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Abstract

This study was designed to explore moral reasoning's relationship with, homophobic attitudes, frequency of contact, affect of contact, closeness of relationship, and affect of relationship toward gay and lesbian people. The study also explored possible relationships with homophobia, and the variables of contact and relationship. By determining if a relationship exists among these variables, a possible method for reducing prejudicial attitudes might be identified.

Ninety-five students from three central Ohio universities volunteered for the study. Participants completed a demographic questionnaire, the Sociomoral Reflection Measure-Short Form (SRM-SF), the Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals (IAH), a Global Assessment of Contact (GAC) and a Global Assessment of Relationship (GAR).

The majority of subjects were white, heterosexual, single, women. The mean age was 27, with a range of 17 to 54. Most subjects were full-time undergraduates, working part-time and reported a family income of $40,000 and above. Correlations among demographic variables and with their relationship to the primary variables of
interest are not remarkable, and supported previous research. An attempt was made to obtain a representative sample of college students. However, the sample appeared biased with regard to demographic characteristics, and IAH scores.

A correlation was found to exist between moral reasoning and homophobia for heterosexual subjects. These findings also supported previous research and moral reasoning theory. However, regressional analysis revealed that moral reasoning accounted for only 1% of the total variance in homophobia. The remaining predictor variables of frequency of contact, affect of contact, closeness of relationship and affect of relationship, accounted for an additional 74% of the variance. Thus, little evidence was found supporting a relationship with moral reasoning and homophobia. The results indicated frequency of contact and closeness of relationship were the important predictor variables. How positive, negative or neutral one perceives the contact or relationship was not significant. Implications and suggestions for future research are discussed.
CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Prejudice has been extensively researched and reported in psychological literature. Theories regarding the etiology and reduction of prejudicial attitudes abound in psychological and sociological professional publications. The extant studies regarding reduction of prejudice against specific racial and ethnic groups has a predominant focus on the reduction of prejudice toward African American people. Research focusing on prejudice and bias against gay and lesbian people has only recently begun to emerge.

It is estimated that ten percent of the population is gay (Dillion, 1986; Dulaney & Kelly, 1982; Gramick, 1983). The relative scarcity of research on gay and lesbian people is interesting, particularly in light of the Kinsey research (1948) which suggests a continuum of sexual orientation. A summary of the Kinsey research demonstrates that 37% of all American males have experienced a homosexual sexual experience to the point of orgasm at sometime in their lives, with 30% having had some type of homosexual relationship between the ages of 20-24.

Research of gay and lesbian people has often focused on comparing the relative mental health of homosexuals and heterosexuals. According to Cabaj (1988) further understanding of gay people through scientific study is in the early stages. The increased interest and investment in conducting current scientific study indicates a recognition and validation of homosexuality as an alternative lifestyle. However, this
recognition and validation is lagging in legal, political, and religious communities as well as in the populace at large. Cabaj credits Dr. Evelyn Hooker (1957) for offsetting the delay in scientific study with her pioneering work demonstrating that gay men are as psychologically healthy as their non-gay counterparts. By offering such evidence, Dr. Hooker set the cornerstone for the movement toward acceptance of homosexuality.

Stein (1988) claimed the movement was furthered by the 1973 decision of the American Psychiatric Association (APA) to remove homosexuality from its diagnoses of mental disorders list (DSM-II to DSM-III). This decision was one of the major forces that attempted to remove the common stigma associated with homosexual behavior. More recently, the further DSM-III revision yielded the removal of ego-dystonic homosexuality from the DSM-III-R, indicating additional positive changes in attitudes and understanding among mental health professionals toward homosexuality. Efforts by the APA to challenge the widespread presumption of abnormality inherent in gay and lesbian lifestyles, has great historic significance. However, these efforts are a beginning and not an end. Forstein (1988) postulates:

The classification of homosexuality as a mental illness did little to deter hostile and fanatical reactions to homosexuality. Eliminating the classification of homosexuality as an illness, likewise, has done little to diminish anti-homosexual attitudes in the general population, nor has it substantially changed the personal opinions of the majority of the mental health professional community (p. 34).

Indeed, as a result of the 1973 decision to remove homosexuality from the DSM-II, Gnepp (1975) was prompted to write an article denouncing the decision. Gnepp states that men and women who turn to homosexuality have a "twisted and warped perspective of the world" (p. 60), "they are alienated from their biological
sexual gender" (p. 60). He compares gay men and lesbian women to "inmates at a mental hospital" (p. 60). He labels gay people as psychologically disturbed, and biologically incompetent, while using adjectives such as reprehensible and sad.

Further, Gnepp (1975) labels the notion of gay as a valid alternative lifestyle as "humbug and fraud" (p. 61). These blatantly prejudicial comments by Gnepp (1975) reflect what has been labeled as homophobic attitudes (Churchill, 1967; Forstein, 1988; Herek, 1989; Hudson and Ricketts, 1980; Tievsky, 1988; Weinberg, 1972).

Homophobia is a result of social and cultural messages given to an individual, related to negative messages about gay people. Forstein (1988) states these negative messages are internalized and lead to violent attitudes toward people who are gay. Forstein states that homophobic prejudice may become "intra-psychically malignant, often leading to a disruption of a healthy, ego-syntonic sexual identity regardless of ones true sexual orientation" (p. 34).

The studies about prejudicial attitudes in regard to gay people focus on what is termed homophobic attitudes or homophobia. Forstein (1988) credits Churchill (1967) with coining the term antihomosexual and Weinberg for popularizing the term homophobia. Weinberg (1972) defines homophobia as "the dread of being in close quarters with homosexuals". Hudson and Ricketts (1980) expanded the definition of homophobia to include any negative attitude, belief, or action directed toward gay or lesbian people. Thus, homophobia is a negative belief about people who are gay, and exists in both gay and non-gay people (Forstein, 1988; Herek, 1988; Herek, 1989; Tievsky, 1988).

Attitudes such as those expressed by Gnepp (1975) have not appeared in scholarly literature since the revision of DSM-III-R (1987). However, as Forstein (1988)
states, removing homosexuality and ego-dystonic homosexuality from the DSM does not alter attitudes. Forstein contends there is continued use of scientifically unsupported research in psychology and psychiatric training programs that maintains the illness model. These training programs fail to include more recent psychologically sophisticated literature that negates old myths and stereotypes. This omission is an expression of homophobia "maintained in the face of scientific study to the contrary" (Forstein, 1988 p. 34).

Graham, Rawlings, Halpern and Hermes (1984) surveyed 112 therapists regarding attitudes, knowledge, concerns and strategies in counseling gay and lesbian people. Results of the study support the strong need for therapist training in issues of knowledge and strategies for counseling gay men and lesbian women. The authors recommended training in counseling this special population become a standard component of accredited training programs, and that competence become a prerequisite for state licensure. The authors also suggest continued education be available to practicing therapists.

McDermott and Stadler (1988) conducted a study involving 120 counseling students and found the majority of the students were homophobic and less accepting of gay men and lesbian women than of ethnic minorities. Similar research by Wisniewski and Toomey (1987) found 31.2% of the social workers they surveyed were homophobic (N=77). Gay people are bombarded with and thus internalize homophobic attitudes as a result of living in a society threatened by and fearful of gay and lesbian people (Forstein, 1988; Hanley-Hackenbruck, 1988; Smith, 1988), a society intolerant of and often hostile toward gay people. Gay people receive the message from birth that a non-gay lifestyle is the only acceptable way of life. This message is
communicated both overtly and covertly. The non-gay person also receives this message and typically is instructed and encouraged to perceive gay people as sick, perverted, mentally ill, criminal or any one of a number of other negative beliefs (Staats, 1978). Herek (1989) states that:

"Fear of antigay harassment functions to enforce rigid norms of gender-appropriate behavior. Gay people and heterosexuals alike may refrain from certain behaviors (e.g. men might not touch other men; women might not excel at tasks that require physical exertion) and avoid certain gestures or clothing styles because they fear being labeled as gay" (p. 948).

There is a need for more research to be conducted studying homophobia, and in developing ways to reduce homophobia and violence against gay people (Herek, 1989). Scientific evidence needs to be gathered to facilitate understanding and support decreasing homophobia.

A relatively small number of studies have been undertaken which focus on attitudes and prejudice toward gay people (Bierly, 1985; Cerny and Polyson, 1984; Herek, 1986, 1988, 1989; Kite, 1984; Kurdek, 1988).

Much of this research has focused on variables that affect homophobic attitudes. One significant variable is moral reasoning, based on Kohlberg's 20-year longitudinal studies and his philosophy of moral development (Kohlberg, 1981, 1984). To date, there have been two studies that have addressed the relationship between homophobic attitudes and moral reasoning (Kurdek, 1988: McDermott and Stadler, 1988).

The concept of principled moral reasoning may be the key to changing negative attitudes toward gay and lesbian people. Kurdek (1988) states that "principled moral
reasoning refers to the views that rules are arbitrary and open to mutual agreement and modification (stage 5) or the belief that the existence of universal principles of conduct permits the possibility that valued forms of behavior may conflict with conventional stereotypes (stage 6)" (p. 730). Thus, people who have obtained a higher level of moral reasoning should be more open to and accepting of alternative lifestyles. Strategies exist and continue to be researched to act as the catalyst for moving people to higher levels of moral reasoning. These strategies could be effective methods of changing prejudice attitudes. Support for this is found in the research of Kurdek (1988) which suggests that principled moral reasoning may explain variability in negative attitudes not explained by other variables.

Both Kurdek (1988) and McDermott and Stadler (1988) were limited in scope of investigating moral reasoning. The purpose of this study will be to determine if an individual's homophobic attitudes toward gay people can be correlated with an individual's level of moral reasoning. If a correlation does exist between level of homophobia and moral reasoning, then a strategy for reducing homophobia may have been identified. In addition, the current study will examine the relationship between contact and relationship with gay and lesbian people, to determine the influence of these variables on both homophobic attitudes and moral reasoning.

The hypotheses for this study are:
1). People who have attained a higher level of moral reasoning will demonstrate more positive attitudes toward gay and lesbian people.
2). People who have had known positive contact with gay and lesbian people will exhibit a higher moral reasoning level than those who have had no known contact with gay and lesbian people.
3). People who have had positive close relationships with gay and lesbian people will exhibit a higher level of moral reasoning than those who have distant relationships.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Limited study has been conducted on prejudicial attitudes and homosexuality. In this chapter the relevant literature on homophobia, homophobia and AIDS, and implications for prejudice reduction will be reviewed as well as the relevant research on measures of homophobic attitudes; changing homophobic attitudes, and characteristics of those who hold negative attitudes and moral stages.

Homophobia

According to Smith, (1988) "Irrational prejudice against homosexuality has been a feature of Judeo-Christian culture for millennia, waning and waxing in intensity from amused but derogatory tolerance to outright genocide", (p. 61). Katz and Young (1976) report that for three centuries gay people in America have been executed, imprisoned, castrated or endured clitoridectomies, discharged from the military, ostracized and been subjected to forced psychiatric treatment.

Prejudice against gay people is unique according to Herek (1989) in that discrimination and intolerance against gay people is often condoned by governmental, religious, and social institutions. In today's society gay people are a stigmatized minority, subjected to severe negative sanctions (Plummer, 1975; Strommen, 1989; Warren, 1980). Herek (1988, p. 451) reports that gay people are the target of "considerable prejudice" and are subjected to verbal and physical attacks. More recent
research has documented an increase in violence against gay and lesbian people increasing yearly as a result of the AIDS crisis (Forstein, 1988; Greer, 1988; Herek, 1988).

Prejudice against gay people exists and is exhibited in the denial of both civil and human rights for gay people. Since the Stonewall riot in 1969, some gay individuals have begun to demand equal civil and human rights. Formal organizations have been established to pursue and ensure these rights. However, many gay people are legitimately afraid to become a visible part of these organizations for fear of discrimination, harassment, and abuse.

Tievsky (1988) reports that the 1980's brought a conservative backlash, hampering advances in civil rights for gay and lesbian people. Efforts to secure civil rights for gay and lesbian people have been thwarted because of a significant contingency of people who oppose equal rights for gay people. In addition and as a result of the AIDS crisis, many Americans who once were neutral or tolerant of gay and lesbian people have returned to the rejection of this minority (Herek and Glunt, 1988; Royse and Birge, 1987; Wallack, 1989).

