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ABSTRACT

Results of prior social psychological research have shown that affect-based attitudes are more effectively changed by affective versus cognition-based persuasive appeals. Previous research also suggests a strong affective component to attitudes toward gay and lesbian people. This study tested the hypothesis that an affect-based persuasive appeal would be more effective in modifying anti-gay attitudes than cognition-based persuasion. Balanced numbers of male and female college students (N=246) were randomly assigned to one of three groups and read persuasive material that was either affect-based, cognition-based, or irrelevant to gay and lesbian issues. Depending on the group assignment, subjects read about either lesbian women or gay men. Results indicated that participants in both the affect-based and cognition-based conditions expressed a greater increase in support for gay and lesbian people than participants in the control condition. Contrary to the hypothesis, affect-based persuasion was not more effective in changing attitudes toward gay and lesbian people than cognition-based persuasion. Women showed a significantly greater increase in support for changes benefiting gay and lesbian people than men. Men and women did not differ significantly in their level of support for either lesbian women or gay men.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

An annual survey conducted by the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force showed a 31% increase in anti-gay violence and harassment between 1990 and 1991 in large cities across the U.S. (National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, 1991). A recent Newsweek poll showed that 53% of Americans still do not consider homosexuality to be acceptable, and 45% saw gay and lesbian civil rights as a threat to the American family and its values (Newsweek, September 14, 1992). It is clear that gay and lesbian people suffer undeserved violence and discrimination simply based on who they are attracted to in this society. Attitudes of many Americans remain negative even after over 25 years since the Stonewall uprising, an event that has traditionally come to be seen as the beginning of the homosexual civil rights movement. A number of studies have been conducted over the past 20 years that investigated heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay and lesbian people in order to better understand the reasoning and functions behind these attitudes. Progress has been made in the area of instrument development and a greater understanding of the correlates related to negative attitudes toward gay and lesbian people has been achieved, but little research has looked specifically at attitude change towards lesbians and gay men.

Because these studies reflect psychology's initial attempt to identify and understand negative attitudes toward gay and lesbian people, much of the research has emphasized the measurement of prejudice rather than attitude change and how tolerance can best be promoted. Few attempts have been made to evaluate the strategies for
increasing tolerance toward homosexuality. Stevenson (1988), in a review of the literature, located only 13 studies which focused on attitude change, and a vast majority of these focused primarily on college students. Intervention strategies have included courses on human sexuality, brief seminars emphasizing homosexuality, and units on homosexuality in other related courses. Results suggest that students who complete human sexuality courses that focus on homosexuality become less fearful of contact with gay and lesbian people, more tolerant of homosexuality in social roles, and more tolerant of homosexual behavior, although the extent and duration of these changes may be limited (Stevenson, 1988).

Unfortunately, most people will never have the desire nor the opportunity to enroll in such courses, and attempts to promote tolerance in the general public have not been evaluated. Since little is known about what specific components of educational courses contribute to an increased level of tolerance towards gay and lesbian people, it is difficult to design interventions for the public at large. Though a large body of social psychological literature addresses the domain of attitude formation and change, little has been directly applied to attitudes pertaining to gay men and lesbian women. Fortunately, relatively recent studies by Edwards (1990) and Edwards and von Hippel (1995) have particular implications for research into attitude change towards gay and lesbian people. Edwards (1990) and Edwards and von Hippel (1995) differentiated between affect-based and cognition-based attitudes and hypothesized that the effectiveness of reason and emotion in persuasion depends on the nature of an attitude's origin.

The distinction between the affective and cognitive components of attitudes has a long history in the literature and has been empirically validated using a number of techniques (Breckler & Wiggins, 1989; Ostrom, 1969). The affective component of attitudes has traditionally included emotions, feelings, or drives connected with an attitude object, while the cognitive component has included beliefs, judgments, or
thoughts associated with an attitude object (Katz, 1960). Some theorists view the affective component of attitude as a postcognitive phenomenon, occurring only after a cognitive process has occurred (e.g. Ajzen & Fishbein, 1975). For example, when someone is listening to a joke, affect is usually expressed through laughter and occurs at the end of the punch line. However, this need not imply that cognition is a necessary component of affect. Zajonc (1980) made a strong argument for the view that affect can precede, and at times, function autonomously from, cognition. An implication of Zajonc’s view is that attitudes with affective origins may be less influenced by attempts that rely on rational arguments and, conversely, may be more responsive to persuasive appeals based on affect. In order to test this hypothesis, Edwards (1990) and Edwards and von Hippel (1995) attempted to create both affect- and cognition-based attitudes in the laboratory. This approach was used because Edwards questioned the ability to determine the cognitive and affective basis of existing attitudes in subjects.

As predicted, an analysis of variance indicated that affective means of persuasion were more successful than cognitive means of persuasion in modifying affect-based attitudes. Cognition-based attitudes, however, showed equivalent change under both forms of persuasion. Edwards (1990) acknowledged that though it may be helpful to delineate affect- from cognition-based attitudes, it is likely that the influence of cognition and affect on the attitude formation process may not be as separable and distinct as the theory suggests: “In reality, attitudes may be positioned along a continuum according to the primacy and relative contribution of affect and cognition in their development” (p.204).

Though attitudes are most often assumed to contain both affective and cognitive “sources,” Zanna and Rempel (1988) have argued, similarly to Zajonc, that attitudes may be more or less determined by affective than cognitive sources depending on the target stimuli. Although recent work has begun to investigate the joint roles of cognition
and affect in the area of intergroup attitudes (Stangor, Sullivan, & Ford, 1991), there has been little interest in assessing the impact of feelings and cognitions as determinants of prejudicial attitudes toward minority groups. In contrast to this trend, Stangor et al. (1991) hypothesized that affect would be expected to be more important as a determinant of negative attitudes toward various minority groups than would cognitions.

Stangor et al. (1991) cited two theoretical reasons to support their hypothesis. First, affective responses are based on direct and therefore highly self-relevant experiences with target group members, whereas stereotypes may often be acquired from secondary sources. Fazio, Powell, and Herr (1983) have shown that direct and self-relevant experiences produce stronger attitudinal responses in comparison to indirect experiences. Based on this finding, one would expect that affect would be the stronger determinant of attitude than cognitions. Second, it has been assumed in many traditional models of stereotyping that stereotypes (cognitions) serve as rationalizations for the negative attitude toward a group (Harding, Proshansky, Kutner, & Chein, 1969). Because stereotypes are learned from secondary sources and develop later to rationalize the attitude, stereotypes may not be as powerful a determinant of attitude as affect.

Stangor et al. (1991) found in their study that emotional responses to the target groups (including homosexuals) accounted for a substantial proportion of the variance in attitude toward and social distance from the groups and were generally better and more consistent predictors of attitude than either of the cognitive measures employed. Additionally, Jackson and Sullivan (1989) used gay men and male heterosexuals as stimulus objects in order to examine the contribution of cognition and affect on the evaluation of stereotyped group members. Results indicated that though both affect and cognition predicted evaluations of gay men, affect was the stronger predictor.

In the case of attitudes toward gay and lesbian people, it is common for people to have both strong feelings about homosexuality as well as a number of stereotyped beliefs
or misinformation. However, based on the aforementioned findings, it is suggested that
the affective response "drives" the attitudinal response, which is then supported and
maintained by the cognitive component (oftentimes negative stereotypes and
misinformation). Assuming the premise is true that attitudes toward gay and lesbian
people are predominantly comprised of an affectively driven component, one would
expect to find results similar to those of Edwards (1990) and Edwards and von Hippel
(1995) when attitude change towards gay men and lesbians is attempted. Stated simply,
this research is designed to test the proposition that an affective route of persuasion will
be more effective in changing negative attitudes towards gay and lesbian people than will
an approach utilizing cognition-based persuasion.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Three main issues will be addressed in this literature review. First, in order to give the reader an understanding of the current state and need for theory driven research, a description and evaluation of studies investigating attitude change towards gay and lesbian people is provided. Second, a brief discussion of the differentiation between affect-based and cognition-based attitudes is presented so that the basis for Edwards' (1990) attitude change theory can be established. The implications this approach has for research on the process of attitude change towards gay and lesbian people are also included. Third, evidence of a strong affective basis for attitudes toward gay and lesbian people is discussed in order to substantiate the rationale for the hypothesis that attitudes toward gay and lesbian people will be more influenced by affect-based appeals versus cognition-based persuasion.

Studies of Attitude Change Toward Gay and Lesbian People

A review of studies examining attitude change towards gays and lesbian people shows that attitudes can be changed through education (Croteau & Kusek, 1992; Stevenson, 1988). With few exceptions, most of this data has been gathered from college students enrolled in courses focused on issues related to human sexuality. Though the feasibility of introducing such interventions to the public at large is questionable, success in changing attitudes within the classroom is evident. Generally, students who have completed these courses become more open to knowing and accepting gay and lesbian people as a part of this society.
Unfortunately, several significant methodological issues exist which weaken such a conclusion. One of the most serious issues concerns the lack of specificity in treatment variables. Oftentimes classroom interventions may consist of several separate components such as lecture and discussion, audio-visual materials, assigned reading, and speaker panels, etc. The available data do not indicate which specific components promote attitude change, nor do the data indicate which components are more effective in changing attitudes in comparison with others (Croteau & Kusek, 1992). Typically, almost no detail is offered to explain the content of the intervention components which adds to the difficulty of any further replication. As a net result, in examining attitude change interventions, it often becomes impossible to partial out the effects of one type of presentation from others designed to induce tolerance towards gay and lesbian people.

Another significant limitation pertains to the internal validity of many of these studies. In some studies, “no treatment” controls have not been used (Cerny & Polyson, 1984; Martin, 1983; Morin, 1974; Taylor, 1982; Wells, 1991). Frequently, completed studies were quasi-experimental in nature using preexisting groups as controls, such as psychology students not enrolled in human sexuality courses (Anderson, 1981; Gilliland, Fong, & Hughes, 1992; Goldberg, 1982; Lance, 1987; Stevenson & Gajarsky, 1991; and Story, 1979). In their review of the literature, Croteau and Kusek (1992) were able to find only one article (Freeland & Stevenson, 1986 as cited in Croteau & Kusek, 1992) that considered between group differences prior to treatment and attempted to control for them. Only Pagtolun-An and Claire (1986) have used a true experimental design employing random assignment. Croteau and Kusek point out that these limitations allow other possible hypotheses to explain the pre to post test differences in attitudes towards gay men and lesbians, including preexisting differences in moderating or outcome variables, prior experiences of participants with gay and lesbian people, and sensitization due to testing effects.
A third limitation of attitude change studies centers around the poor development and use of reliable and valid instruments to measure attitudes toward lesbians and gay people. Many of the conceptual and methodological difficulties that plagued the measurement of attitudes towards gay and lesbian people in the late 70's and 80's had certain negative ramifications when these same measures were used in studies of attitude change. Most early measures of attitudes toward homosexuality did not distinguish between lesbians and gay men, referring instead to homosexuality in general or “homosexuals” (Black & Stevenson, 1984; Larsen, Reed, & Hoffman, 1980; Levitt & Klassen, 1974; and Smith 1971). Interaction effects between the sex of target and sex of respondent could not be studied and thus many questions pertaining to sex differences in attitudes were left unanswered. True/false response formats were also common (Millham, San Miguel, & Kellogg, 1976; Smith, 1971). This type of response format tends to produce inter-item correlations that are either artificially limited in size or are inflated, making reliability estimates of the measures tenuous at best (Herek, 1984).

