

学位論文要約

Vietnamese Anti-gay Attitudes, Correlates and Interventions

Nguyen Thanh Toan

D134882

Hiroshima University

Graduate School of Education

Doctoral Program in Education and Human Science

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction

Section 1: Attitudes toward homosexuals in Vietnam

Section 2: Interventions to improve attitudes toward homosexuals in Vietnam

Section 3: Purposes of this study

Chapter 2: The Vietnamese Version of Attitudes Toward Gay Men: Development, Reliability, Validity, and Correlates (Study 1, 2)

Section 1: Preliminary Survey

Section 2: Main survey

Section 2.1: Social perceptions of gay men in Vietnam (Study 1)

Section 2.2: Scale development, reliability, validity and correlates (Study 2)

Chapter 3: Evaluating the effectiveness of two video-based interventions designed to reduce anti-gay attitudes in Vietnam (Study 3)

Chapter 4: General Discussion

References

Chapter 1: Introduction

Section 1: Attitudes toward homosexuals in Vietnam

Literature has shown that homosexuals have not been socially accepted by Vietnamese adolescents (Feng et al., 2012). Homosexuals are often considered not to be truly homosexual, but rather “temporarily following a Western trend” in Vietnam (Colby et al., 2004). In 2002, the Vietnam Ministry of Labor, War, Invalids and Social Affairs labeled homosexuality a ‘social evil’ on par with drug use and prostitution, and proposed laws permitting the arrest of gay individuals. The dissemination of anti-gay propaganda by the Vietnamese Communist Party has propagated lasting negative social perceptions of homosexuals in Vietnam. These widely held misconceptions put gay people at great exposure to stigma and discrimination. There have been a significant number of studies focusing on the issues of HIV and AIDS among homosexuals in Vietnam (e.g., Colby et al., 2004), yet little has been done to assess Vietnamese heterosexuals’ homonegative attitudes. Thus, a scale to measure Vietnamese attitudes toward homosexuals and an intervention to improve these attitudes are needed. This is the first study to investigate the Vietnamese’s perceptions of gay men elaborately and systematically. A newly developed attitude scale promises to be an adequate measurement for scholars who are interested in studying gay health and anti-gay interventions in Vietnam. Moreover, adoption of effective intervention promises an increase in cultural acceptance and legal rights of homosexuals.

Section 2: Interventions to improve attitudes toward homosexuals in Vietnam

Interventions to improve attitudes toward homosexuals have been grouped into two categories: a cognitive approach or education-based interventions (e.g., dispelling myths and stereotypes) (Guth et al., 2004), and affective approach or empathy-centered interventions (e.g.,

using audio/visual media to enhance empathy for homosexuals) (Cooley & Burkholder, 2011). Although there are some studies that have evaluated the effectiveness of these two interventions in improving homonegativity in Western culture (Hodson et al., 2007), there have been no studies that address the efficacy of these interventions in a different culture, such as Vietnam. Thus, the examination of whether both interventions are also effective in improving Vietnamese's homonegativity within this study is valuable.

Section 3: Purpose of this study

The purpose of this study was to improve Vietnamese attitudes toward homosexuals by conducting a controlled experimental pre-post-follow-up intervention. It would be ideal to distinguish between attitudes toward gay men and attitudes toward lesbians (Herek, 2000). Since aggregate attitudes tend to be more hostile (e.g., mentally ill, child molesters) toward gay men than lesbians (Herek, 2002), this study concentrated on attitudes toward gay men. Study 1 and 2 constructed a scale to measure Vietnamese anti-gay attitudes. Study 3 examined whether both separate intervention videos (educational and empathic) are effective in improving attitudes toward Vietnamese gay men.

Chapter 2: The Vietnamese Version of Attitudes Toward Gay Men: Development, Validity, Reliability, and Correlates (Study 1)

Section 1: Preliminary Survey

Up to date, there has been no validated scale to measure Vietnamese attitudes toward homosexuals. Due to similarities in culture (e.g., Confucianism) between Japan and Vietnam, I

examined the potential application of Japanese Attitudes Toward Homosexuals (JATH; Wada, 2008) in this preliminary survey.