The increase in negative attitude toward gay people perpetuates widespread social and legal discrimination in our society. These trends encourage both gay and non-gay people to ignore the unhealthy psychological consequences of homophobia, as well as the inequality and injustice. Homophobic attitudes promote victimizing gay and lesbian people. By remaining victims, gay and lesbian people are robbed of personal power and find it difficult if not impossible to acquire or use the psychological tools necessary to develop and maintain a positive identity. Non-gay people who are not challenged to overcome prejudicial attitudes also become victims of oppression.
By not challenging their beliefs they become stuck with a limited sense of self (Forstein, 1988; Hanley-Hackenbruck, 1988; Smith, 1988).

Thus, internalized homophobia has a negative impact on the psychological health of all people. Hanley-Hackenbruck (1988) quotes Erikson (1946) as describing internalized homophobia as the internalized "evil image" within the unconscious of individuals both homosexual and non-homosexual.

Internalized homophobia in a gay person makes it difficult for the person to develop and maintain a positive self image or to have a sense of positive self-esteem, or as stated by Hanley-Hackenbruck (1988) "for the achievement of a positive and integrated identity". Forstein (1988) states that:

clinically and theoretically, one could argue that the presence of homophobia or sexism or racism is a manifestation of psychological disruption. Such attitudes lead to violence either psychologically or physically to the self and others. In more subtle, but psychologically eroding ways, homophobia is present whenever gay people are discounted, ignored, or left out of the realm of possibility. Examples include the lack of legal sanction for intimate relationships and the denial of civil rights under the law. These legal and civil mandates become external manifestations of the internalized negative self image (p. 36).

Forstein (1988) further states, "homophobia, as any prejudice, whether overt or subtle, affects the total mental health of our society" (p. 36).

Homophobia and AIDS

As a result of the AIDS epidemic, victimization against gay people and people who are perceived to be gay is increasing (Batchelor, 1988; Gross, Aurand and Addessa 1988; Herdek, 1988; Kim, 1988; Robinson, Walters and Skeen 1989). AIDS
has been labeled the "gay plague" or "WOG", wrath of God (Royse and Birge, 1987). Research by Royse and Birge (1987) supports the contention that homophobia results in a lack of empathy for people with AIDS. Homophobia, expressed through discrimination, lack of education regarding AIDS, negative social attitudes, lack of funding and support for education, and the stigma associated with AIDS are major blocks to ending the spread of AIDS (Fisher, 1988; Morin, 1988; Watkins, 1988). Gay people who have not confronted their internalized homophobia are more likely to engage in unprotected sex (Fisher 1988). Educational efforts are hampered because AIDS is seen as a gay disease and less education regarding AIDS is available because of homophobia (Batchelor, 1988). Homophobia contributes to less money being spent on research to find a cure and/or an effective treatment for AIDS as well as for programs designed for prevention of the spread of AIDS. Pelosi (1988) states that "Congress is becoming increasingly active in oversight activities as they relate to AIDS drug development" (p. 843) and "the federal government has had difficulty mounting effective targeted AIDS prevention campaigns due to restriction on being explicit with regard to sexual behavior and drug use" (p. 843). Pelosi suggests these oversights and restrictions exist because the highest number of individuals affected belong to the groups of drug users, gay, and bisexual men. Non-gay people who believe AIDS is a gay disease, something only gay people or IV drug users can acquire reject the need to practice safer sex, discuss AIDS related issues, or support funding for research education. As a consequence of homophobia people often engage in unsafe practices to avoid being labeled as gay. Fisher (1988) reports there are specific and general group norms and values that affect risk reduction behaviors. Expressing concerns about AIDS or engaging in AIDS preventative behaviors may be
inconsistent with "machismo" values in some racial and ethnic groups. Thus, in addition to negative psychological implications of homophobia, homophobia contributes to the spread of a deadly disease and the tragic death of innocent people.

The reduction of prejudicial attitudes toward gay people can be the impetus for decreasing the spread of AIDS, violence, abuse, and discrimination, as well as self destructive beliefs and behaviors. By reducing homophobic attitudes among non-gay people, both gay and non-gay people will be afforded a safer environment in which to explore their internalized homophobia. Allowing people to explore their internalized homophobia and promoting a decrease in homophobia will positively affect people of all ages, fostering healthy psychological adjustment and thus increasing the likelihood that healthy life choices are made.

Implications of Prejudice Reduction

By reducing homophobia in adults, children will be raised in an environment where sexual orientation becomes less of a barrier to a healthy sense of self. Martin (1982) discusses the process of how young gay people are stigmatized by society as a result of homophobia. The author offers alternatives to current prejudicial attitudes. Martin (1982) contends that positive alternatives to current attitudes must be offered along with accurate information that demonstrate opportunities exist to be gay and maintain personal, social, ethical, and professional integrity. Research conducted by Gross, Aurand and Addessa (1988) found that 19% of gay men and 25% of lesbian women report victimization by a family member. Thus, by reducing prejudicial attitudes a necessary, but not sufficient, condition is set in motion for a reduction in abuse and victimization of young gay and lesbian people. With a reduction in homophobic and
prejudicial attitudes, topics regarding healthy choices, i.e. safer sex, will be more readily explored, and skills to practice healthy choices could be fostered.

Relevant Empirical Research

The professional literature contains a limited amount of research related to attitudes and prejudice toward gay people. Morin (1977) reports on the "heterosexual bias in psychological research" (p. 624). The author states this bias is clear through research beginning with the assumption that homosexuals are abnormal, or psychologically unhealthy or need to be changed. Morin (1977) states that early psychological writings on homosexuality were not based on empirical research, until the 20th century and "remain scarce today" (p. 630).

As previously stated, early research was directed toward labeling gay people as abnormal. According to Hudson and Ricketts (1980) early empirical research was plagued with "faulty designs, inadequate samples and other methodological weaknesses" (p. 357). Ford and Beach (1951) provide data condemning the belief that homosexuality was "unnatural", demonstrating that homosexual behaviors occur in almost all animal species. Among human societies studied, the researchers were able to find evidence indicating that homosexuality existed in almost all of these societies, regardless of the society's attitude toward homosexuality.

Research undertaken by Hooker (1957, 1958) represents the first empirical studies to challenge the notion that homosexuality is indicative of psychopathology. Hooker studied the ability of trained clinicians to determine the sexual orientation of "non-patients" using standard projective techniques. The clinicians were not able to differentiate the sexual orientation of the subjects. With the removal of homosexuality as a mental disorder from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual-II (DSM-II) in 1973,
homosexuality was no longer considered a mental illness. However, the condition of "ego-dystonic homosexuality" was included in the revision. In 1975 the American Psychological Association voted to support the decision which removed homosexuality as a diagnostic label and work to oppose discrimination against gay and lesbian people. In 1986 the DSM-III-R saw the removal of ego-dystonic homosexuality, eliminating the last of any diagnostic labels that could be discriminatory against gay and lesbian people.

It was not until the work of MacDonald, Huggins, Young, and Swanson (1973) that the suggestion to study attitudes of non-gay people toward gay people was proposed. This change in research focus resulted from emerging acceptance of homosexuality as a valid lifestyle. In 1977 Morin conducted a study to assess the "value system" (p. 631) underlying homosexuality research. Morin generated a taxonomy of research questions in professional journals between the years of 1967-1974. A review of the Psychological Abstracts was undertaken, including studies listed under the topics of "homosexuality", "lesbianism", and "male homosexuality". The author included only those studies which were empirical in nature and published in English. A total of 139 studies were identified using these criteria. Results indicated that 170 research questions were undertaken in the 139 studies. Morin divided these research questions into five categories: assessment/diagnosis (16%); causes (30%); adjustment (27%); special topics (20%); and attitudes toward homosexuality (8%). Under the topic of attitudes there were thirteen studies: five studies of attitudes in the general population or among mental health professionals; seven studies to assess personality characteristics associated with anti-homosexual respondents; and one study of methods to facilitate attitude change. In addition, as a result of the research,
Morin concluded there was a heterosexual bias in the research questions being asked. Morin predicted a future trend of less heterosexual bias occurring in the research as attitudes toward homosexuals became more positive. Watters (1986) conducted a study to determine if Morin's prediction had been accurate. Watters found evidence supporting the contention that as a new vision of homosexuality emerged, there has been a change in the research questions toward a less heterosexual bias.

Hudson and Ricketts (1980) report that between 1971 and 1978 there were only 31 studies on attitudes of non-gay people toward gay people. The authors contend that for the most part these studies deal with specific groups such as West Indians, Brazilians, college students, behavioral therapists, and adolescents, focusing on attitudinal differences among groups with regard to sex, social status, and demographic characteristics. Kurdek (1988) states that research in the area of negative attitudes about gay people remains in its early phases. Therefore there continues to be a need for more on attitudes and how negative attitudes can be changed.

In general, a literature review on attitudes toward gay and lesbian people, can be divided into three categories: 1) Developing accurate measures of homophobic attitudes, 2) Methods to change homophobic attitudes, and 3) Characteristics of those who hold negative attitudes.

Measures of Homophobic Attitudes

Hudson and Ricketts (1980) present a review of the scales developed prior to 1980, citing the work of Levitt and Klassen, 1974; Lumby, 1976; Millham, San Miguel and Kellogg, 1976; and Smith 1971.
Hudson and Ricketts (1980) contend that the scale developed by Levitt and Klassen (1974) did not measure homophobia as operationally defined. The scale elicited and measured evaluative responses rather than an affective response. Homophobia is only one dimension of the entire domain of anti-gay responses or "homonegativism" (p. 358). Operationally defined, homophobia is an affective response of "fear, disgust, anger, discomfort, and aversion" (p. 358). They cite MacDonald, Huggins, Young and Swanson (1976) as being in agreement with this contention. The authors further determined that the scale developed by Smith (1971) did not present data regarding the scale's reliability and validity. In 1976 Lumby modified the scale developed by Smith but continued to omit data on reliability and validity, and included mixed items that measured different variables. The scale developed by Millham, San Miguel and Kellogg, (1976) is regarded by Hudson and Ricketts (1980) as "one of the most important pieces of research" (p. 359) to appear in the literature of the time. Kurdek (1988) states that research in the area of negative attitudes about gay people is in its early phases. This research was the first to intentionally address the dimensional concept of homonegativism and identify variables that influence homonegativism along six independent attitude sets. One of these sets most closely matched the definition of homophobia as separately defined. Despite this significant contribution, the authors criticize the scale on several methodological and construct grounds. Based on this review, Hudson and Ricketts (1980) developed a new measure of homophobia, The Index of Attitudes Towards Homosexuals (IAH). The purpose of the IAH was to provide a scale that would distinguish between a general set of negative responses and the more specific concept of homophobia as an affective response to gay men and lesbian women.
Herek (1988) developed an additional scale to measure homophobic attitudes to correct for deficiencies in existing scales, the Attitudes toward Lesbian and Gay Men (ATLG Scale). In addition, this scale yields separate scores for attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women rather than to homosexuals in general. Finally, Larsen, Reed and Hoffman (1980), developed the Heterosexual Attitudes Toward Homosexuality (HATH), to examine attitudes in the work place, and O'Brien and Vest (1988) developed a scale to measure beliefs about the consequences of employing homosexuals.

Changing Homophobic Attitudes

Gross, Green and Vanyur (1980) conducted a study to determine the effects of disclosure of sexual orientation. Results indicated that disclosing that one is gay has a negative impact on impressions. Gurwitz and Marcus (1978) studied the effects of anticipated interaction with gay people by non-gay people, finding that a stimulus person was liked less when identified as gay. Pagtolum, Imelda and Clair (1986) examined the effect of direct positive interaction with a gay male as a guest speaker in a classroom. Data from this study indicated a change toward more positive attitudes.

Stevenson (1988) conducted an evaluation of intervention strategies for increasing tolerance toward gay and lesbian people. This researcher used the d statistic, a meta-analysis, (Glass, McGraw and Smith, 1981; Hedges and Olkin, 1985) to assess success of changing attitudes in 13 studies. The studies examined were designed to promote attitude change via: a course in human sexuality, (8 studies); a brief seminar emphasizing homosexuality, (2 studies); and a unit on homosexuality in some other course, (3 studies). Results indicated that education about gay and lesbian people through these formats did produce positive change. The most
successful of these methods were those which involved a course in human sexuality. The other methods were much less successful.

**Characteristics of Those Who Hold Negative Attitudes**

Kite (1984) conducted a meta-analytic review of the literature on sex differences in attitudes toward homosexuals. The data base included research between 1963 and 1983. Kite's (1984) analysis of the research suggests those who hold negative attitudes toward homosexuals are: Likely to support the maintenance of traditional sex roles; more likely to stereotype the sexes; favor preserving the double standard between men and women; less likely to know someone who is homosexual; more likely to see homosexuals as sick and dangerous; more likely to be status conscious, authoritarian and sexually rigid; more likely to hold more negative attitudes toward minorities. Protestants and Roman Catholics are less tolerant than members of other religions and nonaffiliates, and in general, males have more negative attitudes than females.