Oftentimes, instruments previously validated and shown to have good reliability were not used in later studies and thus the basis for measuring attitude change fluctuated from study to study. For example, Story (1979) assessed the acceptance of particular sexual behaviors (e.g. oral-genital stimulation with someone of the same sex). Serdahely and Ziemba (1984) examined attitudes concerning contact with homosexuals (e.g. I would feel comfortable having a homosexual next door as my neighbor). Other studies used scales that primarily assessed attitudes toward the social roles of homosexuals with items such as: “Schools should not hire teachers who are homosexual” (Anderson, 1981; Cerny & Polyson, 1984; Nevid, 1983), while others used “global” measures including items of varied content.
A final methodological concern stems from the use of college students in experiments of attitude change. With very few exceptions, participants in these attitude change studies have been young Caucasian college students. As a result, the available data do not permit much generalization beyond college level courses or seminars on human sexuality. Additionally, the possibility of volunteer bias makes data difficult to interpret and complicates the choice of a comparison or control group (Stevenson, 1988). For example, those students who choose to take courses in human sexuality usually are better informed, more tolerant (Allgeier & Allgeier, 1984), and more sexually experienced than those who do not.

Stevenson (1990), however, showed that self-selection may play only an indirect role in explaining the effectiveness of sexuality courses in promoting tolerance for homosexuality. Stevenson compared students who were interested in taking a human sexuality course with those that were not. His results indicated that even though students who were interested in taking a human sexuality course held more liberal attitudes toward sexuality in general and were more comfortable with their own sexual behavior than students who were not interested in taking the course, no significant differences between the groups were found for any of the three measures of attitudes toward homosexuality.

Methodological issues aside, two components of classroom interventions have been studied in greater depth than others: the effects of audio-visual materials and gay/lesbian speaker panels. Though these studies typically suffer from the previously discussed flaws, a summary of the work is presented in order to give the reader a broader understanding of what types of interventions have been attempted in the past as well as to show the need for more rigorously controlled, theory driven research.
Treatments Using Visual Media

A few studies have investigated the role that audio-visual materials have on students' attitudes toward gay and lesbian people. Often these studies confound the impact of audio-visual materials with other variables. Goldberg (1982) compared the effect of three audio-visual programs on college students' attitudes toward homosexuality. The three programs included a satirical film on prejudice (but not including prejudice toward homosexuality); a videotape of a gay clergyman discussing the normalcy, legality, and morality of sexual behavior; and two films in which gay and lesbian homosexual behavior is explicitly presented. A control group receiving no intervening treatment was also used. All groups received a one hour lecture about homosexuality. The Attitudes Toward Homosexuality Scale (ATHS) developed by MacDonald and Games (1974) was used to measure attitude change in participants. Participants were pretested two days prior to listening to a one hour lecture. Five days later they were shown one of the three films. Subjects completed the ATHS after they viewed the film and were again given the ATHS five weeks later.

Subjects who watched the film on prejudice and the videotape of a discussion of homosexuality, as well as the control group, were all significantly more tolerant towards homosexuality than subjects who watched the explicit films, but the difference occurred only at the initial posttest. Five weeks after exposure to the AV materials, there were no significant differences. The author concluded that the films and videotape as well as the lecture made an impact on attitudes. However, the three groups who watched audio-visual material did not produce results that were significantly different from the lecture alone control group. Because all treatment groups received the lecture, it is impossible to know if the lecture alone would have been sufficient for attitude change to occur.
In a related study, Martin (1983) showed a series of four videotapes dealing with various issues pertaining to homosexuality to three separate groups of eight subjects each: "self-admitted homophobics," college students, and prison guards. Discussion of each of the videotapes was encouraged after each tape was shown. The survey of Attitudes Towards Deviance/Homosexuality (May, 1974) which measures only attitudes toward gay men was administered both before and after the seminar. The self-admitted homophobics were the only ones to show a significant decrease in negative attitude, though the prison workers did show a trend towards greater tolerance. The college students actually became more homophobic after the seminar though, overall, they were the least negative toward homosexuals. Martin attributed this finding to: "the unsureness of their heterosexuality" (p. 72) rather than problems with the study such as very low subject numbers, the use of a questionable instrument to measure attitudes, and regression towards the mean.

In contrast, Nevid (1983) showed explicit films depicting either male or female homosexual relationships to college students and found that males became less tolerant of homosexuality as measured by the Heterosexual Attitudes Toward Homosexuality Scale (HATS) developed by Larsen, Reed and Hoffman (1980). The HATS, however, is not designed to measure attitudes toward either gay men or lesbians specifically, and refers to "homosexuals" instead. It is not surprising that this effect was not significant for women who viewed the films of lesbians due to the ambiguity of the measure.

Walters (1994) designed a classroom demonstration using visual media as a method for decreasing negative attitudes towards homosexual people, but did not differentiate between gay men and lesbians. Slides and video scenarios showed how gay and lesbian people are most often depicted as stereotyped, suicidal, or pathological. Students enrolled in a human sexuality course which included the 70 minute visual presentation reported significant decreases in homophobia and increases in empathy for
homosexual people. In contrast, students in another section of the same course who were exposed to the lecture on homosexuality and homophobia, but not the video presentation, showed no significant decreases in homophobia or increases in empathy.

When sexually explicit films are integrated into general human sexuality courses, some significant increases in tolerance have been found (Cemy & Polyson, 1984). However, due to a lack of experimental control over the independent variables, it remains questionable whether the film material alone was responsible for the increase in tolerant attitudes. Other researchers, such as Mosher and O’Grady (1979), have shown that viewing explicit films of same-sex sexual behavior increases negative affect. Generally speaking, Stevenson (1988) concluded that sexually explicit homoerotic films appear to be of little value for promoting tolerance. However, the use of visual media to challenge stereotypes or increase one’s awareness of prejudice towards gay and lesbian people appear promising.

**Gay and Lesbian Speaker Panels**

Few studies have evaluated the impact that gay or lesbian speaker panels may have on reducing homophobia. In a review of the literature, Croteau and Kusek (1992) were able to find six studies that examined whether interventions involving gay or lesbian speakers lead to reductions in negative attitudes towards gay and lesbian people.

Morin (1974) was one of the first researchers to study the impact of a seminar on homosexuality for clinical and counseling psychology students. As with many of the studies in this domain, the seminar was described very generally and consisted of individual student projects with oral reports and discussion followed by seven groups of speakers, at least some of whom were open about their lesbian or gay identity. After the seminar, Morin (1974) found that students rated concepts concerning homosexual people closer to the concept “ideal person” on semantic differential scales than they did prior to the seminar. Also using counseling psychology graduate students, Gilliland, Fong
and Hughes (1992) taught a semester long seminar on the topic of psychotherapy with gay and lesbian clients and used speaker panels as a large component of the course. They also found a significant drop in negative attitudes toward homosexual people after completion of the seminar compared to a no treatment control group of counseling psychology students.

Anderson (1981) examined the impact of a 2-hour workshop about lesbian and gay issues on attitudes of nursing students as well as the effects of the workshop leaders' identifying or not identifying themselves as gay or lesbian. A total of 37 students in mental health and community health classes who attended the workshop had fewer negative attitudes toward homosexuals than did a no-treatment control group of nursing students in another class. It did not matter whether or not the workshop leaders disclosed their sexual orientations. Attitude change remained stable about four months later.

Stevenson (1988) reported on two studies which included speaker panels as part of the intervention; one of the studies indicated significant favorable effects for lesbian and gay speakers, while the other did not. Freeland and Stevenson (1986, as cited in Croteau & Kusek, 1992) studied the impact of a unit on homosexuality on heterosexual students in three sections of Introductory Psychology. One section served as a no treatment control, one viewed a film and heard a brief lecture, and one heard a speaker panel discussion presented by the university’s gay and lesbian student group. Stevenson (1988) reported that after using analyses of covariance to control for variation in pretest scores, no significant differences were found between the three groups. Additionally, Stevenson (1988) reported briefly on a study in which a large group of students went through a series of educational activities including a panel of lesbian and gay speakers (Wells, 1987 as cited in Stevenson, 1988). Contrary to the findings of Freeland and Stevenson (1986, as cited in Croteau & Kusek, 1992), Stevenson's
estimate of the effect size based on the difference between pre-and post test scores represented a large change toward more accepting attitudes of more than one standard deviation.

Lance (1987) used gay and lesbian presenters in two human sexuality courses. In order to control for testing effects, one class took the attitude measure before the presentation and served as the control comparison group for the class who took the measures following the panel speakers. Lance found that exposure to the speakers was significant in reducing the students' level of anxiety with homosexual people. Wallik, Cambre, and Townsend (1995) also found a significant reduction in negative attitudes toward homosexual people after a panel discussion, but noted that the mean score for the sample remained in a category they termed "low grade homophobic."

Pagtolon-An and Claire (1986) conducted a well designed study using a Solomon Four Group Design with random assignment. Through a series of analyses, they concluded that interaction with an openly gay speaker had a significant impact on reducing negative attitudes towards homosexual people. Pagtolon-An and Claire also explored how pretesting, gender, prior experience with gay men and lesbian women, and belief in God can moderate the treatment effects. They concluded that "the impact of experimental factors (such as the speaker) appear to be suppressed" by interaction with these moderating variables (p. 132).

Green, Dixon, and Gold-Neil (1993) is the only attitude change study using a panel format that has controlled for an interaction between participant gender and gender of the target group (gay men or lesbian women). A pretest-posttest design was used to assess students' attitudes toward the groups prior to and directly following the speaker panel intervention. Results indicated that the panel was effective in altering the attitudes of females, while males showed no significant change from pretest to posttest.
Serdahely and Ziemba (1984) have suggested that having gay speakers talk to classes and answer questions increases prejudice rather than tolerance. The existing evidence as reviewed here does not support this hypothesis, though the impact of openly gay and lesbian panels have produced results that show no significant differences before and after the presentation (Anderson, 1981; Freeland & Stevenson, 1986 as cited in Stevenson, 1988). Certainly, the extent to which gay and lesbian speakers have an impact on attitudes depends on who the speakers are and what they say or do. Unfortunately, available data deal only with the presence or absence of panel groups, not with the potentially more important qualitative aspects of the presentation (Stevenson, 1988).

**Longitudinal Studies**

Even with well designed studies, the duration of change in attitudes brought about by education in college classrooms is difficult to determine. The process of changing attitudes can be very slow. Only four longitudinal studies that focus on changing attitudes towards gay and lesbian people could be found. Anderson (1981) found that in her sample of 37 nursing students, significant attitude change remained stable four months after a two hour workshop. On the other hand, five weeks after exposure to various audiovisual programs, Goldberg (1982) found that significant effects among the groups had disappeared. Story (1979), in a two year follow up of the effects of a human sexuality course that covered the topic of homosexuality, found steadily more accepting attitudes for certain same sex sexual behaviors among the students who attended the seminar. The no treatment control actually developed less accepting attitudes from posttest to the second year follow up. Story hypothesized that without the mediating effects of a human sexuality course, the participants may have been more influenced by the standard of their community where they presently lived. This standard may have been more restrictive than those of the university community.
Wallik, Cambre, and Townsend (1995) studied the effects of a two hour panel composed of three gay and lesbian physicians on medical students’ attitudes toward homosexual people. The Index of Attitudes toward Homosexuals (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980) was completed four times over a three year period: at the beginning of the school year, two weeks following the panel presentation, at the end of the first academic year, and at the conclusion of the third year. Negative attitudes declined significantly following the panel discussion and again at the end of the first academic year, but rebounded at the end of the third year back to the level found after the initial panel presentation. Without a matched control group, it is impossible to decipher between the effects of the panel presentation and the extent to which medical training itself imposes and maintains attitudes toward gay and lesbian people.

