

**How Would You React?: Exploring Heterosexual Women's  
Reactions to Confrontations of Their Own Homonegative Behaviour**

A Thesis Submitted to the College of  
Graduate Studies and Research  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Master of Arts Degree  
in the Department of Psychology  
University of Saskatchewan  
Saskatoon

By  
Edwin Rogers

## **PERMISSION TO USE**

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirement for a Postgraduate degree from the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of this University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my thesis work or, in her absence, by the Head of the Department or the Dean of the College in which my thesis work was done. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Requests for permission to copy or make other use of the material in this thesis in whole or in part should be addressed to:

Head of Department of Psychology

University of Saskatchewan

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 5A5

## **ABSTRACT**

To date, little research has explored the utility of inter-personal confrontation as a strategy for the reduction of homonegative attitudes and/or behaviours among heterosexual women.

Consequently, the purpose of the current study was to explore three unique aspects of such confrontations among a sample of heterosexual women from the University of Saskatchewan.

These three aspects were: 1) to what extent do high- and low-prejudiced women's reactions to confrontations of subtle homonegative behaviour differ; 2) what differences exist in the way that heterosexual women respond to bias directed towards gay men than to bias directed towards lesbian women; 3) what effect does the vested interest of a confronter have on heterosexual women's reaction to confrontations of homonegative behaviour. A 2(target condition) X 2(modern homonegativity endorsement) X 4(confronter type) between-subjects design was used wherein 286 female volunteers completed a questionnaire booklet developed for the project. The questionnaire booklet asked participants to first imagine themselves in a scenario where they would be confronted for engaging in subtle homonegative behaviour and to then indicated how they would think, feel, and behave in response to such a confrontation. The results indicated that low-prejudice participants reacted with greater negative-self directed affect (e.g., guilt) and compunction (e.g., apologize for behaviour) than high-prejudice participants when confronted by either a gay man or lesbian woman. Such reactions are important as they mark the initiation of a self-regulatory cycle that allows the individual to avoid such biased behaviour in the future. Limitations of the study and directions for future research concerning inter-personal confrontations of homonegativity are also presented.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to express my sincere thanks to everyone who has made this project possible. First, I would like to thank Dr. Melanie Morrison for her unwavering support and guidance. Her positive feedback and enthusiasm was essential to bringing this project to fruition. I will never forget your contributions to this project. Next, I would like to thank my committee members, Dr. Don Cochrane and Dr. Steve Wormith. Their guidance and advice throughout the development of this project was invaluable. Finally, I would like to thank those dearest to me (you know who you are) for supporting me throughout this project. I will never ask you to fill out another survey again!

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PERMISSION TO USE.....	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	ix
CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Homonegativity: A Social Problem.....	1
1.2. The Impact of Homonegativity.....	4
1.3. Homonegativity: Terminology.....	5
1.4. Homonegativity: Past Intervention Strategies.....	10
1.4.1 Cognitive/Educational Approach.....	10
1.4.2 Contact Theory.....	12
1.4.3 Combination Approaches.....	13
1.5. Bias Reduction Through Confrontation.....	14
1.6. Target Groups.....	18
1.7. Different Confronters.....	19
1.8. Study Overview.....	19
CHAPTER TWO – METHODOLOGY.....	21
2.1. Participants.....	21
2.1.1 Recruitment.....	21
2.1.2 Demographic Information.....	21
2.2. Materials.....	22
2.2.1 Questionnaire Booklet.....	22
2.3 Measures.....	22
2.3.1 Modern Homonegativity Scale.....	22
2.3.2 Interpersonal Scenarios.....	22
2.3.3 Affective Reactions.....	24
2.3.4 Thought and Behavioural Reactions.....	24
2.3.5 Interpretation of Confrontation.....	25

2.3.5 Demographic Information.....	25
2.3.6 Manipulations Check.....	25
2.4 Design and Procedure.....	26
CHAPTER THREE – RESULTS.....	29
3.1 Modern Homonegativity.....	29
3.2 Principal Components Analysis.....	30
3.2.1 Affective Reaction Scale .....	30
3.2.2 Thought and Behavioural Reactions Scale.....	31
3.3. Affective Reactions.....	31
3.3.1 Negative Self-Directed.....	32
3.3.2 Negative Other-Directed.....	32
3.3.3 Amused.....	33
3.3.4 Exasperated.....	33
3.4 Thought and Behavioural Reactions.....	33
3.4.1 Compunction.....	34
3.4.2 Antagonism.....	34
3.5 Interpretation of the Confrontation Situation.....	34
3.5.1 Legitimacy of the Confrontation.....	34
3.5.2 Severity of Biased Response.....	35
3.5.3 Likelihood of Confrontation.....	36
3.5.4 Relationship among the Measures.....	36
CHAPTER FOUR – DISCUSSION.....	37
4.1 Homonegativity Endorsement.....	37
4.1.1 Low-Prejudiced Participants.....	38
4.1.2 High- Prejudiced Participants.....	38
4.1.3 The Exasperated Reaction.....	39
4.1.4 Overview.....	39
4.2 Target Condition: Gay Men Versus Lesbian Women.....	40
4.3 Confronter Type.....	41
4.4. Nature of the Homonegative Joke Scenario.....	44
4.5 Limitations and Future Research.....	45

4.5.1 Confrontation Type.....	45
4.5.2 Nature of the Sample.....	46
4.5.3 Modern Homonegativity Endorsement.....	46
4.5.4 Overview.....	47
CHAPTER FIVE – REFERENCES.....	48
APPENDIX A.....	65
APPENDIX B.....	66
APPENDIX C.....	67
APPENDIX D.....	68
APPENDIX E.....	69
APPENDIX F.....	71
APPENDIX G.....	72
APPENDIX H.....	73

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Demographic Information	56
Table 2	Detailed Descriptives	57
Table 3	Skewness and Kurtosis Values: Affective Reaction Scales	58
Table 4	Mean Transformed Negative Self-Directed Scores for the Target Condition by Confronter Type Interaction	59
Table 5	Skewness and Kurtosis Values: Thought and Behavioural Reaction Scales	60
Table 6	Mean Transformed Antagonism Scores for the Target Condition X Modern Homonegativity Interaction	61
Table 7	Mean Severity for the Target Condition by Confronter Type Interaction	62
Table 8	Mean Confronter Likelihood Scores	63
Table 9	Inter-correlations Between Dependent Variable (N = 286)	64



## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

APA	American Psychological Association
ATHS	Attitudes Towards Homosexuals Scale
ATLG	Attitudes Towards Lesbians and Gay Men Scale
MHS	Modern Homonegativity Scale
ARS	Affective Reaction Scale
TBS	Thought and Behavioural Reactions Scale
NSD	Negative Self-Directed Reactions
NOD	Negative Other-Directed Reactions
AMD	Amused Reactions
EXS	Exasperated Reactions
COM	Compunction Reactions
ANT	Antagonistic Reactions
LOC	Legitimacy of the Confrontation
SBR	Severity of Biased Response
LC	Likelihood of Confrontation

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Diagrammatic representation of Monteith's (1993) self-regulatory cycle for prejudice reduction.	55
----------	---	----

## CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION

We have all likely experienced that awkward situation in which a friend, co-worker, or family member says something offensive, or does something discriminatory, towards a gay man or lesbian woman. While we often find these comments or actions inappropriate, we may rarely confront these individuals about their behaviour. This is not to say that we do not consider doing something. We often ask ourselves, “What should I do? Should I say something? Will it really matter? What will they think of me?” Unfortunately, in most cases, the moment that we have to confront someone passes and we continue on as if nothing really happened. No good would come of it anyway, right? But, what if something good could come from confronting the homonegativity directed towards gay men and lesbian women? That is, what if confronting those around us has the potential to reduce the expression of this form of prejudice?

Generally speaking, the purpose of this experiment was to adapt and extend the confrontation research methodology utilized by Czopp and Monteith (2003) to the area of homonegativity. In particular, this study explored the extent to which different confronters (i.e., whether the confronter is a gay man, a heterosexual man, a lesbian woman, or a heterosexual woman) elicited different reactions in the female participants who were confronted. In addition, the experiment studied the extent to which female participants’ reactions differed when confronted about homonegativity directed towards a gay man or a lesbian woman.

Before outlining this study in detail, some discussion is warranted regarding the prevalence of anti-gay and anti-lesbian attitudes and behaviours; the nature of homonegativity; and the impact on sexual minorities. It is hoped this discussion will help to highlight the need for this research.

### *1.1 Homonegativity: A Social Problem*

Blatant and subtle forms of prejudice and discrimination, at institutional (e.g., social services) and interpersonal (e.g., work-place relationships) levels, are experienced by gay men and lesbian women. The present section reviews some of the varied literature that reflects the nature and scope of this large social problem.

Gay men and lesbian women face considerable discrimination and prejudice in a number of institutional settings. For example, Travers and Schneider (1996) have documented the experiences of gay ( $n = 14$ ) and lesbian ( $n = 3$ ) youth within addiction services in Canada. The authors discovered that the youth faced large barriers to their attainment of appropriate

addictions programming. The youth described experiences of being marginalized (e.g., staff withheld services and discharged gay and lesbian youth early), silenced (e.g., staff ignored the importance of sexuality in addictions treatment), and harassed (e.g., staff physically threatened the youth). According to Travers and Schneider (1996), these negative experiences likely reinforced for the sexual minority youths many of the reasons that led to their substance abuse in the first place. For example, Jacobs (1986) has suggested that feelings of inadequacy, isolation, and depression are at the core of all forms of addiction.

Berstein and Kostelac (2002) document institutional discrimination within American police forces. Utilizing survey methodology, the authors discovered that 60% of officers surveyed ( $N = 249$ ) strongly agreed with a statement suggesting that their police department treated gay and lesbian members of the public who had placed calls for service more negatively than their heterosexual counterparts. Using a self-report measure similar to the one employed by Franklin (2000), the authors also reported that 25% of the sample had engaged in at least one form of homonegative behaviour (e.g., avoiding contact and using derogatory/insulting names) in the past five years towards an individual they perceived to be gay or lesbian. Of these behaviours, calling a homosexual man or woman an insulting name was most common (i.e., 18% of police officers indicated they had heard others engage in this type of name-calling). Furthermore, 25% of respondents believed that openly recruiting gay men and lesbian women would decrease force morale, and a further 15% indicated that the presence of openly gay and lesbian officers would undermine the police force. Not surprisingly, Diaz, Ayala, Bein, Henne, and Marin (2001) have found that 20% of the American gay men in their sample ( $N = 912$ ) had been harassed by police on the basis of their sexual orientation. These experiences of discrimination may contribute to the reluctance among some gay men and lesbian women to report violence directed towards them (Comstock, 1991; Herek, Cogan, & Gillis, 2002).

Within the educational system, Pilkington and Cantor (1996) surveyed 64 professional psychology student members of the American Psychological Association (APA). The results provided a disturbing picture of psychological graduate school training. Respondents indicated that the majority of the textbooks they used contained homonegative passages that ridiculed and stereotyped (e.g., homosexuality is pathological) gay men and lesbian women. Approximately, 58% of the graduate students sampled indicated that their instructors were openly negative towards sexual minorities. Furthermore, 75% of students sampled indicated that their courses

ignored sexual orientation issues and 21% indicated that they were actively discouraged from exploring issues of this nature in their research programs. These examples are but a few from the larger body of research that has explored prejudice and discrimination within institutions.

Similar findings emerge when considering the literature on interpersonal homonegativity. For example, survey research conducted by D'Augelli and Grossman (2001) with 416 gay, lesbian, and bisexual American and Canadian individuals indicated that approximately 270 (or 65%) had experienced interpersonal discrimination as a result of their sexual orientation. Of these participants, the majority (63%) had been subjected to verbal abuse in the past. Approximately 16% of the participants had been physically attacked and 29% had been threatened with violence. The results of this research are similar to the earlier work of Herek et al. (1999). Utilizing self-report questionnaires exploring victimization experiences, Herek et al. revealed that 56% of participants sampled ( $N = 2259$ ) had been verbally abused and 19% had been threatened with violence. In addition, 25% of gay men and 20% of lesbian women had experienced, as a result of their sexual orientation, victimization from criminal acts such as sexual or physical assault.

In a recent comprehensive study of both child and adult victimization, Balsam, Rothblum, and Beauchaine (2005) found that gay, lesbian, and bisexual respondents ( $N = 721$ ), when compared to their heterosexual siblings, reported higher levels of psychological, physical, and sexual abuse from parents and guardians. The finding is troubling given previous research suggesting that childhood abuse leads to higher rates of gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth turning to the streets and/or homeless shelters (e.g., Corlis, Cochran, Mays, 2002; Mallon, 2001; Savin-Williams, 1994). This pattern of abuse continued into adulthood, as these same individuals experienced physical and sexual assault at a much higher rate than their heterosexual siblings. For example, only 1.6% of the heterosexual male siblings had experienced sexual assault, compared with 13.2% of bisexual and 11.6% of gay male respondents.

The results are complemented by Franklin's (2000) research which focused on the perpetrators of anti-gay/anti-lesbian behaviours. Using self-report measures, Franklin discovered that 10% of participants sampled ( $N = 489$ ) admitted to physically assaulting a gay man or lesbian woman, with 24% reporting verbally harassing individuals whom they perceived to be gay or lesbian. Of those who did not report harassing sexual minorities, 23% indicated that they had witnessed discrimination directed towards someone who was gay or lesbian. The results of

this study (despite likely under-reporting), combined with the gay and lesbian self-report data, suggest that anti-gay/anti-lesbian behaviours are widespread.

### *1.2 The Impact of Homonegativity*

Numerous studies have sought to explore the impact that discrimination has on gay men and lesbian women (e.g., Grossman, D'Augelli, Hershberger, & O'Connell, 2001). The consistent result is that perceived discrimination has a profound impact on physical and psychological health. Obviously, physical consequences such as bruises, fractures, head injuries, and even death can result from vicious physical assault. Less obvious are physical symptoms such as headaches and sleep disturbances that result from perceived discrimination (Diaz et al., 2001). Furthermore, gay men and lesbian women are at high risk for developing problems with drugs and alcohol (Little, 2001; Lampinen, McGhee, & Martin, 2006). For example, Cochran, Keenan, Schober, and Mays (2000) found that sexually active lesbians consumed alcohol more frequently and in larger amounts than heterosexual women. When considering illicit drug use, both gay men and lesbian women display a moderate elevation in use when compared to their heterosexual counterparts. Gay men and lesbian women are also more likely to exhibit symptoms of dysfunctional drug use and marijuana dependence (Cochran et al.)

Many gay men and lesbian women experience psychological health problems (e.g., depression, anxiety, and post-traumatic stress) as a result of discrimination (D'Augelli & Grossman, 2001; Herek et al., 1999). For example, Diaz et al. (2001) demonstrated a statistically significant relationship between perceived discrimination and psychological distress for sexual minorities. The authors noted that 17% of participants had suicidal ideations, 44% experienced severe anxiety, and 80% considered themselves to be depressed. Earlier work by Herek et al. (1999) found that, among their sample ( $N = 2259$ ), one-fourth of gay men and one-fifth of lesbian women had experienced criminal victimization. Of these individuals, hate crime survivors exhibited significantly more symptoms of psychological distress when they had experienced victimization in the five years previous to the study.

The physical and psychological impact that discrimination has on gay men and lesbian women is evident from the few examples given here. Unfortunately, members of sexual minorities are also less likely to seek medical treatment in order to avoid homonegative healthcare providers (e.g., Daley, 1998). This avoidance clearly places these individuals at risk for undiagnosed and untreated health problems. Furthermore, the process of "coming out" to

friends and family may result in the rejection and loss of much needed sources of social support (D'Augelli, Hershberger, & Pilkington, 2001). As social support has been found to play an important protective function for the health of minority individuals (Yoshikawa, Wilson, Chae, & Cheng, 2004), the rejection and loss of support networks is quite troubling.

### *1.3 Homonegativity: Terminology*

Numerous terms have been developed to describe heterosexuals' anti-gay/anti-lesbian attitudes and behaviours, and some consideration must be given to which term is most appropriate for the purposes of this research. Of these terms, *homophobia*, *homonegativity*, and *sexual prejudice* have been used frequently throughout the literature (e.g., Herek, 2004; Meyer, Forest, & Miller, 2004; Morrison, Kenny, & Harrington, 2005). This paper employs the term "homonegativity," first articulated by Hudson and Ricketts (1980), which is defined as a multifaceted construct that encompasses heterosexuals' negative affective, cognitive, and behavioural responses directed towards individuals perceived, correctly or incorrectly, to be gay or lesbian. This term was selected for two reasons.

First, the term "homonegativity," unlike the term "homophobia" (Weinberg, 1972), does not imply that anti-gay/anti-lesbian attitudes and behaviours are necessarily the result of an intense irrational dread of being in close quarters with homosexuals. Although this type of negative reaction does occur, a large proportion of the current data (e.g., Herek, 1994; Shields & Harriman, 1984) would suggest that negative attitudes towards gay men and lesbian women are rooted in feelings of anger and disgust that individuals believe they are justified in holding (for a detailed discussion, see Herek, 2004). By using the term "homonegativity," our understanding of anti-gay/anti-lesbian attitudes is not limited to viewing them in terms of irrational fear responses.