Method

Participants: The sample consisted of 197 heterosexual students (75% female, $M = 20.88$ years, $SD = 2.94$) enrolling in two large urban universities in Ho Chi Minh City. Those who identified themselves as “homosexual”, “bisexual” or “other” were excluded from analysis.

Measures: 48 items of the JATH (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

Results and Discussion

Factor structure: An exploratory factor analysis (promax rotation) yielded a three factor solution (21 items). However, over half of the items from the original scale had to be dropped. It is an unreliable measure. Thus, it is important to develop a scale to measure Vietnamese attitudes toward gay men. This is the main purpose of Study 1.

Section 2: Main Survey

Initially, I used an open-ended question to explore the social perceptions of gay men (Study 1). The results of this work led to the development of the Vietnamese Version of Attitudes Toward Gay Men (VATG). Next, three related measures [Homonegativity As Discomfort (Monto & Supinski, 2014), Self-report Anti-gay Behaviors (Roderick et al., 1998), and Traditional Male Role Attitudes (Pleck et al., 1994)] were chosen for validity test of the VATG (Study 2). Given that the Homonegativity As Discomfort measures affective aspects and the Self-report Anti-gay Behavior assesses behavioral aspects of attitudes toward gay men, we predicted that both scales would positively correlated with the VATG. Moreover, those who

endorse strong attitudes toward masculinity tend to be homonegativity (Davies, 2004), we predicted Traditional Male Role Attitudes (Pleck et al., 1994) would be positively correlated with the VATG. Finally, given that knowledge about gay issues and interpersonal contact are effective in improving prejudice toward gay men (Wada, 2008), and that traditional male role attitudes is an important factor that shapes prejudice against gay men (Davies, 2004), the current study aims to examine the effects of these factors on attitudes toward gay men in Vietnam.

Section 2.1: Social perceptions of gay men in Vietnam (Study 1)

Method

Participants: The final sample consisted of 252 heterosexual students (63% female, $M = 20.6$ years, $SD = 2.0$) enrolling at four large urban universities in Ho Chi Minh City and Ha Noi from 2012 through 2013. Those who reported only/mostly attracted to same sex, equally attracted to both sexes, unsure, or did not want to disclose their sexual orientation were omitted from analysis.

Instruments: An open-ended question “What do the people around you (your family, your friends, Vietnamese news and media) think or say about gay men?” was used. Because the question was not directly about the participants, it theoretically facilitated more honest answers about their perceptions and attitudes toward gay men.

Results and Discussion

Interpretation: This study generated 574 fragments, which were classified into four major categories (by two coders): *Perceptions and Behaviors* (48%), *Moral Thinking* (17%), *Stereotypes* (12%), and *Others* (23%). The concordance rate between coders was 86%.

Perceptions and Behaviors had four subthemes: Negative Perceptions and Behaviors (24%), Positive Perceptions and Behaviors (19%), Negative Emotions (4%), and Neutral Perceptions (2%). *Moral Thinking* had three subthemes: Moral Condemnation (11%), Moral Approval (5%), and Moral Neutrality (1%). *Stereotypes* had three subthemes: Negative stereotypes (10%), Positive Stereotypes (2%), and Gay Love (1%). Overall, about 25% of all coded fragments related to positive perceptions, behaviors, stereotypes, moral approval of gay men, while almost 46% of the fragments comprised negative views.

Of four categories, *Moral Thinking* might strongly reflect the culture-specific thought patterns of Vietnamese attitudes toward gay men. Strongly exposed to anti-gay propaganda by the Vietnamese Communist Party, most Vietnamese are likely to accuse male homosexuality of being “a social illness” or “against Vietnamese traditional customs and values”. These items have not been included in the literature.