In conclusion, the study of attitude change towards gay and lesbian people is no more than 10-15 years old and still relatively in its infancy. Many of the studies that have been conducted in the past lack the experimental control necessary to determine what components of interventions are more or less effective than others in changing attitudes. Most of the research has not differentiated between attitudes toward gay men versus lesbians nor controlled for possible interaction effects between the gender of the rater and stimulus target. Even though much of the attention and focus of research has centered on showing that attitudes toward gay men and lesbians can change with education, the theories behind why and how attitudes change has not guided this research. The contribution of social psychology in this realm is now reviewed, with particular attention paid to an explanation of affect-based and cognition-based attitudes and the implications this approach has for research on changing attitudes toward gay and lesbian people.
Attitude Formation and Change

This section will: 1) give greater clarity to the terms attitude, affect, and cognition; 2) discuss the role that affect and cognition have on the formation of attitudes; 3) evaluate the theoretical and empirical research that has investigated the susceptibility of different types of attitudes to various forms of persuasion; and 4) review the evidence that indicates attitudes toward gay and lesbian people are to a large extent affect-based.

Definitions

Though the study of attitudes has long preoccupied social scientists, agreement on precisely what an attitude is and how it best can be identified has proven to be somewhat elusive (Mcguire, 1985). The definition of attitude has changed and evolved over time (Katz, 1960; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1975; Zajonc, 1980; Breckler, 1984; Zanna and Rempel, 1988); nevertheless, the disagreement over what constitutes an attitude continues. Generally speaking, attitude can be defined as: “the categorization of a stimulus object along an evaluative dimension” (Zanna & Rempel, 1988, p. 319). The main conflict occurs over what are presently believed to be three components of attitude: cognition, emotion, and behavior. Breckler (1984) defines the cognitive component as: “beliefs, knowledge structures, perceptual responses, and thoughts” (p. 1191). Affect is seen as: “an emotional response, a gut reaction, or sympathetic nervous activity,” while behavior includes: “overt actions, behavioral intentions, and verbal statements regarding behavior” (p.1191).

Several theories have been proposed to account for the relative importance of cognition, affect, and behavior. Breckler (1984) supports a “tripartite” model of attitudes which suggests that an attitude consists of how we feel, what we think, and our behaviors toward an attitude object. Ajzen and Fishbein (1975) developed a model in which evaluations are based primarily on beliefs about the attitude object and viewed...
affect as a purely postcognitive phenomenon. Zajonc (1980), however, viewed the evaluation of the stimulus object as based primarily on affect. Bem (1972) proposed that attitudes are often inferred from past behaviors, taking into account the conditions under which the behavior occurred. In an excellent review of the attitude literature, Zanna and Rempel (1988) suggest that the single component theories have resulted in an oversimplification of the issue, while the tripartite theories suffer from the tendency to assume that an attitude-behavior relationship must exist, a relationship that has proven to be empirically tenuous at best.

Thus, a variety of theoretical frameworks exist for distinguishing among the foundations of attitudes. As Edwards (1990) suggests, the degree to which one theory is more useful than another depends more on the research question than the validity of the classification system itself. The present research focuses on the distinction between affect- and cognition-based attitudes towards gay and lesbian people. It is based on Edward's (1990) research which examined the primacy of affect on attitude formation, a phenomenon first theorized by Zajonc (1980). For this reason, further discussion will focus specifically on the formation of affect- and cognition-based attitudes, though this is not meant to preclude the existence of the behavioral component of attitude formation.

Affect and Cognition in Attitude Formation

The distinction between affective and cognitive components of attitudes is evident in the literature on attitude structure and change (Edwards, 1990). This distinction has been empirically validated using a variety of techniques (Breckler 1984; Breckler & Wiggins, 1989; Ostrom, 1969). As stated earlier, the affective component of attitudes has traditionally included emotions, feelings, or drives associated with an attitude object, whereas the cognitive component has included beliefs, judgments, or thoughts. Though the distinction between affective and cognitive components in attitudes is well
documented, little or no empirical research has been conducted which examines the formation or attempt to change attitudes believed to be affect- or cognition-based.

Edwards (1990) distinguished between affect-based and cognition-based attitudes by focusing on the primacy and dominance of affect during attitude acquisition. For affect-based attitudes, emotional reactions are hypothesized to exert a primary and powerful influence on the individual. The attitude is initially acquired with minimal cognitive appraisal. Relevant information that is acquired after these affective reactions serves only to reinforce and strengthen the initial affect-based attitude. The cognitive elements that are present facilitate an affective reaction, but do not constitute the basis of the attitude (see Zanna & Rempel, 1988). For cognition-based attitudes, relevant information is acquired first, and affective factors come into play only later, after a considerable degree of cognitive processing has occurred. Although affect often occurs in the midst of cognitive processing, the role of affective processes in shaping attitude development is minimal (Edwards, 1990).

Some theoretical models that depict the role that affect and cognition play in attitude formation have conceptualized affect as a purely postcognitive phenomenon (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1975) in which affect is a result of a cognitive process. Zajonc (1980, 1984), however, made a strong case for the primacy of affect in the formation of certain preferences and argued that affect and cognition involve separate and partially independent systems. He believed that affect can occur without extensive cognitive processing. Zajonc’s theory allows for the possibility that affect can precede, and at times function independently from, cognition.

Edwards (1990) suggested that common phobias provide a good example of affect-based attitudes. The formal definition of a phobia is an intense, irrational, fear response to either a specific object or category of objects (Herek, 1986), for example, the fear of spiders. Even though an individual may be able to recognize that his/her fear
of spiders is irrational, the emotional reactions are not influenced by rational thinking. Assurance that the spider is not poisonous or that poisonous spiders do not habitate in the area is not sufficient to reduce the attitude of the spider phobic individual: "I dislike spiders."

Edwards (1990) contrasted this case with that of an individual interested in purchasing a new car. An individual may gather advice from friends, gain information from reading Consumer Reports, and test drive several models. After the information is obtained and considered, pros and cons weighed, the individual may come to hold the attitude that a certain model car is the best car on the market for the money. The buyer may experience positive and negative affect in reaction to each piece of information about the car, for example, "this car has the best maintenance record," or "this car has better gas mileage." However, the affect associated with the car comes into play only after the appraisal of both positive and negative information (Edwards, 1990).

An assumption underlying the distinction between affect-based and cognition-based attitudes is that although two people may appear to hold the same attitude (e.g. "this car is the best one for me"), their attitudes may nonetheless have different origins (i.e. cognitive versus affective). For example, the process of buying a car for one individual may be a very cognitive process which involves weighing all the pluses and minuses of various factors. For another consumer, the car purchase may be based more on the feeling that he/she "liked the feel" or it "looked sporty" (Zajonc, 1980). What is a cognition-based decision for one individual could be a primarily affect-based decision for another. Though there is very little research in this area, this example illustrates the level of complexity that research on this issue needs to achieve.

Likewise, it is important to realize that the distinction between affect- and cognition-based attitudes is rarely a dichotomous one (Edwards, 1990). As Zajonc and Markus (1982) state: "The antecedents of preferences may involve cognitive and
affective components in a variety of combinations. In some cases the cognitive component may be dominant, in some the cognitive and affective factors may interact with each other, and in other cases the affective factors may be dominant and primary” (p. 124). It is unlikely that people ever form pure affect-based or pure cognition-based attitudes. Edwards (1990) sees affect and cognition together determining attitude acquisition, though in varying degrees and sequences: “In reality, attitudes may be positioned along a continuum according to the primacy and relative contribution of affect and cognition in their development” (p.204). Given the possibility that some attitudes are more affect- or cognition-based than others, the next section discusses the implications that type of attitude has on the likely success or failure of the attitude change process.

Type of Attitude x Form of Persuasion Interaction

Persuasion researchers have long assumed that different types of arguments have different effects on attitude change (Millar & Millar, 1990). A small but significant number of studies has demonstrated some of these effects. For example, Vinokur and Burnstein (1974) demonstrated that the novelty and validity of the persuasive communication affect attitude change; Eagly and Warren (1976) demonstrated the effects of message complexity on persuasion. Theoretical precedent for the existence of a link between an attitude's origin and its susceptibility to different forms of influence can be found in the functional approach to the study of attitudes (Katz, 1960; Sarnoff & Katz, 1954). According to this line of thinking, the reasons for forming and modifying attitudes vary according to the psychological functions these attitudes serve for the individual. What role the attitudes play has implications for which influence procedures will be most effective in bringing about attitude change. For ego defensive attitudes, common tactics of attitude change (such as the promise of reward or punishment) are likely to fail, whereas procedures that involve the removal of threat, increased self-insight, or catharsis may be more successful (Katz, 1960; Sarnoff & Katz, 1954).
Functional analysis makes clear that attitudes are formed not only through reason, but also through needs, wishes, feelings, and other emotional factors (Edwards, 1990). The process of changing an attitude is seen as: "indeed a formidable challenge due to the diversity in origins, the range of psychological needs they may fulfill, and the varying composition of affective and cognitive processes that shape attitude acquisition" (p. 203). A major assumption of the research is that notions of function, origin, and change of attitudes are all interrelated: "Knowledge about the function that an attitude serves for an individual gives some suggestion about its affective or cognitive foundations; this knowledge, in turn, may be instructive about how to develop means to change the attitude" (p. 203). Zajonc (1980) suggested the possibility that attitudes with affective origins may be less vulnerable to influence attempts that rely on rational argumentation and might be more responsive to persuasive appeals that tap their affective bases. Therefore, the probable success of reason- versus emotion-based persuasive attempts depends on whether the origin of an attitude is affective or cognitive.

In her initial study, Edwards (1990) hypothesized that affective means of persuasion will be more successful than cognitive means of persuasion in modifying affect-based attitudes. Because Edwards questioned the feasibility of determining the basis of already existing attitudes in subjects, she attempted to create both affect- and cognition-based attitudes toward Chinese ideographs using a rather detailed procedure. Photographs of angry and happy female faces, presented subliminally, functioned as affective primes. In order to induce affect-based attitudes, the subliminal stimulus was displayed for 10 milliseconds before the presentation of the ideograph which was then shown for 2 seconds. A written description of the ideograph presented for 30 seconds followed and served as a cognitive stimulus. In the cognition-based inductions, the ideograph was displayed (2 sec.), information about the ideograph was shown (30 sec.),
and the subliminal affective stimulus followed (10 ms). Once these attitudes were established, Edwards attempted to change them through either an affective or cognitive form of persuasion. Subjects in the affective persuasion condition were presented with a subliminal affective prime prior to the passage about the ideograph, whereas subjects in the cognitive persuasive conditions were presented with the subliminal prime after the passage (see Figure 1). After each trial, subjects rated how much they liked the ideograph. An analysis of variance supported her hypothesis and indicated that affect-based attitudes exhibited more change when persuasion was affective rather than cognitive. Cognition-based attitudes, however, responded equivalently under both forms of persuasion.