Second, Herek (2000, 2004) has advocated use of the term "sexual prejudice" to describe prejudice based on any sexual orientation (whether it be homosexual, heterosexual, or bisexual). This is a very broadly conceived term as sexual prejudice is believed to be multidirectional in that it can be characterized as anti-gay/anti-lesbian/anti-bisexual attitudes expressed by the heterosexual majority (i.e., top-down), and/or as negative attitudes that members of sexual minorities hold toward heterosexual individuals (i.e., bottom-up). In addition, sexual prejudice can refer to the hostility felt between members of various sexual minority groups (e.g., gay men's and lesbian women's negative reactions to bisexuals). While sexual prejudice represents a

very compelling term, this research adopts homonegativity as it focuses attention on the negative attitudes and behaviours that, primarily, heterosexual individuals express towards gay men and lesbian women. Further, the term “sexual prejudice” can be confusing as audiences may assume that it concerns negative attitudes towards women (i.e., it is another term for sexism) or that it concerns specific sexual acts (e.g., anal or oral sex). In order to avoid confusion and to focus more directly on heterosexual individuals’ attitudes, the term homonegativity was adopted.

The second issue that follows from selection of homonegativity as the appropriate term concerns the need to articulate how understanding of this construct has evolved. Akin to theorizing in areas of sexism (e.g., Swim, Aiken, Hall, & Hunter, 1995) and racism (e.g., Dovidio, 2001; McConahay, 1986), it has been argued that homonegativity should be understood in terms of two conceptually distinct forms: modern and old-fashioned (Morrison et al., 2005; Morrison & Morrison, 2002; Morrison et al., in press). Specifically, Morrison and Morrison (2002) have successfully demonstrated that homonegativity, like sexism and racism, could be better understood if a distinction was made between old-fashioned and modern forms.

According to Morrison and Morrison (2002), old-fashioned homonegativity reflects objections and/or misconceptions about gay men and lesbian women that are rooted in traditional religious and moral condemnation (e.g., male homosexuality is a sin and gay men are immoral, respectively). These attitudes are best represented by traditional scales designed to measure attitudes towards gay men and lesbian women (e.g., the Attitudes towards Lesbians and Gay Men scale [ATLG; Herek, 1988] and the Attitudes towards Homosexuals scale [ATHS; Altemeyer, 1988]). Items from the ATLG are particularly good examples of this type of old-fashioned thinking (e.g., “Female homosexuality is a sin,” and “Male homosexuality is a perversion,”). Interestingly, over the past decade, researchers have documented a decrease in heterosexuals’ endorsement of negative attitudinal statements on old-fashioned scales such as the ATLG, with scores falling below the scale mid-points for both male and female respondents (e.g., Altemeyer, 2001; Schellenberg, Hirt, & Sears, 1999; Simon, 1996). Such findings, combined with the results of 20 years of polling data depicting positive change (see Yang, 1997 for a review), suggest that attitudes towards sexual minorities are becoming less negative in North America.

Morrison and Morrison (2002) perceived the documented decrease in negative attitude endorsement as somewhat spurious given behavioural evidence suggesting that heterosexual



individuals have maintained their anti-gay/anti-lesbian attitudes. After considering this evidence, Morrison and Morrison contended that the decrease in endorsement of old-fashioned homonegativity may not constitute greater acceptance of gay men and lesbian women, but the emergence of a modern form of homonegativity. Of course, this is not to suggest that old-fashioned homonegativity has been replaced with this modern form; rather, the authors argued that there has been a shift to a form of homonegativity that is more abstract in nature, and conceptually different from its old-fashioned counterpart. It was believed that a modern conceptualization of homonegativity would help researchers understand the prejudice espoused in populations (e.g., college or university campuses) that demonstrate an increasing acceptance of gay men and lesbian women, as measured by old-fashioned homonegativity scales (Morrison & Morrison, 2002).

Modern homonegativity can be described as the endorsement by heterosexual individuals of three abstract concerns pertaining to gay men and lesbian women. These are: 1) discrimination against gay men and lesbian women is a thing of the past; 2) gay men and lesbian women are making illegitimate demands for changes in the status quo; and 3) gay men and lesbian women exaggerate the importance of their sexual preference and, as a result, prevent their assimilation into mainstream culture (Morrison & Morrison, 2002). These objections are not rooted in the traditional arguments (e.g., religious or moral objections) found behind old-fashioned homonegativity, but are instead grounded in assumptions of heterosexual-homosexual equality. In this way, it is perceived that gay men and lesbian women are asking for greater inclusion (e.g., right to marry) and receiving unwarranted representation (e.g., gay pride parades; gay activist groups) in areas that are believed to be the domain of heterosexual individuals. In their initial study, Morrison and Morrison (2002) demonstrated that modern homonegativity was a conceptually distinct, but interrelated, form of prejudice from old-fashioned homonegativity. In particular, the authors demonstrated that the Modern Homonegativity Scale (MHS) was factorially distinct from measures of old-fashioned homonegativity, and that the MHS correlated more strongly with measures of modern prejudice (e.g., modern sexism [Swim et al., 1995]) than with measures of old-fashioned prejudice (e.g., old-fashioned sexism [Swim et al., 1995]).

Finally, in a later study, Morrison et al. (2005) were able to demonstrate that the MHS, which was developed by Canadian researchers, was still psychometrically sound when distributed to Irish university students. Again, this measure was determined to be factorially

distinct from other old-fashioned measures of homonegativity (e.g., ATLG). In conclusion, the authors echoed sentiments of another researcher (i.e., Steffens, 2005) by agreeing that the ATLG, a good standard measure of old-fashion homonegativity, may not be suitable for assessing homonegative attitudes among contemporary university samples.

While research on the behavioural expression of modern homonegativity has lagged behind research on the attitudinal component of this construct, some evidence has accrued (Morrison & Morrison, 2002). In an interesting adaptation of Snyder, Kleck, Strenta, and Mentzer's (1979) attributional ambiguity technique, Morrison and Morrison hypothesized that the expression of modern homonegativity was governed by two factors: 1) those who endorse modern homonegativity will seek to justify their discriminatory behaviour on non-prejudicial grounds; and 2) these individuals will only behave in a discriminatory manner if a means of justification is present. To test their hypothesis, Morrison and Morrison had participants choose between sitting beside a presumably gay man (or lesbian woman) or a presumably heterosexual man or woman in a mock theatre setting in which participants were led to believe they would be rating silent films for their humour. In the covert justification condition, participants were informed that there were two different movies they could select to watch. In the overt non-justification condition, participants were informed that both theatres would be showing the same film. As predicted, individuals who scored higher in modern homonegativity were more likely to avoid sitting with a presumed homosexual in the covert condition only. It was believed the high-scorers could justify their discriminatory behaviour on the grounds of preferring one movie over the other. However, in the overt condition, this justification was absent (e.g., both theatres displayed the same film). The behavioural pattern that emerged for high-scorers in modern homonegativity was different from the pattern that emerged for those high in old-fashioned homonegativity. For instance, those scoring high on the Homonegativity Scale (Morrison, Parriag, & Morrison, 1999), an old-fashioned measure of homonegativity, did not elect to sit beside the presumably gay/lesbian confederate regardless of experimental condition (overt *or* covert). That is, unlike those high in modern homonegativity, those high in old-fashioned prejudice did not require a justification to socially distance themselves from a presumed gay or lesbian person. The emergence of these different behavioural patterns, in combination with the attitudinal measurement evidence, further supports Morrison and Morrison's (2002) claim that modern homonegativity is distinguishable from its old-fashioned counterpart.

These results would suggest that modern homonegativity, like other forms of modern prejudice, is relatively covert and appears most readily in situations of ambiguity (e.g., deciding not to sit with someone because he or she may be gay when able to justify doing so on “legitimate” grounds; that is, for reasons that would be viewed by others as non-prejudicial). Research in other areas of discrimination (e.g., Gaertner & Dovidio, 1981; McConahay, 1983) has led to a clearer understanding of these ambiguous situations in which participants high in modern prejudice are likely to express a discriminatory response. In particular, McConahay has identified five situations that are likely to elicit discriminatory responses. These situations are: 1) ideological ambiguity in which one or more non-prejudicial/discriminatory values or political beliefs can be readily invoked to explain negative behaviour; 2) situational ambiguity in which one or more non-prejudicial/discriminatory attributions are available to explain the behaviour; 3) situations in which the minority group member has harmed another person; 4) unstructured or norm-less situations in which there are no clear anchor points for evaluation or guides for appropriate behaviour; and 5) situations in which minority status is not a particularly salient feature of the context. These factors suggest that the social context plays an important role in determining whether or not discriminatory behaviour is elicited, especially for individuals who score higher on modern measures of prejudice. Therefore, one would expect to witness some ambivalence in the behaviours of those participants who score higher on modern homonegativity measures as they will behave in a negative or positive manner depending on the extent to which the preceding five conditions are met (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1981; McConahay, 1983).

While research exploring the behavioural expression of homonegativity is relatively new, a few studies have explored the subtle discriminatory responses that heterosexual individuals make when placed in situations of ambiguity. For example, Aberson, Swan, and Emerson (1999) found that American heterosexual college students ( $N= 260$ ), after watching an interview of a gay male and heterosexual male job candidate, did not tend to rate the gay male candidate unfavourably vis-à-vis trait ascriptions but did attribute significantly more favourable traits to the heterosexual candidate. In this instance, when presented with a situation in which there were no clear guides for appropriate behaviour (the participants were simply asked to rate the two candidates), the participants afforded the heterosexual candidate a subtle advantage. When looking at subtle discrimination directed at lesbian women, Swim, Ferguson, and Hyers (1999) demonstrated that heterosexual women ( $N = 79$ ), from an American university, tended to

distance themselves socially from a lesbian woman confederate who explicitly dissented from the heterosexual confederates who were part of the experimental scenario. The participants did so despite the heterosexual confederates' being depicted as possessing unpopular personal preferences, as sexist, and as flatly rejecting feminism. Unfortunately, the heterosexual female participants' were more likely to express similar negative remarks and were less likely to self-identify as feminist when the dissenter was a lesbian woman. A similar pattern was not documented when the dissenter was presented as a heterosexual woman. Overall, the results indicated that the female participants' avoided association with a lesbian woman by expressing opinions that differed from those she expressed.

#### *1.4 Homonegativity: Past Intervention Strategies*

It is clear that discrimination directed towards gay men and lesbian women remains a social problem. Sexual minority persons are the targets of physical and psychological violence that has a profound impact on their well-being. Clearly, researchers need to explore strategies, programs, and policies that could act as vehicles for positive change. Unfortunately, research on intervention programs has, until relatively recently, been quite limited. The goal of the present section is to highlight the varied theoretical bases (e.g., contact theory and educational functions) and approaches (e.g., diversity videos, gay/lesbian peer panels, and inter-group interactions) used to promote attitudinal and behavioural change toward sexual minorities.

The interventions described in the extant literature have generally relied on three bases (Tucker & Potocky-Tripodi, 2006): 1) cognitive/educational approaches, 2) approaches using contact theory, and 3) combined approaches. A brief discussion, with examples of each approach, is given below.

*1.4.1 Cognitive/Educational Approach.* A number of past interventions have used a cognitive and/or educational approach (e.g., Cotton-Huston & Waite, 2000; Finkel, Storaasli, Bandele, & Schafer, 2003) to facilitate change. That is, the intervention is believed to provide participants with information, often presented in a variety of formats (e.g., videos, training workshops), that is designed to dispel common myths and stereotypes about gay men and lesbian women. As an example, Cotton-Huston and Waite (2000) presented participants with a 45-minute video depicting and celebrating gay and lesbian pride and then measured (at post-test only) the participants' attitudes towards gay men and lesbian women. Not surprisingly, there was no significant difference between this intervention and the control group (no intervention) as

the application of this intervention was relatively weak for two reasons. First, Cotton-Huston and Waite (2000) displayed a movie that presented a very positive yet benign depiction of gay pride and it is this researcher's contention that the film had little or no impact value for participants. Research by Devine, Monteith, Zuwerink, and Elliot (1991) suggested that content leading to an internal personal conflict is useful for reducing the expression of prejudice. That is, when the content highlights discrepancies between values of not being prejudiced (e.g., value of being egalitarian) with behaviours or attitudes that are prejudicial, the individual is much more likely to engage in prejudice reduction strategies to reduce these discrepancies in the future. For example, Riggle, Ellis, and Crawford (1996) documented a significant change in heterosexual students' attitudes towards sexual minorities after viewing a documentary that had a profound self-reported impact on participants. Briefly, the film depicted the life of an American politician who was openly gay and was murdered because of his sexual orientation. The video also presented a number of blue-collar individuals who had changed their views on gay men and lesbian women as a result of their contact with this politician. In this way, participants were challenged to assess their own views about gay men in light of the changes in attitudes that others like them had made in the film.

Second, the video intervention was extremely brief as it involved exposure to a single episode lasting less than one hour and the effectiveness of the intervention was measured using only a post-test. While it is felt that the intervention was relatively weak, the lack of a pre-test measure makes it impossible to measure the effect of the program (i.e., change in participants' prejudice levels) between time periods (Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman, 2004). Therefore, there may have been a change in participants' attitudes towards gay men and lesbian women that the authors were unable to detect.

Another example of an educationally-based intervention comes from Finkel, Ragnar, Storaasli, Bandele, and Schafer (2003), who outline the implementation of a Safe Zone training intervention with the goal of increasing participants' sensitivity toward, and knowledge about, sexual minorities. The Safe Zone training intervention involves the completion of two 2-hour diversity-training sessions that employ a number of activities. These activities include: 1) exploring the coming-out process, 2) exploring definitions of sexuality, 3) group discussions on homonegativity, 4) role-playing; and 5) promising to engage in lesbian- and gay-affirming actions between sessions.

The intervention outlined by Finkel et al. (2003) is very comprehensive as it combines a number of techniques designed to create awareness of the issues facing gay men and lesbian women and increase empathy for members of this social group. The combination of multiple strategies is particularly powerful, as similar interventions (e.g., Cramer, Oles, & Black, 1997; Serdahely & Ziemba, 1984) have been successful at reducing the attitudinal expression of homonegativity towards gay men and lesbian women. In addition, this approach has been documented to reduce the negative attitudes that individuals high in old-fashioned homonegativity possess (Serdahely & Ziemba).

Unfortunately, Finkel et al. (2003) did not conduct a comprehensive evaluation of their project. Instead, the authors asked participants to complete a number of post-test measures that included the Riddle Homophobia Scale (Wall, 1995), "I intend..." statement completion rate, and several qualitative questions concerning satisfaction with the process involved in Safe Zone. The results of the post-test measures indicated that participants' attitudes on the Riddle Homophobia Scale were quite positive, the majority (90%) completed the affirming behaviours that they intended to do between sessions, and the students' responses were quite positive with respect to the process involved in Safe Zone (92 % of students would recommend the program to a friend). However, it should be noted that the evaluation was subject to a number of social desirability and demand characteristic problems. In particular, the students were not given a pre-test Riddle Scale and were also taught about the scale during the program. Further, the "I Intend..." statements were made publicly and no checks were made to ensure that the behaviour had actually been completed. Given these weaknesses, further evaluation of this intervention strategy is likely necessary. This research will be important as the scope of this intervention is relatively large and the implementation of this strategy is expensive when one considers the time and cost involved.

*1.4.2 Contact Theory.* A number of intervention strategies also rely on contact theory (Tucker & Potocky-Tripodi, 2006). This theory maintains that people who have multiple, intimate contacts with gay men and lesbian women will tend to have more positive attitudes toward sexual minorities because they are able to learn information about them that counteracts the negative messages about homosexuality upon which they may have based their initial attitudes (Basow & Johnson, 2000). For example, Grack and Richman (1996) outline an intervention that effectively utilizes the principles of contact theory. In their intervention, the

authors had small groups of heterosexual participants complete difficult logic problems with actors who identified as gay or lesbian. The task required cooperative behaviour from all members and required the heterosexual participants to interact (i.e., have contact) with members of this social group. The results of this intervention demonstrated that those in the contact situation exhibited significantly more positive attitudes from their pre-test data. This result is not surprising, as other interventions that involve contact with gay men and lesbian women (e.g., Lance 2002; Nelson & Kreiger 1997) appear to foster attitude change. Additionally, contact with out-group members can foster the development of new behaviour patterns that participants can use when interacting with gay men and lesbian women. As participants engage in more interactions with sexual minorities their behaviours towards these groups will continue to change. This is important as behavioural change is usually a precursor to attitude change (Pettigrew, 1998). With regards to homonegativity, this is a significant issue, as researchers (e.g., Patel, Long, McCammon, & Wuensch, 1995; Roderick, McCammon, Long, & Allred, 1998) have documented a link between participants' homonegative attitudes and behaviours. For example, Roderick et al. (1998) reported that participants' scores on the Index of Attitudes Towards Homophobia (IAH, Serdahely & Ziemba, 1984) were moderately correlated with participants' tendency to engage in discriminatory behaviours towards gay men and lesbian women. Further, Franklin (2000) also found that those who engaged in discriminatory behaviours towards gay men and lesbian women held significantly more negative attitudes towards individuals from this minority group.