Development of initial pool of items: By carefully reviewing and pulling items from the three conceptual categories and existing scales (e.g., LaMar & Kite, 1998; Wada, 2008), I created a pool of 73 items: Stereotypes (19), Moral Condemnation (12), Neutral Attitudes (4), Positive Attitudes (21), and Negative Attitudes (17).

Section 2.2: Scale development, reliability, validity and correlates (Study 2)

Method

Participants: The sample consisted of 455 Vietnamese heterosexual students (48% female, $M = 19.4$ years, $SD = 0.8$) enrolling at four large urban universities in Ho Chi Minh City and Ha Noi during September 2014. Similar to Study 1, non-heterosexuals were excluded. The survey took approximately 15–20 minutes to complete.

Instruments: Participants rated 73-item VATG and 8-item Traditional Male Role Attitudes [Confirmatory factor analysis result in this study (CFA): χ^2 (11, N = 455) = 13.74, χ^2/df = 1.25, *n.s.*, CFI = .99, GFI = .99, RMSEA = .02: α = .62] using 5-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*). An example of Traditional Male Role Attitudes is: “*It is essential for a guy to get respect from others*”. Next, they rated a 10-item Homonegativity As Discomfort scale [CFA: χ^2 (24, N = 455) = 46.84, χ^2/df = 1.95, p < .01, CFI = .99, GFI = .98, RMSEA = .05; α = .86] by choosing from 1 (*very comfortable*) to 5 (*very uncomfortable*). An example of this scale is: “*About two weeks ago you moved in with a new roommate who you found through a mutual friend. You have met his friends, and he has met yours, and you are all getting along pretty well. Today, he comes in holding hands with a man who he introduces as his boyfriend. How does this make you feel?*” Next, they rated an 18-item Self-report Anti-gay Behaviors scale by choosing from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*). The Self-report Anti-gay Behaviors [CFA: χ^2 (112, N = 455) = 220.90, χ^2/df = 1.97, p < .001, CFI = .98, GFI = .95, RMSEA = .05] consisted of two subscales: *Avoidant Behaviors* with an α value of .86 (e.g., “*When a gay person has been near me, I have moved away to put more distance between us*”) and *Aggressive Behaviors* with an α value of .91 (e.g., “*I have participated in damaging someone’s property because he was gay*”). They responded to a 31-item version of Knowledge About Gay Issues (e.g., “*Gay men can usually be identified by certain mannerisms or physical characteristics*”) by circling *True/False/Don’t know*. A correct answer was given 1 point, while a wrong answer was given 0 points. The scale score was computed by summing item scores. Finally, they reported a number of gay friends.

Results and Discussion

Factor structure and reliability: Exploratory factor analyses (promax rotation) yielded a four factor solution (34 items): *Positive Attitudes* (e.g., “Male homosexuality is acceptable”; $\alpha = .90$), *Social Distance* (e.g., “I do not want to communicate with gay men”; $\alpha = .91$), *Moral Condemnation* (e.g., “Male homosexuality is against filial piety”; $\alpha = .90$), and *Effeminacy* (e.g., “Most gay men have heart of a woman”; $\alpha = .70$). The confirmatory factor analysis indicated that the four-factor model was adequate fit ($\chi^2(488, N = 455) = 752.96, \chi^2/df = 1.54, p < .01$, CFI = .97, GFI = .91, RMSEA = .04). All four items of the Neutral Attitudes subscale were eliminated from the factorial structure. This could be attributed to the limitation of the pool items generated for this subscale (four items).

