

2004

## Stereotypical perceptions of the communication behaviors of gay males

Daniel W. Brewster  
*West Virginia University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>

---

### Recommended Citation

Brewster, Daniel W., "Stereotypical perceptions of the communication behaviors of gay males" (2004). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 859.  
<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/859>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact [researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu](mailto:researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu).

Stereotypical Perceptions of the Communication Behaviors of Gay Males

Daniel W. Brewster

Thesis submitted to the  
Eberly College of Arts and Sciences  
at West Virginia University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

Master of Arts  
in  
Communication Theory and Research

James C. McCroskey, D. Ed., Chair  
Virginia Richmond, Ph. D.  
Scott A. Myers, Ph. D.

Department of Communication Studies

Morgantown, West Virginia  
2004

Keywords: Assertiveness, Responsiveness, Homonegativity,  
Socio-Communicative Style, Socio-Communicative Orientation

## ABSTRACT

### Stereotypical Perceptions of the Communication Behaviors of Gay Males

Daniel W. Brewster

This study examined the stereotypical communication behaviors of gay males. The study examined the associations of assertiveness, responsiveness, homonegativity and biological sex. Participants were 359 (195 men, 164 women) students. Participants provided responses to questions about verbal and nonverbal behaviors for known gay individuals and individuals perceived to be gay. The participants then completed the Assertiveness-Responsiveness Measure (Richmond & McCroskey, 1990) in a self-report and observer-report, and the Modern Homonegativity Scale (Morrison & Morrison, 2002). Results indicated some of the more predominant responses to verbal and nonverbal behaviors are inconsistent with the prevalent societal perceptions of homosexuality. Significant associations between biological sex, assertiveness and responsiveness were discovered. The results show that perceived responsiveness and homonegativity were associated. Self-reported assertiveness and self-reported responsiveness were consistent with perceptions of other's assertiveness and responsiveness. There were significant differences based on biological sex, assertiveness and responsiveness. Future research would resolve some of the questions that this research raised, in particular, why are men consistently more likely to illustrate higher levels of homonegativity. Future research should examine other communication constructs that could further resolve many of the questions that plague gay males.

## APPENDIX OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<b>I. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Introduction.....	5
Perceptions of the gay male.....	6
Assertiveness.....	9
Responsiveness.....	10
Interaction of Assertivness/Responsiveness.....	10
Rationale.....	14
RQ1.....	15
RQ2.....	15
RQ3.....	15
RQ4.....	15
RQ5.....	15
RQ6.....	15
RQ7.....	17
<b>II. METHOD.....</b>	<b>16</b>
Participants.....	16
Procedures.....	16
Measurement Instruments.....	16
Data Analysis.....	18
<b>III. RESULTS.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>IV. DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>25</b>

<b>V. MISCELLANEOUS.....</b>	<b>32</b>
References.....	32
Appendices.....	37
The Socio-Communicative Style Measure.....	37
The Socio-Communicative Orientation Measure.....	38
Homonegativity Scale.....	39
Appendix 1-Know is gay-Verbal.....	41
Appendix 2-May be gay-Verbal.....	43
Appendix 3-Know is gay-Nonverbal.....	44
Appendix 4-May be gay-Nonverbal.....	46

## CHAPTER 1

## Introduction

Every day society changes, and daily there are people who serve as architects in the change. One of the most important changes that have taken grip of our society is the homosexual culture. One of the most problematic aspects of this infusion of homosexual culture is the difficulty in determining the homosexual from the heterosexual. An understanding of the communication patterns of these individuals could serve to stymie some of the strife involved in determining sexual orientation. Thus, learning how and why people communicate with others is vitally important.

Researchers have suggested that because of societal pressures many men in our society have been forced to adopt behaviors that conform to the traditional, masculine image. Behaviorally speaking, men, compared to women, are more likely to engage in certain behaviors (like being dominant interpersonally, and physically tough, using alcohol and drugs, being emotionally inexpressive, and being aggressive) which mirror the social definition of masculinity (Gilmore, 1990; Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993; Thompson, Grisanti, & Pleck, 1985; Thompson & Pleck, 1996; Winstead, Derlega, & Rose, 1997). A portion of the definition of masculinity for many heterosexual men also includes the avoidance of behaviors that have the undesired feminine connotations because of the stereotype that cross-sex behaviors are associated with homosexuality. Heterosexual men avoid behaviors that have feminine connotations out of a concern for being labeled as a homosexual, gay, queer, faggot, or maladjusted (Derlega & Chaikin, 1976; Fukuyama & Ferguson, 2000; Herek, 1987; Kite, 1998; Kite & Deaux, 1987, Kite & Whitley, 1998).

Assertiveness (i.e., masculine) and responsiveness (i.e., feminine) are generalized classifications of people's communication styles and gender orientations (Richmond & McCroskey, 1990) and will serve as the means of determining the perceptions of gay males. The following is a review of research conducted on assertiveness, responsiveness, and gay male perceptions. The purpose of this study is to investigate the stereotypical perceptions of the gay male and their perceived socio-communicative style. The socio-communicative style construct has been broken into two interdependent dimensions, which are assertiveness and responsiveness (Anderson & Martin, 1995; Richmond & McCroskey, 1992). This overarching purpose of this study is to examine common perceptions of the gay male, the relationship between assertiveness and responsiveness and perceptions of sexual orientation, and the relationship of heteronegativity and perceptions of sexual orientation.

#### *Perceptions of the gay male*

Wong, McCreary, Carpenter, Engle, and Korchynsky (1999) examined the perceptions that heterosexual college students have of gender role characteristics in male and female target persons and the likelihood that they were homosexual. The basis of their study is the historically assumed relationship between gender role conformity and perceived homosexuality. This belief that homosexuals are judged on a continuum ranked against members of the opposite sex originates from the perception that "masculinity" and "femininity" are bipolar constructs and thus allow for the gay males and lesbians to be examined based on their breaching of this construct.

Wong et al. (1999) contend that perceptions of homosexuality are too commonly based upon the method of describing individuals based upon cross-gender attributes. Some researchers have asserted that the cross-gender attribution is not fool proof. Robinson, Skeen, and Flake-

Hobson (1982) argued that homosexuals tend to be more balanced on the masculinity-femininity continuum. They proceed to argue that homosexuals tend to be androgynous or undifferentiated rather than being masculine or feminine types.

No one theory exists that can explain the multitude of methods of perceiving homosexuality. In an attempt to better understand the complexity of determining homosexuality, Wong et al. (1999) gathered several sources in attempt to provide a parsimonious model of perceived homosexuality. Eagly's (1987) Social Role Theory served as the impetus behind the development of this model. The theory can effectively explain both the formation and maintenance of gender stereotypes. However, the theory is not effective at explaining the relationship between conformity and sex-based stereotypes and perceived homosexuality.

Wong et al. (1999) found that when considering whether someone is homosexual based on his or her conformity to the normal gender roles, the sex of the participant is vitally important. The addition of qualifying information, such as perceived masculinity and femininity, affected the magnitude of the consideration. They found that men who act according to social expectations are viewed as masculine, and thus heterosexual. Contrarily, Wong et al. (1999) contend that men who act in a manner perceived as more feminine and thus more relating to the female behavioral pattern are considered abnormal, therefore, thought to be homosexual.

