I would feel self-conscious greeting a known LGB person in a public place.

|----|----|----|----|----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

19. I have had sexual fantasies about members of my same sex.

|----|----|----|----|----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

20. I am knowledgeable about the history and mission of the PFLAG organization.

|----|----|----|----|----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

21. I would attend a demonstration to promote LGB civil rights.

|----|----|----|----|----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

22. I try not to let my negative beliefs about LGB people harm my relationships with the lesbian, gay, or bisexual individuals I know.

|----|----|----|----|----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

23. Hospitals should acknowledge same sex partners equally to any other next of kin.

|----|----|----|----|----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

24. LGB people deserve the hatred they receive.

|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

25. It is important to teach children positive attitudes toward LGB people.

|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

26. I conceal my positive attitudes toward LGB people when I am with someone who is homophobic.

|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

27. Health benefits should be available equally to same sex partners as to any other couple.

|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

28. It is wrong for courts to make child custody decisions based on a parent's sexual orientation.

|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
 1 2 3 4 5 6

SCORING:

HATE = 4, 24, 8, 14, 9, 18

KNOWLEDGE = 20, 10, 16, 5, 1

CIVIL RIGHTS = 27, 23, 11, 28, 25

RELIGIOUS CONFLICT = 26, 12, 22, 7, 3, 13, 2

INTERNALIZED AFFIRMATIVENESS = 19, 15, 17, 6, 21

There are no reverse scored items. Subscale scores are obtained by averaging ratings on items receiving a response for each participant. As such, if item # 19 is not rated by a specific respondent, only the remaining four items on the internalized affirmativeness subscale are used to obtain the average, and so on. This method ensures comparable scores when there is missing data.

*Appendix C***Letter of Permission from the Acting Dean of the School of Education and Psychology**

1. I am requesting your permission to conduct research using teacher credential candidates in your school as part of my graduate thesis in the M.S. Education program at Dominican University. This work is being supervised by Madalienne Peters, Ed.D. Professor of Education at Dominican University of California. I am requesting voluntary participation of pre-service teacher credential candidates in my study, which concerns their knowledge and attitudes of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual people.
2. Please see my attached IRBPHS Application, which explains precisely how I will keep myself, any voluntary research participants, and the data collection anonymous. Additionally, the application outlines potential risks, benefits, costs, and reimbursement to participants.
3. I will securely keep any personally identifying information of potential participants (i.e. email addresses used to contact participants) in a password protected file on my personal computer, which is also password protected. No other persons will have any access to this information.
4. All data collected will remain anonymous. No personally identifiable information will be included in the survey. Only the researcher and her faculty advisor will see this information. One month after the completion of the research, all written and electronic materials will be destroyed.
5. Any interested parties can access the full thesis through Dominican Scholar, <http://scholar.dominican.edu>, when it becomes available.
6. I understand that if I as the Acting Dean have any further questions about the study, I can contact Casey Halcro at casey.halcro@dominican.edu or call her at 415-599-6255 or her research supervisor, Professor Madalienne Peters, Ed.D., School of Ed Education and Counseling Psychology, Dominican University of California at 415-485-3285. If I have any further questions or comments about participation in this study, I may contact the Dominican University of California Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS), which is concerned with the protection of volunteers in research projects. I may reach the IRBPHS Office by calling (415) 482- 3547 and leaving a voicemail message, by FAX at (415) 257-0165 by writing to the IRBPHS, Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dominican University of California, 50 Acacia Avenue, San Rafael, CA 94901.
7. All procedures related to this research project have been satisfactorily explained to me prior to my permission to allow the researcher to conduct the study.

I HAVE READ AND UNDERSTAND ALL OF THE ABOVE EXPLANATION REGARDING THIS STUDY. I VOLUNTARILY AGREE TO GIVE MY CONSENT FOR CASEY HALCRO TO CONTACT PRE-SERVICE TEACHER CREDENTIAL CANDIDATES AND ASK THEM TO VOLUNTARILY COMPLETE THE SURVEY. A COPY OF THIS FORM HAS BEEN GIVEN TO ME FOR FUTURE REFERENCE.

 Signature

 Date

*Appendix D***LETTER OF INTRODUCTION/CONSENT REQUEST FORM**

Dear Potential Study Participant,

I am conducting research as part of my graduate thesis in the M.S. Education program at Dominican University. This work is being supervised by Madalienne Peters, Ed.D., Professor of Education at Dominican University of California. I am requesting your voluntary participation in my study, which concerns pre-service teacher credential candidates' knowledge and attitudes of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual people. The survey may include questions that are controversial. If you choose to participate in the survey, please know that there is not a right or wrong answer to any of the survey questions and it is only requested that you answer as honestly as possible. Your participation is not compulsory as a student in the teacher credential program and will not impact your performance in that program in any way.

Participation in this study involves taking a 28 question survey online about your knowledge and attitudes about lesbian, gay, and bisexual people. The survey will also include some demographic questions to be used for statistical purposes. Please note that your participation is **completely voluntary and your responses will remain anonymous**. Filing out the survey is likely to take approximately 15-20 minutes of your time. Your email address and participation will not be tracked in any way.

If you have further questions you may contact my research supervisor, Madalienne Peters at 415-485-3285 or the Dominican University of California Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human participants (IRBPHP), which is concerned with protection of volunteers in research projects. You may reach the IRBPHP Office by calling (415) 482-3547 and leaving a voicemail message or FAX at (415) 257-0165, or by writing to IRBPHP, Office of Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dominican University of California, 50 Acacia Avenue, San Rafael, CA 94901.