Construct validity (Table 1): The Homonegativity As Discomfort and Traditional Male Role Attitudes had moderate to strong correlations with *Social Distance*, *Positive Attitudes*, and *Moral Condemnation*. The *Social Distance* subscale had moderate correlations with two subscales of the Self-report Anti-gay Behaviors. As shown in Table 1, the Effeminacy subscale was relatively independent from other subscales of the VATG and it demonstrated low correlations with the Homonegativity As Discomfort and Traditional Male Role Attitudes. Moreover, Positive Attitudes, Moral Condemnation and Effeminacy had low correlations with the Self-report Antigay Behaviors. These results demonstrated construct validity of the VATG

Correlates: Four multiple regression analysis were conducted predicting four subscales of the VATG from a 31-item version of Knowledge About Gay Issues scale, Traditional Male Role Attitudes and Having Gay Friends. The results revealed that Traditional Male Role Attitudes significantly predicted four subscales ($\beta_s > .20, ps < .001$). Having Gay Friends significantly

predicted three subscales (β s > .09, p s < .05) except Effeminacy ($\beta = -.08$, $p = .08$). Consistent with Wada (2008), these results suggested a potential role of knowledge about gay issues and interpersonal contact with gay men in improving attitudes toward gay men.

Table 1: Correlations among the VATG and three other criterion measures

| Variables | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|-------------------------------------|-----|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Vietnamese Attitudes Toward Gay Men | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 <i>Social Distance</i> | --- | -.62 *** | .55 *** | .37 *** | .59 *** | .38 *** | .36 *** | .37 *** | 2.48 | (.71) |
| 2 <i>Positive Attitudes</i> | | --- | -.69 *** | -.24 *** | -.59 *** | -.14 ** | -.26 *** | -.30 *** | 3.47 | (.60) |
| 3 <i>Moral Condemnation</i> | | | --- | .26 *** | .51 *** | .14 ** | .23 *** | .33 *** | 2.56 | (.72) |
| 4 <i>Effeminacy</i> | | | | --- | .23 *** | .13 ** | .12 * | .23 *** | 2.94 | (.80) |
| 5 Homonegativity As Discomfort | | | | | --- | .17 *** | .24 *** | .25 *** | 3.19 | (.60) |
| Self-Report Anti-gay Behaviors | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 <i>Aggressive Behaviors</i> | | | | | | --- | .46 *** | .20 *** | 1.28 | (.50) |
| 7 <i>Avoidance Behaviors</i> | | | | | | | --- | .21 *** | 1.42 | (.54) |
| 8 Traditional Male Role Attitudes | | | | | | | | --- | 3.09 | (.51) |

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Chapter 3: Evaluating the Effectiveness of Two Video-Based Interventions Designed to Reduce Anti-Gay Attitudes in Vietnam (Study 3)

This experimental study investigated the effectiveness of educational and empathic interventions in improving attitudes toward gay men. According to Hodson et al. (2009), participants in the empathic intervention expressed less prejudice toward homosexuals than those in the educational intervention. I predicted that the empathic intervention would be more effective than the educational intervention at post-intervention. Moreover, compared to knowledge, empathy is more likely to decrease over time (West et al., 2007). Thus, there is a possibility that the empathic intervention would be less effective than the educational intervention.

Method

Participants: In 2015, a total of 384 heterosexual students (mean age = 19.7, $SD = 1.0$) at four large urban universities in Ho Chi Minh City participated in the study in three sessions (pre-, post-, and follow-up). Each session lasted about 15 minutes. All participants were naïve to the interventions. Similar to Study 1, non-heterosexuals were excluded.

Measures and Procedure: At pre-intervention, participants completed the 34-item VATG, a 9-item version of Knowledge About Gay Issues scale (most popular misconceptions about gay issues). On return to class 7 days later, participants in each class (17 classes in total) were randomly assigned to either one of three video conditions: Education condition ($N = 183$), empathy condition ($N = 126$), and control condition ($N = 52$). After watching a video, they completed the post-intervention assessment including the 16-item Discrete Emotion Scale (Gross & Levenson, 1995; 1 = *not at all*, 5 = *the strongest in my life*), VATG, and the 9-item version of Knowledge About Gay issues. The Discrete Emotion Scale had three subscales: *Positive Emotions* (e.g., “*Happiness*”; $\alpha = .83$), *Moral Emotions* (e.g., “*Fear*”; $\alpha = .70$), and *Negative Emotions* (e.g., “*Sadness*”; $\alpha = .71$). 45 days later, participants responded to the VATG and the 9-item version of Knowledge About Gay issues.