Edwards conducted a second study in order to improve upon her initial study. It is possible that affective persuasion was confounded with subliminal influence in her first study (i.e., subjects were not aware of the affective primes because they were presented subliminally, whereas subjects were aware of the cognitive manipulations, the passages of information). In order to control for this possible confound, Edwards constructed another elaborate procedure, this time utilizing taste to induce affect-based attitudes toward a beverage product and beverage smell as an emotional form of persuasion. Information about the beverage product again served as the cognitive manipulation. Following the earlier procedure, subjects in the affect-based attitude condition first tasted the beverage and then read some information about the product. Subjects in the cognitive-based attitude condition first read about the drink and then tasted it. During the persuasion stage of the experiment, subjects in the affective persuasion condition first sampled the scent of the beverage and then read further information about the product. Subjects in the cognitive persuasion condition first read the product information and then sampled the scent of the beverage (see Figure 2).
Figure 1. Schematic representation of procedure used to engender affect- and cognition-based attitudes and to create affective and cognitive means of persuasion (Experiment 1). Depicted here is the sequence used to induce and attempt to change favorable attitudes. Used with permission by the author.
Figure 2. Schematic representation of procedure used to engender affect- and cognition-based attitudes and to create affective and cognitive means of persuasion (Experiment 2). Used with permission by the author.
Results replicated those obtained earlier and lent further support for the notion that affect-based attitudes exhibit greater change after exposure to affect-based influence rather than cognitive influence.

Edwards explained her findings by speculating that for affect-based attitudes, an initial emotional reaction to a stimulus predisposes an individual to process subsequent information in a biased manner. Edwards referred to this as the activation of a "hedonic schema." Once the schema is activated, influence attempts composed of instances of information that do not fit the "hedonic schema" (cognitive persuasion) may be assimilated or discounted. Edwards explained that if an influence attempt activates a contradictory hedonic schema (using affective persuasion), pressure to accommodate may occur and result in possible attitude change.

In contrast to Edwards' findings, Millar and Millar (1990) classified subjects as possessing either affect-based or cognition-based attitudes (e.g. liking a beverage because it makes you feel refreshed vs. liking it because it is low in calories) and found that persuasive appeals were more effective when they did not match the presumed basis of the attitude (e.g. when an affective appeal attacked a cognition-based attitude). Olson and Zanna (1993) suggest two methodological differences between these studies that can be used to explain the divergent results. First, Millar and Millar studied relatively well-formed attitudes. Therefore, subjects were probably able to counterargue more effectively messages that matched their attitude than mismatched messages. Second, the appeals used by Millar and Millar were all argument-based, providing information either about others' emotional or rational reactions to the object. The authors did not give subjects a new, emotional experience to the stimuli (as Edwards did when she exposed subjects to an aversive odor). Combining these two points, Olson and Zanna suggested that for well-established attitudes, rational and emotional arguments will yield "mismatch" effects (as in Millar & Millar, 1990).
On the other hand, new affective experiences will be generally powerful sources of influence, perhaps especially for affect-based attitudes.

A possible limitation of Edwards' research involves how the attitudes were formed within the laboratory situation. The entire basis of Edwards' study was grounded on the primacy effect phenomenon in which earlier presented information has been found to have a greater influence on subsequent judgments than does information presented later (recency effect). In some instances, recency effects have been obtained, but their incidence is much lower and seem to depend on factors not present in Edwards' study (e.g. a delay between presentations, memory set instructions). Despite disagreement over the mechanism underlying primacy effects, most theorists agree that the effect emerges because first impressions somehow guide the processing of material presented later (Edwards, 1990), making earlier presented information more accessible for retrieval or prominent.

A second limitation of Edwards' research concerns the nature of the affective responses that were created in the laboratory setting. In Edwards' (1990) experiments, affective responses were produced relatively directly (e.g. through smell or taste) and did not entail much cognitive processing. In order to ascertain whether the initial findings would extend to conditions in which affect is more complex and intertwined with cognitive processing, Edwards and von Hippel (1995) conducted a second experiment.

In the second study, subjects were told that the purpose of the study was to better understand the way people's own views of themselves are similar to or different from the impressions that others have of them. They were instructed to read information from the file of an individual (the target) whom they believed had participated in an earlier phase of the study and to form an impression of the target. Information in a Self-Report Questionnaire was intended to create a favorable impression of the target person. The questionnaire contained replies to two questions, one of which asked the target to:
"Describe one of the most memorable days of your life." In response to this question, the target wrote about the death of his or her mother and made several references to his/her emotional responses during that time. This passage, which had been determined in pre-testing to be emotionally evocative, served as the affective manipulation. Edwards and von Hippel suggested that the emotional impact of this passage could be appreciated only after consideration of the meaning of death, the special significance of the mother-child relationship, and the nature of the target's reaction to this event. Thus, unlike the emotional reaction one has in association with the taste or smell of a drink in the earlier experiments, the subjects' experiences in this study depended to some degree on interpretive, reflective, cognitive processes.

The other question on the Self-Report Questionnaire requested that the target "discuss a situation in which you think you did the 'right' thing." In response to this question, the target person wrote about finding and returning a lost wallet. The account was presented in terms of the reasoning and thought processes involved with the target's decision about what to do with the wallet. This passage served as the cognitive manipulation. The order manipulation was used again for the purpose of inducing affect- and cognition-based attitudes. Subjects in the affect-based conditions first read the paragraph in which the target described the death of his or her mother and then read the paragraph in which the target described returning a wallet to its owner. Subjects in the cognition-based attitude conditions read the same paragraphs in the opposite sequence. After reading both paragraphs, subjects rated their overall impression of the target and indicated how much they liked the target.

Upon finishing the Self Report Questionnaire, subjects were told that they would receive additional information about the target they had just evaluated and would be asked to make additional ratings. The main objective of the next stage of the experiment was to cause subjects to develop a more negative attitude toward the target person. In
order to do so, subjects were presented with another report in which the target described a situation in which he or she betrayed a friend's trust by telling others something the friend had wanted to remain a secret. Whether the persuasion attempt was cognitive or affective in nature was determined by the focus instructions that subjects received before reading the target's response.

Subjects in the affective persuasion condition were told to put themselves in the friend's shoes and to concentrate carefully on how they would be feeling towards the target who describes the situation. Subjects in the cognitive persuasion condition were told to pretend that they were an arbitrator assigned to settle the disagreement between the target and his/her friend and to concentrate on what the target has to say in a clear, calm, and objective manner. They were told to analyze the target's behavior and draw inferences, paying attention to the facts and details. After reading the paragraph, all subjects again indicated their overall impression of and liking for the target. They then indicated the extent to which the passage had affected them emotionally and the extent to which they had considered the paragraph in an objective fashion.

Results from ANOVA analyses revealed that affective persuasion was more effective than cognitive persuasion with affect-based attitudes. However, cognitive persuasion was not more effective than affective persuasion with cognition-based attitudes. It was concluded that these results are not specific to concrete, relatively unfamiliar physical stimuli, but also hold for attitudes about complex and more familiar social stimuli.

Obviously, most attitudes that are formed outside the highly controlled conditions of the laboratory do not undergo subliminal priming effects or order manipulations that create recency effects. This is not to suggest, however, that certain types of attitudes (especially prejudicial attitudes towards gay and lesbian people) cannot be primarily
affect-based. Some research suggests that affective responses may be a better predictor of overall attitude towards gay and lesbian people than cognitive responses.

Evidence for the hypothesis that attitudes toward gay and lesbian people are primarily affect- rather than cognition-based is now presented. Very little research has included gay and lesbian people as a focus for study. Only four studies could be found that examine the cognitive and affective components of attitudes toward homosexuals.

**The Role of Affect in Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gays**

The early 1980’s were a time of shifting focus for social psychology. The exclusive study of cognitions as the basis for attitude formation and maintenance yielded to the reexamination of the role of affect in attitude theory. Abelson, Kinder, Peters and Fiske (1982) were among the early researchers to show that affective responses can be as good or even better predictors of overall attitudes than cognitions. Dijker's (1987) study began the investigation of the role of emotion in the area of intergroup relations. It was not until the late 1980s and early 90s that the role of affect in attitudes toward gay and lesbian people was investigated.

There are two theoretical reasons to postulate that affect is of great importance, if not greater importance than cognitive processes, as a determinant of negative attitudes toward social outgroups (Stangor, Sullivan, & Ford, 1991). Stangor et al. viewed the acquisition and maintenance of stereotypic beliefs as a cognitive process and theorized that affective responses are often based on direct experiences with target group members, whereas stereotypes are often learned from secondary sources. To the extent that direct experiences produce stronger attitudinal responses in comparison to indirect experience (Fazio, Powell, & Herr, 1983) then affect would be expected to be a stronger predictor than cognition. In addition, many traditional models of stereotyping assume that stereotypes serve as rationalizations for the negative attitude toward the group (Harding et al., 1969). Based on the preceding premises, Stangor et al. (1991)
hypothesized that affective responses (feelings) would be a relatively stronger predictor of overall attitude towards certain social outgroups than the accompanying stereotypic beliefs (thoughts). For example, an individual who watches a T.V. drama in which a gay man is depicted as an effeminate, sex-crazed, interior decorator may have a very strong affective reaction to the character (homosexuality is disgusting). This reaction is further fueled by the stereotypical presentation of the individual. Based on Stangor et al.'s hypothesis, the emotional response that the individual experiences will be a better predictor of his/her overall attitude than will beliefs/stereotypes about gay men.

Stangor et al.'s (1991) research extended earlier studies that focused only on perceptions of a single social group (blacks), by investigating the role of affect as a determinant of attitude toward a number of different social groups, including Americans, Asians, Jews, Blacks, Hispanics, Russians, Arabs, and homosexuals. Subjects were asked to list their individual stereotypes for each group. They were then administered an emotions checklist to assess affective responses toward the outgroups. Finally, subjects completed an overall attitude measure to determine their general level of favorability and desire for social distance toward individual social outgroups. Simultaneous regression analyses revealed that affective responses to target groups accounted for a substantial proportion of the variance in attitudes and, in fact, served as a stronger predictor of overall attitude and preferred social distance toward outgroups than did the cognitive measure. Interestingly, positive affect was found to be as predictive of overall attitude than was negative affect. The authors interpreted this finding within a contemporary research framework (Gaertner & Dovidio's (1986) model of "aversive racism") which asserts that the absence of positive affect related to outgroups may affect attitudes toward outgroups more so than the presence of negative feelings. Contrary to expectations, Stangor et al. did not find that various emotions (e.g. fear, hatred, anxiety)
were differentially important for the different social groups. Rather than finding separate factor structures for the emotions across outgroups, a single positive and a single negative factor emerged.

The study by Stangor et al. (1991) has recently been criticized for using a standard checklist of responses to measure the extent to which beliefs versus affect underlie attitudes. Eagly, Mladinic, and Otto (1994) maintain that such methods facilitate the construction of attitude consistent responses that reflect overall evaluation rather than respondents' prior experiences with the attitude object. Forced to respond, participants likely infer their responses from their attitudes. Eagly et al. further suggest that it is unreasonable to argue that positive correlations between respondents' attitudes and their ratings of characteristic attributes of the attitude object show that their beliefs determine or underlie the attitude. Instead, they advocate the use of a free response measure of beliefs and affects in which respondents report the beliefs and affects that "come to mind" in relation to the attitude object.