Carroll and Gilroy (2002) researched the role of appearance and nonverbal behaviors in the perception of sexual orientation among lesbians and gay men. The research was based upon the zero-acquaintance paradigm (Ambady, Hallahan, & Rosenthal, 1995) which asserts that individuals can make accurate assessments of sexual orientation based upon very brief interpersonal contacts with strangers on a variety of dimensions. In particular the paradigm asserts that gay men and lesbians possess the ability to identify other homosexuals accurately



after only a very brief interpersonal contact. The researchers asserted that aspects of appearance hairstyle, clothing, and jewelry were more informative for the basis of women's sexual orientation, while dynamic nonverbal behaviors such as gestures served as the impetus for informing about men's sexual orientation. With the extenuating circumstances surrounding gay men and lesbians in terms of both prejudice and violence, perceptual accuracy provides an impacting form of self-protection.

With the previous research asserting the perceptual accuracy of gay men and lesbians in terms of identifying one another, the research by Carroll and Gilroy (2002) explored the comparative role that specific nonverbal behaviors, such as eye contact and walk, play in the role of identifying sexual orientation. With the aforementioned symbols effectively identifying homosexuality, this research sought to explore some of the more subtle cues that impact the recognition of other gay persons. Carroll and Gilroy (2002) examined the comparative effect of eye contact, gesture, and appearance variables like hair style, and body language and the subsequent ability of gay men and lesbians to identify one another in nongay social contexts and without verbal exchange.

Results indicate that eye contact (both duration of contact and intensity) is the primary method of effectively determining the gay man in a relatively short amount of interaction, although other nonverbal variables also impacted the ability of gay men to recognize other gay men in nongay social contexts. These also include clothing style and subsequent fit, jewelry, facial expressions, posture, body type, walk, and both the method of gesturing and frequency of gesturing. These results confirm the initial findings of Ambady, Hallahan, and Rosenthal (1995) who argued that dynamic nonverbal behaviors, such as walk, posture, and nonverbal gestures are

salient methods of identifying men's sexual orientation. Thus, gay men, like their heterosexual counterparts will rely on traditional stereotypes which depict gay men as effeminate.

Research has perpetuated an intriguing anomaly about gay men and lesbians and their aptitude for identifying other homosexuals as a functional adaptation. Ambady, Hallahan, & Connor (1999) contend that because of the fact that gay men and lesbians so accurately identify gay men and lesbians and then subtly manipulate their own appearance and nonverbal behaviors they perform this self-protective function in the face of such high risks of being victimized by prejudice, violence, and hate crimes.

Researchers have continually proven that gay males are common victims of stereotypes. This research seeks to determine if an individual's socio-communicative style influences the prevalence of stereotypes. By assessing perceptions of an individual's assertiveness and responsiveness, this research seeks to answer that question.

### *Assertiveness*

Assertiveness refers to an individual's ability to utilize appropriate communication to support and defend his/her positions without suppressing others (Richmond & McCroskey, 1992). Richmond and Martin (1998) contend that assertiveness represents the characteristics of independence, dominance, and forcefulness and is generally referred to as one's ability to stand up for one's self and one's ideas. Assertiveness (called "masculinity" by Bem, 1974) is recognized as one of three key components of communication competence (McCroskey, Richmond, & Stewart, 1986). As such a vital aspect of communication, assertiveness has been studied in a variety of contexts. Researchers have studied the benefits of assertive communication in groups (Bacon & Severson, 1986), health care (Ellis & Miller, 1993), organizations (Ash, 1991; Gripton & Valentich, 1993), the courtroom (Podestra, 1995), and

classrooms (Thomas, 1994; VanDerveer, 1989). In psychological circles, Elliott and Gramling (1990) defined assertiveness primarily in terms of dispositional social insight. They suggested that in interpersonal encounters, assertive individuals communicate their thoughts and feelings effectively and in a fashion that respects and regards the thoughts and feelings of others. Costa and Widiger (1994) similarly described individuals high in assertiveness as dominant, forceful, and socially ascendant people who are likely to speak without hesitation and often become group leaders. Individuals low in assertiveness, in contrast, are more passive, preferring to stay in the background and to let others do the talking.

### *Responsiveness*

Responsiveness refers to sensitivity to the communication of others and a willingness to adapt one's own communication accordingly (Richmond & McCroskey, 1992). Responsive (called "femininity" by Bem, 1974) communicators are referred to with terms such as empathetic, friendly, gentle and warm (Bem, 1974; Richmond & McCroskey, 1992; Rubin & Martin, 1994; Thomas, 1994). Responsiveness is recognized as one of the key components of communication competence (McCroskey, Richmond, & Stewart, 1986). Individuals considered responsive care about others, are sincere in communication efforts (Thomas, 1994), and utilize empathetic communication behaviors. However, individuals who are perceived as nonresponsive fail to effectively communicate care and concern for others and may communicate aggressively.

### *Interaction of Assertiveness/Responsiveness*

Anderson and Martin (1995) examined motives for communicating for assertive and responsive communicators. Based upon previous research by McCroskey and Richmond (1992), the participants were labeled into one of the four socio-communicative categories: (1) competent communicators were high in assertiveness and responsiveness; (2) aggressive communicators

were high in assertiveness and low in responsiveness; (3) submissive communicators were low in assertiveness and high in responsiveness; and (4) noncompetent communicators were low in assertiveness and responsiveness. Anderson and Martin (1995) found that each of the four types of communicators were motivated to communicate for a variety of purposes. Affection served as an interpersonal communication motivation for competent, submissive, aggressive, and noncompetent communicators, respectively. Pleasure served as an interpersonal communication motivation for competent, aggressive, submissive, and noncompetent communicators, respectively. Inclusion served as an interpersonal communication motivation for competent, submissive, noncompetent, and aggressive communicators, respectively. Control served as an interpersonal communication motivation for aggressive, noncompetent, submissive, and competent communicators, respectively. Escape served as an interpersonal communication motivation for noncompetent, aggressive, submissive, and competent communicators, respectively. Relaxation served as an interpersonal communication motivation for competent, submissive, aggressive, and noncompetent communicators, respectively.

Myers, Martin, & Mottet (2002) transcended the interpersonal motives for communicating and assessed students' motives for communicating with their instructors based upon the perceptions of their instructor's socio-communicative style as well as their perceptions of their own socio-communicative style (i.e., socio-communicative orientation). Results in this study found that when students perceived their assertiveness level to be high they were more likely to communicate for functional, participatory, excuse-making, and sycophantic motives. Results also found that when students perceived their instructor as high in assertiveness they were willing to communicate for relational and sycophantic motives. Myers, Martin, & Mottet (2002) expanded on the interpersonal motives for communicating and assessed students' motives

for communicating with their instructors based upon their perceptions of their instructor's socio-communicative style as well as their perceptions of their own socio-communicative style (i.e., socio-communicative orientation). Students who perceive themselves as high in responsiveness will communicate with an instructor on the basis of functional, relational, sycophantic motives. Students who perceive their instructors to be high in responsiveness are more likely to communicate with them on the basis of relational, participatory, and sycophantic motives.

Wooten and McCroskey (1996) examined the relationship between an instructor's perceived levels of assertiveness and responsiveness and the subsequent trust they are afforded from students. The researchers through previous research posited that perceived instructor assertiveness would positively correlate with student trust for the teacher. Results indicated that a relationship existed between the trust and assertiveness but the relationship was relatively weak. Wooten and McCroskey (1996) examined the relationship between an instructor's perceived levels of assertiveness and responsiveness and the subsequent trust they are afforded from students. The researchers expected that high levels of responsiveness would positively correlate with the student's trust for the instructor. Results indicated that there did exist a significant relationship between perceived responsiveness and the level of trust that a student had for an instructor.