Interventions: The educational video comprised two sessions: Gender diversity (Danjo Kyoudo Sankaku Sentaa Yokohama, 2009) and facts about gay men. For the empathic video, I chose a 14-minute film entitled “Uncle and Son” focused on social prejudice against a gay man. The control video showed tourist destinations in Japan. Each clip lasted about 15 minutes.

Results

Factorial validity: The VATG comprised four subscales, with fair fit indices [χ^2 (514, N = 361) = 1066.87, $\chi^2/df = 2.07$, $p < .001$, CFI = .93, RMSEA = .06], and adequate reliability ($\alpha s > .82$) at pre-, post-, and follow-up intervention.

Video manipulation check: After watching an empathic video, which depicted scenes showing a gay man was discriminated against, participants in the empathy condition had less *Positive Emotions* (1.51) than other conditions ($M_s > 1.68$, $F(2, 358) = 75.75$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .30$) but had more *Negative Emotions* (1.83) than other conditions ($M_s < 1.09$, $F(2, 358) = 81.19$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .31$). Participants in the education condition (7.77) scored more on the 9-item version of Knowledge About Gay Issues than other conditions ($M_s < 2.17$, $F(2, 358) = 473.31$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .73$). Each video had its intended effect on the participants of each condition. These provided evidence for the validity of the manipulation.

Intervention effects (Table 2): A series of 3 (condition: education, empathy, and control) \times 3 (time: pre-, post-, and follow-up) mixed factorial ANOVAs revealed significant interactions between condition and time factor for *Positive Attitudes*, *Moral Condemnation*, *Social Distance*, *Effeminacy* [$ps < .05$, η_p^2 's $> .02$]. Tests of simple main effects comparing three conditions at pre-intervention revealed no significant differences among conditions in VATG [t_s (1074) < 2.43 , adjusted $ps > .05$, $ds < .15$]. Furthermore, test of simple main effects comparing the three time points revealed no significant changes in VATG in the empathy and control condition [t_s (358) < 1.84 , $ps > .07$, $ds < .19$]. By contrast, participants in the education condition showed a significant increase in *Positive Attitudes*, and a significant decrease in *Social Distance*, *Moral*

Condemnation, and *Effeminacy* across time [$t_s(358) > 2.77$, $p_s < .01$, $d_s > .29$]. Their post- and follow-up *Positive Attitudes* scores were greater than their pre-*Positive Attitudes* score. Conversely, their post- and follow-up *Effeminacy* scores were lower than their pre-*Effeminacy* score. No significant differences were found between post- and follow-up in *Positive Attitudes* and *Effeminacy* scores. Their *Social Distance* and *Moral Condemnation* scores at follow-up were greater than those at post-intervention, but remained lower than those at pre-intervention.