In order to reexamine the issue of scale bias, Eagly et al. conducted a study using the free response method and chose four target groups to serve as attitudinal objects: Men, Women, Republicans, and Democrats. Regressions predicting subjects' attitudes from their beliefs and affect were calculated for each group. For women, men, and Democrats, beliefs were the only significant predictor of attitude, whereas for Republicans, both beliefs and affect were significant predictors, with affect accounting for more variance. A major problem with this study is the tendency for respondents to write down fewer affects than beliefs in relation to the targeted social groups. It may have been easier for respondents to translate their beliefs into words than their emotions and this greater ease may then account for the overall tendency for beliefs to be more predictive of attitudes than affect. Another criticism is that the choice of target groups (e.g., men and women) simply do not elicit a great deal of affective response in
individuals. Further, no attempt was made to explain the difference in predictive ability of affect for the Republican target group although the authors did acknowledge that the relative importance of affective and cognitive information likely depends on the particular attitude investigated.

In a study similar to Stangor et al., Jackson and Sullivan (1989) examined the contribution of cognition and affect to evaluations of homosexuals. Using male homosexuals and heterosexuals as the target stimuli, Jackson and Sullivan predicted that affective measures could account for more variance in evaluations of male homosexuals than of male heterosexuals. Only males served as subjects since the combination of male subjects with male targets was expected to elicit the strongest emotional reactions. The subjects evaluated either a heterosexual or homosexual male applicant to a graduate program in elementary education or the fine arts. Subjects were asked to indicate the percentage of people in the target’s social category (male homosexuals or male heterosexuals) and the percentage of people in the occupational category (elementary education or fine arts) who could be described as having each of 35 characteristics (e.g., creativity, patience, discipline, etc.). An adjective checklist was used to assess subjects’ affect immediately following the applicant evaluation task. Subjects indicated on a five point Likert scale the degree to which each emotion described how they were feeling at the time.

The cognitive measures used to predict evaluations were the discrepancies between stereotypic beliefs about the target’s social category and stereotypic beliefs about the occupation for which the target was applying. Discrepancy scores were used because it was thought that they represent beliefs about how well-suited an applicant is for an occupation (i.e. the smaller the discrepancies between social category stereotypes and occupational stereotypes, the more favorable the evaluations should be of the target on a cognitive level). The example was given that if subjects believe an occupation
requires creativity and that members of category X exhibit more creativity than members of category Y, then the subjects should evaluate members of category X more favorably than members of category Y. The smaller and fewer the discrepancies between social category and occupational stereotypes, the more favorable the evaluation of the target should be.

Results indicated that negative affect in particular predicted evaluations of male homosexuals but not of male heterosexuals. Although both affect and cognition predicted evaluations of male homosexuals, affect was actually a better predictor. Though male homosexuals were actually less discrepant than male heterosexuals on two main stereotype components, femininity and creativity, and seen as positive attributes for elementary educators, homosexuals were evaluated less favorably than heterosexuals. However, homosexuals were seen as more discrepant than heterosexuals on one stereotype component, morality. It is also highly probable that asking subjects to make judgments about the morality of gay men elicits a wide range of feelings for individuals. In effect, an affect-based judgment (e.g. Is homosexuality immoral?) may have been confounded with a cognitive decision making process (which group is more moral?). Jackson and Sullivan suggest that the findings support a weighted averaging model of social judgments in which the weights are determined by the target's social category.

Additional evidence for a strong affective component to attitudes toward gay and lesbian people can be found in a factor analysis completed as part of the construction and validation of the Attitudes toward Gay and Lesbian People scale (Erickson, 1993). Erickson separately factor analyzed 30 item versions of the Gay Men and Lesbian Women scales. The first unrotated factor for the Attitudes toward Gay Men scale and Attitudes toward Lesbian Women scale had eigenvalues of 17.22 and 14.38 and accounted for 88% and 82% of the total common variance respectively. This factor was defined as the affective component of attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women. The second unrotated
factor had eigenvalues of 1.10 and 1.57 for the gay men and lesbian scales and accounted for 6% and 9% of the total common variance respectively. All but one of the cognitive items loaded on this second factor. Thus, this factor was labeled as the cognitive aspect of attitudes. The obtained factor structure clearly suggests a strong affective component underlying attitudes toward gay and lesbian people and a significant but smaller cognitive component.

Some research also suggests that certain personality variables, such as right-wing authoritarianism, may moderate attitude composition for individuals that are either high or low on the trait. Haddock, Zanna, and Esses (1993) postulated that in addition to the affective component, two separate types of beliefs could be relevant to the cognitive component of attitudes towards gay and lesbian people. The first category consisted of stereotypic beliefs which traditionally have been taken as the cognitive component of intergroup attitudes. The second category of beliefs believed to be relevant to the cognitive component of intergroup attitudes were labeled Symbolic Beliefs.

Symbolic beliefs were defined as beliefs that social groups either violate or promote the attainment of cherished values, customs, and traditions (e.g. the perception that typical members of a group are anti-family, against world peace, or promote freedom of expression). Haddock et al. predicted that in addition to stereotypes and affect, symbolic beliefs would play a prominent role in uniquely predicting negative attitudes, especially if gay and lesbian people were perceived as violating cherished values and norms. A second goal of the study was to assess the extent to which Right Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) moderated the relative importance of affect, stereotypes, and symbolic beliefs in predicting attitudes toward homosexuals. High RWAs were defined as extremely self-righteous individuals who maintain a strong acceptance of traditional norms. The term “homosexuals” is used because the authors failed to differentiate between gay and lesbian people as stimulus targets.
values and norms, possess a general willingness to submit to legitimate authority, and display a general tendency to aggress against others (especially those who threaten their conventional values and norms).

Haddock et al. believed that as a result of their more traditional outlook, high RWAs might be likely to perceive gay and lesbian people as maintaining and promoting values that violate RWAs’ highly conventional value system. Possibly, these beliefs would then serve as a primary determinant of RWAs’ negative attitude. It was hypothesized that symbolic beliefs might function as an important source of information in predicting attitudes of high RWAs. In contrast, low authoritarians might be more willing to see value differences between people as more acceptable. Thus, symbolic beliefs may play a less important role in predicting the attitudes of these individuals. Consequently, a balance of stereotypes and affective responses may play a more important role in predicting attitudes of low authoritarians.

Regression analyses revealed a unique contribution for both symbolic beliefs and affect in predicting attitudes toward gay and lesbian people. Stereotypes, on the other hand, were not uniquely predictive of attitudes. Neither stereotypes or affect uniquely contributed to the prediction of attitudes for high RWAs. However, the attitudes of low authoritarians were best predicted by both affect and stereotypic beliefs. Symbolic beliefs were not uniquely predictive of attitudes for low RWAs. It is important to note that affect remained a strong predictor of attitudes toward gay and lesbian people except for people who scored as high authoritarians. Because Haddock et al. (1993) did not differentiate between gay men and lesbians in their study, it is difficult to know if similar results would have been obtained if gay men and lesbian women had been targeted individually. Though these results are suggestive of the combined roles that symbolic beliefs, stereotypes, and affective responses may play in predicting attitudes toward gay
and lesbian people, they are not proof for the basis of the attitude. However, one would expect that if these variables have predictive ability, they also reflect to some degree the basis for the attitude.

It is highly unlikely that any research will ever be able to "prove" that attitudes toward gay men and lesbians are more affect- than cognition-based. A very limited amount of research seems to indicate that emotional responses to gay and lesbian people are better predictors of overall attitude than are cognitive responses. Though these results are suggestive of the role that affect plays in attitudes towards gay and lesbian people, they are not "proof" that the attitudes are affect-based. However, it cannot be denied that many people who hold negative attitudes toward gay and lesbian people also experience a great deal of feeling (e.g. anxiety, disgust, anger, fear) when forced to confront issues related to the existence of gay and lesbian people. Based on the work of Edwards (1990), if attitudes toward gay and lesbian people are indeed more affect- than cognition-based, one would expect that affective means of persuasion will be more effective in modifying anti-gay attitudes than cognitive based persuasion. It is this critical issue that serves as the basis for the present research.
Participants

The participants were 302 (146 male and 166 female) undergraduate students enrolled in introductory psychology courses at The Ohio State University. Cohen and Cohen (1983) suggest using a relatively conservative estimate of the treatment effect size when calculating the number of subjects needed. The number of subjects used in this study provided a power of .90 to detect a moderately small effect size ($R^2=.2$) at alpha equal to .05. The data for 56 of these participants were eliminated from data analysis because they either: a) identified their sexual orientation as other than “exclusively or predominantly heterosexual” ($n=11$), or b) failed to pass the required comprehension tests of the stimulus reading material used in this experiment ($n=45$). Because this is a study about changing attitudes of people who identify as heterosexual, data from participants who did not identify as heterosexual were discarded.

The remaining 246 participants (122 male and 124 female) had an age range of 16-36 years and a mean of 19.6 ($SD=5.68$), while the median age was 18. Seventy-three percent of the sample were in their first year of college, 15% were sophomores, 7% were juniors, and 5% were seniors. Approximately 84% of the sample identified their race/ethnicity as White, while 7% were Asian-American, 6% were African-American, 2% were Hispanic-American, and 1% identified as Native American. Participation in this study was voluntary and anonymous. Students received partial credit towards fulfillment of course requirements.
Instruments

AGLP. The Attitudes Toward Gay and Lesbian People scale (AGLP) developed by Erickson (1993) was used to measure participants' attitudes toward gay and lesbian people. This scale was selected because it separately measures both affective and cognitive components of attitudes toward both gay men and lesbians. The scale consists of 28 items, with an equal number of positively and negatively worded statements, distributed evenly between the two target groups: gay men and lesbian women. Additionally, total scores can be broken down onto four individual subscales, each composed of 7 items, that separately measure affective (e.g. "I would feel comfortable working closely with a lesbian woman") and cognition-based responses (e.g. "Gay men should not have the same civil rights as heterosexual men") towards both gay men and lesbians. Subjects responded to each item on a 5-point Likert scale indicating their level of agreement from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree.”

Because there was no evidence that the factor structure of attitudes toward gay men and lesbians are the same, principal components factor analyses were performed separately on the Attitudes toward Gay Men and the Attitudes toward Lesbian Women subscales. A two-factor solution emerged for each subscale indicating that the items represent distinct cognitive and affective components. Erickson (1993) reported high internal consistency for the entire scale ($\alpha = .97$) as well as for the subscales specific to gay men ($\alpha = .95$) and lesbians ($\alpha = .94$). Evidence for concurrent validity is also provided by the strong correlation between the AGLP (total score) and the Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980, $r = .86$, $p<.0001$), and the Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men scale (Herek, 1988, $r = .90$, $p \leq .0001$).

Good support for construct validity was shown in correlations between the AGLP (total score) and right-wing authoritarianism ($r = -.61$), fear of AIDS ($r = -.44$) and
the Attitudes Towards Women scale ($r = .63$). Positive attitudes towards gay and lesbian people were inversely related to authoritarianism and fear of AIDS. More positive attitudes toward gay men and lesbians were directly related to more egalitarian sex-role attitudes towards women. All correlations were significant at the $p \leq .0001$ level. A copy of the AGLP scale is included in Appendix A.