Research after Kites' 1984 meta-analytic review has found support for the above characteristics existing in those who hold negative attitudes about gay and lesbian people, (Herek, 1984, 1988; Kurdek, 1988; VanderStoep, and Green 1988; Whitely, 1987, 1988). In addition, Ernulf, Innala and Whitam (1989) conducted research indicating non-gay people who hold the belief that people who are gay are "born that way" have significantly more positive attitudes toward gay people than those who believe gay people "choose" or "learn to be gay".

Only two studies, Kurdek (1988) and McDermott and Stadler (1988) have looked at correlates of negative attitudes toward people who are gay and moral development. In the Kurdek study, negative attitudes were assessed in 103 undergraduate, non-gay
college students. Negative attitudes toward gay people were found to correlate inversely to age, academic performance, and moral development. Further, a positive correlation related to traditional attitudes toward men, women, the equality of men and women, and homophobia were found. Based on his research, Kurdek concluded negative attitudes toward gay people are part of a larger belief system regarding conventional social order.

Kurdek (1988) states that his study demonstrates positive attitudes toward gay people are related to higher level moral reasoning. He suggests moral reasoning explains variability in negative attitudes not explained by other variables. This variability appears to be related to the individual's ability to construct principles apart from rules and regulations which uphold the conventional social order. These findings suggest that the fostering of positive attitudes toward individual differences can be enhanced by interventions which stress the arbitrary nature of rules and regulations that govern human behavior.

Limitations of the Kurdek (1988) study are that it included only undergraduate students who may not be a representative sample of the larger college student population, nor does it provide for a wider range of potential difference in level of moral reasoning.

Another limitation pointed out by Kurdek (1988) is that the study was based on attitudes toward gay people in general, rather than on actual interaction with gay people. The present study will include a wider range of college students and in addition to general attitudes, will examine actual interaction with gay people.

McDermott and Stadler (1988) researched attitudes using 120 counseling students representing 10 programs across the United States. The authors describe the
subject population as "typical" Americans, fairly young, mostly caucasian, middle class and raised in two-parent families. The researchers hypothesized that the amount and quality of previous experience with minority groups and moral development level contributes to attitudes toward minority groups. McDermott and Stadler (1988) found counseling students are homophobic yet hold positive attitudes to ethnic minority groups. In regard to moral development, a positive statistical relationship was found between higher levels of moral development and lower scores of homophobia. In addition, the research found a higher frequency of experience with minorities was significantly related to lower homophobia scores. Significance was not achieved in regard to quality of experience of contact with minorities and decreased homophobia, however the authors indicated a trend in this direction.

The Kurdek (1988) and the McDermott and Stadler (1988) studies are the first two studies to look at moral reasoning and attitudes toward gay and lesbian people. Moral reasoning may be the link to individuals changing their attitudes toward minorities. A brief discussion of Moral reasoning follows.

Moral Reasoning

Darley and Shultz (1990) report several characteristic themes of early research on moral reasoning. First, moral judgements are stage based. Second, there is some dependency on cognitive development. Based on recent research, the authors report cognitive developments are necessary for attaining certain stages, however, cognitive development alone is insufficient in bringing about stage attainment. The role of peer interaction is an additional factor influencing moral reasoning (Darley and Shultz, 1990; Selman, 1971; and Walker, 1980). Kohlberg, Levine, and Hewer (1983) label this the moral atmosphere concept, the sense of community, group solidarity, cohesion and
collective norms. Moral atmosphere dictates that an individuals' moral decisions will be made in the context of group norms or the group decision making process.

Darley and Shultz (1990) define moral rules as those to which obligatory adherence is expected. They believe an action's morality is judged according to violation or observance of a moral rule. Regardless of attitude toward it, a rule applies to everyone. The rule's force is impersonal and external. Kohlberg, Levine and Hewer (1983) state that the morality and moral development assumptions and definitions which guided Kohlberg's original work were derived from Hare's 1963 neo-Kantian morality definition. The moral quality of a judgement must be: "a) prescriptive: a categorical obligation to act, and b) universalizable: a point of view which any human being could or should adopt in reaction to the dilemma" (p. 17).

Kohlberg et al. (1983) states that moral reasoning stages reflect justice reasoning, not emotions, aspirations, or actions. Gibbs, Basinger, and Fuller (1992) characterize moral reasoning as a progression from superficial to profound moral judgement (p. 4). Thus, by addressing attitudes through the moral reasoning domain, core developmental features are involved apart from perception, actions, or emotions, and proceed from lower level reasoning to more profound reasoning. The moral atmosphere is addressed and methods for advancing moral reasoning are offered.

Kohlberg (1971) contends that to raise an individual's moral reasoning level, one must be exposed to the next reasoning level. Darley and Shultz (1990) state numerous professionals in psychology are committed to the validity and utility of moral reasoning theory. They go on to say there are various training programs utilized to raise a person's moral reasoning level. Sander (1990) says the domain of moral reasoning offers an empirically evaluable structure. Gibbs, Basinger and Fuller
have developed a production measure that empirically evaluates an individual's moral judgement level. The authors believe their work provides the researcher with a "valid and practical instrument for assessing the maturity of moral judgement" (p. 33).

**Empirical Measurement of Moral Reasoning**

Gibbs, Basinger, and Fuller (1992) reviewed instruments used to measure moral reasoning. Gibbs et al. (1992) cite the Moral Judgment Interview (MJI), developed by Colby and Kohlberg (1987), as the most prominent production measure. As stated by Gibbs et al. (1992), production measures have the advantage of making subjects produce reasoning statements rather than using recognition, reading, or prescribed and sometimes sophisticated reasoning justification evaluation. The disadvantage in this instrument is difficulty learning to make inferential assessment. Recognition measures such as the Defining Issues Test (DIT), developed by Rest (1975, 1979), or the Sociomoral Reflection Objective Measure-Short Form developed by Basinger and Gibbs (1987) also have disadvantages. These disadvantages include the measures length, limited use with children, and limited use with 11 year or lower reading level subjects.

Gibbs, Basinger and Fuller (1992) developed the Sociomoral Reflection Measure-Short Form (SRM-SF) to address inherent disadvantages in current recognition and production measures. The SRM-SF production measure does not include moral dilemmas such as the classical Heinz dilemma. Thus, the SRM-SF is a more practical moral reasoning measure, quicker to administer, and is easier to score. The psychometric and practical properties of the SRM-SF are discussed in the methods section.
Sociomoral Stages

According to Gibbs et al. (1992) "A given sociomoral stage, then, refers primarily to the character or 'structure' of one's justifications pertaining to prescriptive relations and transactions between people" (p. 20). The authors provide an example demonstrating moral reasoning at each of the four stages:

You should always keep your promise, and never be a tattletale. If you made a promise to a friend, it wouldn't be nice to break your promise because then he wouldn't play with you and wouldn't be your friend any more. Or he'd cry or beat you up. Not only that, but your parents will punish you if you lie or break a promise.

Your friend has probably done things for you and may return the favor if you help him by keeping your promise. Besides, you may like your friend, and this could be your only friend. Lies catch up with you sooner or later, and once they do you'll be in worse trouble because the other person may get even. If it's parents and children, then parents should keep their promises to the children if the children have kept their promises to their parents. But if the promise is to someone you hardly know, then why bother? They'll probably never know whether you kept it or not.

Your friend has faith in you, and you shouldn't betray that trust or hurt their feelings. After all, you'd expect them to keep their promises to you, and having a friend to share feelings with means a lot. Even if it's not a friend, honesty is still the best policy and it's just common courtesy. It's selfish to break promises, and once you make a bad impression people won't think much of you. If it's a child and the parents don't keep promises, the children will stop believing in their
parents and will start thinking that lying is alright. Even if it's someone you hardly know, you may start a good relationship by showing that you care and can be trusted.

Society is based on trust, and keeping promises is necessary for the sake of the social order. Honesty is a standard everyone can accept, and you wouldn't want to live in a society where you couldn't trust anyone. After all, promises have intrinsic value, and a relationship is meaningless if there is no trust. In the case of a child, parents have an obligation to keep their word and to provide an example of character so that the child develops a sense of responsibility. Keeping a promise is a commitment and a matter of honor failing to keep it, even if it's to someone you hardly know, reflects on your integrity. People must be consistent and not break promises whenever they feel like it, so that they earn others' respect to say nothing of their own. (pp. 20-21)

The paragraphs demonstrate both a qualitative difference as well as an adequacy and maturity progression in reasoning. What follows is a brief sociomoral stage summary as defined by Gibbs, Basinger, and Fuller (1992).

Stage 1: Unilateral and Physicalistic

Stage 1, grounded in concrete justification, constitutes an immature level of reasoning, confusing morality and physical power. A stage one thinker can recognize different perspectives over time, however, there is little discernible coordination of these perspectives. Five aspects define stage 1 thinkers.

Aspect 1: Edicts of Unilateral Authority (Unilateral Authority)

Aspect 1 demonstrates a simple appeal to an authority figure with no differentiation between the position and the person.
Aspect 2: Immediate or Physical Status (Status)

This aspect demonstrates an appeal to the status of those involved, i.e. "big", "older", "grown up", or what they possess. The content may be tied to an object having status due to its' value. In addition, the status appeal is immediate "in that it is conceptualized without an appreciation of underlying psychological mediators" (p. 22).

Aspect 3: Coercive Rules, Maxim-Like Prescription, or absolute Proscription (Rules)

This aspect reflects stage 1 justifications consisting of flat assertions that are couched in absolute terms. The justification is usually proscriptive but may be prescriptive.

Aspect 4: Unqualified Positive or Negative Labels (Labels)

This aspect consist of how gross or undifferentiated labels of good/bad, right/wrong, or "tattletale" etc. are applied.

Aspect 5: Physical or Punitive Consequences (Physical Consequences)

Justifications grounded in physicalistic and usually punitive consequences are reflected in Aspect 5. However, justifications may reflect a positive consequence such as receiving a reward or treat.

Stage 2: Exchanging and Instrumental

In stage 2, stage 1 unilateral justifications are replaced with justifications that reflect a moral understanding based on interaction with others. It is a more rational stage, but still reflects an immature sociomoral reflection level. It is a stage that reflects a narrow scope of social ethics, extrinsic and superficial, consisting of pragmatic deals and/or exchanges. Six aspects characterize stage 2 reasoning.
Aspect 1: Quid Pro Quo Deals or Exchanges (Exchanges)

This aspect is characterized by "tit-for-tat" exchanges or deals. It includes anticipation of either positive or negative reciprocation.

Aspect 2: Strict Equalities or Inequalities (Equalities)

An emphatical egalitarian justification, ie. "I don't steal so they shouldn't either" or "The children are equal, so parents shouldn't boss them around" (p. 24) is expressed.

Aspect 3: Concrete Rights or Unfettered Freedoms (Freedoms)

Justifications typical under this aspect appeal to freedoms as concrete rights. It is not important to save a strangers life because "You shouldn't stick your nose in someone else's business".

Aspect 4: Contingent Preferences or Dispositions (Preferences)

This aspect reflects justification based on one's wishes or inclinations, i.e., "Helping a friend is important 'if you want to'" (p. 24). The preference can be generalized, "no one wants to go to jail" or explicitly prescriptive "you should want to live" (p. 24).

Aspect 5: Pragmatic Needs (Needs)

"This aspect consists of appeal to assumed or probable pragmatic needs. For example, not stealing is important because 'you may not need to steal' or other people 'need their things.' Helping others is important 'if they need you' to help them or because 'this might be your only friend.'" (p. 24).

Aspect 6: Calculated Advantages or Disadvantages (Advantages)

Moral thinking bases values on anticipated practical benefit or liability calculation. Thus, one is encouraged to live because "they could still have fun". It is important to help a friend because they "might do you a favor some day". However, keeping a
promise to someone you hardly know is not important, "that person will never know" (pp. 24-25).

**Stage 3: Mutual and Prosocial**

Stage 3 reflects a mature moral reasoner. "Stage 3 thinking transcends the pragmatics of instrumental preferences and exchanges to construct the intrinsic mutualities or interpersonal expectations of prosocial feeling, caring, and conduct" (p. 26). Six aspects represent stage 3 thinking.