*1.4.3 Combination Approaches.* Finally, a number of intervention strategies have been developed that use a combination of contact theory and the cognitive/educational approach in their designs. The best examples of this combined approach involve discussion panels comprised of gay men and lesbian women (e.g., Cotton-Huston & Waite, 2000; Grutzeck & Gidycz, 1997; Nelson & Krieger, 1997). Generally speaking, the discussion panels last upwards of one hour and involve two components. The first is a narrative element in which the panellists (typically made up of both gay men and lesbian women) describe their own personal stories of being gay or lesbian. The second is a question and discussion component between the audience (a majority of whom are heterosexual) and the panel. The success of these interventions has varied; that is, some have found positive changes in participants' attitudes (e.g., Nelson & Krieger, 1997) while others have found no significant post-test differences (Cotton-Huston &

Waite, 2000; Grutzeck & Gidycz, 1997). In addition, many reflect time-limited and expensive strategies for the reduction of homonegativity. Given these short-comings, efforts at identifying simpler strategies that could have a similar (if not greater) impact on the expression of homonegativity are critical. It is my belief that everyday interpersonal confrontation of homonegativity can reflect one such intervention strategy.

### *1.5 Bias Reduction through Confrontation*

The exploration of the effect that confrontation can have on prejudice has been relatively limited. However, there are some compelling reasons for postulating that interpersonal confrontation could represent a powerful strategy for reducing homonegativity. First, prejudice reduction through *self-confrontation* has been a long-standing and effective strategy used by social scientists. For example, Rokeach and Cochrane (1972) demonstrated that participants experienced deep feelings of dissatisfaction when made aware of the inconsistency between their values and their racist attitudes and behaviours. Subsequently, in an effort to amend this contradiction, participants tended to change their attitudes and behaviours in order to obtain greater consistency with their value system (i.e., egalitarianism) and their prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory behaviours. The Rokeach and Cochrane protocol has been termed the value self-confrontation method and has been adapted successfully for research in the area of homonegativity. For example, work by Vicario, Liddie, and Luzzo (2005) has identified many of the stable values (e.g., salvation and obedience), measured by the Rokeach Values Survey Inventory (RVS; Rokeach, 1988), that are correlated with homonegative attitudes. They argue that values may offer a powerful framework from which to generate a number of plausible intervention strategies, particularly in the area of value self-confrontation.

Since the 1970s, Monteith (1993) has proposed a model of self-regulation for the reduction of prejudice. A diagrammatic representation of this cycle is found in Figure 1. The self-regulation model begins with the presence of out-group membership cues that often lead to the automatic activation of our knowledge of stereotypes that are held by both high- and low-prejudiced individuals (Devine & Elliot, 1995; Nelson, 2006). Often, this activation leads to spontaneous and unintentional stereotype use as these are highly accessible knowledge structures. For low-prejudiced individuals, who have a well internalized set of non-prejudiced values, this leads to a discrepant response.



If the individual becomes aware of this discrepant response, such awareness may foster negative affective states (e.g., guilt) that are directed towards the self and/or behaviour. These negative affective states are believed to trigger a heightened period of self-focus in which the individual is highly motivated to explore the discrepancy situation and to discover cues that can be used to avoid it in the future. Therefore, the hope is that when presented with the same cues, in future situations, the individual will inhibit the use of the automatically activated stereotype content about the out-group by deliberately replacing them with egalitarian responses (Monteith, 1993).

In the first of two initial studies, Monteith (1993) demonstrated that low-prejudiced participants did experience negative self-directed emotions and exhibited increased amounts of self-focused thoughts when made aware of the discrepancy between their values and automatically activated stereotypes. Interestingly, these individuals also spent a greater amount of time (when compared to high-prejudiced participants) reading an essay on the automatic nature of prejudice. Presumably, they were looking for cues that they could use in the future to avoid behaving in a discrepant manner. These results suggest that low-prejudiced participants do engage in a self-regulatory cycle when made aware of their discrepant responses. In the second study, Monteith was able to demonstrate that activation of the self-regulation cycle fostered the reduction of anti-gay behaviour as participants low in prejudice were more likely to rate homonegative jokes as less funny, creative, and witty. Therefore, it was believed that the participants had learned cues to recognize situations that have the potential to lead to unintentional bias responses, as a result of past activation of the self-regulatory cycle.

This model has been tested in a number of subsequent studies (e.g., Blanchard, Lilly, & Vaughn, 1991; Monteith, Ashburn-Nardo, Voils, & Czopp, 2002; Monteith et al., 1996; Monteith & Voils, 1998) and the results appear to support the self-regulatory model. While a large proportion of this research has focused on racial prejudice, some research (beyond the initial study) has been conducted in the area of homonegativity (e.g., Devine, Monteith, Zuwerink, & Elliot, 1991; Monteith et al., 1996).

For example, Devine et al. (1991) demonstrated that, when heterosexual participants were made aware of the discrepancy between the responses they *would* have made (these tended to be more homonegative) and the responses they *should* have made (these tended to be more egalitarian) when interacting with gay men and lesbian women, greater feelings of global

discomfort and self-directed guilt and shame were evident. In a more recent study, Monteith et al. (1996) demonstrated that, when a non-prejudiced opinion was expressed by a confederate, participants vocalized fewer homonegative opinions. That is, the activation of egalitarian norms encouraged participants to exhibit less prejudice. Interestingly, prejudicial opinions that were expressed by the confederates did not have a significant effect on participant behaviour. Specifically, participants were not more likely to provide a homonegative opinion and this result led the authors to conclude that the norms opposing homonegativity are stronger than those supporting homonegativity.

It would appear that self-confrontation is an effective strategy for reducing prejudice and evidence does exist for the utility of this strategy in areas such as homonegativity. However, there are important limitations to the effectiveness of self-induced confrontations, as research has suggested that the reduction of prejudice through self-confrontation is highly dependent upon the individual being aware of his or her biased affective, cognitive, or behavioural responses and being motivated to address them (Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006). While a powerful model, Monteith (1993) may underestimate or downplay the role of awareness in her model. That is, past research has suggested that stereotypes and subsequent behaviours based upon those stereotypes are activated in an automatic rather than a controlled fashion (Bargh, 1999; Nelson, 2006). This automatic activation often leads to discriminatory behaviours that unintentionally occur beyond the individual's awareness. This is even true of low-prejudiced individuals who espouse non-biased and egalitarian views. It is generally believed that this automatic activation results from global acquisition of stereotypes and their contents during the socialization process (Devine & Elliot, 1995).

From this evidence, it may be overly optimistic to expect that individuals in an everyday situation will be aware that they are behaving in a prejudicial and/or discriminatory fashion. It is more likely that these behaviours will go unnoticed and that the self-regulatory cycle will not be engaged. In addition, Monteith (1993) argues that prejudice reduction occurs in a step-by-step fashion such that repeated activation of the cycle will improve one's ability to reduce discriminatory responses. However, this process may be slowed even further if individuals are continually unaware that they are acting on automatically activated stereotypes. Given these critiques, it is believed that confrontation from others may be important for fostering the

initiation of this self-regulatory mechanism. Research by Czopp and Monteith (2003) underscores this observation and is outlined below.

In two studies, Czopp and Monteith (2003) examined how people responded to being confronted about their discriminatory behaviour. As predicted, participants exhibited greater discomfort, compunction, and concern after being confronted about discriminatory behaviour. Interestingly, these effects were influenced by two other interpersonal factors.

First, the authors determined that the target of the discrimination had an important influence on the effect of the confrontation. Participants indicated feeling much more guilt and discomfort when confronted about their imagined racist responses (i.e., towards Blacks) than when confronted about their imagined sexist responses (i.e., towards women). This result led Czopp and Monteith to concur with other researchers (e.g., Glick & Fiske, 2001) that, in the minds of participants, sexism is perceived as less severe than racism.

Second, Czopp and Monteith demonstrated that the group membership of the confronter had an important influence on the effect of the confrontation (i.e., the effectiveness of the confrontation was enhanced when it was made by an individual who was not a member of the out-group targeted in the scenario). For example, a man confronting someone about his or her sexist attitudes towards women garnered a stronger response than did a woman confronter about the same issues. That is, once confronted, they felt greater self-directed negative affect such as guilt and disappointment (i.e., affective reaction), and stated that they would think (i.e., cognitive reaction) that they were wrong and apologize (i.e., intended behavioural reaction). This result led the authors to conclude that not all confronters will be equally effective. Specifically, it is believed that confrontations are taken less seriously and discounted more readily as typical when the confronter confirms group-based expectations (e.g., “She is just another woman complaining about sexist remarks!”).

The Czopp and Monteith (2003) study provides an intriguing yet simple strategy for the reduction of racism and sexism. However, this strategy has yet to be extended to the area of homonegativity. Given the nature of prejudice, it is felt that this extension is warranted. Numerous researchers (e.g., Aberson & Dora, 2003; Davies, 2004, Morrison & Morrison, 2002) have advocated viewing all prejudice as a generalized phenomenon that is rooted in intolerance (O’Bryan, Fishbein, & Ritchey, 2004). As a result, participants’ negative attitudes towards one social group such as Blacks often correlate with negative attitudes towards other minority groups

such as women and gay men. The argument then would be that trends observed from one phenomenon (e.g., racism) may surface in other phenomena (e.g., homonegativity) and vice versa (Morrison et al., 2005). Given the generalized nature of prejudice, it is believed that confronting homonegativity can foster a similar reaction to that demonstrated by Czopp and Monteith (2003) in racist and sexist situations. It is the goal of the proposed study to extend this methodology to explore confrontations of bias directed towards both gay men and lesbian women.

The recognition of homonegative attitudes and behaviours as socially unacceptable suggests that a norm exists within society that opposes such homonegative responses (Monteith, Deenan, & Tooman, 1996). Therefore, it is hypothesized that, considering socialization has instilled within us values of egalitarianism and fairness (Devine et al., 1991), participants will experience concern (e.g., feeling bad, worrying about what others will think) when confronted about their biased responses in general. Also, following Czopp and Monteith (2003), it is hypothesized that low-prejudiced individuals will evidence greater self-directed concern (i.e., feelings of shame and guilt). Conversely, it is hypothesized that high-prejudiced individuals will evidence greater other-directed concern as they are expected to exhibit irritation and anger towards the confronter.

In summary, it is believed that interpersonal confrontations will lead to greater feelings of concern for both high- and low-prejudiced individuals. However, can all confrontations be considered equal in their ability to produce a response from those who are confronted? The proceeding discussion will outline a number of factors that are likely to influence the effect that an interpersonal confrontation can have.

### *1.6 Target Groups*

Most of the methodologies utilized in the empirical literature have explored attitudes towards sexual minorities in non-gendered terms by referring to either homosexuals or homosexuality (Herek, 2000). Using these terms negates researchers' ability to explore and discover differences between heterosexual females' attitudes towards gay men and lesbian women. Further, participants may interpret such general terms to represent one sex over the other. That is, when presented with the word "homosexual," the participant may interpret this as referring solely to a gay man or solely to a lesbian woman. For example, when Black and Stevenson (1984) asked participants what they thought of when presented with the term

homosexual, 75% of participants indicated that they thought of men. Therefore, it is necessary to be very specific in the language that is used in our experimental designs as one target may elicit different attitudes and behaviours when compared to the other.

In addition, the research literature is somewhat mixed as to the extent to which heterosexual women's attitudes differ between gay men and lesbian women. Some studies have suggested that heterosexual women exhibit more negative attitudes towards lesbian women than gay men (e.g., Larsen, Cate, & Reed, 1980; Kite & Deaux, 1986), while others have suggested that there is little difference in attitudes between the two targets (Herek, 1988; Herek, 2000). While the general consensus appears to be that heterosexual women display only marginal differences in their attitudes towards the two groups (See Kite & Whitley (1996) for a review), it would be prudent to explore any differences that may exist in female participants' reactions to confrontations of bias directed towards gay men versus lesbian women. It is hoped that this exploration would highlight how interpersonal confrontation interventions are influenced by the target of the homonegative behaviour.

### *1.7 Different Confronters*

Czopp and Monteith (2003) successfully demonstrated that the group membership of the confronter had a marked effect on participants' responses (i.e., the vested interest of the in-group member would work to discount the confrontation, whereas the effect of an out-group member's confrontation would be enhanced). This thesis sought to extend this methodology to the area of homonegativity. The manipulation of confronter group membership was identical to that utilized by Czopp and Monteith (2003). However, four confronter groups were used: 1) a gay man; 2) a lesbian woman; 3) a heterosexual woman; and 4) a heterosexual man. The inclusion of the four confronter types allowed us to explore the intersection of sexual orientation and gender and the effect that it has on participants' reaction to being confronted. In this way, we were able to determine if sexual orientation, gender, or both are important factors for the effectiveness of confrontations as a strategy for reducing prejudice. Following the Czopp and Monteith (2003) study, it was hypothesized that the lesser the vested interest the confronter is perceived as having, the greater the effectiveness of the confrontation.

### *1.8 Study Overview*

The purpose of this study was to replicate and extend Czopp and Monteith's (2003) methodology to the area of homonegativity. It is felt that interpersonal confrontation can be an

important strategy for reducing homonegativity for both high- and low-prejudiced women. However, it is also my belief that the target of the homonegativity and the group membership of the confronter play important roles in determining the effectiveness of the confrontation. The hypotheses investigated were: 1) low-prejudiced participants will evidence greater self-directed concern (i.e., feelings of shame and guilt) and apologetic behavioural intentions; 2) high-prejudiced participants will evidence greater other-directed concern (i.e., feelings of anger and irritation towards the confronter) and antagonistic behavioural intentions; and 3) the vested interest of the confronter will be inversely associated with the effectiveness of confrontation. Finally, while no specific predictions were made, this research was designed to explore differences in female participants' reactions to confrontations of homonegative behaviour directed toward gay men versus lesbian women.

## CHAPTER TWO - METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Participants

2.1.1 *Recruitment.* In total, 315 female volunteers were recruited from three sources for this study. First, 146 participants were obtained from the Psychology Participant Pool and were given a single course credit for participating. Second, 90 participants were recruited from the general student population at the University of Saskatchewan via an advertisement placed on the on-line Personalized Access to Web Services (PAWS<sup>1</sup>) system's bulletin board. Participants from the general student population were given the opportunity to enter their names into two draws for \$100.00. Finally, 79 family members and friends (60 students, 19 general population members) of the primary researcher were recruited. These participants were not compensated for participating.

Unfortunately, a number of participants were removed in order to meet the inclusion criteria (1) 5 participants were removed as they self-identified as lesbian women; and 2) 12 participants were removed as they failed the manipulations check and statistical assumption<sup>2</sup>s for the analyses used in this study). After removing these participants' responses, the total sample consisted of 286 female volunteers who completed the study and met the inclusion criteria. All of the participants were fully informed as to the purpose and procedures of the study. Upon completion, participants were fully debriefed as to the nature of the study and given their compensation as outlined in the informed consent sheet.

2.1.2 *Demographic Information.* The majority of the participants who completed the study were Caucasian (86.7%) and exclusively heterosexual (82.4%). The participants' ages ranged from 17 to 52 years ( $M = 22.25$ ,  $SD = 5.32$ ). Further, 193 (68 %) of the participants indicated that they were either very liberal ( $n = 26$ ; 9.1 %), liberal ( $n = 81$ ; 28.3 %), or somewhat liberal ( $n = 86$ ; 30.1%). In addition, 64 participants (22.6 %) indicated that they were either very religious ( $n = 19$ ; 6.6%) or quite religious ( $n = 45$ ; 15.7 %). Finally, approximately 60% ( $n = 170$ ) of the participants reported attending religious services only on special occasions ( $n = 91$ ; 31.8 %) or never ( $n = 79$ ; 27.6%). Additional demographic information about the participants who completed the study can be found in Table 1.

---

<sup>1</sup> The PAWS system provides on-line accounts to all students and staff on the University of Saskatchewan campus

<sup>2</sup> Box Plots and Mahalanobis' distance analyses were used to detect both univariate and multivariate outliers. Participants who scored as extreme outliers were removed from the study.

## 2.2 Materials

*2.2.1 Questionnaire Format.* All of the participants received a questionnaire containing the experimental materials. Specifically, the questionnaire contained: 1) the Modern Homonegativity Scale, 2) three Interpersonal Confrontation Situations, 3) an Affective Reactions Scale, 4) a Thought and Behavioural Reactions Scale, and 5) an Impression of the Confrontation Scale. While the order of the materials remained constant for all participants, participants could complete the questionnaire in one of two formats. Initially, participants were asked to complete the questionnaire in a pencil-and-paper format. However, given time and resource constraints, an on-line version of the questionnaire was developed in order to gain access to a larger number of students during the data collection phase of the study. In total, 253 participants (88.5%) completed the questionnaire using the on-line version; whereas, 33 participants (11.5 %) completed the questionnaire using the pencil-and-paper format.