**Post-Assessments.** In the experimental conditions, participants read articles that addressed specific gay and lesbian issues. Because the AGLP is a measure of global attitudes toward gay and lesbian people, the instrument may not possess the sensitivity needed to detect changes in attitude on more specific gay and lesbian related issues (e.g., violence towards gay and lesbian people). For this reason, post-assessment scales were developed to assess participants’ subjective attitude shift toward the target groups. After reading each of the three stimulus articles, participants were asked to rate a 4 item post-assessment scale using a 7 point Likert response format. Responses varied from 0 (a great deal less agreement) through 3 (about the same level of agreement) to 6 (a great deal more agreement). Post-assessment items were designed to correspond with the gender of the target group presented in the reading material (i.e. either gay men or lesbians). Copies of the post-assessment scales for the custody rights, suicide prevention, and violence topic areas are included in Appendix B.

Tables 1 and 2 present descriptive statistics separately for the target groups (gay men and lesbian women) for each of the three post-assessment scale items. Item means ranged from a low of 2.91 (expressing a less supportive attitude) to a high of 3.69 (indicating a more supportive attitude) while standard deviations ranged from .96 to 1.57. Item-total correlations ranged from .43 to .87 for the items targeting lesbian women and .24 to .75 for the items targeting gay men. All items fell above Nunnally's (1978) suggested minimum item-total correlation criterion of .20.
Table 3 presents internal consistency reliability values for the overall post-assessment scale and for the three subscales relating to the topic areas of custody rights, suicide prevention, and violence towards gays and lesbian people. Cronbach's alpha values ranged from .76 to .93 for the scales targeting lesbian women and .67 to .87 for the scales targeting gay men. All alpha values, except for the custody subscale targeting gay men, met Nunnally's (1978) standard for internal consistency (.70) for research scales.

Comprehension Quizzes. In order to ensure that participants completely read and understood the materials, short (five item) quizzes were administered immediately following each reading. For respondents in the experimental groups, an average of 80% correct across all three quizzes, with no single quiz score below 60% was required. Because comprehension of the control readings was not crucial, no minimum cutoff score was used for participants in the control condition. Copies of the comprehension questions for the affect-based, cognition-based, and control group reading are included in Appendices C, D, and E respectively.

In order to assess whether the comprehension scores differed among participants in the experimental and control conditions, a one way between subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. Comprehension scores showed a significant main effect for condition, \( F(2,244)=70.38, \ p < .0001 \). Post hoc analyses using a tukey comparison revealed that comprehension scores for participants in the affect (\( M=93.25, \ SD=6.74 \)) and cognitive (\( M=89.46, \ SD=6.74 \)) groups did not differ. As expected, comprehension scores for participants in the control condition (\( M=73.81, \ SD=16.75 \)) were significantly lower than either of the experimental groups. Because participants' comprehension scores in the control condition did not need to meet a minimum passing criterion, their scores are consequently lower than those from the experimental conditions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Item-total Correlation with entire scale</th>
<th>Item-Total Correlation with subscale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=121
The potential score range is 0-6 with higher scores representing more supportive attitudes.
* Entire scale includes all items from the Custody, Suicide, and Violence subscales.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for the Post-assessment Scale Items (Lesbian Target)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Item-total Correlation with entire scale</th>
<th>Item-Total Correlation with subscale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=125
The potential score range is 0-6 with higher scores representing more supportive attitudes.
* Entire scale includes all items from the Custody, Suicide, and Violence subscales.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for the Post-assessment Scale Items (Gay Male Target)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Standardized Cronbach Alpha Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gay Male Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-assessment Scale (Total)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody Subscale</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Subscale</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide Subscale</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Internal Consistency Reliability Values for the Post-assessment Scale and Subscales by Gender of Stimulus Target
Treatments

Short 3-4 page reading materials were chosen and adapted for this study in order to present various topics as they relate to gay and lesbian issues. The three topics for the readings included violence towards gay and lesbian people, suicide of gay and lesbian youth, and custody rights for gay and lesbian parents. These three topics were chosen based on their propensity for being expressed in both an affect and cognition-based manner. An affect-based approach was defined as one that attempts to elicit emotions, feelings, or drives in the individual. Thumbnail sketches of people are excellent attitude objects when the goal is to arouse strong affective responses (Edwards & von Hippel, 1995). Thus, short stories about gay and lesbian individuals were chosen as the content for the affect-based persuasion. A cognitive approach was defined as one that requires the individual to process beliefs, knowledge, and thoughts. Information of a factual nature, including the presentation of statistical data, comprised the content for the cognition-based persuasion.

The different types of persuasive messages are not mutually exclusive categories, but rather are assumed to exist on a continuum extending from predominantly affect-based to primarily cognition-based messages. Two versions of each reading were produced targeting gay men and lesbian women for both the cognition- and affect-based experimental groups (i.e. one half of the participants who read affect-based materials read about gay men, the other half read about lesbian women). Only names and gender references were changed to correspond with the gender of the target group. All other content remained the same between the two versions. The affect-based, cognition-based and control readings that were used in the present research can be found in Appendices F, G, and H respectively.
Judges’ ratings. Using the aforementioned definitions, a group of five expert judges (three licensed psychologists and two licensed clinical social workers; 3 females and 2 males) read eight stimulus articles (5 hypothesized to reflect an affect-basis, and 3 reflecting a cognition-basis) and rated the degree to which the readings were either affect- and/or cognition-based. A Likert scale was used ranging from 1 (representing a minimal level of affect/cognition) through 3 (reflecting an equal balance of affect/cognition) to 5 (almost entirely affect/cognition based). Appendix I contains an example of the raters’ instructions. For a given topic area (e.g. violence towards gays and lesbians), the reading materials that received the highest average rating for a cognitive basis and the lowest average rating for an affective basis were selected as the cognitive-based material for the anti-violence topic area. Similarly, the reading materials that received the lowest average rating for a cognitive basis and the highest average rating for an affective basis were used for the affect-based material. Reading materials were balanced for length and targeted gay men and lesbian women separately.

Individual t-tests were performed on the judges’ ratings to determine which scenarios differed on the basis of affect and cognition. One affect-based reading for the violence scenario was eliminated due to a failure to find a significant difference between the affect and cognition ratings. Another affect-based reading for the suicide scenario was eliminated because it did not differentiate as well between a cognition and affect basis in comparison with other scenarios, although the t-test was significant. A summary of the means, standard deviations, and corresponding t-tests for the judges’ ratings of the affect and cognition-based readings can be found in Tables 4 and 5.

Four out of the five judges agreed that the three articles selected to represent the affect-based readings were predominantly affect-based and only somewhat cognition based. For the cognition-based anti-violence and custody rights readings, all of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Number</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Mean Affect Rating (Standard Deviation)</th>
<th>Mean Cognitive Rating (Standard Deviation)</th>
<th>t (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>3.40 (1.34)</td>
<td>2.20 (1.64)</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>4.00 (.71)</td>
<td>2.00 (.71)</td>
<td>4.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>3.80 (.45)</td>
<td>2.20 (.45)</td>
<td>5.66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>3.80 (.45)</td>
<td>2.00 (.71)</td>
<td>4.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>4.20 (.84)</td>
<td>1.80 (.84)</td>
<td>4.53*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=5

* p≤.01  
** p≤.0001

The potential score range on each scale is 1 to 5, with higher scores reflecting more agreement.

Table 4. Means, Standard Deviations, and t Tests for the Significance of Differences Between Ratings of Cognition and Affect on Affect-based Readings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Number</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Mean Affect Rating (Standard Deviation)</th>
<th>Mean Cognitive Rating (Standard Deviation)</th>
<th>t (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>1.2 (0.45)</td>
<td>4.6 (0.55)</td>
<td>-10.75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>1.0 (0.00)</td>
<td>5.0 (0.00)</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>1.8 (0.84)</td>
<td>4.2 (0.84)</td>
<td>-4.54*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=5
* p<.01
** p<.0001
The potential score range on each scale is 1 to 5, with higher scores reflecting more agreement.

Table 5. Means, Standard Deviations, and t Tests for the Significance of Differences Between Ratings of Cognition and Affect on Cognition-based Readings
judges agreed that the readings predominantly reflected a cognitive basis and minimally reflected an affect-basis. The agreement dropped to 80% for the cognition-based suicide prevention reading.

Separate 2 x 3 (Type of Rating x Reading Theme) within subjects analyses of variance on the affect and cognition-based readings yielded similar results. As expected, a significant main effect for the type of rating (i.e. affect or cognition) was found for the affect-based readings. Judges rated the affect-based readings as having a significantly higher level of affect ($M=4.0, SD=.65$) than thought basis ($M=2.0, SD=.65$), $F(1,4)=30.0, p<.01$. For the cognition-based readings, a significant main effect for the type of rating was also found. The judges' ratings of the cognition-based readings were significantly higher for level of thought basis ($M=4.6, SD=.63$) than affect ($M=1.33, SD=.62$), $F(1,4)=219.28, p<.0001$. No significant interaction effects were found for either the affect or cognition-based readings.

Participants in the control condition read material unrelated to gay/lesbian issues (e.g. how to buy a car, the differences between assertive, non-assertive, and aggressive behavior, and an article about the opening of Disney World). Because these readings were not constructed to reflect either a cognitive or affect basis and were used mainly as distraction devices, they were not evaluated by the raters.

Procedure

Participants were studied in groups of 25-50, under similar testing conditions. Responses were anonymous and answer sheets were coded only to monitor participation. Each participant received an NCS Scantron sheet, a set of instructions (see Appendix J) and the stimulus reading packet corresponding to their experimental group. Participants were randomly assigned by gender to one of three conditions: affect-based persuasion, cognition-based persuasion, or a control condition. Additionally, the target group in each of the treatment conditions was varied by sex. The genders of the participant and target
groups were included as independent variables to test for the possibility of an interaction effect. Previous research indicates that men may hold more negative attitudes toward gay men than lesbians (Herek, 1988; Kite, 1984), whereas women’s attitudes do not differ towards either. Each participant was presented with three readings during the course of the experiment; one for each of the selected topic areas (custody rights, suicide, and violence).

A posttest-only control group design was implemented to control for testing effects. Administering the same attitude measure both as a pre- and posttest may add to the participants’ curiosity concerning the experimental hypothesis and present possible demand characteristics or an increased likelihood of socially desirable responses. Using a large sample size and random assignment to the treatment and control groups, the posttest-only control group design adequately controls for all sources of internal validity (Neale & Liebert, 1986).