**Aspect 1: Relationships or Mutualities (Relationships)**

This reflects an understanding of the "psychological meaning of interpersonal relationships" (p. 27). Keeping a promise is important, due to the relationship and understanding of the impact on others, not with the consequences to oneself.

**Aspect 2: Empathic Role-Taking or Intrinsic Concern (Empathic Role-Taking)**

This aspect demonstrates a clear and direct empathic transposing of psychological or emotional welfare with another person. This reflects a more mature level of reasoning than stage one, where there may be some empathic understanding like crying, or at stage two where someone may "want" or "need" something.

**Aspect 3: Normative Expectations**

The expectation that roles and norms are not violated is reflected. A concern is if laws are broken or not enforced, norms will break down and "chaos" will ensue.

**Aspect 4: Underlying Prosocial or Antisocial Intentions or Personality (Prosocial Intentions)**

"This aspect generally covers appeals to the prosocial intentions or features of the normal social personality. Prosocial prescriptions of sympathy or sacrifice or judgments of antisocial intentions (‘inhuman’, ‘selfish’, ‘greedy’) are used not as
unqualified labels (Stage 1), but rather as characterizations reflecting underlying
motivational features of personality" (p. 28).

Aspect 5: Generalized Caring or Valuing (Generalized Caring)

This pertains to generalizations beyond friends or family, to value all human life.
This aspect reflects a generalized normative prosocial prescription or value beyond
particular relationships or roles.

Aspect 6: Intrapersonal Approval or Disapproval (Intrapersonal Approval)

There is a sense of moral conscience. The importance of moral values are
reflected by the belief of having a "clean conscience or pride" or "reflect
self-disapproval for misconduct" (p. 28).

Stage 4: Systemic and Standard

Stage 4 goes beyond the maturity attained in the Stage 3 interpersonal sphere,
extending to a complex social system. Thus, the Stage 4 reasoner goes beyond the
superficial or extrinsic considerations of Stages 1 and 2, as well as the interpersonal
relationships of Stage 3 to infer the societie's bases. There are seven aspects of
Stage 4.

Aspect 1: Societal Requirements

Under this aspect are those justifications whose moral value is viewed as a social
requirement. For example, laws are important so the system will not break down;
trust is essential for a society; or "the family must come before individual desires"
(p. 29).

Aspect 2: Basic Rights and values

This aspect covers justifications based upon moral norms of basic rights or
values applicable to any viable society. Examples include: Keeping a promise is
important because "honesty is a standard everyone can accept", or life is important because "everyone has something to offer society".

Aspect 3: Societal Responsibilities or Contractual Obligations (Responsibilities)

This covers adherence to moral norms supported by responsibility, obligation, or commitment. For an individual to enjoy social benefits, the individual must accept the coinciding responsibilities.

Aspect 4: Responsible Character or Integrity (Character)

This aspect reflects justifications appealing to integrity considerations. "For example, keeping promises may be justified as 'a sign of character', 'a reflection of one's integrity', or 'showing self-respect'" (p. 30).

Aspect 5: Procedural Precedents or Consistent Standard Practices (Consistent Practices)

Justifications refer to belief that consistent or standard practices of normative moral values are important, because arbitrary normative moral value repercussion can be disastrous for a society. "For example, sending lawbreakers to jail is important 'to avoid setting a dangerous precedent' or because 'inconsistencies will lead to anarchy'" (p. 31).

Aspect 6: Procedural equity or Social Justice (Procedural Equity)

This is a complement to the Responsibility and Consistent Practices aspect discussed above. Procedural Equity goes further emphasizing what either society or authority owes the individual. In other words, it is social justice. To avoid unfairness, the need for standard procedures is recognized. The emphasis under Procedural equity recognizes the need for case-by-case application.
Aspect 7: Standards of Conscience

"This aspect justifies moral values by appeal to standards of individuals or personal conscience: to one's 'self-respect', 'sense of self-worth', 'personal satisfaction', 'dignity', 'honor', 'consistency', or 'integrity'. (An appeal specifically against 'compromising one's integrity' is scored under Character.)" (p. 31).

In addition to the Stages, the mature Stages of 3 and 4 are described either moral type A or type B. This distinction relates the degree to which the stage's prescriptive ideals are evidenced. Type A reflects an "embedding of the stages' ethical ideality in social conventions, or an assimilation of basic, universalizable interpersonal and societal ideals to existing social arrangements" (p. 25). Type B thinking reflects ethical ideals. The authors state that Moral Type B ethical ideality features three components: balancing, fundamental valuing, and conscience.

Balancing in moral Type B relates to orientation of the ideal mutuality of interpersonal and societal expectations. Moral Type A emphasizes expectations in an interpersonal relationship or society. Moral Type B is considered to be more balanced in perspective.

Fundamental Valuing relates to the universalistic thinking exhibited in Moral Type B. Values extend or are generalized to all humanity. Moral Type A, reflects values that extend only to a given relationship or society.

Conscience refers to the Moral Type B characteristic of reflecting an internal frame of reference. "The ideals of mature morality are felt 'from within'" (p. 26). Thus, Moral Type B is considered to be more prescriptive than Moral Type A.

Gibbs et al. (1992) state that transitional phases do not lend themselves to distinct discussion beyond the 3/4 Transition, or Relativism of Personal Values (RPV).
Transitional phases are generally unstable, however, the authors suspect the 3/4 RPV can remain "functionally stable" (p. 29) for an indefinite period of time. This occurs because of cultural support in western societies. The 3/4 transition is characterized by moral reasoning concerns extending beyond particular interpersonal relationships, but do not clearly address the functional social system requirements. Justifications at the RPV transition become subjectively defensible values, which cannot be questioned or invalidated by others. As one continues to develop their moral reasoning, they "come to realize its anarchistic implications and reflect upon the need to establish commonly accepted standards if society is to survive and function smoothly (ie. to construct Stage 4)" (p. 29).

**Stages 5 and 6**

A major difference between the moral reasoning instruments and theories presented by Gibbs et al. (1992) and Kohlberg, is the belief in stages 5 and 6. Kohlberg's model goes beyond Stage 4 to identify two additional stages. However, in his response to Gibbs' criticisms of these stages, Kohlberg et al. (1983) agrees that at least for now "we do not have extensive or sufficient empirical data to substantiate any claims as to the use of a sixth stage, even though we still maintain its usefulness as a theoretical construct" (p. 154). Material that had been scored as a Stage 6 response is now scored as substage B of a lower stage. According to Kohlberg et al. (1983), this scoring change handles both the moral judgment data of Stage 6 and also "partially handles the judgement-action implication of Stage 6" (p. 61).

In regard to Stage 5, Kohlberg et al. (1983) state that Gibbs contends this stage is not a new operative structure or system-in-action. Therefore, according to Gibbs et al. (1992) it is not an additional form of normative ethical judgement. "In our view,
however, such reasoning does not entail any additional stages beyond Stage 4. We do not see that it makes any theoretical sense to characterize the explicit use of ethical philosophy as a higher natural developmental stage any more than it would make sense to characterize the use of a systematic philosophy of language or mathematics as a higher natural stage in language or logical development" (p. 17).

Kohlberg et al. (1983) state that "Gibbs wishes to call our postconventional stages 'existential' positions rather than new moral or normative ethical structures" (p. 154). What Gibbs has labeled "existential thinking" at Stages 3B, 4B, and 5, they "identify as the development of the ability to generate statements about what morality is, to identify the grounds for it in conceptions of human nature and metaphysics, and to justify its necessity" (p. 154). According to Kohlberg et al. (1983) it is the individual's ability to generate normative-ethical reasoning, a moral theory, that is indicative of Stage 5 reasoning. This reasoning is not particularistic. Such reasoning statement go beyond identifying the laws of a society to provide a theoretical justification or criticism, using a "prior-to-society perspective" (p. 154).

However, the researchers agree "moral development in adulthood beyond Stage 5 appears characterizable by metaethical and 'existential' reflection and theorizing, phenomena that can be studied with 'soft' stage models" (p. 155). Gibbs et al. (1992) contend it is "rare for a subject to be scored Stage 5 in production measures" (p. 19). Thus, for the purpose of this research the four stage model and production measure developed by Gibbs et al. (1992) will be employed. The results of the production measure will yield Stage 3A or 3B or Stage 4A or 4B and moral type A and B provide distinctions of a progressive increase in Moral Judgement.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This section describes the methods used to conduct this study, including a description of the sample, procedure for data collection, and instrumentation.

Subjects

Students at The Ohio State University (OSU), Capital University, and Wittenberg University were the subjects for this study. The subjects who volunteered to participate in this study range in class rank from first year undergraduate to Ph.D. students.

Procedure

Professors were contacted to determine if they would allow the researcher to come into their classroom and solicit volunteers to participate in the study. A copy of this letter is included in Appendix A. For those classes where permission was given, the researcher approached the class asking for volunteers. The potential volunteers were told the researcher was investigating the relationships between attitudes and variables that affect attitudes. The written script is included in Appendix B. For those students that volunteered, each was given a packet containing the instrumentation along with instructions for completing the instruments. The subjects took the instruments home, completed the packet, and returned it the next class meeting. Each packet was marked with a code number, and each instrument in the packet had the same code number. Thus, the anonymity and confidentiality of the subjects was insured. A copy of the instruments are included as Appendices D-H; a copy of the
instructions is included as Appendix C. Data on the distribution of subjects will be presented in the results chapter.

Instrumentation

The packet contained five instruments for data collection: 1) The Demographic Questionnaire, 2) The Sociomoral Reflection Measure-Short Form (SRM-SF), 3) The Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals (IAH), 4) The Global Assessment of Contact questionnaire (GAC), 5) The Global Assessment of relationship questionnaire (GAR). The instruments were presented and were completed in the above order.

1. The Demographic Questionnaire was developed by the researcher to determine basic demographic data (age, sex, ethnic origin, year in school, etc.), to profile each group, and to compare groups. A copy of the questionnaire is included as Appendix D.

2. The Sociomoral Reflection Measure--Short Form (SRM-SF) was developed by Gibbs, Basinger, and Fuller (1992) as a production measure to assess moral judgement. The SRM-SF is comprised of eleven short-answer items that require the individual to address sociomoral issues (Appendix E). For each of the eleven items the individual is presented with brief stimulus materials (instead of a moral dilemma). For example, item 4 from the SRM-SF asks: In general, how important is it for people to tell the truth? These "lead-in's" "seem to provide sufficient contextual support for reflection..."(p. 38). The individual responds to evaluative questions, grounded to the "lead-in" stimulus, circling either very important, important, or not important. Finally, the individual must explain "why" they answered as they did.

The responses to each of the eleven why questions are scored by a trained rater (see Gibbs et al. 1992 for information regarding training) yielding a moral judgement
level for that item: 1; 1/2; 2; 2/3; 3; 3/4; 4. Transitional scores (1/2, 2/3 or 3/4) are replaced with a numerical value midway between the stage represented in the transition (1.5, 2.5, 3.5). A summary score is obtained by calculating the arithmetic mean of each response to obtain the Sociomoral Reflection Maturity Score, SRMS, the primary summary score of the SRM-SF assessment. No fewer than seven of the eleven responses must be scorable. Questionnaires with less than seven scorable items are discarded from analysis.

A "Global Stage" (p. 55) is assigned to each questionnaire which represents the individuals developmental vicinity. The global stage score represents either a "stage" score or a transitional score:

- **STAGE 1** = 1.00 - 1.25
- **TRANSITION 1(2)** = 1.26 - 1.49
- **TRANSITION 2(1)** = 1.50 - 1.74
- **STAGE 2** = 1.75 - 2.25
- **TRANSITION 2(3)** = 2.26 - 2.49
- **TRANSITION 3(2)** = 2.50 - 2.74
- **STAGE 3** = 2.75 - 3.25
- **TRANSITION 3(4)** = 3.26 - 3.49
- **TRANSITION 4(3)** = 3.50 - 3.74
- **STAGE 4** = 3.75 - 4.00

The authors suggest multiplying the SRMS by 100 for data-analytic purposes, thus yielding scores in the range of 100-400.

The instrument also provides for information regarding Moral Type, Type A or Type B. "Type A/Type B distinction pertains to the extent to which the prescriptive
ideals of the mature stages are evidenced" (p. 25). Moral Type A emphasizes given expectations in an interpersonal relationship (Stage 3) or society (Stage 4), where as Type B designates an orientation to the ideal mutuality of interpersonal or societal expectations (pp. 25-26).