## 2.3 Measures

*2.3.1 Modern Homonegativity Scale.* The Modern Homonegativity Scale (MHS; Morrison & Morrison, 2002) contains two parallel forms: one for gay men (MHS-G) and one for lesbian women (MHS-L). Each form contains 12 items and measures participants' level of agreement with contemporary concerns about gay men and lesbian women, respectively. A sample MHS-G scale item is: "Many gay men use their sexual orientation so that they can obtain special privileges." A copy of both the MHS-G and the MHS-L can be found in Appendix A. Participants' level of agreement was measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1= strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). Scores on each measure could range from 12 to 60, with higher scores representing greater modern homonegativity. Past research has documented the MHS-G and MHS-L as possessing good psychometric properties (Morrison & Morrison, 2002).

*2.3.2 Interpersonal Situations.* Three interpersonal situations were adapted from the scenarios used by Czopp and Monteith (2003; Study 2) to depict bias directed towards the target groups of interest in this study (i.e., gay men and lesbian women). Each scenario was designed to portray the participant as engaging in a transgression that he or she was then subsequently confronted about by another individual. Specifically, the first two scenarios were designed to be filler scenarios (e.g., stealing a neighbour's paper and being confronted by group members on lack of performance). The critical third situation was designed to describe the participant as engaging in a subtle homonegative response (e.g., laughing at a homonegative joke) that could



be considered a biased response for both lesbian and gay target groups. See Appendix B for a copy of the scenarios. The experimental manipulations of the variables of interest (i.e., target group and group membership of the confronter) were made in the third interpersonal situation. Depending upon the experimental condition, participants were to imagine themselves as making either a gay-biased or lesbian-biased response and then being subsequently confronted by a gay man, lesbian woman, heterosexual man, or heterosexual woman. The scenarios were designed to be equivalent between experimental conditions except for the group targeted and the group membership of the individual who is the confronter.

In order to equate the two versions of the critical scenario, pilot testing was conducted in order to identify two parallel jokes. Therefore, 19 second year university students (8 men and 11 women) were asked to evaluate 23 jokes (11 jokes were directed towards gay men; 10 jokes were directed towards lesbian women; 2 jokes were taken from the original Czopp and Monteith (2003) study for comparison) on three dimensions measuring how funny each joke was, how offensive each joke was, and how clear each joke was. Each dimension was rated on a scale from 1 (Not at all Funny/Offensive/Did not at all understand the joke) to 5 (Very Funny/Offensive/ Understood the joke completely). The purpose of this testing was to identify a pair of jokes from the same content area (e.g., nature of homosexual sexual behaviour) that were also clear to the participants. Following this procedure, two parallel jokes were selected that drew upon the same content area, had near identical wordings, and were rated as very clear by participants. The jokes selected were as follows: 1) “What do you call a gay dinosaur? A Mega-sore-ass; and 2) What do you call a lesbian dinosaur? A Lick-alota-pus. A set of paired t-tests demonstrated no significant differences in the way that participants rated the jokes on the three dimensions of interest. In particular, participants did not rate the gay joke ( $M = 3.42$ ,  $SD = 1.17$ ) as significantly more funny than the lesbian joke ( $M = 3.00$ ,  $SD = 1.41$ ),  $t(18) = 2.04$ ,  $p = .06$ . The participants did not rate the gay joke ( $M = 3.26$ ,  $SD = .93$ ) as significantly more offensive than the lesbian joke ( $M = 3.11$ ,  $SD = .99$ ),  $t(18) = 1.00$ ,  $p = .33$ . Finally, the participants did not rate the gay joke ( $M = 4.47$ ,  $SD = .69$ ) as significantly more clear than the lesbian joke ( $M = 4.52$ ,  $SD = .77$ ),  $t(18) = -.27$ ,  $p = .79$ .

The third scenario was purposely designed to depict subtle homonegative behaviour for two reasons. First, subtle verbal responses fit well with current documentation of the types of discrimination that heterosexual individuals display, particularly in university and college

settings. For instance, Franklin (2000) determined through self-reports that homonegativity more often occurs in the form of verbal transgressions than physical altercations. In addition, even those who had not participated in discrimination had witnessed high rates of verbal abuse directed towards sexual minorities. Therefore, it is believed that participants will be better able to imagine themselves as making a biased verbal remark rather than an overt display of discrimination. Second, the biased response needs to be subtle in nature as this type of behaviour is more likely to go unnoticed and thus require someone (the confronter, in this case) to bring it to the individual's attention. Furthermore, the behavioural expression of modern homonegativity has been documented to be subtle in nature as those who are prejudiced do not wish to appear as such (Morrison & Morrison, 2002). Therefore, participants are presumed to be better able to imagine behaving this way.

*2.3.3 Affective Reactions.* Participants' affective reactions to being confronted were measured using 18 items obtained from past research on prejudice reduction (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Monteith, Ashburn-Nardo, Voils, & Czopp, 2002). A list of the affective reaction items can be found in Appendix C. In accordance with past research, these items were analysed using principal components analysis with oblique rotation to yield a number of response indexes. The extent to which participants believed that the affective responses would be reflective of how they would feel in the confrontation situation were assessed using a 5-point response format (1= does not apply at all; 5 = applies very much), with higher scores denoting greater anticipated affective responses to the confrontation.

*2.3.4 Thought and Behaviour Reactions.* Participants' thought and behavioural reactions were assessed using a 12-item measure adapted from Czopp and Monteith (2003). Specifically, 6 items were used to assess participants' thoughts in reaction to being confronted. The 6 items are believed to reflect: 1) self-conflict, 2) self-reflection, 3) other-directed thoughts, 4) bias not perceived, 5) bias justified, and 6) hostility. A sample item denoting self-conflict is: "I would think that I am wrong, I should not have done that." The remaining 6 items were used to assess participants' behavioural reactions to being confronted. These 6 items are believed to reflect: 1) correction, 2) discussion, 3) concession, 4) unintentional bias, 5) bias defended, and 6) hostile behaviour. A sample item denoting correction is: "I would apologize and try to avoid the behaviour in the future." A list of the thought and behaviour reaction items can be found in Appendix D. The extent to which participants believed the thoughts and behaviours to be

reflective of how they would respond were assessed using a 5-point scale (1= does not apply at all; 5 = applies very much), with higher scores denoting greater perceived thought and behavioural reactions. Principal components analysis with oblique rotation has demonstrated this measure yields two factors that have good internal reliability. Previous research has demonstrated the following components: 1) Compunction ( $\alpha = .78$ ), and 2) Antagonism ( $\alpha = .72$ ).

*2.3.5 Interpretation of Confrontation.* Five additional questions were asked to help gauge participants' interpretations of the confrontation. Two items, taken from Czopp and Monteith (2003), were used to measure the legitimacy of the confrontation directed towards them (e.g., "How reasonable do you think the other person is being?" and "To what extent do you think the confronter is overreacting in this situation?"). Two items, also taken from Czopp and Monteith, were used to measure the perceived severity of the biased behaviour (e.g., "To what extent would you be concerned that you had offended the other person?" and "How much do you think your behaviour upset the other person?"). Finally, a fifth item was used to explore the extent that participants would expect the various confronters to engage in this type of confrontational behaviour. For example, "To what degree would you expect a gay man (lesbian woman, heterosexual man, heterosexual woman, neighbour, or classmate) to confront you in similar situations to the one you just read?"

*2.3.6 Demographic Information.* Participants were also asked to complete seven demographic items at the conclusion of the study. Information such as age, sex, ethnic background, and sexual orientation was collected. Further, single item measures were used to assess political conservatism (i.e., participants were asked to indicate whether they were very liberal, liberal, somewhat liberal, somewhat conservative, conservative, or very conservative), as well as the frequency with which they attend religious services (i.e., regularly, now and then, on special occasions, never) and their religious self-schema (i.e., if they are very, quite, somewhat, or not at all religious). Past research using these single item measures of political conservatism (Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, & Signorielli, 1994) and religious behaviour and self-schema (Gorsuch & McFarland, 1972) found them to be psychometrically sound.

*2.3.7 Manipulations Check.* In order to ensure that participants were aware of the experimental manipulations, participants were asked to indicate, without going back and reviewing the materials, the gender (male or female) and sexual orientation (gay or lesbian) of

the individual who confronted them in the critical third scenario. In addition, participants were also asked to indicate who the target of the homonegative behaviour was in the scenario (i.e., a gay man or a lesbian woman). Similar manipulation checks were designed for the two filler scenarios.

#### *2.4 Design and Procedure*

The experiment used a 2 (target group: gay man versus lesbian woman) x 2 (modern homonegativity endorsement: high versus low) x 4 (confronter group membership: gay man, lesbian woman, heterosexual woman, or heterosexual man) between-subjects design. The three dependent variables measured were: 1) affective reactions; 2) thought and behavioural reactions; and 3) interpretation of confronter. Participants were randomly assigned to one of eight experimental conditions and completion of the questionnaire required approximately 30 minutes.

Before completing the questionnaire, participants were asked to read and sign the informed consent sheet (see Appendix E for copy of the consent form) indicating that they understood the nature of the study and were willing to participate. The on-line version of the questionnaire asked the participants to click a checkbox indicating that they had read and understood the informed consent sheet (participants could not move forward in the survey until they checked this box). The consent sheet provided a general introduction to the purpose and procedures of the study. At this time, participants were also informed that their participation was purely voluntary; they could withdraw from the study at any time; and their responses would be kept strictly confidential.

When the informed consent procedure was completed, participants were given a brief written introduction to the study that also contained a set of instructions. Participants who completed the pencil-and-paper format of the questionnaire were verbally reminded about their right to withdraw at any time without consequence and encouraged to ask any questions they might have. At this time, participants proceeded to complete the questionnaire.

Participants began the study by reading a general set of instructions outlining the procedure for each scenario. This set of instructions preceded all three scenarios. Generally speaking, they were informed that the study was designed to examine how people react to being confronted about certain responses they have made. In particular, they were asked to imagine themselves in three hypothetical scenarios in which they are confronted by another individual and to consider how they would respond to this confrontation. The instructions emphasized that,

although these situations may not necessarily describe responses that participants would actually make, they were to imagine themselves as if they had truly done exactly what the scenarios described. In addition, the instructions encouraged each participant to make an honest effort to mentally place him or herself within the scenario that they were reading and to carefully consider how he or she would respond.

Consistent with past research, filler scenarios always preceded a third critical scenario within the questionnaire booklets. The filler scenarios were designed to familiarize participants with the procedural elements of the experiment and to the demands made on them (i.e., imagining themselves in the situations, manipulation checks, and the nature of the response format). In addition, the filler scenarios helped to confirm the description which indicated that the researchers were interested in reactions to general confrontation situations. This was done to avoid both social desirability and demand characteristic bias. For all participants, the third and final scenario was always the critical bias confrontation situation.

It is in the third scenario that the experimental manipulations were made. Depending on the experimental condition, participants were asked to imagine that they had made either a gay-biased or lesbian-biased response that they were subsequently confronted on by another individual. The group membership of the confronter was also manipulated so that participants believed that they were confronted by a hypothetical gay man, lesbian woman, heterosexual man, or heterosexual woman. Information about the group membership of the confronter was made parenthetically to help draw the participants' attention to the experimental manipulation. In order to be consistent, similar parenthetical information was provided in the initial two filler scenarios.

After reading a given scenario, participants were asked to complete the dependent measures. Participants were first asked to indicate what their affective, thought, and behavioural reactions would be to being confronted in this situation. Following these reactive measures, participants were asked to provide an indication of their impression of the confrontation situation. In addition, the questionnaire contained a manipulation check after each scenario asking the participants to indicate who the target of the behaviour was as well as to who the confronter was.

The next portion of the experiment asked participants to complete both versions of the MHS. Finally, participants were asked to complete a number of demographic items (e.g., age,

sex, and ethnicity). Upon completion of the questionnaire booklet, participants were thanked for their participation and debriefed as to the true purpose of the experiment and given any compensation as stipulated in the informed consent sheet (see Appendix F for a copy of the debriefing form).

## CHAPTER THREE - RESULTS

### 3.1 Modern Homonegativity

*3.1.1 Reliability.* A measure of Cronbach's alpha indicated that both the MHS-L ( $\alpha = .90$ , 95% CI = .88 - .92) and the MHS-G ( $\alpha = .91$ , 95% CI = .89 - .93) possessed excellent levels of reliability within this sample of participants. In addition, participants' total scores were highly related as the two scales were significantly correlated with one another,  $r(286) = .97, p < .001$ . This suggests that those individuals who held negative attitudes towards gay men also held them towards lesbian women. Further, a paired samples t-test indicated that there was no significant difference in the female participants' attitudes towards gay men ( $M = 30.72; SD = 9.47$ ) and lesbian women ( $M = 30.70; SD = 9.10$ ),  $t(285) = -.125, p = .901$ . This is consistent with past research (e.g., Herek, 1988; Herek, 2000; Kite & Whitley, 2003) suggesting that the females' attitudes do not differ significantly for gay men and lesbian women.

*3.1.2 MHS-G.* Analysis of participants' total MHS-G scores indicated that the mean score on the MHS-G fell near the scale mid-point ( $M = 30.72, SD = 9.47, N = 286$ ) as the distribution of scores ranged from 12 to 58. This is not surprising given that 68% ( $n = 194$ ) of the sample scored at or below the scale mid-point of 36. The participants' MHS-G scores were significantly correlated with political conservatism,  $r(283) = .53, p < .001$ , religious self-schema,  $r(283) = -.22, p < .001$ , and religious service attendance,  $r(283) = -.27, p < .001$ . Thus, female participants who held more negative attitudes toward gay men were also more likely to self-identify as conservative, to identify themselves as being religious, and more likely to attend religious services.

*3.1.3 MHS-L.* The mean score on the MHS-L fell near the scale mid-point ( $M = 30.70, SD = 9.10, N = 286$ ) as the distribution of the scores ranged from 12 to 60. This is not surprising given that 67% ( $n = 192$ ) of the sample scored at or below the scale mid-point of 36. The participants' MHS-L scores were significantly correlated with political conservatism,  $r(284) = .53, p < .001$ , religious self-schema,  $r(283) = -.23, p < .001$ , and religious service attendance,  $r(283) = -.26, p < .001$ . As with the MHS-G scores, female participants that held more negative attitudes towards lesbian women were also more likely to self-identify as conservative, to identify themselves as being religious, and more likely to attend religious services.

*3.1.4 High/Low Classification.* A classification of participants as being either high or low in endorsement of modern homonegativity was required to conduct the planned analyses. A

median split-analysis was used to make this classification. That is, on both the MHS-G and MHS-L scales, values of 31 or greater were used to denote individuals who were high in modern homonegativity endorsement (i.e., high endorsers). Conversely, values of 30 or lower were used to denote individuals who were low in modern homonegativity endorsement (i.e., low endorsers). After matching the version of the MHS to the target condition participants were presented, 141 participants (49.3%) were classified as scoring low and 145 participants (50.7%) were classified as scoring high on the MHS.

### 3.2 *Principal Components Analysis.*

The affective reaction items and the thought and behavioural reaction items were reduced to a smaller number of components using principal components analysis with oblique rotation. Principal components analysis (PCA) was selected as it allowed the researcher to maximize the total amount of variance explained (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) and was consistent with the procedure used by Czopp and Monteith (2003). Furthermore, oblique rotation was selected as it was expected that the various components should be, at least, modestly inter-correlated (Tabachnick & Fidell). As suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell, a cut-off of .45 (20% of variance) was selected for inclusion of a variable in an interpretation of a factor. Loadings under .45 were replaced by zeros. This analysis was completed in order to generate the dependent variables measuring the participants' reactions to the critical third scenario.

*3.2.1 Affective Reaction Scale (ARS).* Initially, the factorability of the 18 item ARS was examined in order to ensure that the statistical assumptions were met for this analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell). First, the sample size was considered satisfactory for PCA as 286 ( $N = 300$  is considered good) participants were included in this analysis and the ratio (ratios of 10:1 or better are preferred) of participants to variables was approximately 16:1 (Howell, 2007; Tabachnick & Fidell). Second, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was .91. Tabachnick and Fidell suggest that KMO values should be greater than 0.6. Finally, Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant,  $\chi^2(153) = 3858.53, p < .001$ .

The PCA yielded a four component (See Appendix G for the list of the items that made up each component) solution that accounted for 74.55% of the total variance. The first component, *Negative Self-Directed Reactions* (eigen value = 7.59), included 10 items denoting negative affective reactions directed at the self and maintained satisfactory scale score reliability. The second component *Negative Other-Directed Reactions* (eigen value = 3.62), included four



items that represent negative reactions directed at the confronter and maintained satisfactory scale score reliability. The third component, *Amused* (eigen value = 1.34), included two items that represent amused reactions to the confrontation and maintained satisfactory scale score reliability. The final component, *Exasperated Reaction* (eigen value = 1.00), included two items denoting the participants' reactions of frustration and threat arousal. See Table 2 for detailed descriptive information for each sub-scale

*3.2.2 Thought and Behavioural Reactions Scale (TBS).* Initially, the factorability of the 12 item TBS was examined in order to ensure that the statistical assumptions were met for this analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). First, the sample size was considered satisfactory for PCA as 286 participants were included in this analysis and the ratio of participants to variables was approximately 24:1 (Howell, 2007; Tabachnick & Fidell). Secondly, a sufficient sampling adequacy was demonstrated as the KMO value was .77. Finally, Bartlett' test of sphericity was significant,  $\chi^2(66) = 969.27, p < .001$ .