After completing basic demographic information, the participants were instructed to read each article individually. Following each reading, participants completed the comprehension quiz and responded to the appropriate post-assessment attitude measure (lesbian or gay target) by indicating the level to which they currently agreed or disagreed with the presented issue. The order of presentation for the reading topics did not vary. Participants in the experimental groups first read the custody rights article, followed by the suicide reading, and concluded by reading the article about violence. Due to the complexity of the current experimental design, presentation order was not added as an additional variable to control. The violence reading was placed last in the reading order since it was hypothesized to create the largest affective response. Control participants read non-related material but continued to rate their current level of agreement with the post-assessment items. All participants then completed the global attitude measure (AGLP).
Following the completion of all instruments, participants responded to items that asked: a) whether they had any friends or relatives that were gay or lesbian, b) how they identified their own sexual orientation, and c) to what degree they responded to the post-assessment surveys based on their thoughts and beliefs or feelings and emotions. Debriefing occurred in written form since the rate at which participants completed their questionnaires differed. As participants completed the experiment, they received an information sheet that (a) explained the purpose of the research, (b) informed them of how they could obtain the research results, and (c) offered several resources for further questions about the study (including how to contact the researcher) or for counseling if they were interested. The debriefing statement is included in Appendix K. The experiment took approximately 45 minutes to complete with no participants spending more than 60 minutes to finish. Participants’ responses to all instruments remained anonymous throughout the procedure.

After each experimental session, participants’ comprehension quizzes were scored to determine eligibility in the study (80% correct across all three quizzes with no single quiz score below 60%). Additionally, if participants indicated they were not predominantly or exclusively heterosexual, their results were not considered useable. Depending on the pass rate for any given trial, additional slots were kept open during the next experimental session to adjust for the loss of useable data and maintain balanced cell numbers.

Data Analysis.

Descriptive statistics were calculated including means and standard deviations on the AGLP for the entire sample as well as by gender. Internal consistency reliability coefficients were obtained for both the AGLP and the post-assessment attitude measures that pertain to the three gay/lesbians issues presented. Relationships among all variables were examined using Pearson product moment correlations. In order to
analyze the effect that treatment conditions have on subjects' attitudes toward gay and lesbian people, a series of $2 \times 3 \times 2$ (Sex of subject) x (Type of message) x (Sex of target) between subjects univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were performed with scores on the AGLP and post-assessments as the dependent variables. Due to slightly differing cell sizes, the General Linear Models (GLM) procedure from the SAS software package was used to correct for this imbalance. The GLM procedure uses a multiple regression approach to the data and reports results as Type III sums of squares for the ANOVA model. Since the overall multivariate $F$ was significant, pairwise comparisons between the treatment and control group means were conducted using the Tukey Test as the a priori post-hoc analysis.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

ANOVA Using Post-Assessment Scores as Dependent Variables

A 2 (Participant's gender) x 2 (Gender of Target) x 3 (Type of Reading Material) between-subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine what effect the reading material had on participants' overall level of support for gay and lesbian issues (scores from the three post-assessment opinion surveys). The opinion surveys measured subjects' subjective self-reports of increases or decreases in their support for various gay and lesbian issues. There were significant main effects for both type of reading material and participants' gender. Results from a Tukey multiple comparisons test showed that participants in both the affect-based ($M=3.54$) and cognition-based ($M=3.46$) conditions expressed a greater increase in support for gay and lesbian people than participants in the control condition ($M=2.82$), $F(2, 234)=17.32$, $p<.0001$. Across all three scenarios, participants who read the affect- and cognition-based articles showed a small positive change in support of gay and lesbian people, whereas the participants in the control condition reported no change. However, participants exposed to the affect-based and cognition-based scenarios did not differ significantly on level of support. Contrary to the hypothesis, affect-based persuasion was not more effective in modifying attitudes toward gay and lesbian people than cognition-based persuasion.
The main effect for participants' gender was also significant. Women showed a small, but significantly greater increase in support \((M=3.52)\) for changes benefiting gay and lesbian people than men \((M=3.01)\), \(F(1,234)=22.22, \ p<.0001\). No main effects were found for gender of the target group in the readings. Women and men did not differ significantly on their level of support for either gay men or lesbian women.

Additionally, three separate 2 (Participant's gender) x 2 (Gender of Target) x 3 (Type of Reading Material) ANOVAs were conducted for each scenario (custody rights, suicide prevention, and violence) to determine whether or not findings were consistent for each scenario. The between subjects ANOVAs for the custody rights, suicide prevention, and violence scenarios produced significant main effects for both participant's gender and type of reading material. Table 6 presents the means and standard deviations for participants' ratings of support for each scenario by gender. In comparison to men, women again showed a small but significantly greater increase in support for changes benefiting gay and lesbian people for each of the custody rights, suicide prevention, and violence scenarios, \(F_s(1,234)=21.05, 12.89, 13.87\) respectively, \(p_s<.001\). Female subjects were more inclined to show a small increase in support for gay and lesbian people, while male subjects generally reported little or no change after reading the articles.

For each of the custody, suicide, and violence scenarios, participants in both experimental conditions were more supportive than participants in the control condition, \(F_s(2,234)=11.16, 16.48, 10.96, \ p_s<.0001\). Compared to how they felt before reading the articles, subjects in the affect and cognition-based reading groups reported a small increase in support for gay and lesbian people with the largest change coming from subjects who read the affect-based violence scenario \((M=3.69)\).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Males (n=122)</th>
<th>Females (n=124)</th>
<th>Total (n=246)</th>
<th>F-Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Post-Assessment Scale</td>
<td>3.01 .89</td>
<td>3.52 .92</td>
<td>3.27 .94</td>
<td>22.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody Rights Post-Assessment</td>
<td>3.00 1.04</td>
<td>3.57 1.01</td>
<td>3.28 1.06</td>
<td>21.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide Prevention Post-Assessment</td>
<td>2.91 1.13</td>
<td>3.40 1.18</td>
<td>3.16 1.18</td>
<td>12.89*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Post-Assessment</td>
<td>3.15 1.01</td>
<td>3.59 .98</td>
<td>3.37 1.02</td>
<td>13.87*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The potential score range on each scale is 0 to 6, with higher scores representing more positive attitudes.

* p≤.001  ** p≤.0001

Table 6. Means and Standard Deviations with F values and Significance levels for All Subjects and by Gender for the Post-Assessment Scale and Subscales
The subjects in the control group generally reported no change in support and even indicated a small negative change in attitude on the suicide post-assessment ($M=2.60$). However, results from a Tukey multiple comparisons test again showed that participants exposed to the affect and cognition-based scenarios did not differ on level of support. Affect-based persuasion was not more effective in modifying attitudes toward gay and lesbian people than cognition-based persuasion for any of the scenarios. Table 7 presents the means and standard deviations for participants' level of support for each scenario by type of reading material.

**ANOVA Using AGLP Scales as Dependent Variables**

A 2 (Participant's gender) x 2 (Gender of Target) x 3 (Type of Reading Material) ANOVA was conducted to assess what effect the reading material had on participants' global attitudes toward gay and lesbian people as measured by scores on the entire AGLP. As expected, a main effect for Gender of Participant was found. Women expressed more positive attitudes toward gay and lesbian people ($M=3.85$) than men ($M=3.22$), $F(1,234)=46.69$, $p<.0001$. No other main effects or interactions were significant.

In order to investigate the effect of reading material on the affective and cognitive components of participants' attitudes towards gay men and lesbian women, separate 2 (Participant's gender) X 3 (Type of Reading Material) between-subjects ANOVAs were completed using the appropriate AGLP subscales as the dependent variable. The first 2 x 3 ANOVA assessed only participants' attitudes who responded to survey items about gay men. A significant main effect for gender was found. Females ($M=3.94$) expressed more positive attitudes toward gay men than males ($M=3.04$), $F(1,119)=45.32$, $p<.0001$. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Affect-based (n=82)</th>
<th>Cognition-based (n=81)</th>
<th>Control (n=83)</th>
<th>F-Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Post-Assessment Scale</td>
<td>3.54 .98</td>
<td>3.46 .97</td>
<td>2.82 .69</td>
<td>17.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody Rights Post-Assessment</td>
<td>3.55 1.18</td>
<td>3.43 1.01</td>
<td>2.88 .84</td>
<td>11.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide Prevention Post-Assessment</td>
<td>3.38 1.16</td>
<td>3.50 1.23</td>
<td>2.60 .93</td>
<td>16.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Post-Assessment</td>
<td>3.69 1.06</td>
<td>3.44 1.07</td>
<td>2.99 .78</td>
<td>10.96**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The potential score range on each scale is 0 to 6, with higher scores representing more positive attitudes. **p<.0001

Table 7. Means and Standard Deviations with F-values and Significance levels for All Subjects by Reading Condition for the Post-Assessment Scale and Subscales
A significant interaction between type of reading material and gender of the participant was also found, $F(2, 119) = 5.37, p < .01$. A Tukey multiple comparisons test revealed that women in the affect and cognition-based groups expressed more positive attitudes than men. However, in the control condition, men and women did not differ significantly on their attitudes toward gay men. Figure 3 illustrates the interaction between type of reading material and gender of the participant using gay men as the target. Similar results were found for the ANOVAs that used cognitive attitudes (G-COG) and affective attitudes (G-AFF) towards gay men as the dependent variables. Type of reading material had no effect on subjects' global attitudes toward gay men. Table 8 presents the means and standard deviations for participants' AGLP subscale scores (G-Total, G-COG, and G-AFF) for gay men by gender of the participant.

A second set of 2 x 3 ANOVAs assessed participants' attitudes who responded only to survey items about lesbian women. A significant main effect for gender was found. Females ($M = 3.81$) expressed more positive attitudes toward lesbian women than males ($M = 3.39$), $F(1, 112) = 8.91, p < .01$. No main effect for reading material was found and the interaction between participants' gender and type of reading material was not significant. Type of reading material had no effect on subjects' global attitudes toward lesbian women. Similar results were found for the ANOVA that used participants' cognitive attitudes as measured by the L-COG scale of the AGLP as the dependent variable. However, no main effect for gender of the participant was found for the ANOVA that used subjects' affective attitude scores (L-AFF) towards lesbians as the dependent variable. Women's affective attitudes toward lesbian women ($M = 3.44$) did not differ from men's affective attitudes ($M = 3.28$), $F(1, 114) = 1.11, ns$. Table 9 presents the means and standard deviations for participants' AGLP subscale scores (L-Total, L-COG, and L-AFF) for lesbian women sorted by gender.
Figure 3. Means by Gender and Reading Group for the Attitudes Toward Gay Men Subscale.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Males (n=60)</th>
<th>Females (n=58)</th>
<th>Total (n=118)</th>
<th>F-Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward Lesbian Women (L-Total)</td>
<td>3.39 .79</td>
<td>3.81 .71</td>
<td>3.60 .78</td>
<td>8.91*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Attitudes toward Lesbian Women (L-AFF)</td>
<td>3.28 .80</td>
<td>3.44 .89</td>
<td>3.36 .85</td>
<td>1.11 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Attitudes toward Lesbian Women (L-COG)</td>
<td>3.52 .88</td>
<td>4.17 .63</td>
<td>3.84 .83</td>
<td>21.09**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The potential score range on each scale is 1 to 5, with higher scores representing more positive attitudes.

Table 9. Means and Standard Deviations with F values and Significance levels for All Subjects and by Gender for the AGLP Subscales Targeting Lesbian Women
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Males (n=61)</th>
<th>Females (n=64)</th>
<th>Total (n=125)</th>
<th>F-Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward Gay Men (G-Total)</td>
<td>3.04 (.79)</td>
<td>3.94 (.75)</td>
<td>3.50 (.89)</td>
<td>45.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Attitudes toward Gay Men (G-AFF)</td>
<td>2.79 (.86)</td>
<td>3.80 (.83)</td>
<td>3.31 (.98)</td>
<td>48.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Attitudes toward Gay Men (G-COG)</td>
<td>3.30 (.80)</td>
<td>4.08 (.77)</td>
<td>3.70 (.87)</td>
<td>32.10**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The potential score range on each scale is 1 to 5, with higher scores representing more positive attitudes.