The authors report that the SRM-SF has acceptable levels of reliability. Test-retest correlations were significant, \( r = .88 \), (no time interval was stated). The instrument is homogeneous (Cronbach's alpha = .92). Acceptable concurrent validity between the SRM-SF and the Moral Judgment Interview (MJI) was found, \( r = .69 \). Convergent validity was demonstrated through positive correlations with the theoretically relevant variables of age, \( r = .66 \); verbal intelligence, \( r = .49 \) (with age parcelled out); and socioeconomic status (SES, \( r = .20 \)). Discriminant validity was evidenced by showing no correlation with a measure of social desirability.

3. The Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals (IAH) was used to measure attitudes toward homosexuals. The instrument was developed by Hudson and Ricketts (1980). The IAH includes twenty-five items assessing the respondent's personal affective responses of disgust, anxiety, aversion, discomfort, fear and anger with respect to either proximal or distal contact, as well as involvement with male and female homosexuals (Appendix F). The instrument requires the individual to respond to each of the items by indicating on a likert scale whether they: 1-Strongly Agree, 2-Agree, 3-Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4-Disagree, 5-Strongly Disagree with the statement. Some of the items represent positive statements, the remainder are negative to control for response biases.

The IAH is scored by first reversing the scores of all negatively worded items. Once this has been completed the total score is computed using Equation 1.
\[ S = \frac{(\sum X - M)(100)}{((M)(4))} \]

(1)

X is a single item score and N is the number of items that were actually completed. Items left blank or scored outside of the 1-5 range are scored 0. This scoring formula has the advantage of yielding a total score that will range between 0 to 100, regardless of the number of items left blank or improperly completed. Scores are interpreted as follows:

- 0 - 25 = high grade non-homophobic
- 26 - 50 = low grade non-homophobic
- 51 - 75 = low grade homophobic
- 76 - 100 = high grade homophobic

The reliability coefficient Alpha for this instrument was found to be within the acceptable range (.901). Construct validity of the IAH was demonstrated by a significant relationship with attitude toward the expression of human sexuality (i.e. individuals with more conservative attitudes tended to be more homophobic) and small positive or zero relationships with indicators of personal and interpersonal relationship problems. The content validity of the IAH is very high according to Hudson and Ricketts and is "intimately connected with the authors' definition of homophobia" (p. 365). The factorial validity was investigated using the multiple-group method of factor analysis (Nunnally, 1978) and all of the item-total correlations were found to be statistically significant with a median of .541. (Note: the authors found item 21 on the IAH made a very small contribution to the overall measurement of homophobia and offered a replacement question for this item. The authors state that the validity and reliability are not affected by these changes).
4 and 5. The Global Assessment of Contact (GAC) questionnaire and the Global Assessment of Relationship (GAR) questionnaire were developed by the investigator to determine quantity and quality of contact subjects have with gay and lesbian people. For each measure, the subjects rated their unique level of contact and relationship, assigning their self a score between 1 and 5. Copies of the questionnaires are located in Appendices G and H. The correlations between the primary variables of interest and the GAC and GAR offer support for the construct validity of these instruments.

Analyses

Basic descriptive statistics will be presented on the demographic data and the primary variables of SRM, IAH, GAC, and GAR. This will consist of frequencies on the categorical demographic variables, and of means and standard deviations on the continuous variables.

Next, correlations between SRM, IAH, GAC, AND GAR will be presented. The correlation between SRM and IAH will be a direct test of hypothesis one which state, people who have attained a higher level of moral reasoning will demonstrate more positive attitudes toward gay and lesbian people. The other correlations will be indirect evidence that address the second and third hypotheses. For example, the correlation between SRM and GAC will indicate whether subjects who have had more known contact with gay and lesbian people have a higher level of moral reasoning, regardless of whether contact was positive or negative.

Hypotheses two and three will be tested by t tests between appropriate groups. For hypothesis two (people who have had known positive contact with gay and lesbian people will exhibit a higher level of moral reasoning than those who have had no
known contact with gay and lesbian people), two groups will be formed; 1) subjects who are aware they have had contact with gay and lesbian people and that contact has been positive, and 2) subjects who are not aware of having had any contact with gay and lesbian people. These subjects will be identified by their responses on the GAC. The mean level of moral reasoning for each of these groups will be calculated, and the difference between these two means tested for significance by a $t$ test.

Hypothesis three will be tested in a similar manner by a $t$ test between subjects who have had a positive relationship with gay and lesbian people, and subjects who have had no relationship with gay and lesbian people.

For extended exploration of the relationship between SRM, IAH, GAC, and GAR, a regression analysis will be conducted. IAH will be the dependent variable. SRM, GAC, and GAR will be the predictor variables. The regression analysis will indicate: 1) how much total variance in homophobia the three variables can explain, 2) which variable explains the largest percentage of unique variance in IAH, 3) how much variance contact and relationship can explain in homophobia beyond level of moral reasoning, 4) how much more variance the level of relationship can explain beyond level of contact.

Finally, to verify relationships found in previous research between homophobia and demographic variables, correlations will be conducted between demographic variables and the IAH.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The results are presented in three sections. First, basic statistics are presented on sample characteristics and on the primary variables of interest (moral reasoning, homophobia, contact with and relationships with gay and lesbian people). Second, the hypotheses are tested by examining correlations and means. Additional relationships among the primary variables of interest are explored through regression analyses. Third, analyses of the relationships between demographic variables in this and prior research are presented.

Descriptive Statistics

Sample Characteristics

A total of 95 questionnaire packets were returned, yielding a 38% return rate. Categorical demographic variable percentages are presented in Table 1. Means for the continuous demographic variables are presented in Table 2.

Most subjects are white (90%) and heterosexual (87%). 13% of the sample identified themselves as homosexual (12%) or bisexual (1%), slightly higher than the general population estimate of 10%. Almost three-fourths of the subjects are female (73%), over half are single (58.5%), and approximately one-third are either married or partnered (36%).

Regarding religion, the largest group of subjects grew up (52%) and currently (48%) are protestant. However, it must be noted that of the subjects who marked
"OTHER" and indicated what "OTHER" was, it appeared that most of these could have marked under the response "protestant". For example, "Lutheran" or "Fundamentalist" was written as the past and current religious background but marked as "OTHER". Each of these were scored as OTHER to avoid having to "interpret" whether "OTHER" as Lutheran or "OTHER" as Fundamentalist is protestant or not.

Although the mean age is 27 years, with a range of 17 to 54 years, roughly half of the subjects are the traditional college student age. Almost one-third are 19 or 20 years old.

Almost two-thirds are undergraduates (61%), most are full-time students (84%), and the mean number of years in school beyond high-school is five, with a range of 1 to 36 years.

The majority work part-time (55%), although roughly one-fourth are not employed. The largest numbers of subjects are either employed as work-study (27%), professionals (21%), or as a university assistants (20%). Over half reported a family income greater than 40,000.

To further examine the characteristics of the sample, correlations among the demographic variables were conducted (see Table 3). Because some demographic variables were predominated by one category, the other categories were collapsed to form a second category. Specifically, the ethnic variable was collapsed to form white versus non-white. The sexual orientation category was collapsed to form heterosexual versus homosexual and bisexual. Educational level was collapsed to form a variable indicating undergraduate versus graduate student.

Significant, moderate, positive relationships were found between age, educational status, educational level, and the number of years in school beyond high-school
(r's range from .29 to .69). As would be expected, older subjects have spent more years in school beyond high-school and have attained a higher level of education. They are also more likely to be in school part-time. The significant, moderately-low negative relationship between ethnic category and family income (r=-.30) indicates that non-white subjects tended to report slightly lower family income levels. The only other significant correlation was a moderately-low, positive correlation between education level and sexual orientation (r=.29), which suggests homosexual and bisexual subjects tended to have a slightly higher education level.

Primary Variables of Interest

Moral Reasoning

Moral reasoning was measured by the SRM-SF. Four protocols were not scoreable and are treated as missing data in the analyses. Twenty-two of the protocols were scored by a second rater. The interrater reliability based on the twenty scoreable protocols is .96, which indicates high reliability, consistent with past research.

Table 4 presents the distribution of moral reasoning scores by the stages. All scores fell between three and four inclusive. The mean score was 337 with a standard deviation of 26 (see Table 2). The mean is consistent with those reported for university students and adults (Gibbs, Basinger, and Fuller 1992).

Homophobia

Homophobia was based on Hudson and Rickett's (1990) Index of Attitudes toward Homosexuals (IAH). Table 4 indicates the majority of the sample was non-homophobic. This is in contrast to prior research with college populations which reported homophobic samples (McDermott and Stadler, 1988; Kurdek, 1988).
Contact

Contact variable percentages are presented in Table 4, and the means in Table 2. The percentages suggest almost three-fourths of the subjects answering this question have frequent contact with gay and lesbian people (73%). The majority (60%) consider their contact positive.

The correlation between frequency and affect of contact indicates a moderately-high positive relationship ($r=.57$), suggesting more frequent contact is associated with positive contact. The correlation is low enough, however, to indicate that the two variables are not measuring the same concept.

Relationship

Roughly 40% of the subjects responding to this question indicated that they have or have had a close or very close relationship with a gay or lesbian person. Over half (59%) indicated this relationship was positive.

The correlation between the frequency and affect of the relationship ($r=.82$) is high and positive, suggesting that closer relationships are much more likely to occur when the relationship is positive.

Correlations between contact and relationship variables are moderately high to high, suggesting that people in closer relationships tend to have more frequent contact and view the contact more positively. People involved in positive relationships tend to have more contact and are particularly more likely to view their contact positively.

Tests of Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

People who have attained a higher level of moral reasoning will demonstrate more positive attitudes toward gay and lesbian people. Hypothesis One is tested by a
correlation between moral reasoning and homophobia ($r=-.11$). This correlation is not significant, although it is in the predicted direction. It suggests subjects who had more positive attitudes toward gay and lesbian people did not necessarily have higher moral reasoning levels.

Although the hypothesis did not specifically consider sexual orientation, logically sexual orientation might affect the relationship between moral reasoning and homophobia. Someone who is gay, lesbian, or bisexual will be less homophobic. At the same time, this may not be related to their level of moral reasoning. That is, their reasoning and attitude toward their "own group" does not necessarily indicate the individual has achieved a higher moral reasoning level or reflect the concept, "The Mature moral reasoner 'penetrates' through superficial or extrinsic considerations to infer the bases of interpersonal relationships (Stage 3) or society (Stage 4)" (Gibbs, et al. 1992 p. 25). Thus, the relationship between moral reasoning and homophobia was examined separately for heterosexuals and for homosexuals. As indicated by a significant moderately-low negative correlation ($r=-.27$), the relationship does hold for heterosexual subjects. Heterosexual subjects who have attained a higher level of moral reasoning did demonstrate more positive attitudes toward gay and lesbian people. The correlation for homosexual/bisexual subjects was not significant ($r=.14$), but that correlation is only based on 10 subjects and should not be used to draw any conclusions.

**Hypothesis Two**

People who have had known positive contact with gay and lesbian people will exhibit a higher moral reasoning level than those who have had no known contact with gay and lesbian people. Hypothesis Two is tested by a $t$ test between two groups: 1)
subjects who indicated they had very infrequent or no contact with gay and lesbian people by marking one or two on the frequency of contact variable; and 2) subjects who indicated they have had positive contact with gay and lesbian people by marking four or five on the affect of contact variable. Subjects who indicated positive but infrequent contact were included in the infrequent group.

The results of the $t$ test support hypothesis two (see Table 6). The mean moral reasoning level was higher for subjects who had known positive contact than it was for subjects who had no known contact.

To further examine the relationship correlations were calculated (see Table 5). The correlation between moral reasoning and frequency of contact was significant and in the expected positive direction ($r=.33$), suggesting that subjects who had more frequent known contact with gay and lesbian people attained a higher moral reasoning level. On the other hand, the correlation between moral reasoning and affect of contact was not significant ($r=.06$), and suggests positive or negative contact is not related to moral reasoning level independent of the frequency of contact.

The simple correlations then suggest that frequency of contact has a stronger relationship with moral reasoning than the affect of the contact. Given the moderate correlation between frequency and affect of contact ($r=.57$), given that subjects with more frequent contact tended to have more positive contact, the results of the $t$ test may be due to higher frequency of contact versus the affect of that contact.

**Hypothesis Three**

People who have had positive close relationships with gay and lesbian people will exhibit a higher level of moral reasoning than those who have had distant relationships. Hypothesis Three is tested by a $t$ test between two groups: 1) subjects
who indicated they have had distant relationships with gay and lesbian people by marking one or two on the closeness of relationship scale; and 2) subjects who indicated they have had positive relationships with gay and lesbian people by marking four or five on the affect of relationship variable. Subjects who indicated positive but distant relationships were included in the distant relationship group. The results support hypothesis three (see Table 6). The mean moral reasoning level was higher for subjects who had positive relationships with gay and lesbian people than for subjects who had distant relationships.