Wanzer & McCroskey (1998) examined how students' perceptions of "instructor misbehaviors" may be related to teacher's level of assertiveness. The researchers hypothesized that there would exist an inverse relationship between student's perceptions of instructor assertiveness and students' perceptions of instructor misbehaviors. The results indicated that teachers perceived to be assertive are less likely to misbehave in the classroom setting. Thus, the student's perception of instructor assertiveness was negatively associated with instructor

misbehaviors. Wanzer & McCroskey (1998) examined how students' perceptions of "instructor misbehaviors" may be related to teacher's level of responsiveness. The researchers believed there would be an inverse relationship between students' perceptions of instructor responsiveness and students' perceptions of instructor misbehaviors. The results indicate that responsive instructors are substantially less likely to be seen as engaging in misbehaviors. Essentially, the results indicate that the student's perceptions of instructor responsiveness were negatively associated with instructor misbehaviors.

Socio-communicative style refers to the way in which a person presents himself or herself to others and rests on the assessment of an individual's use of assertive and responsive behaviors (McCroskey & Richmond, 1996). A plethora of socio-communicative research has been done in the instructional context. Various instructional research studies have shown assertive and responsive instructors are considered to be nonverbally immediate (Thomas, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1994), clear (Sidelinger & McCroskey, 1997), and credible (Martin, Chesebro, & Mottet, 1997). The research has also afforded instructors a variety of other labels. Responsive instructors have been classified as being sensitive and understanding (Kearney, 1984).

The influence of socio-communicative style has been examined across a variety of communication situations. McCroskey and Richmond (1992) classified individuals into one of four socio-communicative styles determined by their levels of assertiveness and responsiveness, respectively. Individuals high in both assertiveness and responsiveness are classified as competent, contrarily, individuals low in both assertiveness and responsiveness are classified as noncompetent. Individuals high in assertiveness and low in responsiveness are classified as aggressive, contrarily, individuals low in assertiveness and high in responsiveness are classified

as submissive. Differentiations were made concerning the competent, aggressive, submissive, and noncompetent individuals. Competent individuals are open to communication and stand up for themselves, whereas aggressive communicators are control-oriented and display noticeably less immediacy and attentiveness behaviors. Submissive communicators are self-sacrificing and yielding, but fail to stand up for themselves, contrarily, noncompetent individuals, who lack assertive and responsive behaviors, remain the least successful communicators among the various types (McCroskey & Richmond, 1992).

Wooten and McCroskey (1996) examined the relationship between an instructor's perceived levels of assertiveness and responsiveness and the subsequent trust they are afforded from students. The researchers believed that the teachers who were perceived to have a socio-communicative style similar to the socio-communicative style of their student would receive higher trust ratings than those perceived as dissimilar. There existed no interaction between a student's perceptions of an instructor's levels of responsiveness in relation to the perception of their own levels of responsiveness and subsequent increases in trust ratings for the instructor. Contrarily, highly assertive students reported trusting highly assertive teachers much more than they did less assertive teachers, thus providing a significant relationship between the perceived socio-communicative style and their perceived socio-communicative orientation.

### *Rationale*

The purpose of this study is to examine the stereotypically perceived communication behaviors (i.e., SCS) of gay males. Previous perceptions of gay male communication patterns show that gestures, eye contact, and walk all impact the conclusion that someone is homosexual. However, token symbols, physical shape, clothing, and hairstyle impact perceptions of gay male communication. Based on the perceptions that heterosexuals have about homosexuality and how

it is partially derivative from cross-gender attributes, this research seeks to examine how socio-communicative style impacts perceptions of homosexuality. With research showing the extensiveness of cross-gender attribution, this research expects that masculinity/femininity, or assertiveness/responsiveness will relate.

### **Research Questions**

**RQ1:** What are stereotypical verbal and nonverbal perceptions of homosexuality?

**RQ2:** Is knowledge of sexuality (i.e., know that the individual is gay or believe them to be gay) associated with observed assertiveness and responsiveness?

**RQ3:** Is the biological sex of the participant associated with perceptions of their own assertiveness, responsiveness, or homonegativity?

**RQ3:** Is the biological sex of the participant associated with observed assertiveness, responsiveness, or homonegativity?

**RQ4:** Is homonegativity of participant associated with perceived assertiveness and responsiveness of gay or presumed gay males?

**RQ5:** Is self-reported assertiveness of participant associated with perceived assertiveness of gay or presumed gay males?

**RQ6:** Is self-reported responsiveness of participant associated with perceived responsiveness of gay or presumed gay males?

**RQ7:** Is homonegativity of the participant associated with perceived assertiveness and responsiveness of gay or presumed gay males?



## CHAPTER 2

## Method

*Participants*

Participants were 359 students enrolled in an introductory communication course at a large mid-Atlantic university. Participants included 195 men and 164 women. The composition of the participants consisted of 177 individuals who assessed people they knew to be gay, while 182 assessed individuals they believed to be gay.

*Procedures*

The participants each completed a questionnaire consisting of part qualitative and part quantitative examination. The person would assess the same individual throughout the questionnaire.

The qualitative portion instructed participants to respond to a one question assessing the verbal and nonverbal communication behaviors of either known gay males or perceived-to-be gay males. In this question, the participants were instructed to indicate the stereotypical verbal and stereotypical nonverbal behaviors of the individual they are referencing.

The quantitative portion instructed participants to first complete a self-report of their own assertiveness/responsiveness (SCO) and a report of the perceptions of another person's assertiveness/responsiveness (SCS). Upon completion of that measure, the participants were then instructed to complete a measure assessing homonegative attitudes.

*Measurement Instruments*

The instruments completed by the participants were the *Assertiveness-Responsiveness Measure* (Richmond & McCroskey, 1990) and the *Modern Homonegativity Scale (MHS)* (Morrison & Morrison, 2002)

The *Assertiveness-Responsiveness Measure* is a simplified 20-item measure, composed of items drawn to report their perceptions of themselves or the individuals with whom they have

interacted. The instrument instructs respondents to answer each item on a one-step continuum (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree*. Items for assertiveness and responsiveness are randomly intermingled when presented to participants. Assertive items include defends own beliefs, independent, has strong personality, assertive, dominant, willing to take a stand, acts as a leader, aggressive, and competitive. Responsiveness items include responsive to others, sympathetic, compassionate, sensitive to the feelings of others, sincere, gentle, warm, tender, and friendly. The instrument is used as a self-report and as a report of perceptions concerning another individual. Previous reliability coefficients have ranged from .83 to .91 for the assertiveness dimension, and from .83 to .93 for the responsiveness dimension (Anderson & Martin, 1995; Martin & Anderson, 1996; Myers & Avtgis, 1997; Richmond & McCroskey, 1990; Wooten & McCroskey, 1996). In this study, a coefficient alpha of .85 ( $M=31.5$ ,  $SD=7.0$ ) was obtained for the self assertiveness assessment. In this study, a coefficient alpha of .89 ( $M=39.8$ ,  $SD=6.1$ ) was obtained for the self responsiveness assessment. In this study, a coefficient alpha of .86 ( $M=37.6$ ,  $SD=6.6$ ) was obtained for the other assertiveness assessment and a coefficient alpha of .91 ( $M=38.8$ ,  $SD=6.5$ ) was obtained for the other responsiveness assessment.