The PCA yielded a two factor solution (See Appendix H for the list of the items that made up each component) that accounted for 46% of the total variance. The first component, *Compunction* (eigen value = 3.74) included six items consistent with past research (see Czopp & Montieth, 2003) and involved self-focused thoughts and apologetic behaviours. The second component, *Antagonism* (eigen value = 1.72), included six items consistent with past research (see Czopp & Montieth, 2003) that represented other-directed thoughts and hostile behaviour. Each component demonstrated satisfactory scale score reliability. See Table 2 for detailed descriptive information for each sub-scale.

### *3.3 Affective Reactions*

*3.3.1 Overview of ARS Analysis.* Several 2 (target group: gay man versus lesbian woman) x 2 (modern homonegativity endorsement: high versus low) x 4 (confronter group membership: gay man, lesbian woman, heterosexual woman, or heterosexual man) analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures were performed on each of the four dependent variables measuring affective reactions: Negative Self-directed Reactions, Negative Other-directed Reactions, Amused, and Exasperated. Prior to conducting these analyses, a number of investigations were made in order to assess the extent to which the ANOVA assumptions were met. First, a visual inspection of the sample indicated that each analysis would involve an unequal cell design. As a result, an unweighted-means analysis strategy was selected in order to

account for the overlapping variances created in this situation. Second, in order to meet the normality assumption, both multivariate and univariate outliers were removed. Finally, normality was assessed by examining histograms and the skewness and kurtosis of each of the dependent variables. A visual inspection of histograms, as well as the skewness and kurtosis values, suggested that participants' scores on the Negative Other, the Amused, and the Exasperated sub-scales were non-normal<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, logarithmic transformations were made on all of the Affective Reaction Sub-scale scores<sup>4</sup> (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). See Table 3 for the skewness and kurtosis values for the Affective Reaction dependent variables before and after the transformation.

*3.3.2 Negative Self-directed Reactions (NSD).* The ANOVA conducted on the transformed Negative Self-directed reaction data indicated that there was a significant main effect of modern homonegativity endorsement, as high endorsers ( $M = 34.05$ ,  $SD = 10.62$ ) reacted with less concern and negative self-directed affect than low endorsers ( $M = 27.54$ ,  $SD = 11.41$ ),  $F(1, 270) = 27.47$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .06$ . This result confirmed the first hypothesis that low-prejudiced individuals would be more likely to respond with self-directed negative affect and concern than high-prejudiced individuals.

There was also a significant target group X confronter group interaction,  $F(3, 270) = 2.65$ ,  $p = .049$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .03$ . Post-hoc simple effects analysis<sup>5</sup> of the interaction indicated that the lesbian confronter ( $M = 34.41$ ,  $SD = 9.51$ ) elicited a greater concerned and negative-self-directed affective reaction than heterosexual female confronter ( $M = 24.97$ ,  $SD = 10.65$ ) only in the lesbian target condition,  $F(3, 270) = 3.52$ ,  $p = .016$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .04$ . That is, the match of lesbian target/lesbian confronter elicited larger negative self-directed reactions than the lesbian target/heterosexual female confronter condition. See Table 4 for the mean target condition X confronter type interaction scores.

*3.3.3 Negative Other-Directed Reactions (NOD).* The ANOVA conducted on the transformed Negative Other-directed data indicated a significant main effect of modern homonegativity endorsement, as high endorsers ( $M = 6.23$ ,  $SD = 3.14$ ) reacted with greater

---

<sup>3</sup> Normality was not assessed using the formal inference test as the standard errors are decreased by larger sample sizes and the null hypothesis is likely to be rejected. Therefore, Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggest that the researcher should rely on a visual inspection and the skewness and kurtosis values.

<sup>4</sup> Both the transformed and untransformed data were tested. Differences in significance levels were noted between data sets; therefore, the transformed data were used in the following analyses.

<sup>5</sup> All post hoc analyses utilized an un-weighted means solution to control for the unequal cell sizes. In addition, the bonferroni correction was used to control for Type 1 error inflation across multiple comparisons.

negative other-directed affect than low endorsers ( $M = 5.30$ ,  $SD = 2.41$ ),  $F(1, 270) = 13.61$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .05$ . This result confirmed the second hypothesis that predicted that high-prejudiced individuals would exhibit greater reactions of anger and irritation in response to confrontations about their homonegative behaviour.

There was also a significant main effect of confronter type,  $F(3, 270) = 5.05$ ,  $p = .002$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .05$ . Post hoc simple effects analysis indicated that the lesbian female confronter ( $M = 6.13$ ;  $SD = 2.81$ ) elicited larger negative other-directed reactions than the gay male confronter ( $M = 4.93$ ,  $SD = 1.71$ ),  $p = .04$ . The heterosexual male ( $M = 7.44$ ,  $SD = 3.40$ ) confronter also elicited stronger negative other-directed reaction than the gay male confronter ( $M = 4.93$ ,  $SD = 1.71$ ),  $p = .002$ . All other comparisons were statistically non-significant,  $ps > .05$ .

*3.3.4 Amused (AMD).* The ANOVA conducted on the transformed Amused data indicated a significant main effect of modern homonegativity endorsement, as high endorsers ( $M = 2.88$ ;  $SD = 1.41$ ) exhibited greater amused reactions than low endorsers ( $M = 2.39$ ;  $SD = 1.22$ ),  $F(1, 270) = 13.09$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .05$ . The remaining main effects and interactions were all statistically non-significant,  $ps > .05$ .

*3.3.5 Exasperated Reaction (EXS).* The ANOVA conducted on the transformed exasperated reaction data indicated a single main effect of confronter type,  $F(3, 270) = 3.71$ ,  $p = .012$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .04$ . A post hoc simple main effects analysis indicated that the heterosexual female confronter ( $M = 2.54$ ;  $SD = 1.29$ ) elicited a weaker exasperated reaction than the lesbian confronter ( $M = 2.63$ ;  $SD = 1.17$ ),  $p = .003$ , and the heterosexual male confronter ( $M = 2.75$ ;  $SD = 1.44$ ),  $p = .01$ . The remaining comparisons were all statistically non-significant ( $ps > .05$ ).

### *3.4 Thought and Behavioural Reactions*

*3.4.1 Overview of Analysis.* Several 2 (target group: gay man versus lesbian woman) x 2 (modern homonegativity endorsement: high versus low) x 4 (confronter group membership: gay man, lesbian woman, heterosexual woman, or heterosexual man) analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures were performed on the two dependent variables measuring thought and behavioural reactions: Compunction and Antagonism.

Prior to conducting these analyses, the extent to which the ANOVA assumptions were satisfied was tested. First, as with the affective reaction ANOVAs, a visual inspection of the sample indicated that each analysis would involve an unequal cell design. Thus, an unweighted-means analysis strategy was selected in order to account for the overlapping variances created in

this situation. Second, in order to meet the normality assumption, both multivariate and univariate outliers were removed. Finally, normality was assessed by examining histograms and the skewness and kurtosis of each of the dependent variables. A visual inspection of histograms, as well as the skewness and kurtosis values, suggested that both variables required a square root transformation<sup>6</sup> (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). See Table 5 for the skewness and kurtosis values before and after the transformations.

*3.4.2 Compunction (COM).* The ANOVA for the transformed Compunction scores indicated a main effect of modern homonegativity endorsement, as low endorsers ( $M = 22.16$ ;  $SD = 18.37$ ) exhibited greater compunction reactions than high endorsers ( $M = 19.33$ ;  $SD = 5.43$ ),  $F(1, 270) = 112.56, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .04$ . This result is consistent with the first hypothesis as it was predicted that low-prejudiced participants would think and intend to behave in an apologetic manner after being confronted compared to high-prejudiced participants.

*3.4.3 Antagonism (ANT).* Analysis of the ANOVA for the transformed antagonism scores yielded two significant results. First, there was a significant main effect of modern homonegativity endorsement, as high endorsers ( $M = 12.74$ ;  $SD = 3.72$ ) exhibited larger antagonistic reactions than low endorsers ( $M = 10.44$ ;  $SD = 3.16$ ),  $F(1, 270) = 37.42, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .12$ . This result is consistent with the first hypothesis as it was predicted that high-prejudiced participants would think and intend to behave in a hostile and aggressive manner compared to low-prejudiced participants.

Second, the main effect was qualified by a significant target condition X modern homonegativity endorsement interaction,  $F(1, 270) = 4.66, p = .032, \eta_p^2 = .02$ . Post hoc analysis of the interaction indicated that the endorsement effect (i.e., high endorsers responding with a greater antagonistic reaction than low endorsers), while present in both target conditions, was greater in the gay condition ( $M_{\text{difference}} = -.514$ ) than in the lesbian condition ( $M_{\text{difference}} = -.246$ ). See Table 6 for the mean target condition X modern homonegativity endorsement scores. The remaining main effects and interactions were all statistically non-significant ( $p > .05$ ).

### *3.5 Interpretation of the Confrontation Situation*

*3.5.1 Legitimacy of the Confrontation (LOC).* The two items measuring the perceived legitimacy of the confrontation responses were inter-correlated,  $r(285) = .56, p < .01$ , and were

---

<sup>6</sup> Both the transformed and untransformed data were tested. Differences in significance levels were noted between data sets; therefore, the transformed data were used in the following analyses.

combined to form a single legitimacy measure. The ANOVA for this measure demonstrated a significant main effect for modern homonegativity endorsement, as low endorsers ( $M = 8.16$ ;  $SD = 1.80$ ) indicated that they found the confrontation of their own behaviour to be more legitimate than high endorsers ( $M = 7.12$ ;  $SD = 2.06$ ),  $F(1, 267) = 9.45$ ,  $p = .002$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .03$ .

There was also a significant main effect of confronter type,  $F(3, 270) = 3.42$ ,  $p < .02$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .04$ . Post hoc analysis of this effect indicated that those participants were confronted by a heterosexual man ( $M = 7.31$ ;  $SD = 2.02$ ) were less likely to rate the confrontation as legitimate when compared to participants who were confronted by a gay man ( $M = 8.28$ ;  $SD = 1.94$ ),  $p = .031$ . Likewise, those participants who were confronted by a heterosexual female confronter ( $M = 7.16$ ;  $SD = 1.82$ ) were less likely to rate the confrontation as legitimate when compared to those participants who were confronted by a gay man ( $M = 8.28$ ;  $SD = 1.94$ ),  $p = .003$ . The remaining comparisons were all statistically non-significant ( $p > .05$ ).

*3.5.2 Severity of Biased Response (SBR).* The two items measuring the severity of the biased behaviour (i.e., laughing at a joke directed towards gay men or lesbian women) of the confrontation responses were intercorrelated,  $r(284) = .39$ ,  $p < .01$ , and were combined to form a single severity measure.

The ANOVA conducted for this measure demonstrated a significant main effect of modern homonegativity endorsement, as low endorsers ( $M = 8.04$ ;  $SD = 1.39$ ) rated the biased behaviour as more severe than high endorsers ( $M = 7.31$ ;  $SD = 1.78$ ),  $F(1, 268) = 7.42$ ,  $p = .007$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .03$ .

There was also a significant main effect of confronter type,  $F(3, 268) = 10.77$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .11$ . A post hoc simple effects analysis indicated that participants believed the biased behaviour to be more severe when confronted by a gay man ( $M = 8.34$ ;  $SD = 1.43$ ) than when confronted by both a heterosexual man ( $M = 7.32$ ;  $SD = 1.62$ ) and a heterosexual woman ( $M = 6.95$ ;  $SD = 1.73$ ). Further, participants believed the biased behaviour to be more severe when confronted by a lesbian woman ( $M = 8.00$ ;  $SD = 1.39$ ) than when confronted by a heterosexual woman ( $M = 6.95$ ;  $SD = 1.73$ ).

However, the main effect of confronter type was qualified by a significant target condition X confronter type interaction,  $F(3, 268) = 3.80$ ,  $p = .01$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .04$ . Post hoc analysis indicated that the pattern of the severity ratings were dependent upon the specific target/confronter matches. That is, the simple effects analysis indicated that participants were

more likely to rate the behaviour as severe when the target of the bias matched the confronter type. That is, the gay confronter elicited a larger severity rating when matched with the gay target ( $M = 8.73$ ;  $SD = 1.00$ ) than when matched with the lesbian target ( $M = 7.91$ ;  $SD = 1.70$ ),  $F(1, 268) = 5.72, p = .018, \eta_p^2 = .02$ . Likewise, the lesbian confronter elicited a larger severity rating when matched with the lesbian target ( $M = 8.40$ ;  $SD = 1.04$ ) than when matched with the gay target ( $M = 7.56$ ;  $SD = 1.60$ ),  $F(1, 268) = 4.17, p = .042, \eta_p^2 = .02$ . See Table 7 for mean target condition X confronter type scores.

*3.5.3 Likelihood of Confrontation (LC).* The ANOVA conducted on the likelihood scores indicated that there was a significant main effect of confronter type,  $F(3, 270) = 4.20, p = .006, \eta_p^2 = .05$ . Post hoc simple effects analysis indicated that the participants felt that the heterosexual male confronter ( $M = 2.17$ ;  $SD = .99$ ) was less likely to confront similar biased behaviour in the future when compared to the gay male confronter ( $M = 3.00$ ;  $SE = 1.22$ ),  $p = .003$ . See Table 8 for the mean likelihood scored for each confronter. The remaining comparisons were all statistically non-significant ( $p > .05$ ).

*3.5.4 Relationship among the Measures.* A correlation matrix (see Table 9) revealed that, as expected, those participants who expressed higher levels of concern and negative self-directed affect also expressed higher levels of exasperation and compunction. They also tended to view the biased behaviour as more severe and to see the confrontation as more legitimate. Conversely, those participants who expressed higher levels of negative other-directed affect also expressed high levels of amusement, exasperation, and antagonism. They also tended to see the biased behaviour as less severe and the confrontation to be less legitimate.

## CHAPTER FOUR - DISCUSSION

The goal of this research was to examine how female participants reacted to confrontations of their imagined homonegative responses. Consistent with past research exploring self-discovered and self-confronted homonegativity (e.g., Devine et al., 1991), low-prejudiced participants (i.e., scoring low on modern homonegativity endorsement) indicated that they would feel much more concern (e.g., guilt and discomfort), as well as think and behave with greater compunction (e.g., think that they were wrong and apologize for behaviour) than high-prejudiced participants. However, this study moves beyond self-discovered prejudices and self-initiated confrontation to explore other-initiated confrontations and the unique reactions they may produce.

In particular, the purpose of this study was to explore the influence of two important inter-personal variables on the effectiveness of the confrontation strategy. These variables were: 1) the group membership of the target of the homonegativity (i.e., bias directed towards gay men versus bias directed toward lesbian women); and 2) the group membership of the confronter (i.e., gay man, lesbian woman, heterosexual man, or heterosexual woman). As with research in other areas (see Czopp & Monteith, 2003), these variables have important implications for how participants react to inter-personal confrontations. In turn, these reactions likely have important implications for the initiation of the self-regulatory cycle (e.g., Monteith, 1993) necessary for future prejudice inhibition. The following discussion will review the results of the study and outline the implications they have for the use of interpersonal confrontations as a strategy for homonegativity reduction.

### *4.1 Homonegativity Endorsement*

As outlined by Monteith (1993) and others (e.g., Monteith, Devine, & Zuwerink, 1993), engagement of the self-regulatory cycle is highly dependent upon individuals' level of prejudice endorsement (homonegativity endorsement in this study). In particular, it has been documented (Devine et al., 1991; Monteith, 1993) that the awareness of discrepancies between one's behaviour and one's self-concept leads to feelings of self-dissatisfaction that motivates the individual to engage the self-regulatory cycle that fosters future egalitarian behaviour. Unfortunately, it is more likely for low-prejudiced participants to possess a well internalized egalitarian self-concept and set of behavioural standards than high-prejudiced participants. Therefore, it is low-prejudiced individuals who are more likely to use the self-regulatory cycle to

foster future prejudice inhibition. The goal of this research was to determine if the effectiveness of the inter-personal confrontations would be dependent upon prejudice levels. The results of this study suggest that low-prejudiced participants respond more favourably to inter-personal confrontations when compared to high-prejudiced participants.