Table 2: 3 x 3 Factorial ANOVA results

| Variables | Time | Condition | | | | | | Condition $F(2, 358)$ | Time $F(\epsilon df1, \epsilon df2)$ | Group x Time $F(\epsilon df1, \epsilon df2)$ | Education |
|---------------------------|-----------|------------------------|-------|----------------------|-------|---------------------|-------|--------------------------|---|--|----------------------------|
| | | Education (N = 183) | | Empathy (N = 126) | | Control (N = 52) | | | | | |
| | | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | | | | |
| <i>Positive Attitudes</i> | Pre- | 3.49 | (.75) | 3.49 | (.84) | 3.43 | (.80) | 1.55 | 11.50 *** (1.84, 660.41) | 3.33 * (3.69, 660.41) | Pre < Post \cong F |
| | Post- | 3.73 | (.64) | 3.58 | (.73) | 3.47 | (.72) | | | | |
| | Follow-up | 3.68 | (.59) | 3.54 | (.78) | 3.50 | (.64) | | | | |
| <i>Social Distance</i> | Pre- | 2.21 | (.72) | 2.22 | (.78) | 2.26 | (.72) | 3.07 * | 12.94 *** (1.97, 706.04) | 6.41 *** (3.94, 706.04) | Pre > Post & F Post < F |
| | Post- | 1.91 | (.57) | 2.13 | (.75) | 2.26 | (.67) | | | | |
| | Follow-up | 2.10 | (.65) | 2.21 | (.71) | 2.38 | (.69) | | | | |
| <i>Moral Condemnation</i> | Pre- | 2.55 | (.69) | 2.52 | (.83) | 2.51 | (.73) | 2.28 | 2.73 (1.91, 683.19) | 14.58 *** (3.82, 683.19) | Pre > Post & F Post < F |
| | Post- | 2.30 | (.68) | 2.57 | (.78) | 2.58 | (.74) | | | | |
| | Follow-up | 2.38 | (.69) | 2.56 | (.82) | 2.68 | (.73) | | | | |
| <i>Effeminacy</i> | Pre- | 2.87 | (.83) | 2.77 | (.95) | 3.10 | (.86) | 10.04 *** | 8.66 *** (1.99, 712.62) | 10.03 *** (3.98, 712.62) | Pre > Post \cong F |
| | Post- | 2.50 | (.80) | 2.74 | (.85) | 3.06 | (.67) | | | | |
| | Follow-up | 2.42 | (.80) | 2.76 | (.72) | 3.10 | (.71) | | | | |

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$
 ϵ : correction coefficient

Correlation analysis: Analysis of correlations between mean change scores (mean scale score at follow-up minus mean scale score at pre-intervention) of the VATG and mean change scores of 9-item version Knowledge About Gay Issues for education condition showed a significant positive correlation for positive attitudes ($r = .15$, $p = .04$) and significant negative correlations for moral condemnation and effeminacy ($r_s > -.20$, $p_s < .05$). As mentioned earlier, the strong anti-gay attitudes among Vietnamese heterosexuals were permeated by Vietnamese Communist Party's anti-gay propaganda. As such, although the correlation effects in this study were small (r_s

> .15, $p < .05$), they statistically significant, and suggested that change in Vietnamese attitudes toward gay men (except for Social Distance) was due to change in Knowledge about Gay Issues.

Chapter 4: General Discussion

In aiming to mitigate Vietnamese prejudice against gay men, I developed the VATG (Study 1), and examined its reliability, validity and correlates (Study 2). Study 3 examined the effects of two intervention strategies (education-based interventions and empathy-centered interventions) on mitigating prejudices against gay men. As a result, I found that enhancing knowledge might be a more effective way of decreasing anti-gay attitudes than building up empathy. This is in contradiction to results in Hodson et al. (2009). Empathy training programs promoting students' ability to take perspective of gay men have long been conducted in the United States. These programs put American in a less prejudicial frame of mind and increases intergroup contact with gay men. By contrast, such programs are scarce in Vietnam. Being less exposed to empathy training programs, Vietnamese respondents in Study 3 might not think that a gay man in the movie was discriminated against. This might fail to activate their favorable attitudes, which led to no changes in their attitudes toward gay men across three time points. Another explanation was that the movie I selected failed to enable participants to feel empathic enough to change their attitudes toward gay men.

Study 1 found that *Moral Thinking* strongly reflected the culture-specific thought patterns of Vietnamese attitudes toward gay men. This may be due to being strongly exposed to anti-gay propaganda by the Vietnamese Communist Party. As such, most Vietnamese are likely to accused male homosexuality of being “a social illness” or “against Vietnamese traditional

customs and values”. However, Study 3 proved that moral condemnation can be altered by having ample and accurate knowledge about gay issues. This proved educating Vietnamese heterosexuals with knowledge about gay issues is an important factor in mitigating prejudice.