The *Homonegativity Scale* is 13-item self-report scale developed to measure modern prejudice toward gay men and lesbian women. This scale was constructed from a variety of previous scales that assessed old-fashioned homonegativity and measures of modern sexism. The purpose of this scale stemmed from the research that has shown that many college and university students no longer endorse old-fashioned measures that reflected prejudice against gay men and lesbians (i.e., prejudice rooted in traditional religious and moral beliefs and misconceptions about homosexuality). Research has shown that students consistently show more favorable attitudes toward gay men and lesbians and consider the former ideologies to be anachronistic.

This scale measures attitudes toward homosexual individuals (i.e., both men and women). The instrument instructs respondents to answer each item on a five-step continuum (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree*. This scale had no previous data reporting alpha reliability.

However, the scale has been modified to complete the constitution of this scale. In this study, a coefficient alpha of .90 ( $M=40.5$ ,  $SD=10.6$ ) was obtained for the 13-item measure.

### *Data Analysis*

Frequency counts were completed for the various responses referencing both verbal, and nonverbal behaviors for known gay males and verbal and nonverbal behaviors for males perceived to be gay, in order to assess research question one. Following the frequency count tabulation, the responses were content analyzed. The verbal responses were grouped into one category. The nonverbal responses were grouped into the nonverbal categories identified by Richmond and McCroskey. The categories utilized are (1) physical appearance, dress and artifacts; (2) kinesics (i.e., gestures and movement); (3) oculosics (i.e., face and eye behaviors); (4) vocalics (i.e., vocal behaviors); (5) space (territoriality and personal space); and (6) haptics (i.e., touch). Some participants incorrectly identified some behaviors as verbal. In the content analysis, these responses were properly identified and grouped as nonverbal rather than verbal behaviors.

The remaining research questions were examined using an analysis of variance. This design placed biological sex and knowledge of an individuals' sexuality as the independent variables. Conversely, self scores of responsiveness and assertiveness, perceptions of other's responsiveness and assertiveness, and homonegativity served as the dependent variables.

The first post hoc analysis examined those participants who scored their own assertiveness or responsiveness to be high or low (high>44/low<32 and high>45/low<32,

respectively). In this analysis, the responses for all participants were classified as high/low assertive and high/low responsive. This analysis was conducted to determine if these individuals varied from the entire sample in their perceptions of the verbal and nonverbal behaviors they recognized in the person they used to complete the questionnaire.

The second post hoc analysis was conducted to determine if there was a relationship between the sex of the participant and whether they were high/low assertive or high/low responsive and their perception of other's assertiveness and responsiveness. In doing this analysis, the intention was to determine if there was a relationship between males who were either high/low assertive and high/low responsive and their perceptions of other's assertiveness and responsiveness and females who were either high/low assertive and high/low responsive and their perceptions of other's assertiveness and responsiveness.

The third post hoc analysis was conducted to determine to what extent participants perceive gay males to be different in assertiveness and/or responsiveness than themselves. In doing this analysis the intention was determine if there was a relationship between self reports of assertiveness/responsiveness and perceptions of assertiveness/responsiveness of gay or presumed gay males.

## CHAPTER 3

## Results

Research question one asked about the stereotypical perceptions of homosexuality. The responses to these questions indicated some consistent patterns for both individuals who returned assessments for gay males and the individuals who returned assessments for people they thought to be possibly gay. The most prevalent responses for verbal behaviors of known gay males were: (1) soft spoken=52; (2) speaks with a lisp=30; (3) talkative =27; (4) high pitch=25; (5) well spoken=19; (6) open with discussion=18; and (7) colorful language (e.g., super, gorgeous, fabulous, sexy, neato, for sure, valley, oh my god, honey, sweetie, totally, let me tell you, delirious, girlfriend, cutie, silly)=15. A full listing of the responses can be viewed in Appendix D. The most prevalent responses for verbal behaviors of males who may be gay were: (1) soft spoken=105; (2) speaks with a lisp=36; (3) high pitched voice=34; (4) uses extensive colorful language= 21; (5) talks a lot=18; (6) well-spoken=18; and (7) talks fast=17. A full listing of these responses can be viewed in Appendix E. The most prevalent responses for nonverbal behaviors of known gay males were: (1) uses hands/hand motions when speaking=100; (2) dresses fashionably=45; (3) walks with fingers out=34; and (4) touches other guys a lot=16. A full listing of the responses can be viewed in Appendix F. The most prevalent responses for nonverbal behaviors of males who may be gay were: (1) uses hands/hand motions while speaking=100; (2) dresses fashionably=45; (3) walks with fingers out=34; and (4) touches other guys a lot during conversation=16. A full listing of these responses can be viewed in Appendix G.

A content analysis of responses directed to answer research question one returned a variety of categories. Both those participants who assessed individuals they knew to be gay and those participants who assessed individuals they thought to be gay concluded that there was a

large group of verbal behaviors and several varying nonverbal behaviors (i.e., (1) physical appearance, dress and artifacts; (2) kinesics (i.e., gestures and movement); (3) oculusics (i.e., face and eye behaviors); (4) vocalics (i.e., vocal behaviors); (5) space (territoriality and personal space); and (6) haptics (i.e., touch). A content analysis of responses to research question one identified categories of communication behaviors for individuals who may be gay: (1) vocalics was the primary source; followed by; (2) kinesics; (3) verbal behaviors; (4) physical appearance, dress, and artifacts; (5) all responses identified as “other”; (6) oculusics; (7) haptics; and (8) space. Additionally, categories of communication behaviors were identified for individuals known to be gay: (1) verbal behaviors served as the primary source; followed by; (2) kinesics; (3) vocalics; (4) all responses identified as “other; (5) oculusics; (6) haptics; (7) physical appearance, dress and artifacts; and (8) space.

Research question two asked whether knowledge of another individual’s sexuality (i.e., know that the individual is gay or believe them to be gay) was associated with observed assertiveness and responsiveness. The main effect referencing knowledge of sexuality of an individual and observed assertiveness was significant ( $F [3, 355] = 13.91, p < .001, \eta^2 = .04$ ). The results indicated that there was no significant difference ( $F [3, 355] = .54, p > 0.5$ ) between the assertiveness level for an individual known to be gay ( $M=37.3$ ) and an individual perceived to be gay ( $M=37.8$ ). The main effect referencing knowledge of sexuality of an individual and observed responsiveness also was significant ( $F [3, 355] = 54.24, p < .0001, \eta^2 = 0.14$ ). The results indicated that there was no significant difference ( $F [3, 355] = 1.38, p > .05$ ) between the responsiveness level for an individual known to be gay ( $M=39.4$ ) and an individual perceived to be gay ( $M=38.6$ ).

Research question three asked if the biological sex of the observer was associated with perceptions of their own assertiveness, responsiveness, or homonegativity. A main effect existed for biological sex and perceptions of own assertiveness ( $F [3, 350] = 26.38, p < .0001, \eta^2 = .08$ ). The results indicated that women ( $M = 40.9$ ) perceived their assertiveness to be higher than men ( $M = 38.9$ ). A main effect existed for biological sex and perceptions of own responsiveness ( $F [3, 350] = 9.53, p < .002, \eta^2 = .03$ ). The results indicated that women ( $M = 33.5$ ) perceived their responsiveness to be higher than men ( $M = 29.8$ ). A main effect existed for biological sex and homonegativity ( $F [3, 355] = 64.36, p < .001, \eta^2 = .16$ ). Results indicated that men ( $M = 44.3$ ) exhibited higher scores than women ( $M = 35.9$ ) on the homonegativity measure.