Correlations were computed to further examine the relationship between moral reasoning and relationships with gay and lesbian people (see Table 5). The correlation between moral reasoning and closeness of relationships with gay and lesbian people is significant in the expected direction ($r=.26$). It suggests subjects who have had closer relationships with gay and lesbian people tended to exhibit a higher moral reasoning level. The correlation between moral reasoning and the affect of the relationships with gay and lesbian people is not significant ($r=.13$), suggesting how positive or negative the relationship is does not relate to moral reasoning level.

The data suggests that the closeness or distance of the relationship has a stronger correlation with moral reasoning than the affect of the relationship.

**Additional Analyses.** To further examine the relationships between moral reasoning, homophobia, contact and relationships with gay and lesbian people, a regression analysis was conducted. The dependent variable was homophobia, and the predictor variables were moral reasoning, frequency and affect of contact, and closeness and affect of relationships. Standardized regression analyses are reported so that the relative effects of the predictor variables can be compared.
Table 7 presents the regression analysis results. The model (with all five variables) is significant and indicates that all five variables taken together explain 75% of the variance in homophobia. The only parameters that were significant were the closeness of the relationship and the affect of the contact, both in the expected direction. The beta weight for closeness of relationship indicates that the closer the relationship with gay and lesbian people, the less homophobic the subject tended to be. The beta weight for affect of contact indicates that the more positive the contact with gay and lesbian people, the less homophobic the subject tended to be.

Given the large amount of variance accounted for by the model, the small number of significant parameters is likely due to multicollinearity, or the moderately high correlations between the predictors (see Tables 5 & 7). Given the multicollinearity, the beta weights should be interpreted with extreme caution. They suggest, however, that the closeness of the relationship with gay and lesbian people had the largest effect on homophobia, when considering all the variables.

To further explore the relationships, correlations were examined and found to partially support the results of the regression. As indicated earlier, the relationship between homophobia and moral reasoning is not significant ($r=-.11$). In addition to the closeness of relationship ($r=-.81$) and affect of contact ($r=-.77$) being significant and in the expected direction, affect of relationship ($r=-.80$) and frequency of contact ($r=-.65$) were significant and in the expected direction. These correlations suggest that subjects who had more positive relationships with gay and lesbian people tended to be less homophobic, and subjects who had more frequent contact with gay and lesbian people tended to be less homophobic.
The simple correlations also indicated that when the variables are considered separately, the closeness of relationships with gay and lesbian people had the strongest relationship with homophobia, followed by the affect of the relationship with the second strongest relationship. Undoubtedly, the correlation between closeness and affect of relationship obscured this relationship in the regression. Similarly, the frequency of contact is significant when considered by itself. (Affect of contact is third and frequency of contact is fourth strongest in their relationships with homophobia.)

To determine how much variance each variable explained in homophobia beyond other variables, hierarchical regressions were conducted (see Table 7). Hierarchical regression analyses consists of running regressions in stages, adding a variable or a set of variables at each stage, and comparing the variance explained (the R-squared) to the previous stage. The increase in the R-square above the previous stage can be attributed to variables added at that stage.

Moral reasoning alone explained 1% of the variance in homophobia and was not significant. Adding the contact variables (i.e. frequency and affect of contact) explained 69% more variance beyond moral reasoning, for a total of 70% explained variance. Adding the relationship variables (i.e., closeness and affect of relationship) explained 5.5% more variance beyond moral reasoning and contact, for a total of 75% of the explained variance.

To further explore the data, analysis was conducted separating out heterosexual subjects, and female and male subjects as sub-groups. This data is presented in Tables 9 through 13.

Table 9 presents correlational data among the primary variables of interest for the sub-sample of heterosexual subjects. When compared with the same data from the
sample as a whole, the only significant difference found, beyond moral reasoning and homophobia, was a significant relationship with moral reasoning and affect of relationship \( r = .23 \). This data suggests that when considered separately, a relationship does exist between moral reasoning and homophobia, and affect of relationship for heterosexual subjects. The remaining data did not change significantly or remarkably between the sub-group and the total sample.

The hierarchical regression for the heterosexual sub-sample (see Table 10), did not demonstrate a remarkable difference from the regression for the total sample. As previously reported, significance was found for moral reasoning and homophobia in this sub-group. In general, the model with all five variables accounted for 71% of the variance in homophobia, a change from 75% for the total sample. Examined separately, moral reasoning accounted for 7% of the variance, a change from 1% for the total sample. Moral reasoning and the contact variables accounted for an additional 61%, thus accounted for a total of 68% of the variance, a change from 70% for the total sample. The beta weights remained relatively consistent with those of the total sample on the variables that were significant in both samples.

Table 11 contains the results of the heterosexual sub-sample t-tests for hypotheses 2 and 3. This data is not remarkably different from that of the total sample. The mean moral reasoning scores were significantly higher for the heterosexual subjects who had positive contact and positive relationships with gay and lesbian people. This is consistent with the finding of the total sample.

Finally, correlations among the primary variables of interest were examined by the subject's sex (Table 12, Women's Sub-sample, and Table 13, Men's Sub-sample). There was no difference in the results from the sub-sample of women and the total
sample. However, the results from the sub-sample of men, did reveal a difference in the results for the variable of moral reasoning and the other variables. Although the size of the correlations were about the same as those for the women, the values were not significant for the men. These findings must be interpreted cautiously due to the low number of men in the study. A definite statement cannot be made. The findings may suggest that frequency of contact and closeness of relationship with gay and lesbian people may not have a relationship with moral reasoning for men.

As a result of these analyses, the data for the most part, will be presented from the results of the total sample, and not from the heterosexual or sex sub-samples.

Demographics and Variables of Interest

Homophobia

To verify relationships found in the previous research between homophobia and demographic variables, correlations were conducted between the IAH and the demographic variables. Results are presented in Table 8.

The only significant predictor of homophobia was sexual orientation. The means were in the expected direction, with homosexual and bisexual subjects reporting less homophobia. When the education variable was collapsed, the undergraduate vs graduate categories demonstrated significance with homophobia, with graduate students being less homophobic.

Moral Reasoning

Significant correlations were found between moral reasoning and age, educational status, educational level, and number of years in school beyond high-school. Subjects who have attained higher levels of moral reasoning tended to be older, be at a higher level of education, have spent more years in school, and be in
older, be at a higher level of education, have spent more years in school, and be in school part-time. (As noted earlier, these demographic variables all correlate with each other).

Contact and Relationship

Sexual orientation was the only variable that showed significant relationships with all four contact and relationship variables. Heterosexual subjects had less frequent contact, more negative contact, more distant relationships, and more negative relationships with gay and lesbian people.

The collapsed educational category variable showed significant relationships with the affect of contact, the closeness of the relationship, and the affect of the relationship. Graduate students tended to have more positive contact, closer relationships, and more positive relationships with gay and lesbian people than undergraduates.

Sex was significantly related to the affect of contact and the affect of relationships, showing that female subjects tended to be more positive about their contact and relationships with gay and lesbian people than were male subjects.

Family income was significantly related to the affect of contact, suggesting lower-income students were more positive toward gay and lesbian people.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The discussion is presented in three sections. First the study is summarized. Next, the results are discussed in terms of the hypotheses and demographic variables. Finally, implications and limitations of the study will be discussed, as well as suggestions for future research.

Summary

This study was designed to explore the relationship between moral reasoning and attitudes toward gay and lesbian people. The study's purpose was to determine if a relationship between these variables existed, and if moral reasoning could predict homophobia level. In addition, the study was designed to explore the possible relationship between level of contact and level of relationship with gay and lesbian people, as they relate to homophobia and moral reasoning. By further exploring these variables and examining data to determine if a relationship exists among these variables, a possible method for reducing prejudicial attitudes might be identified.

Subjects from three Ohio Universities, Wittenberg, Capital, and Ohio State, were recruited and volunteered to participate in the study. Volunteers completed an instrument packet which included a moral reasoning production measure titled the Sociomoral Reflection Measure-Short Form (SRM-SF), a likert type scale to measure homophobia titled the Index of Attitudes towards Homosexuals (IAH), two global experience measures titled the Global Assessment of Contact (GAC) and Global
Assessment of Relationship (GAR), and a demographic questionnaire. A total of 95 useable packets were returned.

Discussion of Results

Hypothesis One

People who have attained a higher level of moral reasoning will demonstrate more positive attitudes toward gay and lesbian people. The correlation was in the predicted direction, but not significant. As reported in Chapter IV, these findings suggest subjects who had more positive attitudes toward gay and lesbian people did not necessarily have higher moral reasoning levels. Several factors could have influenced these findings.

The original hypothesis did not consider sexual orientation, which did impact the findings. When sexual orientation was statistically factored, a significant moderately low correlation was found between moral reasoning and homophobia for heterosexual subjects. Evidence was found to support hypothesis one when the analysis was limited only to people who identified themselves as heterosexual.

Kurdek (1988) reports all subjects in his study "described themselves as exclusively heterosexual" (p. 730). The McDermott and Stadler (1988) study does not report any information regarding subject sexual orientation. Logically, sexual orientation may impact findings, because someone who is gay, lesbian, or bisexual is less likely to be homophobic. The current study found this to be true. Heterosexual subjects had a mean IAH score of 48.97, a score of 51 would have indicated low homophobia. Homosexual and bisexual subjects had a mean IAH score of 7.43, indicating high non-homophobia. At the same time, their non-homophobia may not be related to their level of moral reasoning. In other words, their reasoning and attitude
toward their "own group" does not necessarily reflect the mature reasoner's ability to penetrate "through superficial or extrinsic considerations to infer the bases of interpersonal relationships (Stage 3) or society (Stage 4)" (p. 25, Gibbs, et al. 1992).

Finding that heterosexuals with higher moral reasoning levels demonstrate more positive attitudes toward gay and lesbian people, is consistent with Kurdek's (1988) research. The McDermott and Stadler (1988) study found the same relationship but did not identify the sexual orientation of the subjects.

In the present study, the correlation is not as strong as in the previous two studies. As discussed, one factor that may account for the difference between this study and McDermott and Stadler is sexual orientation. A second factor which may account for this difference is the number of non-homophobic subjects in the present study (70%). This sample had a mean score of 44 on the IAH. McDermott and Stadler report a mean score of 72.3 on the IAH for their college student sample. Kurdek (1988) used a different instrument to measure homophobia in college students, Negative Attitudes Toward Homosexuals, and reported results, "clearly toward the negative end" (p. 732), i.e., homophobic responses with a mean of 131.27 (SD=31.48) out of a total score of 200.

A third factor may account for the low correlation between homophobia and moral reasoning was the limited range of moral reasoning scores obtained from this sample. Gibbs et al. (1992) only reported means for the SRM-SF, not standard deviations. As a result it is not known if these findings reflect a restricted range. If a range restriction does exist, the results could be attenuated.

Similarly, limited variability on moral reasoning and homophobia scales may explain the moderately low correlation in support of hypothesis one. In other words,
since 70% of the sample scored as non-homophobic and 65% had a moral reasoning level scored at Stage 3/4 or above, the sample may not have provided sufficient score variability to determine if a stronger correlation exists. However, since the sample is skewed in both non-homophobic and mature moral reasoning level direction, more research is required to determine the correlation's strength supporting hypothesis one.

A fourth factor may account for the difference in the correlation's strength. Different instruments were used to measure moral reasoning in this research and the two prior studies. Both of the previous studies used the DIT, a recognition measure developed by Rest (1983). The current study used the SRM-SF, a production measure developed by Gibbs et al. (1992). As discussed in Chapter II, the SRM-SF uses a 4 Stage development model. The DIT uses a 6 stage model. Although the 6 stage model provides for less restricted range of scores than the 4 stage model, the SRM-SF addresses the inherent disadvantages in recognition measures. Production measures have the advantage of making subjects produce reasoning statements, rather than rely on recognition, reading, or prescribed and sometimes sophisticated reasoning justification evaluation. This contradistinction may account for low correlation found in this study.

In summary, for the total sample, no correlation was found between moral reasoning and homophobia. However, the sample seemed biased with an unusually low number of homophobic scores and a relatively large number of high moral reasoning scores. For heterosexual subjects only, a correlation exists between moral reasoning and homophobia. This finding was consistent with moral reasoning theory and supports previous research. Although the gay and lesbian subjects were not homophobic, they still represented the moral reasoning score range.
Hypothesis Two

People who have had known positive contact with gay and lesbian people will exhibit a higher moral reasoning level than those who have had no known contact with gay and lesbian people. The t-test supported hypothesis two.