*4.1.1 Low-prejudiced Participants.* Low-prejudiced participants exhibited a number of important reactions across the dependent variables measured in this study. As hypothesized, low-prejudiced participants exhibited greater negative self-directed affect, concern, and compunction when compared to high-prejudiced participants. These reactions are consistent with the low-prejudiced participants' ratings of the confrontation, as they were more likely to rate the hypothetical homonegative behaviour as severe and to believe that confrontation of this hypothetical behaviour was legitimate. That is, the low-prejudiced participants saw the hypothetical behaviour as wrong and expressed guilt and concern for engaging in such behaviour.

Overall, these results are consistent with previous research that suggests that low-prejudiced participants tend to have well internalized sets of egalitarian values and to identify as non-prejudiced (Devine et al., 1991). Therefore, they experience greater reactions of guilt, concern, and compunction when made aware of responses that are discrepant with their values. This type of reaction is important as it suggests that the inter-personal confrontation strategy is effective for eliciting reactions of negative self-directed affect and apologetic thoughts/behaviours among relatively low-prejudiced individuals. These reactions are important as they comprise important steps in self-regulatory attempts to curb future homonegative behaviours (Monteith, 1993).

*4.1.2 High-prejudiced Participants.* High-prejudiced participants also exhibited a number of important reactions across the dependent variables measured in this study. As hypothesized, high-prejudiced participants reacted with greater negative other-directed affect, amusement, and antagonism when compared to low-prejudiced participants. These reactions are consistent with the high-prejudiced participants' ratings of the confrontation scenario, as they were less likely to rate the hypothetical behaviour as severe (i.e., it was not homonegative or homonegative enough) and to believe that confrontation of this behaviour was justified. That is, high-prejudiced participants were less worried about offending and upsetting the confronter when compared to low-prejudiced participants. As a result, high-prejudiced participants



responded with a mixture of amusement and anger. Unfortunately, such reactions are not conducive to the engagement of the self-regulatory cycle outlined by Monteith (1993).

Overall, these results are consistent with previous research suggesting that high-prejudiced participants do not possess well internalized egalitarian values (Devine et al., 1991). Therefore, when made aware of a discrepant response, high-prejudiced individuals tend to respond with negative other-directed affect and antagonism. This finding is important as it suggests that high-prejudiced participants' reactions prevent them from recognizing homonegative behaviour as homonegative and from engaging the self-regulatory cycle used to stop future similar behaviour.

*4.1.3 The Exasperated Reaction.* The results suggested that both high and low-prejudiced participants experienced similar levels of frustration and threat from the confrontation. While somewhat unexpected, this result is consistent with Devine et al.'s (1991) conclusions. Over a series of studies, Devine et al. (1991) found that an individual's reaction to a discrepant behaviour is dependent upon standards of behaviour that are derived from one of two standpoints. These standpoints are: 1) Standards derived from one's own personal standpoint; 2) Standards derived from the standpoint of those around us. What Devine et al. documented was that low-prejudiced participants tend to derive their behavioural standards from the standpoint of the self. Thus, when made aware of discrepant responses, they find such behaviours threatening to their well internalized self-image of egalitarianism and are frustrated by their own lack of control. Conversely, high-prejudiced participants derive their behavioural standards from their perception of how other individuals in their lives believe they should behave. Thus, when made aware of a biased response, the high-prejudiced individuals express general feelings of frustration as they have failed to meet the standards of others. As a result, they tend to feel threatened and respond with negative affect directed at those in the confrontation situation.

*4.1.4 Overview.* The results of this study suggest that inter-personal confrontations can have a positive effect on low-prejudiced participants as it makes them aware of their biased response and motivates them to engage the self-regulatory cycle. However, this is not the case for high-prejudiced participants as the opposite reaction was elicited. Czopp and Monteith (2003) have argued that the inter-personal confrontation strategy may also curb future biased behaviour among high-prejudiced individuals, as the confrontation establishes norms of egalitarianism and tolerance. The results of this study suggest that an egalitarian norm was not

established as high-prejudiced participants tended to view the biased behaviour as benign and believe that the confrontation was unjustified. This is not unexpected as the homonegative behaviour depicted in this study was designed to be subtle in nature. This is important as individuals who score higher on modern homonegativity have been documented to engage in subtle forms of discrimination that can easily be justified to others (Morrison & Morrison, 2002). Further, they tend to disagree that such subtle behaviour constitutes discrimination. Regrettably, this suggests that inter-personal confrontation may be ineffective for individuals who espouse modern homonegative beliefs, as they fail to recognize such subtle discrimination as discrimination. However, this is not to imply that other confrontations of more blatant behaviour would not generate such norms. For example, Monteith et al. (1993) demonstrated that high-prejudiced persons do possess well internalized standards of behaviour that reject blatantly unacceptable but controllable (e.g., old-fashioned discrimination) discriminatory behaviours. Therefore, it is likely that confrontations of such blatant discrimination would result in positive consequences for high-prejudiced persons.

It should also be noted that, while norm activation has been documented to be an effective strategy for high-prejudiced individuals (e.g., Monteith et al., 1996), the research literature has yet to demonstrate that norm activation leads to measurable, long lasting change in high-prejudiced participants' attitudes and behaviours. Instead, it is argued that norm activation generates temporary social desirability concerns among high-prejudiced participants that promote situation specific positive changes (i.e., they do not want to look racist, homonegative, or sexist). Future research should explore this issue as confrontations of blatant homonegativity may have positive consequences for both high and low-prejudiced individuals.

#### *4.2 Target Condition: Gay Men versus Lesbian Woman*

As stated in the hypotheses, the goal of this research was to explore the role of target group membership on female participants' reactions to inter-personal confrontations of homonegative behaviour. The results of this study indicated that female participants' generally did not react with different emotions, thoughts, or behaviours when confronted on bias directed towards both gay men and lesbian women. For example, there were no significant differences involving target condition in participants' negative self-directed affective reactions, negative other-directed affective reactions, and exasperated reactions. These results are not entirely surprising given that women in this study did not rate the confrontation of biases directed

towards one target as more legitimate over another. This result suggests that participants found confrontations of either bias to be warranted. Furthermore, the modern homonegativity scores indicated that female participants who scored high on one version (e.g., gay version) of the MHS also scored high on the other version (e.g., lesbian version) of the MHS. Therefore, there was little difference in the way that participants viewed gay men and lesbian women. However, it should be noted that the parallel lesbian and gay versions of the MHS were combined into a single measure. Unfortunately, this may have produced a near equal response set for both measures (i.e., they answered the parallel lesbian version of the question as they answered the gay version of the question). As a result, this response set may have masked subtle differences in the female participants' attitudes towards gay men versus their attitudes towards lesbian women.

Despite the apparent equality in the way that participants responded to gay and lesbian bias, there was a significant target condition X modern homonegativity endorsement interaction. That is, the endorsement effect (i.e., high endorsers reacted with greater antagonism than low endorsers) was greatest in the gay target condition, as low-prejudiced participants expressed significantly lower antagonism responses. This result suggests that low-prejudiced participants were particularly unwilling to think or behave in an aggressive or confrontational manner when the target was a gay man. This result is consistent with some of the research literature that has demonstrated that female participants' attitudes towards gay man are more favourable when compared to their attitudes towards lesbian woman (Kite & Deaux, 1986; Kite & Whitley, 2003; Larsen, Reed, & Hoffman, 1980).

#### *4.3 Confronter Type*

The second goal of this research was to explore the extent to which the four different (i.e., gay man, lesbian woman, heterosexual man, and a heterosexual woman) confronters selected for this study would influence participants' reactions. In particular, it was predicted that the most effective confronters would be those who had the least vested interest (i.e., heterosexual men and heterosexual women) in the confrontation, as their confrontations would be both unanticipated and taken more seriously by participants. While the likelihood scores did indicate that the participants would not anticipate the heterosexual confronters to confront the biased behaviour (especially true of the heterosexual male confronter), the severity results indicate that (in both target conditions) the homosexual confronters were taken more seriously as they elicited

stronger severity ratings than the heterosexual confronters. Furthermore, this effect is likely compounded by the participants' legitimacy ratings, as the female participants rated the heterosexual confronters as having the least justification for confronting the homonegative behaviour. Taken together, these results suggest that the participants would not react favourably to the heterosexual confronters as the participants may believe that, because of their lack of vested interest, they should just mind their own business.

Consistent with this conclusion, a pattern emerged in the results that suggested the homosexual confronters are much more effective, as they elicit those reactions that are important for motivating people to engage in the self-regulatory cycle (Monteith, 1993). The homosexual confronters elicited stronger negative self-directed affective reactions and compunction reactions than the heterosexual confronters. In addition, the homosexual confronters elicited weaker antagonistic responses that are known to inhibit the engagement of the self-regulatory cycle.

In general, these results likely reflect the participants' stronger severity ratings of the biased behaviour when the target of the behaviour matched the confronter of that same behaviour (e.g., the behaviour was viewed as more severe in the gay target/gay confronter and lesbian target/lesbian confronter condition). The effect of these severity ratings was particularly apparent in the participants' concerned negative self-directed reactions as it was the lesbian target/lesbian confronter match that elicited the greatest reaction.

Unexpectedly, the results also suggested another pattern of confronter effectiveness in the participants' negative other-directed reactions and exasperated reactions. The results indicated that the heterosexual man and lesbian woman confronters elicited larger negative reactions than the gay male or heterosexual female confronters. For the heterosexual male confronter, this pattern seems to reflect the participants' severity and legitimacy ratings. In particular, the results suggested that the heterosexual male confronter was perceived to possess the least legitimacy and to elicit the weakest severity ratings from participants. Given these ratings, it would be plausible to assume that the participants resent the heterosexual male's confrontation and respond with high levels of negative-other directed affect (directed at the male confronter) and exasperation. Interestingly, the heterosexual female confronter is not as polarizing as the heterosexual male confronter despite similar low legitimacy and severity ratings. Perhaps, these reactions reflect the female participants' perception of the heterosexual female confronter as a part of their own minority group (i.e., women) and sympathize with her struggle to confront such

prejudice. Thus, the participants react with less anger and frustration, but not with increased guilt, concern, or compunction (this is not her minority group).

For the lesbian female confronter, this pattern seems to suggest that lesbian women elicit polarized reactions from participants (e.g., strong negative self-directed reactions and strong negative other-directed reactions). It is believed that this polarization is a by-product of the participants' severity ratings. The inter-correlation matrix (See Table 9) indicates that participants who rated the behaviour as severe also tended to react with greater concerned negative self-directed reactions. However, the severity ratings were also significantly correlated with the exasperated reactions, as those who rated the behaviour as severe also tended to react with greater exasperation. Further, this exasperated reaction may also produce a negative-other directed reaction as these reactions are inter-correlated.

In general, the results suggest that the lesbian confronter elicits strong severity ratings (especially in the lesbian target condition) that lead to strong concerned negative self-directed and exasperated reactions. Interestingly, this also produces a negative other-directed reaction that may work to inhibit those reactions (e.g., concern, guilt, embarrassment) that are important for engaging the self-regulatory cycle. Future research should look to explore this polarized reaction and the effect it has on the participants motivation to prevent similar homonegative behaviour in the future.

To summarize, the results do not support the third hypothesis, as the homosexual confronters were more effective. This was unexpected as past research conducted by Czopp and Monteith (2003) has demonstrated that out-group member (from the perspective of the target) confronters are more effective. In particular, they found that white confronters were much more effective than black confronters when confronting racism. However, it should be noted that the scenarios used by Czopp and Monteith depicted much more blatantly biased behaviour (e.g., failing to recognize a candidates' credentials) than the biased behaviour depicted here. In such a scenario, it is unlikely that the participants would have trouble defining the behaviour as biased. This is in contrast to the subtle behaviour used here. The legitimacy and severity ratings would suggest that the heterosexual confronters struggled to convince participants that this was indeed a significant biased response. Conversely, the homosexual confronters were much more effective at convincing the participants that the behaviour was significant.

Furthermore, unlike gender or race, sexual orientation is not generally determined through visual cues and heterosexual women may have few opportunities to knowingly interact with gay men and/or lesbian women. As a result, heterosexual women may be apprehensive and cautious when confronted with situations that require information about gay and/or lesbian lifestyles. Consequently, heterosexual women may be more inclined to take gay men and lesbian women seriously in such situations as they have a vested interest (i.e., they live that lifestyle). Future research should look to explore differences between subtle and blatant homonegative behaviour as one group of confronters may be more effective in one behaviour condition when compared to another. In addition, research should look to study differences in the way that individuals react to one kind of prejudice over another (e.g., racism and homonegativity) in order to understand how individuals derogate unique minority groups in different and/or similar ways.

#### *4.4 Nature of the Homonegative Joke Scenario*

Zillmann and Cantor (1976) have proposed a dispositional theory of disparaging humour that outlined two important variables for determining how individuals will react to group-disparaging humour. First, in an early study, Zillmann and Cantor (1972) demonstrated that a preference for a joke can be determined by one's own reference group. When presented with jokes depicting interactions between dyads with socially understood status differentials (e.g., heterosexual/homosexual), it was demonstrated that those in the socially superior role (e.g., heterosexual) preferred jokes in which the subordinate was the victim (e.g., homosexual). Second, a participant's enjoyment of a group disparaging joke is dependent upon that participant's disposition (ranging from very positive to very negative) toward the target of the joke. Not surprisingly, Zillman and Cantor (1976) were able to demonstrate that participants will prefer and laugh more (or at least find the joke funnier) when the joke depicts a salient out-group member (from one's reference point) who is disliked (i.e., negative disposition).

The results of the present experiment were consistent with this theory. That is, high-prejudiced participants (i.e., negative disposition) exhibited greater amused reactions as well as, lower severity and legitimacy ratings. Zillman and Cantor's (1976) theory suggests that we should expect greater amused reactions from high-prejudiced participants as these are the individuals who will prefer homosexual disparaging jokes. It is arguable that many of these high-prejudiced participants found a great deal of humour in these jokes and were surprised (didn't accept) that they were being confronted. As a result, we see larger amusement reactions

coupled with mild negative other-directed affective and antagonistic reactions. In future, more research will be required to expand upon our understanding of confrontations in a humour or joke scenario. In particular, it would be interesting to explore differences in reactions to confrontations of laughing at a joke as opposed to reactions to confrontations for telling a homonegative joke. In addition, future research might explore differences in reactions by manipulating the group's response (everyone laughs versus just you laughing). This research should help to further our understanding of the effectiveness of inter-personal confrontations of homonegative humour.

#### *4.5 Limitations and Future Research*

*4.5.1 Confrontation Type.* The first limitation of this study would be that the study utilizes written scenarios and imagined inter-personal confrontations in order to explore the participants' reactions. Unlike inter-personal confrontations that take place in real time (i.e., in an everyday conversation outside of the lab), participants are not required to overcome the surprise (if not disbelief and frustration) of suddenly being confronted. Presumably, such surprise confrontations may elicit greater affective reactions that could detract from or enhance the effectiveness of the inter-personal confrontation strategy. Therefore, researchers should look to design experimental manipulations that involve spontaneous confrontations of the participants' behaviour.

This research is particularly important given the research conducted by Plous (2000) that has described some of the difficulties that students face when trying to enact inter-personal confrontations of prejudice and discrimination. In particular, the students indicated that it was difficult for them to confront prejudice without appearing argumentative and self-righteous to the offender (i.e., a hot confrontation). In fact, such perceptions led to resistance and anger from those who were confronted. This was true even of participants' who considered themselves egalitarian. Conversely, the students indicated that asking questions (e.g., Do you treat everyone in this group like that?), invoking dissonance (e.g., I always thought you were open-minded), and responding with how one feels (e.g., I think that is wrong) were more effective ways to approach the confrontation situation (i.e., cold confrontations). In future, it would be interesting to explore the role that hot and cold confrontations play in determining the effectiveness of this strategy for homonegativity reduction.

*4.5.2 Nature of the Sample.* A second limitation to this study would be the composition of the sample used. That is, the majority of the sample could be described as young, liberal, Caucasian heterosexual females. Therefore, this sample is representative of this small group of college aged women and it is difficult to extend the results of the study beyond this group as the external validity of this research is likely bound to this group. However, there is some value in testing this group as young educated women tend to hold greater liberal attitudes towards gay men and lesbian women (Altemeyer, 1988; Herek, 1988; Morrison & Morrison, 2002). As a consequence, it could be considered encouraging to demonstrate that the endorsement effect (i.e., high-prejudiced participants reacted with greater negative other-directed affect and antagonism) occurred among a liberal sample of participants.

However, the failure to document differences in participants' reactions to bias directed towards the two targets may reflect the absence of male participants. The research literature suggests (Herek, 1988; Herek, 2000) that while both groups are viewed in a negative fashion; heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men have tended to be much more negative. Further, the magnitude of this difference varies between heterosexual men and women (i.e., the former express much more negativity towards gay men than towards lesbian women whereas the latter display only a marginal difference in their attitudes towards the two groups). Therefore, further research is required in order to explore the effectiveness of the confrontation strategy within a sample of men and women, as participant gender may be an important variable in determining reactions to confrontations of bias directed towards gay men and lesbian women.