Research question four asked if homonegativity was associated with perceived assertiveness and responsiveness. A main effect existed for homonegativity and perceived assertiveness ( $F [3, 355] = 23.77, p < .0001, \eta^2 = .08$ ). The results indicated those individuals who rated low in assertiveness ( $M = 43.3$ ) were more likely than those who rated high in assertiveness ( $M = 38.0$ ) to foster homonegative attitudes. A main effect referencing homonegativity and perceived responsiveness existed ( $F [3, 355] = 14.93, p < .0001, \eta^2 = .08$ ). The results indicated that those individuals who rated low in responsiveness ( $M = 42.8$ ) were more likely than those who rated high in responsiveness ( $M = 38.6$ ) to foster homonegative attitudes.

Research question five asked if self-reported assertiveness was associated with perceived assertiveness. A main effect was statistically significant ( $F [7, 351] = 5.75, p < .02, \eta^2 = .08$ ). Results indicated that those individuals high in assertiveness ( $M = 38.4$ ) rated the perceived assertiveness higher than low assertive individuals ( $M = 36.6$ ).

Research question six asked if self-reported responsiveness associated with perceived responsiveness. A main effect was statistically significant ( $F [7, 351] = 42.57, p < .001, \eta^2 = .27$ ).

Results indicated that those individuals high in responsiveness ( $M=40.7$ ) rated the perceived responsiveness higher than those low in responsiveness ( $M=36.5$ ).

Research question seven asked if people in differing categories of socio-communicative orientation perceive assertiveness and responsiveness differently. A main effect was statistically significant ( $F [7, 351] = 4.28, p < .0001, \eta^2 = .08$ ). Results indicated that those individuals who assessed themselves high assertive/high responsive ( $M=39.6$ ) were more likely than those high assertive/low responsive ( $M=37.1$ ), low assertive/high responsive ( $M=37.1$ ), and low assertive/low responsive ( $M=36.1$ ) to assess other's assertiveness as high. A main effect was statistically significant ( $F [7, 351] = 18.13, p < .0001, \eta^2 = .27$ ). In addition, results indicated those individuals' high assertive/high responsive ( $M=42.6$ ) were more likely than those low assertive/high responsive ( $M=38.8$ ), high assertive/low responsive ( $M=38.0$ ), and low assertive/low responsive ( $M=35.0$ ) to assess other's responsiveness as high.

The first post hoc analysis indicated that there existed no difference between individuals who were high/low assertive and high/low responsive and the entire sample and their perceptions of the stereotypical verbal and nonverbal communication behaviors of gay males.

The second post hoc analysis indicated that there was no relationship between the sex of the participant, levels of own assertiveness/responsiveness, and perceptions of other's assertiveness/responsiveness ( $F [7, 351] = 0.38, p < .0001, \eta^2 = .08$ ). Males who were high assertive/high responsive ( $M=40.7$ ) were more likely than males who were high assertive/low responsive ( $M=39.0$ ), males who were low assertive/high responsive ( $M=38.9$ ), females who were high assertive/high responsive ( $M=38.6$ ), males who were low assertive/low responsive ( $M=37.5$ ), females who were low assertive/high responsive ( $M=35.2$ ), females who were high assertive/low responsive ( $M=35.2$ ), and females who were low assertive/low responsive



( $M=34.8$ ) to assess higher levels of other's assertiveness. In addition, this analysis examined responsiveness. Results indicated that females who were high responsive/high assertive ( $M=44.3$ ) were more likely than females who were high assertive/low responsive ( $M=41.0$ ), males who were high assertive/high responsive ( $M=40.8$ ), females who were low assertive/high responsive ( $M=40.6$ ), males who were low assertive/high responsive ( $M=37.0$ ), males who were low assertive/low responsive ( $M=35.1$ ), females who were low assertive/low responsive ( $M=35.0$ ), and males high assertive/low responsive to assess higher levels of other's responsiveness.

The third post hoc analysis indicated that participants did perceive a difference between themselves and gay or presumed gay males in assertiveness/responsiveness. The participant's self-report of assertiveness ( $M=31.5$ ) was significantly different than perceptions of other's assertiveness ( $M=37.6$ ) and responsiveness ( $M=38.8$ ). The participant's self-report of responsiveness ( $M=39.8$ ) did not differ significantly from perceptions of other's assertiveness and responsiveness.

## CHAPTER 4

## Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the stereotypical communication behaviors of gay males. Albright, Kenny, and Malloy (1988) identified the zero-acquaintance paradigm which posits that people can make accurate assessments based upon very brief interpersonal contacts with strangers on a variety of dimensions. This research perpetuated research by Ambady, Hallahan and Connor (1999) who explored both homosexual and heterosexual respondents judgments about sexual orientation that lasted no less than one second and no more than ten seconds. The analysis of that research showed that gay men and lesbians were more proficient than heterosexuals in recognizing other homosexuals on the basis of brief exposure to nonverbal behaviors. The current research didn't identify participants on the basis of sexual orientation, but that could have proven beneficial.

The current research did show that some of the predominant perceptions of the gay male were identified but a plethora of new themes were also prevalent. Many of the verbal and nonverbal behaviors revolved around some of the behaviors that have previously been proven to allow for easy interpretation of sexual orientation. Previous research by Carrol and Gilroy (2002) contended that communication behaviors like hand and body gestures, eye contact, and method of walk were the most efficient way of identifying sexual orientation. This research provided some common responses including but not limited to being soft spoken, speaking with a lisp, having a high-pitched voice, dressing fashionably, and being well-spoken/intelligent.

Surprisingly, some of the more historic methods of delineating sexuality are not as prevalent in these findings. Carrol and Gilroy (2002) contend that physical shape, hair style, and the prevalence of symbols like rainbows and triangles were noticeably less existent. Though

these themes were mentioned, they were not repeatedly identified. An explanation for this shift can not be determined from this research but future research could possibly entertain the topic.

Another purpose of this research was to determine if heterosexuals identify sexuality based on some of the more prevalent historic methods, meaning cross-gender attributes. This portion of the research was operationalized using the socio-communicative style and socio-communicative orientation constructs. In order to examine cross-gender attributes, assertiveness/responsiveness and masculinity/femininity, respectively, were compared. Bem (1974) contended that masculinity and femininity served as a sex role dichotomy. In her research she sought to elicit a possibility for psychological androgyny, meaning that a person didn't necessarily have to be at one of the two ends of the masculine-feminine continuum. This research was completed using the continuum, with assertiveness and responsiveness constituting the ends of the continuum. Responsiveness (called "femininity" by Bem, 1974) has been operationalized by communication scholars (Richmond & McCroskey, 1992) as communicators identified by terms like empathetic, friendly, gentle and warm. Conversely, assertiveness (called "masculinity" by Bem, 1974) was operationalized by the same scholars as communicators identified with terms like independent, dominant and forceful. Previous research by Kite and Deaux (1987) strengthens the argument that cross-gender attributes are a successful way of identifying sexual orientation. They contend that examining perceptions of homosexuals show that people often describe homosexuals using cross-gender attributes.