To further examine this relationship, the correlation between moral reasoning and frequency of contact was examined and found to be significant in the expected positive direction. The findings suggested subjects who had more frequent known contact with gay and lesbian people attained a higher moral reasoning level.

When the correlation between moral reasoning and affect of contact was examined, it was not significant. This suggested positive or negative contact is not related to moral reasoning level, independent from frequency of contact. Further, the correlations from this study suggest frequency of contact has a stronger relationship with moral reasoning than affect of contact. The correlation supports that the t-test results were related to frequency of contact and not affect of contact.

The above finding is supportive of research presented by McDermott and Stadler, (1988) which reports: "lower scores on the homophobia index are related to more frequent contact with homosexuals and higher levels of moral reasoning" (p. 67). The study by Kurdek did not examine contact or relationships variables.

These finding are consistent with other research targeting minorities, such as Barnard and Benn's (1987) research, which found contact itself to be the variable which influences attitudes. Barnard and Benn investigated the effect of shared beliefs on prejudicial attitude reduction in interracial contact settings. Naive subjects, all white males, participated in two discussion groups consisting of five male confederates (three black and two white). The confederates were instructed, on a predetermined
basis, to either agree or disagree with the subject while discussing current topics.

Overall prejudice toward blacks was measured with a pretest and post-tests immediately after the discussion sessions and again in six weeks.

Although the researchers expected to find greater prejudice reduction and more positive perceptions in groups where conditions of similar as opposed to dissimilar beliefs were promoted, "Prejudice reduction was evident for all interracial discussion groups, regardless of the degree of agreement with other group members on a series of discussion topics" (p. 132).

In summary, in addition to data supporting hypothesis two, further analysis offered evidence which suggested the contact did not have to be positive for subjects to exhibit higher moral reasoning scores. The finding that frequency of contact, not the affect of contact, is the more significant variable is consistent with previous research.

**Hypothesis Three**

People who have had positive close relationships with gay and lesbian people will exhibit a higher level of moral reasoning than those who have had distant relationships. The results of the t-test supported hypothesis three. However, the correlation computed to further examine relationship closeness and moral reasoning also yielded significant results and in the expected direction. This suggested subjects who have had closer relationships with gay and lesbian people tended to exhibit a higher moral reasoning level. When looking at the correlation between moral reasoning and affect of the relationship, the correlation was not significant. How positive or negative the relationship was did not significantly impact moral reasoning level. Rather, the data suggested that closeness of relationship had the stronger correlation. These findings indicated the t-test results were probably based on the
closeness of relationship as the important variable, rather than the affect regarding the relationship.

In conclusion, at this level of analysis, it was found that relationship was the important variable. How positive, negative or neutral one perceives the relationship is not significant.

Further Analyses

Using additional analyses, the relationships between moral reasoning, contact, and relationship (predictor variables) and homophobia (dependent variable) were examined. The hierarchical regression results revealed that when taken together, the predictor variables account for 75% of the variance in homophobia. Moral reasoning only accounted for 1% total variance. The regression data indicated closeness of relationship and affect of contact were the significant predictors of homophobia.

Correlations calculated to further understand these relationships supported the findings of the regression. However, the correctional data also indicated significance for the variables of affect of relationship and frequency of contact. When considering the variables separately, the simple correlations revealed closeness of relationship had the strongest relationship with homophobia, followed by affect of relationship, affect of contact and finally frequency of contact.

This finding supports rejecting hypothesis one. Moral reasoning in the context of the other variables is not an effective predictor of homophobic attitudes. Only when considered separately and for heterosexual subjects could a significant relationship between moral reasoning and homophobia be found. This is not practical in a real world setting. Rather, it appears that attitudes are influenced by contact and relationships. Thus the findings of this study do not support moral reasoning as a
method to reduce homophobia or prejudicial attitudes. However, as previously discussed, the subject sample for this study appeared biased. Additional research is needed to further explore the relationship between moral reasoning and attitudes.

**Demographic Variables**

An attempt was made to obtain a representative sample of college students. Analysis of the demographic variables revealed that the sample population was mostly single, white, heterosexual, full-time, undergraduate, and female. The majority worked part-time and reported a family income of $40,000.00 or above. The mean age was 27, with a range of 17 to 54 years old. More than half of the subjects grew up protestant and just under half still consider themselves protestant.

Analysis among demographic variables found significant, moderate, positive relationships with age, educational status and level, as well as years in school beyond high school. As expected, older students tended to be in school part-time, had obtained a higher level of education, and had been in school more years. An unexpected finding was that homosexual and bisexual subjects tended to have a slightly higher education level than their counterparts. No research was found reporting a similar finding.

Expected relationships were found with demographic variables and the primary variables of interest. A significant positive relationship was found with non-homophobia and a sexual orientation of homosexual and bisexual. It was also found that graduate students tended to be less homophobic than undergraduate students. Sex was significantly related to affect of contact and affect of relationship. Women tended to be more positive. Further, the high number of women in the study may have had an impact on the IAH scores and may offer a possible explanation for the high
number of subjects who scored as non-homophobic. Kite (1984) reports women tend to be less homophobic than men. Therefore, the high number of women in the study may contribute to the low number of homophobia scores. Furthermore, having a majority of women subjects and a low number of homophobic subjects could have obscured a relationship with homophobia and moral reasoning. Additional research is required to investigate these possibilities.

Significant correlations were found with moral reasoning and the age and education variables. This finding is consistent with moral reasoning theory and research (Darley and Shultz, 1990).

As expected, the contact and relationship variables showed a significant relationship with sexual orientation. Heterosexual subjects had less frequent, more negative contact and more distant, negative relationships with gay and lesbian people. The results also indicated graduate students tend to have more positive contact, and closer, more positive relationships with gay and lesbian people than undergraduates. More research is required to understand the dynamics of these relationships.

Finally, results indicate subjects who reported lower-incomes were more positive. It would be interesting to investigate this finding further. A possible relationship could exist between lower-income and a variety of variables, such as non-traditional values, sex roles, liberalism, or definition of family. In turn, these variables could explain additional variance in homophobic attitudes and possibly relate to moral reasoning.

Implications and Limitations

**Implications**

This research does not support the premise that prejudice and attitudes are affected in a positive direction by moral reasoning level. Contact and relationship,
however, do appear to have a significant impact on homophobia. More research is needed to clarify moral reasoning's role and its influence on prejudice reduction and attitude change.

Taken together, the moral reasoning, contact, and relationship variables accounted for 75% of the variance regarding an individual's homophobia level. Thus, a strategy for developing programs to reduce prejudice and change attitudes should take into account these variables, focusing on contact and relationship, since moral reasoning only accounted for 1% of the variance. Supplementary research is indicated to account for additional variance.

This study's results offer evidence indicating the most effective way to reduce homophobia would be to include openly gay and lesbian people in programs, workshops, classes, etc. designed for this purpose. The results also indicate people who "know", either by contact or relationship, someone who is gay or lesbian are impacted by the contact or relationship. Therefore, these findings promote support for gay and lesbian people who are "out" as a method of influencing attitude change among people that "know" them. Research by Bouton, Gallaher, Garlinghouse, Leal, Rosenstein and Young (1989) supports the findings that contact results in lowered homophobia scores. Barnard and Benn (1987) provide research demonstrating contact reduces prejudicial attitudes among whites toward blacks. The findings of Barnard and Benn (1987) and Bouton et al. (1989) support the premise that contact contributes to positive attitude change. Additional research needs to be designed to further examine the contact variable to determine if exposure through a variety of media (indirect contact) has the same effect as direct contact. Support for education as a method of
providing "indirect contact" as a related variable can be inferred from previous research.

Stevenson (1988) provides a review of thirteen studies designed to increase tolerance for homosexuality. The analysis of these studies suggest courses designed to reduce homophobia were generally successful. These findings are in agreement with Watter's (1987) earlier report. Watter reviewed teaching strategies and generally found classes designed to reduce homophobia were successful.

A common thread to these programs and research might be "exposure" to the targeted group for which attitude change is desired. Possibly, exposure is a key variable affecting attitudes, with contact and relationship being components of this variable. Further research is needed to determine if additional variance can be accounted for by other types of "exposure".

**Limitations**

In an attempt to obtain a representative sample, the present study was an investigation conducted at three Ohio universities. However, external validity and generalizability are unclear. In addition, the results of this study are limited to relationships and should not be interpreted to imply causality. The subject population was comprised of 90% white, 73% female, and 64% undergraduate subjects. In addition, 70% of the subject population scored as non-homophobic.

The above data is not consistent with expected scores and previous research. Therefore, these findings probably represent a sampling error. University demographics, from which the sample was drawn, are not skewed with such high percentages of female students. Further, the intent of the research was to have a more representative sample of non-white and graduate subjects. Future research
would need to correct this design error. Similarly, previous research reporting college campuses' homophobia scores, found a homophobic population (Henley and Pincus, 1978; Kurdek, 1988; McDermott and Stadler, 1988).

Since it appears the population studied does not reflect the actual student population, a bias exists in the sample. The bias could have affected the study's outcome. For example, as a result of the large number of women in the study, homophobia scores may have been lower. In previous research women have been found to be less homophobic (Bouton, et al. 1989; Kite, 1984; MacDonald, Huggins, Young and Swanson, 1973). A sample that includes more men could result in more homophobic scores, and may find a relationship with moral reasoning and homophobia.

The sample may be expanded to include younger subjects. Inclusion of younger subjects may help to find a wider range of moral reasoning scores. In the current study a limited range was found, all subjects scoring in the Stage 3 or Stage 4 range. This restricted range could impact correlations with moral reasoning and homophobia.

One possible reason for the biased sample could be the classes the subjects were drawn from. The students were all enrolled in social science classes (ie. sociology, counseling etc.). A second reason may explain the sample bias. Subjects may have self selected in or out of the study. Subjects who were less homophobic would agree to participate. Those who were more homophobic would decide not to participate.

Another limitation of the study is the inability to compare findings from the SRM-SF with other studies. The SRM-SF is a new instrument. There is no published research on or using the instrument beyond what the authors provide. The study's
findings can only be compared with studies using other moral reasoning measures. As more research is conducted using this new instrument, additional comparisons will be available.

The IAH has been used repetitively in previous studies to measure homophobia, and has been shown to demonstrate good reliability and validity. However, the instrument has limitations. It is obvious in what it measures. Thus, the IAH is easily answered in a direction yielding a "politically correct" response set. The IAH also appears geared toward heterosexual subjects and therefore may not be an accurate measure of homophobia measure in gay and lesbian subjects. An example from the IAH to demonstrate this point is item 17. "I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my spouse or partner was attracted to members of his or her sex." For gay and lesbian subjects, agreement with this statement may measure jealousy or insecurity rather than homophobia.

Future research may explore moral reasoning in the gay and lesbian community, using homophobia measures designed for this population. Another approach would be to use measures designed to measure other "isms" gay and lesbian people might have. The assumption being that those who have attained a higher moral reasoning level would have less "isms" than those with lower moral reasoning levels. Research targeting this population, or any other special population, may find additional support to determine the role of moral reasoning on attitudes.
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Dear Colleague:

Keith Oliver is a Ph.D. candidate under my advisement in the Counselor Education program of the Department of Educational Services and Research. As a Full Professor, and his advisor, I am the principle investigator for his Research. He is currently beginning the process of data collection for his dissertation. The focus of Keith's research is a correlational study of attitudes and Moral Reasoning. The subjects for his study will be undergraduate and graduate students who will be asked to complete the following:

1. A demographic questionnaire
2. The Sociomoral Reflection Measure-Short Form (SRM-SF)
3. The Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals (IAH)
4. A Global Assessment of Contact and Relationship Measure (GAC/GAR)

The instrument packet will take approximately 40-60 minutes to complete. Responses will be anonymous and therefore confidential. Approximately 100 subjects are needed to complete this study.

Keith would like to come to your class to secure voluntary participation for this study. For those who do volunteer, Keith requests that they complete the instrumentation packet during their own time and return the packet the following class period at which time Keith will collect the packet.

Your cooperation in allowing Keith to come to your class to secure volunteers is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact either me (292-8936) or Keith (841-0598). Keith will be contacting you in the near future to determine your willingness to participate in this study and to arrange a time to visit your class.

Thank You!