*4.5.3 Modern Homonegativity Endorsement.* In order to identify equal numbers of high and low-prejudiced participants, the present study utilized a median split analysis. Admittedly, this classification strategy requires the categorization of a continuous variable into two mutually exclusive groups. While this classification is consistent with past research and makes testing the differences between the two groups of participants easier, it should be noted that there is a trade-off in information. In particular, participants who score near the middle of the scale are classified as either high or low in prejudice (e.g., a 1 = 30; 31 = 6). Further, participants who score 30 (i.e., low-prejudice) are classified very differently from participants who score 31 (i.e., high-prejudiced). Therefore, the effect of modern homonegativity may be muted as there is little difference between a person who scored 30 and a person who scored 31. Likewise, the effect may be muted as there may be a lot of difference between a person who scores 1 and a person



who scores 30 that is not tested. While it is encouraging to note that the expected prejudiced effects emerged, it will be important to explore differences between participants who score at the upper and lower bound of the MHS scale in the future (e.g., perhaps comparing the top third of MHS scores with the bottom third of the MHS scorers), as important differences may exist in their reactions to confrontations.

Finally, the MHS was not counterbalanced with the experimental scenario (i.e., the MHS did not appear before and after the scenarios an equal amount of times). As a result, social desirability may be a concern as participants always completed the MHS after the experimental manipulations. Unfortunately, some participants may have guessed the true nature of the study (i.e., that we were interested in reactions to confrontations of homonegative behaviour) and modified their MHS responses in order to look less homonegative. However, it should be noted that participants were informed that they would be questioned further on aspects of one of the three confrontation scenarios. It was my belief that participants would take this to mean that they were simply selected to be questioned further on the third scenario. As a result, it was hoped that the female participants would experience fewer social desirability concerns.

#### *4.5.4 Overview*

In summary, the results of this study suggest that inter-personal confrontation can be an effective strategy for eliciting those reactions (e.g., guilt, disappointment, and compunction) that will allow the individual to engage in the self-regulatory cycle that fosters future homonegativity reduction. However, the effectiveness of this strategy is dependent on the participants' prejudice level, confronter type, and target of the bias. While this strategy exhibits much promise, future research should continue to expand upon this work to determine what other factors are important for prejudice reduction via this strategy.

## CHAPTER 5: REFERENCES

- Aberson, C.L., & Dora, J. (2003). Reactions to gay men: Contact and overcorrection in an employee selection simulation. *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality, and Social*, 22, 164-174.
- Aberson, C.L., Swan, D.J., & Emerson, E.P. (1999). Covert discrimination against gay men by U.S. college students. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 139, 323-334.
- Altermeyer, B. (2001). Changes in attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 42, 63-75.
- Altermeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of freedom*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Balsam, K.F., Rothblum, E.D., & Beauchaine, T. P. (2005). Victimization over the life span: A comparison of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and heterosexual siblings. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, 73, 477-487.
- Bargh, J.A. (1999). The cognitive monster: The case against the controllability of automatic stereotype effects. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual process theories in social psychology* (pp.361-382). New York: Guilford.
- Basow, S.A., & Johnson, K. (2000). Predictors of homophobia in female college students. *Sex Roles*, 42, 391-404.
- Bernstein, M., & Kostelac, C. (2002). Lavender and blue: Attitudes about homosexuality and behavior toward lesbians and gay men among police officers. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 18, 302-328.
- Blanchard, F.A., Crandall, C.S., Brigham, J.C., & Vaughn, L.A. (1994). Condemning and condoning racism: A social context approach to interracial settings. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 79, 993-997.
- Cochran, S.D., Keenan, C., Schober, C., & Mays, V.M. (2000). Estimates of alcohol use and clinical treatment needs among homosexually active men and women in the U.S. population. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 68, 1062-1071.
- Comstock, G.D. (1991). *Violence against lesbians and gay men*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Corliss, H.L., Cochran, S.D., & Mays, V.M. (2002). Reports of parental maltreatment during childhood in a United States population-based survey of homosexual, bisexual, and heterosexual adults. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 26, 1165-1178.

- Cotten-Huston, A.L., & Waite, B.M. (2000). Anti-homosexual attitudes in college students: Predictors and classroom interventions. *Journal of Homosexuality, 38*, 117-133.
- Cramer, E., Oles, T.P., & Black, D. (1997). Reducing social work students' homophobia: An evaluation of teaching strategies. *Arete, 21*, 36-49.
- Czopp, A.M., & Monteith, M.J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to confrontation of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 532-544.
- Czopp, A.M., Monteith, M. J., Mark, A.Y. (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 784-803.
- Daley, A. (2003). Lesbian health and the assumption of heterosexuality: An organizational perspective. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 22*, 105-121.
- D'Augelli, A.R., Hershberger, S. L., & Pilkington, N. W. (2001). Suicidality patterns and sexual orientation-related factors among lesbian, gay, and bisexual youths. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 31*, 250-264.
- D'Augelli, A.R., & Grossman, A.H. (2001). Disclosure of sexual orientation, victimization, and mental health among lesbian, gay, and bisexual older adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*, 1008-1027.
- Davies, M. (2004). Correlates of negative attitudes toward gay men: Sexism, male role norms, and male sexuality. *Journal of Sex Research, 41*, 259-266.
- Devine, P.G., & Monteith, M.J. (1999). Automaticity and control in stereotyping. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual process theories in social psychology* (pp.339-360). New York: Guilford.
- Devine, P.G., & Elliot, A.J. (1995). Are racial stereotypes really fading? The Princeton trilogy revisited. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 1139-1150.
- Devine, P.G., Monteith, M.J., Zuwerink, J.R., & Elliot, A.J. (1991). Prejudice with and without compunction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 817-830.
- Diaz, R.M., Ayala, G., Bein, E., Henne, J., & Marin, B.V. (2001). The impact of homophobia, poverty, and racism on the mental health of gay and bisexual latino men: Findings from 3 US cities. *American Journal of Public Health, 91*, 927-932.

- Gaertner, S.L., & Dovidio, J.F. (1981). Racism among the well intentioned. In E. Clausen & J. Bermingham (Eds.), *Pluralism, racism, and public policy: The search for equality*. Boston: G. K. Hall.
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., & Signorielli, N. (1984). Political correlates of television viewing. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *48*(1), 283-300.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 491–512.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S.T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist*, *56*, 109-118.
- Gorsuch, R. L., & McFarland, S. G. (1972). Single versus multiple-item scales for measuring religious values. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *11*(1), 53-64.
- Grack, C., & Richman, C.L. (1996). Reducing general and specific heterosexism through cooperative contact. *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality*, *8*, 59-68.
- Grutzeck, S., & Gidyez, C.A. (1997). Reducing general and specific heterosexism through cooperative contact. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality*, *8*, 59-68.
- Fiske, S.T., Lin, M., & Neuberg, S.L. (1999). The continuum model: Ten years later. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.). *Dual process theories in social psychology* (pp.231-254). New York: Guilford.
- Finkel, M.J., Storaasli, R.D., Bandele, A., & Schaefer, V. (2003). Diversity training in graduate school: An exploratory evaluation of the Safe Zone project. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *34*, 555-561.
- Franklin, K. (2000). Antigay behaviors among young adults: Prevalence, patterns, and motivators in a non-criminal population. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *15*, 33-362.
- Herek, G.M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *25*, 451-477.
- Herek, G.M. (1994). Assessing heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: A review of empirical research with the ATLG scale. In B. Greene, & G. M. Herek (Eds.), *Lesbian and gay psychology: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 206-228). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Herek, G.M. (2000). The psychology of sexual prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9, 19-22.
- Herek, G.M. (2004). Beyond “homophobia”: Thinking about sexual prejudice and stigma in the twenty-first century. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy: A Journal of the NSRC*, 1, 6-24.
- Herek, G.M., Gillis, J.R., & Cogan, J.C. (1999). Psychological sequel of hate-crime victimization among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67, 945-951.
- Hicks, G.R., & Lee, T.T. (2006). Public attitudes toward gays and lesbians: Trends and predictors. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 51, 57-77.
- Hudson, W.W., & Ricketts, W.A. (1980). A strategy for the measurement of homophobia. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 5, 357-372.
- Kite, M. E., & Deaux, K. (1986). Attitudes towards homosexuality: Assessment and behavioural consequences. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 7, 137 -162.
- Kite, M. E., & Whitley, B. E. Jr. (1996). Sex difference in attitudes towards homosexual persons, behaviours, and civil rights: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 336 – 353.
- Lance, L.M. (2002). Heterosexism and homophobia among college students. *College Student Journal*, 36, 410-414.
- Lampinen, T.M., McGhee, D., & Martin, I. (2006). Increased risk of “club” drug use among gay and bisexual high school students in British Columbia. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 38, 458-461.
- Larsen, K. S., Cate, R., Reed, M. (1983). Anti-Black attitudes, religious orthodoxy, permissiveness, and sexual information: A study of the attitudes of heterosexual toward homosexuality. *Journal of Sex Research*, 19, 125-135.
- Little, J.N. (2001). Embracing gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered youth in school-based settings. *Child & Youth Care Forum*, 30, 99-110.
- McConahay, J.B. (1983). Modern racism and modern discrimination: The effects of race, racial attitudes, and the context of simulated hiring decisions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 9, 551- 558.
- Meyers, K.A., Forest, K.B., & Miller, S.L. (2004). Officer friendly and the tough cop: Gays and lesbians navigate homophobia and policing. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 47, 17-37.

- Monteith, M. (1993). Self-regulation of prejudiced responses: Implications for progress in prejudice reduction efforts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*, 469-485.
- Monteith, M.J., Ashburn-Nardo, L.A., Voils, C.I., & Czopp, A.M. (2002). Putting the breaks on prejudice: On the development and operation of cues for control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*, 1029-1050.
- Monteith, M.J., Deneen, N.E., & Tooman, G.D. (1996). The effect of norm activation on the expression of opinions concerning gay men and blacks. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *118*, 267-288.
- Monteith, M.J., & Voils, C.I. (1998). Proneness to prejudice responses: Towards understanding the authenticity of self-reported discrepancies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*, 901-916.
- Morrison, M.A., & Morrison, T.G. (2002). Development and validation of a scale measuring modern prejudice toward gay men and lesbian women. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *43*, 15-37.
- Morrison, M.A., Morrison, T.G., & Franklin, R. (in press). Testing the cross-cultural viability of the theory of modern prejudice as it pertains to gay men and lesbian women in Canada and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*.
- Morrison, T.G., Kenny, P., & Harrington, A. (2005). Modern prejudice toward gay men and lesbian women: Assessing the viability of a measure of modern homonegative attitudes within an Irish context. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, *13*, 219-250.
- Nelson, E.S., & Krieger, S.L. (1997). Changes in attitudes towards homosexuality in college students: Implementation of a gay men and lesbian peer panel. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *33*, 63-81.
- Nelson, T.D. (2006). *The psychology of prejudice*. Toronto: Pearson.
- O'Bryan, M., Fishbein, H.D., & Ritchey, P.N. (2004). Intergenerational transmission of prejudice, sex role stereotyping, and intolerance. *Adolescence*, *39*, 407-426.
- Patel, S., Long, T.E., McCammon, S.L., & Wuensch, K.L. (1995). Personality and emotional correlates of self-reported antigay behaviors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *10*, 354-366.
- Pettigrew, T.F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *49*, 65-85.

- Pilkington, N.W., & Cantor, J.M. (1996). Perceptions of heterosexual bias in professional psychology programs: A survey of graduate students. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 27*, 604-612.
- Plous, S. (2000). Responding to overt displays of prejudice: A role-playing exercise. *Teaching of Psychology, 27*, 198 – 200.
- Riggle, E.D., Ellis, A.L., & Crawford, A.M. (1996). The impact of media contact on attitudes towards gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality, 31*, 55-69.
- Roderick, T., McCammon, S.L., Long, T.E., & Allred, L.J. (1998). Behavioral aspects of homonegativity. *Journal of Homosexuality, 36*, 79-88.
- Rokeach, M., & Cochrane, R. (1972). Self-confrontation and confrontation with another as determinants of long-term value change. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 2*, 283-292.
- Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W., & Freeman, H.E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Savin-William, R.C. (1994). Verbal and psychical abuse as stressors in the lives of lesbian, gay male, and bisexual youths: Associations with school problems, running away, substance abuse, prostitution, and suicide. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62*, 261-269.
- Schellenberg, E.G., Hirt, J., & Sears, A. (1999). Attitudes toward homosexuals among students at a Canadian university. *Sex Roles, 40*, 139-152.
- Serdahely, W.J., & Ziemba, G.J. (1984) Changing homophobic attitudes through college sexuality education. *Journal of Homosexuality, 10*, 109-116.
- Shields, S.A., & Harriman, R.E. (1984). Fear of male homosexuality: Cardiac responses of low and high homonegative males. *Journal of Homosexuality, 10*, 53-67.
- Simon, A. (1996). Some correlates of individuals' attitudes toward lesbians. *Journal of Homosexuality, 29*, 89-103.
- Snyder, M.L., Kleck, R.E., Strenta, A., & Mentzer, S.J. (1979). Avoidance of the handicapped: An attritional ambiguity analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 2297-2306.
- Steffens, M. (2005). Implicit and explicit attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality, 49*, 39-66.

- Swim, J.K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *68*, 199-214.
- Swim, J.K., Ferguson, M. J., & Hyers, L.L. (1999). Avoiding stigma by association: Subtle prejudice against lesbians in the form of social distancing. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *21*, 61-68.
- Travers, R., & Schneider, M. (1996). Barriers to accessibility for lesbian and gay youth needing addictions services. *Youth & Society*, *27*, 356-378.
- Tucker, E.W., & Potocky-Tripodi, M. (2006). Changing heterosexual' attitudes toward homosexuals: A systematic review of the empirical literature. *Research on Social Work Practice*, *16*, 176-190.
- Vicario, B.A., Liddie, B.J., & Luzzo, D.A. (2005). The role of values in understanding attitudes towards lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *49*, 145- 159.
- Waldo, C.R., & Kemp, J.L. (1997). Should I come out to my students? An empirical investigation. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *34*, 79-93.
- Weinberg, G.H. (1972). *Society and the healthy homosexual*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Yang, A.S. (1997). The polls-trends: Attitudes toward homosexuality. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *61*, 477-507.
- Yoshikawa, H., Wilson, P., Chae, D.H., & Cheng, J. (2004). Do family and friendship networks protect against the influence of discrimination on mental health and HIV risk among Asian and Pacific Islander gay men? *AIDS Education and Prevention*, *16*, 84-100.
- Zillmann, D., & Cantor, J. R. (1972). Directionality of transitory dominance as a communication variable affecting humour appreciation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *24*, 191–198.
- Zillmann, D., & Cantor, J. R. (1976). A disposition theory of humour and mirth. In A. J. Chapman & H. C. Foot (Eds.), *Humour and laughter: Theory, research and applications* (pp. 93–116). New York: Wiley.





Stereotype Activation → *Slow Down; Careful* → *Prejudice Inhibited*



Discrepant Response



Awareness of Discrepancy



Discrepancy-Associated consequences

1. Negative self-directed affect (punishment)
2. Self-Focus
3. Attention to discrepancy relevant stimuli (cues present when discrepancy occurred)
4. Search for indications of the discrepant response
5. Association built between cues, discrepant response and punishment

*Figure 1.* Diagrammatic representation of Monteith's (1993) self-regulatory cycle for prejudice reduction.