This research sought to both identify the common verbal and nonverbal behaviors of individuals who are known to be gay and those perceived with a strong possibility of being gay. The open-ended portion of the questionnaire asked participants to identify the common verbal and nonverbal communication behaviors. Surprisingly, there existed little difference between the

two groups. Many of the same responses emerged and were consistently the more prevalent responses. Both groups of participants insisted that hand motions/hand gestures, dressing fashionably, being soft-spoken, and speaking with a lisp served as the paramount way of identifying. This leads to the possibility in explanation that there are certain attributes that are socially perceived to be of a gay nature and no matter whether the person is open with their sexual orientation or try to conceal their sexuality, lay people seem to notice the same behaviors. This could also possibly serve as one of the limitations of this study. If people are identifying socially perceived mechanisms for identifying sexual orientation, then possibly some of their responses are invalid and instead could be a manifestation of what they see around them (i.e., via television, motion picture, magazines, etc). With there being no clear differentiation in the open-ended responses between the two groups, that raises a number of questions that future research could answer.

The current research exposed many of the prevalent stereotypes about gay males. The content analysis identified confirmed many of the same stereotypes. The content analysis exposed physical appearance, dress and artifacts and kinesics as the preeminent nonverbal behaviors that participants identified among gay and presumably gay males. In respect to the content analysis for verbal behaviors, also consistent with stereotypes, vocalics served as the prominent method of identifying someone as gay or presumably gay. An interesting possibility of these findings involves individuals classified as shy. Shy people tend to be less likely to dress in a flamboyant manner as they aspire to attract as little attention as possible. Shy people also tend to use very few forms of kinesics, as their use of gestures and movement are typically less predominant. Finally, shy people don't typically have a variety of vocal behaviors, thus males could be presumed gay. The findings of this study indicated no basis of differentiation in regard

to assertiveness and responsiveness based on participant or other sexuality. Three important variables were associated. The measure of homophobia defined as heteronegativity in this study were related to assertiveness and responsiveness. Participants that interpreted their assertiveness as low or their responsiveness as high were less likely to harbor homonegative attitudes.

However, the participants who interpreted their assertiveness to be high or their responsiveness as low were more likely to harbor homonegative attitudes. Consistent with previous findings, this study confirmed biological sex associations in assertiveness and responsiveness. In particular, males were more likely to harbor assertive dispositions and females responsive dispositions, respectively.

The second research question indicated that the knowledge of another individual's sexuality had no association with observed assertiveness and responsiveness. Observers considered the assertiveness of both known gay individuals and perceived gay individuals to be similar. The results indicate that observed responsiveness was viewed comparably among both known gay individuals and perceived to be gay individuals. These two findings indicate that the sexuality of an individual had no significant impact on the observed assertiveness and responsiveness.

The third research question indicated that there was an association between biological sex and perceptions of one's own assertiveness. A finding that illustrated the evolution that women have experienced indicated that women reported higher levels of assertiveness than their male counterparts. Biological sex and responsiveness were also associated. These findings revert to traditional sex roles as women maintained higher reports of perceived responsiveness. Also, consistent with traditional ideologies, this study indicated that men continue to exhibit stronger negative attitudes toward homosexual men.

The fourth research question raised the question of associations between homonegativity and assertiveness and responsiveness. The results indicated an association between homonegativity and perceived assertiveness. Those individuals who were high in assertiveness were more likely to harbor stronger homonegative attitudes. However, not surprisingly, the results indicated that individuals who displayed lower levels of responsiveness were more likely to harbor homonegative attitudes.

The fifth and sixth research questions had to do with self-reported assertiveness/responsiveness and perceived assertiveness/responsiveness. Consistent with previous findings, individuals high in assertiveness perceived assertiveness higher than low assertive individuals. In addition, those individuals who exhibited higher responsiveness displayed perceptions of higher responsiveness.

The seventh research questions examined how differing categories of socio-communicative orientation perceive assertiveness and responsiveness. Richmond and McCroskey (1992) developed the four categories: (1) competent; (2) noncompetent; (3) aggressive; (4) submissive. The results from this study indicated that competent communicators were more likely than aggressive, submissive, and noncompetent communicators to assess other's assertiveness higher. In addition, competent communicators were more likely than submissive, aggressive, and noncompetent to assess other's responsiveness higher.

The first of the two post hoc analyses secured no significant findings. However, the second of the post hoc analyses returned some interesting results. The second analysis examined the associations of biological sex, assertiveness and responsiveness orientations and perceptions of other's assertiveness and responsiveness. Consistent with traditional sex roles, males were more likely than females to perceive higher assertiveness. Conversely, traditional roles and

responsiveness were similar with females perceiving higher responsiveness than the males. In particular, these findings indicate that competent male communicators were more likely than aggressive males, submissive males, competent females, noncompetent males, submissive females, aggressive females, and noncompetent females to perceive higher levels of assertiveness. Also, the findings assert that traditional sex roles and responsiveness are associated. Competent female communicators were more likely than aggressive females, competent males, submissive females, submissive males, noncompetent males, noncompetent females, and aggressive males to perceive higher levels of other's responsiveness.

The results of this study allow for some prevalent conclusions. Males remain more likely than females to foster feelings of animosity (i.e., heteronegativity). Males remain more assertive in their communication, while females are more responsive. Though much of the results are mirrored with no true differentiations based on whether the person is known to be gay or might be gay, the content analysis exposed some differences. In the content analysis, participants who assessed individuals who may be gay found vocalics to be the primary point of reference, while participants who assessed individuals they knew to be gay found verbal behaviors the primary point of reference.

The implications of the entire study led to the post hoc analysis. In this analysis, the open-ended responses of those individuals who scored at the end of the continuum for both the assertiveness continuum and the responsiveness continuum were reassessed. Ideally, this would have opened up possibilities for future research, if we had been able to determine that those individuals who rated the person has highly assertive/highly responsiveness or conversely lowly assertive/lowly responsive returned responses that were not in consensus with the entire sample.

This analysis indicated that the same popular responses were prevalent among both these groups and the sample as a whole.

The overarching implications of this study are that college students don't necessarily recognize a difference between those individuals whom they know are gay and those individuals who are perceived to possibly be gay. These findings also show that college students tend to disregard the more pejorative beliefs about gay men. The open-ended responses show that there are prevalent perceptions but none of them are necessarily derogatory in nature. However, that doesn't necessarily mean that college-students don't possess strong homonegative attitudes.

Future research would resolve some of the lapses in this research. Future research could work to answer the question of sex in relation to the constructs. Future research should seek to determine why men are more likely to foster homonegative attitudes, why men are more likely to perceive high assertiveness and low responsiveness and conversely why women are more likely to perceive higher levels of responsiveness and lower assertiveness. Another platform for future research would work to further examine where these perceptions of communication patterns originate. What institutions perpetuate these perceptions? Future research could move into other areas of communication and society in general to determine what facets of the homosexual culture could be manipulated to allow them a normal existence.



## References

- Adams, H. E., Wright, L. W., & Lohr, B. A. (1996). Is homophobia associated with homosexual arousal? *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 105*, 440-445.
- Albright, L., Kenny, D., & Malloy, T. E. (1988). Consensus in personality judgments of zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*, 387-395.
- Ambady, N., Hallahan, M., & Connor, B. (1999). Accuracy of judgments of sexual orientation from thin slices of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 538-547.
- Ambady, N., Hallahan, M., & Rosenthal, R. (1995). On judging and being judged accurately in zero acquaintance situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 518-529.
- Anderson, C. M., & Martin, M. M. (1995). Communication motives of assertive and responsive communicators. *Communication Research Reports, 12*, 186-191.
- Ash, S. (1991). How to make assertiveness work for you. *Supervisory Management, 36*, 8.
- Bacon, C. C., & Severson, M. L. (1986). Assertiveness, responsiveness, and versatility as predictors of leadership emergence. *Communication Research Reports, 24*, 53-58.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*, 155-162.
- Carroll, L., & Gilroy, P. J. (2002). Role of appearance and nonverbal behaviors in the perceptions of sexual orientation among lesbians and gay men. *Psychological Reports, 91*, 115-122.
- Costa, P. T., & Widiger, T. A. (1994). *Personality disorders and the five-factor model of personality*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Derlega, V. J., & Chaikin, A. L. (1976). Norms affecting self-disclosure in men and women. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44*, 376-380.

- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Elliott, T., & Gramling, S. (1990). Psychologists and rehabilitation: New roles and old training models. *American Psychologist, 45*, 762-765.
- Ellis, B. H., & Miller, K. I. (1993). The role of assertiveness, personal control, and participation in the prediction of nurse burnout. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 21*, 327-342.
- Fukuyama, M. A., & Ferguson, A. D. (2000). Lesbian, gay men, and bisexuals: A consequence of heterosexism, homophobia, and stigmatization. In G. M. Herek (Ed.), *Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals* (pp. 138-159). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gilmore, D. D. (1990). *Manhood in the making: Cultural concepts of masculinity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Gripton, J., & Valentich, M. (1993). Assertiveness at work: A norm for work relationships in democratic societies and market economies. *Human Systems Management, 12*, 217-226.
- Herek, G. M. (1987). On heterosexual masculinity: Some psychological consequences of the social construction of gender and sexuality. In M. S. Kimmel (Ed.), *Changing men: New directions in research of men and masculinity* (pp. 68-82). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kearney, P. (1984). Perceptual discrepancies in teacher communication style. *Communication Education, 13*, 95-105.
- Kite, M. E. (1998). When perceptions meet reality: Individual differences in reactions to lesbians and gay men. In B. Greene & G. M. Herek (Ed.), *Lesbian and gay psychology: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 25-53). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Kite, M. E., & Deaux, K. (1987). Gender belief systems: Homosexuality and the implicit inversion theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11*, 83-96.
- Kite, M. E., & Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1998). Do heterosexual women and men differ in their attitudes toward homosexuality? A conceptual and methodological analysis. In G. M. Herek (Ed.), *Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals* (pp. 39-61). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Martin, M. M. & Anderson, C. M. (1996). Argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 11*, 547-554.
- Martin, M. M., Chesebro, J. L., & Mottet, T. P. (1997). Students' perceptions of instructors' socio-communicative style and the influence on instructor credibility and motivation. *Communication Research Reports, 14*, 431-440.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, C. P. (1992). *Introduction to interpersonal communication*. Edina, MN: Burgess International Group.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1996). *Fundamentals of human communication: An interpersonal perspective*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., & Stewart, R. A., (1986). *One on one: The foundations of interpersonal communication*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Myers, S. A., & Avtgis, T. A. (1997). The association of socio-communicative style and relational type on perceptions of nonverbal immediacy. *Communication Research Reports, 14*, 339-349.
- Myers, S. A., Martin, M. M., & Mottet, T. P. (2002). Students' motives for communicating with their instructors: Considering instructor socio-communicative style, student socio-communicative orientation, and student gender. *Communication Education, 51*, 121-133.

- Podestra, C. (1995). Life would be easy if it weren't for other people. *Trial*, 31, 82.
- Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (1993). Masculinity ideology: Its impact on adolescent males heterosexual relationships. *Journal of Social Issues*, 49, 11-29.
- Richmond, V. P., & Martin, M. M. (1998). Socio-communicative style and socio-communicative orientation. In J. C. McCroskey, J. A. Daly, M. M. Martin, & M. J. Beatty (Ed.), *Communication and personality: Trait perspectives* (pp. 133-148). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1990). Reliability and separation of factors on the assertiveness-responsiveness measure. *Psychological Reports*, 67, 449-450.
- Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1995). *Communication: Apprehension, avoidance, and effectiveness*. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.
- Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (2004). *Nonverbal Behavior in Interpersonal Relations*, 5th edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Robinson, B. E., Skeen, P., & Flake-Hobson, C. (1982). Sex role endorsement among homosexual men across the life span. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 11, 355-359.
- Rubin, R. B., & Martin, M. M. (1994). Development of a measure of interpersonal communication competence. *Communication Research Reports*, 11, 33-44.
- Sidelinger, R. J., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997). Communication correlates of teacher clarity in the college classroom. *Communication Research Reports*, 14, 1-10.
- Thomas, C. E. (1994). *An analysis of teacher socio-communicative style as a predictor of classroom communication behaviors, student liking, motivation, and learning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, Morgantown.
- Thomas, C. E., Richmond, V. P. & McCroskey, J. C. (1994). The association between

- immediacy and socio-communicative style. *Communication Research Reports*, 11, 107-114.
- Thompson, E. H., Jr., Grisanti, C., & Pleck, J. H. (1985). Attitudes toward the male role and their correlates. *Sex Roles*, 13, 413-427.
- Thompson, E. H., Jr., & Pleck, J. H. (1996). Masculinity ideologies: A review of research instrumentation on men and masculinities. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Ed.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 129-163). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- VanDerveer, E. (1989). Stopping discipline problems before they start. *Music Educator's Journal*, 75, 23.
- Wanzer, M. B., & McCroskey, J. C. (1998). Teacher socio-communicative style as a correlate of student affect toward teacher and course material. *Communication Education*, 47, 43-52.
- Winstead, B. A., Derlega, V. J., & Rose, S. (1997). *Gender and close relationships*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wong, F. Y., McCreary, D. R., Carpenter, K. M., Engle, A., & Korchynsky, R. (1999). Gender-related factors influencing perceptions of homosexuality. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 37, 19-31.
- Wooten, A. G., & McCroskey, J. C. (1996). Student trust as a function of socio-communicative style of teacher and socio-communicative orientation of student. *Communication Research Reports*, 13, 94-100.

**APPENDIX A****Socio-Communicative Style Measure**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The questionnaire below lists twenty personality characteristics. Please indicate the degree to which you believe each of these characteristics applies to **(Some Person)** while interacting with others by marking whether you (5) strongly agree that it applies, (4) agree that it applies, (3) are undecided, (2) disagree that it applies, or (1) strongly disagree that it applies. There is no right or wrong answer. Work quickly; record your first impression.

- \_\_\_\_\_ **1. Helpful**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **2. Defends own beliefs**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **3. Independent**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **4. Responsive to others**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **5. Forceful**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **6. Has strong personality**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **7. Sympathetic**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **8. Compassionate**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **9. Assertive**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **10. Sensitive to the needs of others**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **11. Dominant**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **12. Sincere**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **13. Gentle**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **14. Willing to take a stand**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **15. Warm**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **16. Tender**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **17. Friendly**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **18. Acts as a leader**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **19. Aggressive**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **20. Competitive**

**APPENDIX B****Socio-Communicative Orientation Scale (SCO)**

INSTRUCTIONS: The questionnaire below lists twenty personality characteristics. Please indicate the degree to which you believe each of these characteristics applies to you while interacting with others by marking whether you (5) strongly agree that it applies, (4) agree that it applies, (3) are undecided, (2) disagree that it applies, or (1) strongly disagree that it applies. There is no right or wrong answer. Work quickly; record your first impression.