Although the study met criteria for a well-established experiment, it is limited. Firstly, the sample was restricted to a college population. Secondly, I only reported changes in anti-gay attitudes, but did not examine whether there are improvements in behaviors as well as sentiments. Thirdly, participants in this study reported changes in attitudes and knowledge in a short term period (45-day follow-up). Given that making a durable change is one of the main objectives of the intervention program, further studies should address whether the improvement in attitude toward gay men will have a lasting effect. Moreover, future studies should examine Vietnamese attitudes toward lesbians. Finally, future studies should address whether other films which help to enhance empathy toward gay men can result in improving attitudes toward gay men.

References

- Colby, D., Cao, N. H., & Doussantousse, S. (2004). Men who have sex with men and HIV in Vietnam: A review. *AIDS Education and Prevention*, 16(1: Special issue), 45-54.
- Cooley, J. J., & Burkholder, G. J. (2011). Using video and contact to change attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. *Journal of Social, Behavioral, and Health Sciences*, 5(1), 83-90.
- Danjo Kyoudo Sankaku Sentaa Yokohama. (2009). Sekusharu mainoritii rikai no tame ni: Kodomotachi no gakkou seikatsu to kokoro wo mamoru. Kyouseinetto. Retrieved December, 31, 2015 from <http://www.kyouseinet.org/dvd/dvd.html>

- Davies, M. (2004). Correlates of negative attitudes toward gay men: Sexism, male role norms, and male sexuality. *Journal of Sex Research*, 41(3), 259-266.
- Feng, Y., Lou, C., Gao, E., Tu, X., Cheng, Y., Emerson, M. R., & Zabin, L. S. (2012). Adolescents' and young adults' perception of homosexuality and related factors in three Asian cities. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 50(3), 52-60.
- Gross, J. J., & Levenson, R. W. (1995). Emotion elicitation using films. *Cognition & Emotion*, 9(1), 87-108.
- Guth, L. J., Lopez, D. F., Rojas, J., Clements, K. D., & Tyler, J. M. (2004). Experiential versus rational training: A comparison of student attitudes toward homosexuality. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 48(2), 83-102.
- Herek, G. M. (2000). Sexual prejudice and gender: Do heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men differ? *Journal of Social Issues*, 56(2), 251-266.
- Herek, G. M. (2002). Gender gaps in public opinion about lesbians and gay men. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 66(1), 40-66.
- Hodson, G., Choma, B. L., & Costello, K. (2009). Experiencing alien-nation: Effects of a simulation intervention on attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(4), 974-978.
- LaMar, L., & Kite, M. (1998). Sex differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians: A multidimensional perspective. *Journal of Sex Research*, 35(2), 189-196.

- Monto, M. A., & Supinski, J. (2014). Discomfort with homosexuality: A new measure captures differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 61(6), 899-916.
- Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (1994). Attitudes toward male roles among adolescent males: A discriminant validity analysis. *Sex Roles*, 30(7-8), 481-501.
- Roderick, T., McCammon, S. L., Long, T. E., & Allred, L. J. (1998). Behavioral aspects of homonegativity. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 36(1), 79-88.
- Wada, M. (2008) Douseiai ni taisuru taido no seisa: Douseiai ni tsuite no chishiki, douseiaisha to no sesshoku, oyobi jendaa taipu to no kanren. [Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexuals: Examining the relationships among knowledge about homosexuality, contact with homosexuals and type of gender]. *Japanese Journal of Adolescentology*, 26(3), 322-334.
- West, C. P., Huntington, J. L., Huschka, M. M., Novotny, P. J., Sloan, J. A., Kolars, J. C., Habermann T. H., & Shanafelt, T. D. (2007). A prospective study of the relationship between medical knowledge and professionalism among internal medicine residents. *Academic Medicine*, 82(6), 587-592.