Table 1

Demographic Information		
Demographic	Overall	
	<i>n</i>	Percent
Ethnicity		
Aboriginal	8	2.80
African	4	1.40
Asian	12	4.20
Hispanic	2	0.70
Caucasian	248	86.70
Other	1	0.30
Missing	11	3.80
Political Conservatism		
Very Liberal	26	9.10
Liberal	81	28.30
Somewhat Liberal	86	28.30
Somewhat Conservative	53	18.50
Conservative	32	11.20
Very Conservative	6	2.10
Missing	2	0.70
Religiosity		
Very religious	19	6.60
Quite religious	45	15.70
Somewhat religious	137	47.90
Not at all religious	82	28.70
Missing	3	1.00
Religious Service Attendance		
Regularly	50	17.50
Now and then	63	22.00
On special occasions	91	31.80
Never	79	27.60
Missing	3	1.00
Sexual Orientation		
Exclusively heterosexual	234	81.80
Primarily heterosexual	47	16.40
More heterosexual than homosexual	3	
Missing	2	0.70

Table 2

## Detailed Scale Descriptives

Scale	Possible Range	Observed Range	Descriptives			
			<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Alpha</i>	<i>95% CI</i>
MHS_L	12 - 60	12 - 52	30.70	9.10	0.90	.88 - .92
MHS_G	12 - 60	12 - 58	30.72	9.46	0.91	.89 - .93
Negative Self-Directed	10 - 50	10 - 50	30.75	11.37	0.95	.94 - .96
Negative Other- Directed	4 - 20	4 - 17	5.97	2.87	0.87	.85 - .90
Amused	2 - 10	2 - 10	2.64	1.35	0.89	.86 - .91
Exasperated	2 - 10	2 - 10	3.50	1.78	0.71	.64 - .77
Compunction	6 - 30	7 - 30	20.72	5.23	0.74	.69 - .78
Antagonism	6 - 30	6 - 26	11.60	3.63	0.70	.64 - .75

Table 3

## Skewness and Kurtosis Values: Affective Reaction Scales

Affect Reactions	Skewness Value (Standard Error)		Kurtosis Value (Standard Error)	
	Before	After	Before	After
Negative Self-Directed	-0.12 (.14)	-0.71 (.14)	-1.11 (.29)	-0.52 (.29)
Negative Other-Directed	1.58 (.14)	0.98(.14)	2.02 (.29)	-0.28 (.29)
Amused	2.29 (.14)	1.75(.14)	6.06 (.29)	1.97 (.29)
Exasperated	1.24 (.14)	0.52(.14)	1.17 (.29)	-0.94 (.29)

Table 4

Mean Transformed Negative Self-Directed Scores for the Target Condition by Confronter Type Interaction

Target Condition	Confronter Type			
	Gay Man	Lesbian Woman	Heterosexual Man	Heterosexual Woman
Gay Target	1.50 (.20)	1.41 (.19)	1.41 (.16)	1.45 (.19)
Lesbian Target	1.48 (.17)	1.52 (.14)*	1.45 (.19)	1.38 (.20)*

\* Significant Difference

Table 5

Skewness and Kurtosis Values: Thought and Behavioural Reaction Scales

Sub-Scale	Skewness Value (Standard Error)		Kurtosis Value (Standard Error)	
	Before	After	Before	After
Compunction	-0.49 (.14)	-0.79 (.14)	-0.48 (.29)	0.08 (.29)
Antagonism	0.92 (.14)	0.47 (.14)	1.23 (.29)	0.21 (.29)

Table 6

Mean Transformed Antagonism Scores for the Target Condition by Modern Homonegativity Interaction

---

	Modern Homonegativity Endorsement	
Target Condition	High	Low
Gay Target	3.57 (.46)	3.12 (.47)
Lesbian Target	3.49 (.57)	3.27 (.46)

---

Table 7

Mean Severity Scores for the Target Condition by Confronter Type Interaction

Target	Confronter			
	Gay Man	Lesbian Woman	Heterosexual Woman	Heterosexual Man
Gay Man	8.73 (1.00)*	7.56 (1.60)^	7.20 (1.83)	7.33 (1.80)
Lesbian Woman	7.91 (1.70)*	8.40 (1.03)^	6.62 (1.55)	7.54 (1.44)

\*Significant Difference

^ Significant Difference



Table 8

Mean Confronter Likelihood Scores

---

Confronter	Mean Score (SD)
Gay Man	3.00 (1.22)
Lesbian Woman	2.61 (1.43)
Heterosexual Man	2.15 (.99)
Heterosexual Woman	2.56 (1.24)

---

Table 9  
 Inter-correlations Between Dependent Variables ( $N = 286$ )

	NSD	NOD	AMD	EXS	COM	ANT	LOC	SBR	LC
NSD	1	-.10	-.32	.49	.71	-.33	.47	.59	.22
NOD		1	.39	.34	-.36	.46	-.43	-.23	-.14
AMD			1	.04	-.34	.44	-.32	-.31	-.07
EXS				1	.23	.01	.06	.19	.12
COM					1	-.32	.57	.61	.19
ANT						1	-.50	-.33	-.14
LOC							1	.47	.28
SBR								1	.11
LC									1

Appendix A  
Modern Homonegativity Scale

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree

After each statement, PLEASE ENTER THE NUMBER THAT CORRESPONDS with the statement that BEST represents your opinion: (\* Reverse scored)

1. Many gay men (lesbian women) use their sexual orientation so that they can obtain special privileges. \_\_\_\_\_
2. Gay men (lesbian women) seem to focus on the ways in which they differ from heterosexuals, and ignore the ways in which they are the same. \_\_\_\_\_
3. Gay men (lesbian women) do not have all the rights they need. \_\_\_\_\_\*
4. The notion of Universities providing students with undergraduate degrees in Gay and Lesbian studies is ridiculous. \_\_\_\_\_
5. Celebrations such as “Gay Pride Day” are ridiculous because they assume that an individual’s sexual orientation should constitute a source of pride. \_\_\_\_\_
6. Gay men (lesbian women) still need to protest for equal rights. \_\_\_\_\_\*
7. Gay men (lesbian women) should stop shoving their lifestyle down other people’s throats. \_\_\_\_\_
8. If gay men (lesbian women) want to be treated like everyone else, then they need to stop making such a fuss about their sexuality/culture. \_\_\_\_\_
9. Gay men (lesbian women) who are “out of the closet” should be admired for their courage. \_\_\_\_\_\*
10. Gay men (lesbian women) should stop complaining about the way they are treated in society, and simply get on with their lives. \_\_\_\_\_
11. In today’s tough economic times, Canadians’ tax dollars shouldn’t be used to support gay men’s (lesbian women’s) organizations. \_\_\_\_\_
12. Gay men (lesbian women) have become far too confrontational in their demand for equal rights. \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix B

### Interpersonal Confrontation Scenarios

#### *Scenario 1*

Imagine that you are returning to your apartment after class and notice that today's paper had been delivered to your neighbour's door. The front page caption catches your eye and you casually bend down to pick up the paper for a better look. As you stand up with the paper, in hand, the neighbour's door opens and your neighbour (who is a large man) looks at you and says, "I can't believe you were trying to steal my newspaper." How do you react?

#### *Scenario 2*

Imagine that you are working on a group project with three other students in the same class. The project is quite large and everyone agreed to complete a unique portion of the project in order to complete it on time. During the course of a meeting with your group members, you refer to the fact that you are "a little bit behind" as you have several other classes this semester. One of the group members (who is a woman) with whom you are talking says, "The rest of us are close to completing our portions of the project, don't you think that you should put more effort into your performance on this project?" How do you react?

#### *Scenario 3*

Imagine that you are hanging out with a small group of people and one of them tells the following joke: "What do you call a gay dinosaur? A Mega-sore-ass!" (Lesbian Bias Condition: What do you call a lesbian dinosaur? A lick- alota- pus.). You laugh at the joke, and then one of the people in the group (who is a gay man, who is a lesbian woman, who is a heterosexual man, who is a heterosexual woman) says, "I really don't think people should tell or laugh at jokes that play on stereotypes." How do you react?

## Appendix C

### Affective Reaction Items

1	2	3	4	5
Does not apply at all	Somewhat does not apply	Somewhat Applies	Applies	Applies very much

To what extent would the following emotions be reflective of your reaction to being confronted in this situation? After each statement, PLEASE ENTER THE NUMBER THAT CORRESPONDS with the statement that BEST represents your opinion:

1. I would feel angry with myself \_\_\_\_\_
2. I would feel guilty \_\_\_\_\_
3. I would feel disappointed with myself \_\_\_\_\_
4. I would feel shameful \_\_\_\_\_
5. I would feel self-critical \_\_\_\_\_
6. I would feel dissatisfied with myself \_\_\_\_\_
7. I would feel embarrassed \_\_\_\_\_
8. I would feel bothered \_\_\_\_\_
9. I would feel tense \_\_\_\_\_
10. I would feel threatened \_\_\_\_\_
11. I would feel uncomfortable \_\_\_\_\_
12. I would feel frustrated \_\_\_\_\_
13. I would feel angry towards the confronter \_\_\_\_\_
14. I would be irritated with the confronter \_\_\_\_\_
15. I would be disgusted with the confronter \_\_\_\_\_
16. I would be annoyed with the confronter \_\_\_\_\_
17. I would be amused by the confrontation \_\_\_\_\_
18. I would be entertained by the confrontation \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix D

### Thought and Behavioural Reactions

1	2	3	4	5
Does not apply at all	Somewhat does not apply	Somewhat Applies	Applies	Applies very much

To what extent would the following thoughts be representative of what you would be thinking about after being confronted in this situation? After each statement, PLEASE ENTER THE NUMBER THAT CORRESPONDS with the statement that BEST represents your opinion:

1. I would think I was wrong, I shouldn't have done that \_\_\_\_\_
2. I would think about what I had done and why \_\_\_\_\_
3. I would think about the other person's reaction without getting upset \_\_\_\_\_
4. I would think I really didn't mean anything by what I did \_\_\_\_\_
5. I would think there's nothing wrong with what I did \_\_\_\_\_
6. I would think this person is being a jerk \_\_\_\_\_

To what extent would the following behaviours be representative of what you might do after being confronted in this situation?

1. I would apologize and try to avoid such behaviour in the future \_\_\_\_\_
2. I would talk it over with the person and work it out \_\_\_\_\_
3. I would tell the person they are right and drop the subject \_\_\_\_\_
4. I would tell the person, "Whatever, sometimes things like this just happen." \_\_\_\_\_
5. I would tell the other person that my position is right \_\_\_\_\_
6. I would tell the person to lighten up, they're being stupid. \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix E

### Consent Form

**You are invited to participate in a study entitled “... And How Would You React?”: Exploring Undergraduate Students’ Reactions to Interpersonal Confrontations. Please read this form carefully, and feel free to ask any questions. (Study F32)**

**Student Researcher:** Edwin Rogers, MA (cand.), Department of Psychology, Arts Building, Room 161, University of Saskatchewan, (306) 966-1773. My email address is: [ejr545@mail.usask.ca](mailto:ejr545@mail.usask.ca)

**Research Supervisor:** Melanie A. Morrison, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, Arts Building, Room 163, University of Saskatchewan, (306) 966-2564. My email address is: [melanie.morrison@usask.ca](mailto:melanie.morrison@usask.ca).

**Purpose and Procedures:** The purpose of this study is to obtain a better understanding of how people react when confronted about some aspects of their behaviour. We are particularly interested in learning about how people react to being confronted about behaviours such as theft, lack of academic performance, and discrimination directed towards gay men and lesbian women. In this study, you will be required to read short fictional confrontation scenarios and asked to imagine yourself within the depicted scenarios. After each scenario, you will be then asked to indicate what kind of reaction you would have to the particular scenario in question. In addition, you will be asked to indicate your agreement or disagreement with a number of items. These items were designed to further understand your responses to 1 or more of the confrontation scenarios. Finally, you will also be asked to complete a number of single-item demographic questions. These will include: 1) age, 2) sex, 3) academic major, 4) ethnic background, 5) sexual orientation, 6) political conservatism, 7) religious service attendance, and 8) religious self-schema. This information will be used to help the student researcher better describe the sample. Your participation is voluntary and the survey should take approximately 30 minutes.

**Risks:** There are no known risks associated with participation in this study. Therefore, it is not anticipated that there will be a risk of psychological or physical harm to participants either during the study or after completion of the study. Further, no risk of fatigue is expected; as the experiment will last approximately 30 minutes. At the end of the study you will be given a sheet that better explains the nature of the study and you will be given a chance to ask any further questions that you might have.

**Potential Benefits:** Your participation in this study will assist researchers in their effort to better understand how people respond when confronted about their behaviour. Your responses will help us learn about not only the nature of the confrontation situations but also the effectiveness of confrontations as a potential intervention strategy. **However, you may receive no personal benefit from participating in this study.** Regardless, your opinions and responses are highly valued.

**Storage of Data:** The data collected today will be kept in a secure location in a locked filing cabinet in Dr. Melanie Morrison’s Social Psychology Lab for a minimum of five years, after which the data will be destroyed. Only the researchers will have access to the data. Please note that your consent forms will be stored separately from the original surveys. .

**Confidentiality:** The data from this study will be published and presented at conferences; however, your identity will be kept confidential. The survey data (both demographic and experimental questions) will be reported in aggregate form to protect the confidentiality and anonymity of the participants.

**Right to Withdraw:** You may withdraw from the study for any reason, at any time, without penalty of any sort. If you choose to withdraw from the study you will still receive the additional bonus course credits associated with participating in this study. In addition, if you withdraw from the study, any data that you have contributed will be destroyed at your request.

**Use of data and dissemination of results:** The findings from the study will be written up in the form of a Master's thesis. It also is anticipated that the findings from this study will be presented at academic conferences (e.g., the Annual Convention of the Canadian Psychological Association) and submitted for publication to a peer-reviewed scientific journal.

**Debriefing:** A debriefing sheet will be handed out when the study is complete, or in the event that a participant chooses not to participate. The debriefing sheet will provide some background to the study and identify the specific aims and implications of the study.

**Questions:** If you have any questions concerning the study, please feel free to pose them; you are also free to contact the researcher at the numbers provided above if you have questions at a later time. This study has been approved on ethical grounds by the University of Saskatchewan Behavioural Sciences Research Ethics Board on February, 29<sup>th</sup>, 2008. Any questions regarding your rights as a participant may be addressed to that committee through the Ethics Office (966-2084). Out of town participants may call collect. Information concerning the results of the study may be arranged (following the study's completion) via Edwin Rogers or Dr. Morrison at the contact address above.

**Consent to Participate:** I have read and understood the description provided above; I have been provided with an opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered satisfactorily. I consent to participate in the study described above, understanding that I may withdraw this consent at any time. A copy of this consent form has been given to me for my records.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature of Participant)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature of Researcher)



## Appendix F

### Debriefing Form

Thank you so much for your participation in this research project. Your time and contribution is greatly appreciated by the researcher.

The procedure you just completed has been previously used in racism and sexism research, however, research has yet to utilize this procedure with work in the area of homonegativity (i.e., negative behaviours directed toward individuals perceived, correctly or incorrectly, to be gay or lesbian). If we hope to prevent discrimination towards gay men and lesbian women, it is necessary to develop, explore, and refine intervention strategies that are not only effective but also efficient. By participating in this study, you have helped us take the first steps in this direction.

The purpose of this experiment was to further explore and understand undergraduate students' reactions to being confronted about behaviours that could be viewed as homonegative (e.g., being found to laugh at a gay or lesbian joke) confrontations of homonegative behaviours. Past research has suggested that those who score low on measures of prejudice will react with negative self-directed affect (e.g., guilt), discomfort (e.g., anxiety), and compunction (i.e., thinking one is wrong and intend to apologize for behaviour). This reaction is important, as it is believed to be an important precursor to the inhibition of future discrimination. Therefore, the primary goal of this research was to explore the extent to which confrontation discrimination directed towards gay men and lesbian women would foster such a reaction.

Additionally, the present research looked to explore the role of two important factors that influence the nature of students' reactions to confrontation situations. First, past research has suggested that the target of the discrimination is an important factor. Therefore, we were interested in determining if participants' exhibit a different reaction when confronted about bias directed towards a gay man or towards a lesbian women. Second, past research has also suggested that the group membership of the confronter also plays an important role. That is, confronters who are not from the same group (e.g., heterosexual woman or man) as the target (e.g., gay man or lesbian women) of the bias tend to be more effective. Therefore, we explored how participants' reactions differ when confronted by a gay man, a lesbian woman, a heterosexual woman, or a heterosexual man.

As stated above, the present research represents the first step in understanding this phenomenon. Thank you again for your participation in this study. If you would like to be informed of the outcome of the study, or have further questions regarding the study, please feel free to contact either the student researcher or the faculty supervisor.

Student Researcher: Edwin Rogers (M.A. Candidate)  
Phone: 966-1773  
E-Mail: [ejr545@mail.usask.ca](mailto:ejr545@mail.usask.ca)

Supervisor: Dr. Melanie Morrison  
Department of Psychology  
Phone: 966-2564  
E-mail: [melanie.Morrison@usask.ca](mailto:melanie.Morrison@usask.ca)

PLEASE PRINT A COPY OF THIS PAGE FOR FUTURE REFERENCE

## Appendix G

### Affective Reaction Scale: Component Breakdown

#### Affective Reaction Scale

##### Negative Self-Directed Reactions

1. I would feel shameful
2. I would feel guilty
3. I would feel disappointed with myself
4. I would feel embarrassed
5. I would feel dissatisfied with myself
6. I would feel self-critical
7. I would feel uncomfortable
8. I would feel angry with myself
9. I would feel bothered
10. I would feel tense

##### Negative Other-Directed Reactions

1. I would be annoyed with the confronter
2. I would feel angry with the confronter
3. I would be disgusted with the confronter
4. I would be irritated with the confronter

##### Amused Reactions

1. I would be amused by the confrontation
2. I would be entertained by the confrontation

##### Exasperated Confrontation

1. I would feel threatened
2. I would feel frustrated

## Appendix H

### Thought and Behavioural Reaction Scale: Component Breakdown

#### Thought and Behavioural Reaction Scale

##### Compunction Reactions

1. I would apologize and try to avoid such behaviour in the future
2. I would think it over without getting upset
3. I would talk it over with the person and work it out
4. I would think that I was wrong, I shouldn't have done that
5. I would tell the person they were right and drop the subject
6. I would think about what I had done and why

##### Antagonism Reaction

1. I would think there's nothing wrong with what I did
2. I would tell the person to lighten up, they're being stupid
3. I would tell the person, "Whatever, sometimes things like this just happen."
4. I would think I really didn't mean anything by what I did
5. I would tell the person that my position is right
6. I would think this person is being a jerk.