- \_\_\_\_\_ **1. Helpful**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **2. Defends own beliefs**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **3. Independent**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **4. Responsive to others**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **5. Forceful**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **6. Has strong personality**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **7. Sympathetic**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **8. Compassionate**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **9. Assertive**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **10. Sensitive to the needs of others**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **11. Dominant**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **12. Sincere**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **13. Gentle**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **14. Willing to take a stand**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **15. Warm**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **16. Tender**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **17. Friendly**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **18. Acts as a leader**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **19. Aggressive**
- \_\_\_\_\_ **20. Competitive**

## APPENDIX C

**Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research study. This questionnaire asks about knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and behavior relevant to men who have sex with, or are attracted to, other men. Please answer the questions in the order in which they appear on the questionnaire. You do not have to answer any question you don't want to. Please do not discuss questions with others around you.**

1. Many gay men use their sexual orientation so that they can obtain special privileges.

**Strongly disagree**    1       2       3       4       5       **Strongly agree**

2. Gay men seem to focus on the ways in which they differ from heterosexuals, and ignore the ways they are the same.

**Strongly disagree**    1       2       3       4       5       **Strongly agree**

3. Gay men do not have all the rights they need.

**Strongly disagree**    1       2       3       4       5       **Strongly agree**

4. The notion of universities providing students with undergraduate degrees in Gay and Lesbian studies is ridiculous.

**Strongly disagree**    1       2       3       4       5       **Strongly agree**

5. The media devote far too much attention to the topic of homosexuality.

**Strongly disagree**    1       2       3       4       5       **Strongly agree**

6. Celebrations such as “Gay Pride Day” are ridiculous because they assume that an individual’s sexual orientation should constitute a source of pride.

**Strongly disagree**    1       2       3       4       5       **Strongly agree**

7. Gay men still need to protest for equal rights.

**Strongly disagree**    1       2       3       4       5       **Strongly agree**

8. Gay men should stop shoving their lifestyle down other people’s throats.

**Strongly disagree**    1       2       3       4       5       **Strongly agree**

9. If gay men want to be treated like everyone else, then they need to stop making such a fuss about their sexuality/culture.

**Strongly disagree**    1       2       3       4       5       **Strongly agree**



10. Gay men who are “out of the closet” should be admired for their courage.

**Strongly disagree**    **1**    **2**    **3**    **4**    **5**    **Strongly agree**

11. Gay men should stop complaining about the way they are treated in society, and simply get on with their lives.

**Strongly disagree**    **1**    **2**    **3**    **4**    **5**    **Strongly agree**

12. In today’s tough economic times, American’s tax dollars shouldn’t be used to support gay men’s organizations.

**Strongly disagree**    **1**    **2**    **3**    **4**    **5**    **Strongly agree**

13. Gay men have become far too confrontational in their demand for equal rights.

**Strongly disagree**    **1**    **2**    **3**    **4**    **5**    **Strongly agree**

## APPENDIX D

<b>Know is Gay</b>	<b>Verbal</b>
Soft spoken	52
Lisp	30
Talkative	27
High Pitch	25
Well-spoken	19
Open	18
Colorful language	15
Expressive	13
Funny	12
Extensive Vocabulary	12
Talks about feelings	12
Girly topics	11
Nice	8
Flamboyant	8
Talks fast	7
Confident	7
Encouraging	7
Outgoing	7
Shy	7
Friendly	7
Defends others	6
Loud	6
Opinionated	5
Strong voice	5
Many girlfriends	5
Non-confrontational	4
Happy	4
Talks less	4
Shows emotions/feelings	3
Giggles	3
Gossips	3
“Fruity”	2
No slang	2
Good listener	2
Very giving	2
Direct	1
Honest	1
Extroverted	1
Smacks lips	1
Looks at other guys	1
Machiavellian	1

<b>(Cont) Know is Gay</b>	<b>Verbal</b>
Sarcastic	1
Whiney	1
Colorful clothes	1
No sports topic	1
No slang	1

## APPENDIX E

May Be Gay	Verbal
Soft Spoken	105
Lisp	36
High Pitch	34
Colorful language	21
Talks a lot	18
Well-spoken	18
Talks fast	17
Sympathetic	13
Accents words	11
Exaggerates/dramatic	11
Opinionated	10
Uses adjectives/large vocabulary	9
Discusses feelings/emotions	8
Flamboyant speaker	8
Outspoken	8
Talks about fashion	7
Overly helpful	6
Shy	6
Gossips	5
Emotional	5
Giggles	4
Slower Speech	4
“Sings show tunes”	3
Avoids controversial topics	2
Very open about sexuality	2
Defends females	2
Feminine laugh	2
Loud	2
Walks with little steps	2
“Distressed over words like fag, queer, gay”	1
Hostile	1
Smooth voice	1
Talks through nose	1
Non-confrontational	1
“Pouts constantly”	1
Punctual	1
Southern Accent	1
“Whiney speech”	1

## APPENDIX F

<b>Know is Gay</b>	<b>Nonverbal</b>
Uses hands/hand motion	119
Dresses fashionably	28
Touchy	17
Facial Expressions	12
Crosses legs at thighs	10
Walks with fingers out	10
Smiles a lot	9
Limp wrist	8
Upright posture	7
Walks with chest/ass out	6
Rolls eyes	5
Jewelry	5
Tight clothes	5
Walks with hands on hips	5
Hygiene	5
Good eye contact	5
Wears women's clothing	4
Fruity	4
Leans forward when listening	4
Hugs a lot	3
Female characteristics	2
Overly dramatic	2
Polite	2
Full of energy	2
Affectionate	2
Not touchy	2
Blinks a lot	2
Poor eye contact	2
Likes Madonna a lot	2
Sways back and forth when speaking	2
Wears rainbow paraphernalia	1
Wears black wife beaters	1
Works out a lot	1
Eats a lot	1
Prances	1
Gets nails done regularly	1
Relaxed	1
Plays sports like a girl	1
No rough housing	1
Organized	1
Smokes a lot	1

<b>(Cont) Know is Gay</b>	<b>Nonverbal</b>
Orders fruity drinks at the bar	1
Has ears pierced	1
Soft turn of head	1
Lots of eye contact	1
High strung	1
Nose in the air	1
Flirts with other guys	1
Wears make-up	1

## APPENDIX G

May be Gay	Nonverbal
Uses hands/hand motions	100
Dresses fashionably	45
Walks with fingers out	34
Touches other guys a lot	16
“Feminine characteristics”	13
Smiles a lot	12
Stands close to people when speaking	11
Has many ‘girlfriends’	10
Facial expressions	10
Different postures	8
Hugs a lot	7
Good hygiene	7
“Spirit” fingers	7
Stands with hands on hips	7
Limp wrist	7
Personable	6
Tight clothes	6
Wears bracelets, rings, earrings	6
Head dangles when speaking	5
Has ears pierced	4
Rolls eyes	4
Cries openly	4
Stares at other males	4
Avoids eye contact	4
Spiky hair	4
Wears women’s clothing	4
Sticks out chest/ass	4
Nods head a lot when speaking	2
Good eye contact	2
Fearful of others	2
Attractive	2
Eyebrows waxed	2
Tans a lot	2
Smacks lips when speaking	1
Listens well	1
80’s dress	1
Stands at a distance	1
Blinks a lot	1
Nails done	1
Good listener	1
No girlfriend since 6 <sup>th</sup> grade	1

<b>(Cont) May be Gay</b>	<b>Nonverbal</b>
Won't discuss sports	1
Wimpy	1
Smokes a lot	1
Chews gum loudly	1
Stands on toes	1
"Orders feminine drinks at the bar"	1
Obsesses about non-important topics	1
Takes short steps	1
Distinctive pauses in speech	1
Lifts fingers when drinking	1