If you would like to know the results of this study once it has been completed, a summary of the results will be available through Dominican Scholar, <http://scholar.dominican.edu>. Thank you in advance for your participation. If you choose to take the survey, please answer as honestly and completely as possible. Your responses will be collected only as an aggregate and will remain confidential. Please check one of the two boxes below and provide me, the researcher, with your email address if you consent to participate in the survey. You may also wish to take time to think about whether or not you want to participate and return the letter in the self-addressed stamped envelope or you can scan this consent letter and email it to me, the researcher. I, the researcher, am collecting your email address for the purpose of contacting you, via email, with the link to the survey. I will keep these email addresses in a password-protected file that only I, the researcher, will be able to access. One month upon the completion of the study, the researcher will destroy all email addresses.

- I consent to participate in this survey.
 I do not consent to participate in this survey.

Email address: _____

Sincerely,
Casey Halcro
MS. Education Candidate
Dominican University of California
50 Acacia Avenue, San Rafael, CA 94901
Email address: casey.halcro@dominican.edu

*Appendix E***IRB Approval Letter**

March 3, 2015

Casey Halcro
50 Acacia Ave.
San Rafael, CA 94901

Dear Casey:

I have reviewed your proposal entitled *Analysis of Responses by Pre-Service Teacher Credential Candidates at a Small, Private, University in Northern California to the Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Knowledge and Attitudes Scale* submitted to the Dominican University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Participants (IRBPHP Application, #10346). I am approving it as having met the requirements for minimizing risk and protecting the rights of the participants in your research.

In your final report or paper please indicate that your project was approved by the IRBPHP and indicate the identification number.]

I wish you well in your very interesting research effort.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Martha Nelson".

Martha Nelson, Ph.D.
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Chair, IRBPHP

cc: Madalienne Peters

Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects

Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs • 50 Acacia Avenue, San Rafael, California 94901-2298 • 415-257-1310
www.dominican.edu

Appendix F

LGB-KAS Survey Results

ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5	6	Mean
	Row N %	Row N %	Row N %	Row N %	Row N %	Row N %	
I feel qualified to educate others about how to be affirmative regarding LGB issues.	1.9%	9.3%	16.7%	46.3%	13.0%	13.0%	4
I have conflicting attitudes or beliefs about LGB people.	83.3%	11.1%	3.7%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	1.3
I can accept LGB people even though I condemn their behavior.	68.5%	1.9%	5.6%	1.9%	5.6%	16.7%	2.2
It is important to me to avoid LGB individuals.	94.4%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1
I could educate others about the history and symbolism behind the "pink triangle."	29.6%	18.5%	20.4%	11.1%	14.8%	5.6%	2.8
I have close friends who are LGB.	5.6%	5.6%	7.4%	9.3%	14.8%	57.4%	5
I have difficulty reconciling my religious views with my interest in being accepting of LGB people.	85.2%	9.3%	3.7%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2
I would be unsure what to do or say if I met someone who is openly lesbian, gay or bisexual.	87.0%	9.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	1.9%	1.3
Hearing about a hate crime against a LGB person would not bother me.	92.6%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	1.9%	3.7%	1.3
I am knowledgeable about the significance of the Stonewall Riot to the Gay Liberation Movement.	29.6%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	11.1%	9.3%	3
I think marriage should be legal for same sex couples.	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	5.6%	87.0%	5.6
I keep my religious views to myself in order to accept LGB people.	57.4%	9.3%	7.4%	5.6%	7.4%	13.0%	2.4
I conceal my negative views toward LGB people when I am with someone who doesn't share my views.	70.4%	5.6%	3.7%	7.4%	5.6%	7.4%	2
I sometimes think about being violent toward LGB people.	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1
Feeling attracted to another person of the same sex would not make me uncomfortable.	7.4%	11.1%	9.3%	18.5%	9.3%	44.4%	4.4
I am familiar with the work of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.	37.0%	24.1%	16.7%	11.1%	3.7%	7.4%	2.4
I would display a symbol of gay pride (pink triangle, rainbow, etc.) to show my support of the LBG community.	5.6%	7.4%	9.3%	7.4%	22.2%	48.1%	4.8
I would feel self-conscious greeting a known LGB person in a public place.	94.4%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	1.1
I have had sexual fantasies about members of my same sex.	37.0%	18.5%	11.1%	13.0%	7.4%	13.0%	2.7
I am knowledgeable about the history and mission of the PFLAG organization.	57.4%	11.1%	18.5%	7.4%	1.9%	3.7%	2
I would attend a demonstration to promote LGB civil rights.	7.4%	5.6%	13.0%	20.4%	18.5%	35.2%	4.4
I try not to let my negative beliefs about LGB people harm my relationships with the lesbian, gay, or bisexual individuals I know.	57.4%	7.4%	3.7%	3.7%	7.4%	20.4%	2.6
Hospitals should acknowledge same sex partners equally to any other next of kin.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	94.4%	5.9
LGB people deserve the hatred they receive.	96.3%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	1.1
It is important to teach children positive attitudes toward LGB people.	0.0%	1.9%	3.7%	0.0%	7.4%	87.0%	5.7
I conceal my positive attitudes toward LGB people when I am with someone who is homophobic.	55.6%	16.7%	9.3%	11.1%	7.4%	0.0%	2
Health benefits should be available equally to same sex partners as to any other couple.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	98.1%	6

It is wrong for courts to make child custody decisions based on a parent's sexual orientation.	3.7%	0.0%	1.9%	5.6%	3.7%	85.2%	5.6
--	------	------	------	------	------	-------	-----