Sincerely,

Donald J. Tosi, Ph.D.

DT/jm
APPENDIX B

WRITTEN SCRIPT TO CLASSES
Dear Potential Volunteer:

For my doctoral dissertation I am conducting a study on attitudes. My Advisor and the principle investigator for this study is Dr. Donald Tosi, a full professor in the Department of Educational Services and Research, Counselor Education Program. Attitudes are shaped and affected by a variety of variables. This study is designed to contribute to the understanding of what key variables influence attitudes.

Participants will be asked to do the following:

1. Complete a demographic questionnaire.
2. Respond to a short answer instrument, titled the Sociomoral Reflection Measure-Short Form.
3. Complete an agree/disagree questionnaire (on a scale of 1-5), titled the Index of Attitudes towards Homosexuals.
4. Respond to two (2) global experience measures, titled the Global Assessment of Relationship the Global Assessment of Contact.

Your response to the above will be kept confidential and anonymous. Each packet is coded so that the responses can be kept together. Your name or other identity information is not included with the packet. Please, do not put your name on any part of the packet.

Your participation or non-participation will have no effect on your classwork or grade.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. You have the option to withdraw from the study at anytime. Any questions you may have about the specifics of this research will be answered by the researcher, and results can be obtained upon request upon completion of the study.

I hope you will consider participating in this study.

Thank you.

Keith Oliver
Doctoral Candidate
INSTRUCTIONS

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my doctoral dissertation research. The packet in front of you contains the instrumentation selected for this study. Once you have finished reading this brief information, you can begin completing the instruments. For each instrument, it is important that you follow the instructions and provide a response to each and every item.

Please complete the entire packet at one time. Do not do one instrument, stop and do another at some later time. It will take you no longer than one hour to complete the packet.

If you need to change a response, please erase your original response completely, so that I know which is your final response.

One of the instruments ask that you provide a brief written response. When writing your response, please make sure it is legible.

Please use a pencil when completing this packet. Do not put your name on any part of this packet or its contents.

Bring the completed packet to your next scheduled class, and I will collect it from you. If you decide not to complete the packet - please return it anyway. Thank-you for your cooperation and consideration.

Any questions? Please, feel free to call me.

   Home 469-4696
   Office 841-0598
APPENDIX D

DEMOGRAPHICS
DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Date of birth: / / 
For questions 2-13, please check the appropriate response.

2. Sex:
   (1). Female
   (2). Male

3. Ethnic background:
   (1). Afro-american
   (2). Hispanic
   (3). American indian
   (4). Asian
   (5). Caucasian
   (6). Other
   (indicate) ___________________

4. Religious background growing-up:
   in what religion were you raised?
   (1). Catholic
   (2). Protestant
   (3). Jewish
   (4). None
   (5). Other
   (indicate) ___________________

5. Religious background current:
   what is your current religion?
   (1). Catholic
   (2). Protestant
   (3). Jewish
   (4). None
   (5). Other
   (indicate) ___________________

6. Educational status:
   (1). Full-time student
   (2). Part-time student

7. Year in school:
   (1). Freshman level
   (2). Sophomore level
   (3). Junior level
   (4). Senior level
   (5). Masters level
   (6). PhD level
   (7). Other
   (indicate) ___________________

8. Number of years in school beyond high school.
   __________

9. Occupational status:
   (1). Employed full-time
   (2). Employed part-time
   (3). Unemployed--if unemployed, skip 10 and go to 11

10. Occupation:
    (1). Homemaker
    (2). Manual
    (3). Clerical
    (4). Professional
    (5). University assistantship
    (6). Work study
    (7). Other
    (indicate) ___________________

11. Family income level:
    (1). Under $5,000
    (2). $5,000-9,000
    (3). $10,000-19,000
    (4). $20,000-29,999
    (5). $30,000-39,999
    (6). $40,000 and above

12. Relationship status:
    (1). Married
    (2). Separated
    (3). Divorced
    (4). Widowed
    (5). Partnered
    (6). Single

13. Sexual orientation:
    (1). Heterosexual
    (2). Homosexual
    (3). Bisexual

(code #: __________)
APPENDIX E

SRM-SF
Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

83-87,
89-90

University Microfilms International
APPENDIX G

GAC
GLOBAL ASSESSMENT OF CONTACT

Below is a set of statements to assess your global level of contact with gay and lesbian people. Please circle a number between 1 and 5 that best describes your global level of contact with this group. There are no right or wrong responses and it is most important you honestly assess your unique global level of contact.

5  I have (or have had) very frequent contact with a person(s) who is gay or lesbian. My contact ranges from daily to at least once a week.

4  I have (or have had) frequent contact with a person(s) who is gay or lesbian. My contact ranges from almost weekly to at least once a month.

3  I have (or have had) infrequent contact with someone who is gay or lesbian. My contact ranges from less than once a month to several times a year.

2  I have (or have had) very infrequent contact with a person(s) who is gay or lesbian. My contact ranges from at least once a year to at least once every couple of years.

1  I have (or have had) practically no contact, or no contact with a person(s) who is gay or lesbian. My contact ranges from once every few years to no contact whatsoever.

Please circle the number which best describes your global level of contact with gay and lesbian people.

1  Very Negative
2  Somewhat Negative
3  Neither Positive nor Negative
4  Somewhat Positive
5  Very Positive

(code #: _____________)
GLOBAL ASSESSMENT OF RELATIONSHIP

Below is a set of statements to assess your global level of relationship(s) with gay and lesbian people. Please circle a number between 1 and 5 that best describes your global level of relationship(s) with this group. There are no right or wrong responses and it is most important you honestly assess your unique level of relationship.

5 I have (or have had) a very close relationship with a person(s) who is gay or gay lesbian. This relationship receives from about most of my relationship time to about an equal amount of my relationship time.

4 I have (or have had) a close relationship with a person(s) who is gay or lesbian. We participate in social or professional activities (ie. a group social activity, or work on a school project together). This person(s) is someone I seek out for other social or professional activities.

3 I have (or have had) a casual relationship with a person(s) who is or gay lesbian. We have interacted when our paths have crossed but do not initiate activities together.

2 I have (or have had) a distant relationship with a person(s) who is gay or lesbian. If we speak it is only to exchange greetings and/or pleasantries.

1 I have (or have had) a very distant relationship with someone who is gay or lesbian. This relationship ranges from non-verbal acknowledgment to referencing a third person in conversation as gay or lesbian.

Please circle the number which best describes your global level of relationship with gay and lesbian people.

1 Very Negative
2 Somewhat Negative
3 Neither Positive nor Negative
4 Somewhat Positive
5 Very Positive

(code #:  )
### Table 1

#### Percentages for Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex (N=94)</th>
<th>Occupational Status (N=94)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73%</td>
<td>part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic (N=94)</th>
<th>Occupation (N=70)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>afro-american</td>
<td>homemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asian</td>
<td>manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caucasian</td>
<td>clerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>university assistantship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>work study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past religion (N=94)</th>
<th>Family Income (N=89)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>catholic</td>
<td>under $5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protestant</td>
<td>$5000-9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jewish</td>
<td>$10,000-19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>$20,000-29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>$30,000-39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current religion (N=93)</th>
<th>Relationship Status (N=94)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>catholic</td>
<td>married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protestant</td>
<td>divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jewish</td>
<td>widowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>partnered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational status (N=94)</th>
<th>Sexual Orientation (N=94)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>full-time</td>
<td>heterosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part-time</td>
<td>homosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bisexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational level (N=94)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sophomore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding error.
Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges for Continuous Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26.57</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>17 - 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in School (beyond high school)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1 - 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Reasoning</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>336.78</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>264 - 388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward homosexuals</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>44.18</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>0 - 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Contact</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect of Contact</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness of Relationship</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect of Relationship</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

**Intercorrelations of Demographic Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Ethnic</th>
<th>Educational Status</th>
<th>Educational Level I</th>
<th>Educational Level II</th>
<th>Years in School</th>
<th>Family Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Status</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(full-time vs part-time)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continuous)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(undergraduate vs graduate)</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(beyond high school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(heterosexual vs homosexual)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Ns range from 86 to 94.

* p < .05, ** p < .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Contact (N=85)</th>
<th>Affect of Relationship (N=88)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>practically no contact</td>
<td>very negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very infrequent</td>
<td>somewhat negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrequent</td>
<td>neither positive nor negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequent</td>
<td>somewhat positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very frequent</td>
<td>very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect of Contact (N=90)</th>
<th>Stage of Moral Reasoning (N=91)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very negative</td>
<td>stage 3/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat negative</td>
<td>stage 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither positive nor negative</td>
<td>stage 3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat positive</td>
<td>stage 4/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very positive</td>
<td>stage 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closeness of Relationship (N=85)</th>
<th>Attitude toward Homosexuals (N=95)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very distant</td>
<td>0-25 high grade-non homophobic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distant</td>
<td>25-50 low grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causal</td>
<td>51-75 low grade homophbic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close</td>
<td>76-100 high grade homophbic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5  
**Intercorrelations among Primary Variables of Interest (Total Sample)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moral Reasoning</th>
<th>Attitude toward Homosexuals</th>
<th>Frequency of Contact</th>
<th>Affect of Contact</th>
<th>Closeness of Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward Homosexuals</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Contact</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.65**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect of Contact</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.77**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness of Relationship</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-.81**</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect of Relationship</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.80**</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ns range from 79 to 95.
* p < .05, ** p < .01
Table 6

$t$ tests for Hypothesis Two and Hypothesis Three (Total Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no or very unfrequent contact group</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>311.50</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>-3.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive contact group</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>338.86</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis Three</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distant relationship</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>324.70</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>-2.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive relationship</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>340.14</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$
Table 7

Hierarchical Regressions on Attitude Toward Homosexuals (Total Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$ (df)</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>Beta Weights</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>moral reasoning</td>
<td>frequency of contact</td>
<td>affect of contact</td>
<td>closeness of relationship</td>
<td>affect of relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moral reasoning</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.1 (1,89)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moral reasoning, contact</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>57.0 (3,74)**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.64**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moral reasoning, contact, and</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>43.2 (5,71)**</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$
Table 8

Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Primary Variables of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moral Reasoning</th>
<th>Attitude toward Homosexuals</th>
<th>Frequency of Contact</th>
<th>Affect of Contact</th>
<th>Closeness of Relationship</th>
<th>Affect of Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic (white vs non-white)</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Status (full-time vs part-time)</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level I</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level II (undergraduate vs graduate)</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in School (beyond high school)</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation (heterosexual vs homosexual)</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ns range from 84 to 94. * p < .05, ** p < .01
Table 9

Intercorrelations among Primary Variables of Interest (Heterosexual Sub-sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moral Reasoning</th>
<th>Attitude toward Homosexuals</th>
<th>Frequency of Contact</th>
<th>Affect of Contact</th>
<th>Closeness of Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward Homosexuals</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Contact</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-.63**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect of Contact</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.75**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness of Relationship</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-.77**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect of Relationship</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>-.78**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ns range from 73 to 82.
* p < .05, ** p < .01
Table 10

Hierarchical Regressions on Attitude Toward Homosexuals (Heterosexual Sub-sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$ (df)</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>Beta Weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>moral reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moral reasoning</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>6.0 (1,78)*</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>frequency of contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moral reasoning, contact</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>44.6 (3,64)**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>affect of contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moral reasoning, contact, and relationship</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>30.5 (5,62)**</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>closeness of relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>affect of relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$
Table 11

$t$ tests for Hypothesis Two and Hypothesis Three (Heterosexual Sub-sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no or very unfrequent contact group</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>306.64</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>-4.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive contact group</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>342.39</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis Three</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distant relationship</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>322.86</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>-3.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive relationship</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>343.20</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moral Reasoning</th>
<th>Attitude toward Homosexuals</th>
<th>Frequency of Contact</th>
<th>Affect of Contact</th>
<th>Closeness of Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward Homosexuals</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Contact</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>-.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect of Contact</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.75**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness of Relationship</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>-.79**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect of Relationship</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.73**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ns range from 62 to 69.
* p < .05, ** p < .01
### Table 13

**Intercorrelations among Primary Variables of Interest (Men Sub-sample)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moral Reasoning</th>
<th>Attitude toward Homosexuals</th>
<th>Frequency of Contact</th>
<th>Affect of Contact</th>
<th>Closeness of Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward Homosexuals</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Contact</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.63**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect of Contact</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.73**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness of Relationship</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.82**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect of Relationship</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.90**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Ns range from 22 to 25.

* * .05, ** * .01