**p<.0001

Table 8. Means and Standard Deviations with F values and Significance levels for All Subjects and by Gender for the AGLP Subscales Targeting Gay Men
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The present study sought to extend the theory and findings of Edwards (1990) by evaluating changes in attitudes toward gay and lesbian people. Past research has focused on factors that influence attitude change towards gay and lesbian people, such as the impact of education. However, the theoretical bases for how attitudes change have not guided this research. This study attempted to improve upon past research by using social psychological theory of attitude change as the groundwork for the experimental hypothesis. Past research suggests that attitudes toward gay and lesbian people are predominantly affect-based. It was hypothesized that affect-based persuasion would be more effective in eliciting support for gay and lesbian people than cognition-based content.

The primary hypothesis that affect-based persuasion would be more effective in changing negative attitudes toward gay and lesbian people than cognition-based persuasion was not supported. Though participants who read the affect- and cognition-based scenarios were more supportive than participants in the control condition, participants in the affect based condition were not more supportive than participants in the cognition-based condition. It may be that attitudes toward gay and lesbian people are more cognition-based than previously believed. Some of the past research which has shown that affect toward gay and lesbian people is a stronger predictor of overall attitude than beliefs has been critiqued on the basis of methodological flaws. Based on the results of the current study, it remains possible that attitudes toward gay and lesbian people are
composed of both cognitive and affective components. The findings of Haddock, Zanna, and Esses (1993) further support this possibility. If attitudes toward gay and lesbian people are more cognition-based, then the current results seem to support the findings of Edwards (1990) and Edwards and von Hippel (1995) who found that neither cognitive or affect-based persuasion was more effective in changing more cognitively based attitudes.

It is important to note that some minimal support for the main hypothesis was obtained for the violence scenario. Women in the affect-based reading group showed a non-significant trend towards expressing a greater positive change in support for anti-violence measures protecting gay and lesbian people than women who read the cognition-based scenario. In accordance with Edwards' theory, female subjects may have found the violence scenario more emotionally arousing than the other scenarios, and this produced more change in support than the cognition-based reading.

Some of the difficulty in obtaining a statistically significant result may also be an issue of statistical power. The number of subjects used in this study provided a power of .9 to detect a moderately small effect size ($R^2=.3$) at alpha equal to .05. It is possible that the actual effect size was smaller than the current power of this experiment was able to detect. If the actual effect size is more in the range of .10, approximately 125 subjects would be needed per reading group (for a total of 375) in order to reach a power of .90 at an alpha level of .05 (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). Though an effect size below .2 is considered very small, it may still be information that can further the understanding of gender differences in attitude change towards gay and lesbian people.

**Gender Differences**

Women showed greater change in level of support than men for all three scenarios: custody rights of gay/lesbian people, taking greater suicide prevention measures in schools for gay/lesbian youth, and implementing anti-violence policies.
protecting gay and lesbian people. These results support the finding of Green, Dixon, and Gold-Neil (1993) who found that females demonstrated significantly more positive attitudes than males after exposure to a gay/lesbian panel discussion. The current finding also throws into question the conclusion of Stevenson and Gajarsky (1991) who suggested that women and men do not differ in the extent to which their responses to lesbian and gay people changed after a course that covered gay and lesbian issues. Stevenson and Gajarsky used a general global measure covering a variety of attitudes toward gay and lesbian people, one that may not have been sensitive to more specific changes in support.

Generally, men reported a very small amount of supportive change for either the affect or cognition-based reading conditions. A great deal of research has shown that men generally hold more negative attitudes toward homosexuality than women, and in particular towards gay men (Cerny & Polyson, 1984; D'Augelli & Rose, 1990; Herek, 1988; Kite, 1984; Larsen, Reed and Hoffman, 1980; Whitely & Kite, 1995). Written material, whether it is affect- or cognition-based, may not be enough to counter the stronger negative attitudes that most men hold. Krosnick, Betz, and Lynn (1992) have suggested that attitudes which have developed through many years of association between the expression or experience of a particular affect and the attitude object can create very strong and stable attitudes. Without an equally powerful affect-based experience that can counter the negative attitude, little change can be expected. It remains possible that a more powerful method of affect-based persuasion, such as a video tape presentation, would yield better results though it becomes more difficult to control for the affect and cognition basis of the stimuli.

The level of support between male or female participants did not differ as a function of whether the focus was on gay men or lesbian women. Male and female participants showed small increases in support for both gay men and lesbian women. The
present finding partially supports the results of Green, Dixon, and Gold-Neil (1993) who found that women expressed less negative attitudes towards both gay men and lesbian women after a panel discussion. However, males' attitudes toward lesbian women and gay men did not change significantly from pretest to posttest. The current finding also conflicts with the previous findings of Stevenson and Gajarsky who found that a sexuality course increased tolerance toward lesbians, but attitudes toward gay men did not change significantly.

The most parsimonious explanation for these diverse and apparently conflicting findings is that the nature of the intervention greatly affects whether interaction effects between the subjects' gender and the lesbian or gay target stimulus will be found. Green et al. used a panel discussion format as the main intervention, whereas Stevenson and Gajarsky measured change after a semester long human sexuality course in which two class periods were devoted to lecture and discussion about issues of sexual orientation, heterosexism, and homophobia. The present research required subjects to read short articles about gay/lesbian issues. The items used to assess attitude change were targeted specifically to issues presented in the scenarios and did not utilize more global measures, as was the case in the previously mentioned studies.

**Attitudes Toward Gay and Lesbian People Scales**

As expected, the results indicated that neither of the experimental reading groups had any effect on subjects' global attitudes toward gay and lesbian people. This instrument is likely not sensitive to changes in peoples' attitudes focused on specific issues as they relate to gay and lesbian people (e.g. violence prevention). Gaesler, Croteau, Heineman, and Edlund (1995) support this possibility and suggest that global paper and pencil attitude scale measurements may fail to detect more subtle positive attitude changes.
Sex differences were further investigated since previous research has yielded some conflicting results. Contrary to prior research, female participants in this study expressed more positive attitudes toward lesbian women than did male participants. Previous studies have found that when the target was lesbian, men's attitudes were similar to those of women (Oliver & Hyde, 1995). It could be that as lesbian women gain more attention in the media and more heterosexual women are aware of knowing someone lesbian, women's' attitudes toward lesbian women are slowly improving. Another possible explanation is evident when the overall scale score is broken down into its affective and cognitive components.

When subjects' scale scores were broken down for lesbian women, sex differences were found for the cognitive component, but not for the affective component of attitudes toward lesbian women. This finding parallels the results of Erickson (1993). Apparently, women are able to support lesbian women on a cognitive level (e.g. civil rights, advocating child care roles for lesbian women, voting for a lesbian candidate) more than men, but on an affect level (feeling at ease in social settings, having lesbian friends, etc.) women's attitudes do not differ from their male counterparts.

In support of past findings, the current study found that women, in comparison to men, expressed more positive attitudes toward gay men on both the affective and cognitive subscales. Most likely, the discomfort that women may experience when in social situations with other lesbian women is not as strong when gay men are the focus. A more perplexing result is the significant interaction that was found between type of reading material and gender of the participant.

Women in the affect- and cognition-based groups expressed more positive attitudes than men. However, men and women in the control condition did not differ significantly on their attitudes toward gay men. It is possible that a central tendency
response set developed for men and women in the control group as a carry over effect
from reading unrelated material during the experiment. Most participants in the control
group indicated that their attitudes were “about the same” as in comparison to before
they read the article, which was the middle-most response on the rating scale. This
pattern of responding may have affected responses on the AGLP and could account for a
dampening of gender differences in the control condition, producing an interaction effect.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

Several limitations of the present study could be improved upon in future
research. First, it was expected that subjects in the control condition would report very
minimal attitude change as measured by the post-assessment scale items. On the average
across all three scenarios, over two thirds of the control group reported no change after
reading their articles. However, approximately 20% of the sample reported some small,
negative decrease in level of support, while 12% indicated some increase in level of
support. Barring control subjects’ failure to accurately follow directions on the post­
assessment items, most likely subjects responded either above or below the neutral
response of “no change” out of a need to convey their support or disapproval of gay and
lesbian people. Eliminating readings for the control group altogether could reduce the
possibility that subjects became tired or irritable during the testing sessions after
reading material unrelated to the post-assessment items. A response format in which all
subjects are asked, after reading the articles, to only indicate their level of agreement
with post-assessment items versus assessing their own personal change may help to
reduce anomalies in the control group.

Second, internal consistency for the post-assessment scales was very good except
for the Custody Rights subscale. Cronbach’s alpha approached .80 targeting lesbian
women, whereas it was considerably lower using gay men as the target. The parenting
rights scale should be revised in order to increase internal consistency reliability to .8.
The first item of the scale which addresses the repeal of state legislation that forbids gay fathers from gaining custody of their children did not correlate highly with the other items. This was the only item to address issues of repealing state legislation and may also be tapping willingness to make legal changes separate from attitudes toward gay and lesbian people.

Third, as mentioned earlier, written material by itself may not be sufficient to produce a strong enough affect-based experience to counter negative attitudes. In order to assess the bases for participants' attitudes, participants responded to a manipulation check after the experiment concluded. Approximately half (48%) of all participants indicated that their responses to the attitude measures were based upon a balance of their thoughts and feelings. Another 48% reported that mostly their thoughts/beliefs influenced their responses to the measures, while only 4% felt that their responses were based on their feelings/emotions. In order to increase the cognitive or affective bases of participants' attitudes, an added manipulation that asked the participants to focus on either their feelings or cognitions could be implemented in future studies. Though it can be argued that a manipulation check could create sufficient demand characteristics for participants to respond in an expected fashion (e.g. participants are asked to first “pay attention to the facts in an objective manner” and are then asked “To what extent did you consider the paragraph in an objective fashion?”), the focus manipulation is an interesting technique to attempt in the future.

Finally, it is important to note that this study is limited in terms of generalizability beyond a college student population. Gender differences, as well as resistance to attitude change towards gay and lesbian people, may be larger during high school and college years and then diminish in adulthood (Oliver & Hyde, 1995). Erickson's (1968) theory of psychosocial development suggests that adolescence is a period of crisis between identity and role confusion. Gender role identity
(masculine/feminine) and sexual identity (homosexual, heterosexual, bisexual) are among the identities at issue. If, as some theorists suggest, male identity development involves the denial of and distancing oneself from the feminine (Chodorow, 1978), then adolescence could be a time when males are especially prone to distance themselves from homosexuality and its perceived threat to masculine heterosexuality, creating more negative attitudes among males than females. Resistance to positive attitude change towards gay and lesbian people would also be characteristic of this time period. In adulthood, when these issues are more resolved, the gender difference in attitudes may diminish. While it was important to assess the immediate impact of the intervention on attitude change in the current research, the design did not allow for evaluating long-term attitude change. In general, an older clinical sample may be personally less threatened by issues of sexual orientation and respond more positively to affect-based persuasion attempts in comparison to the current college-aged sample. The possibility of this developmental phenomenon, and possible theoretical explanations for it, merit further research.

The current study does seem to support the work of Haddock, Zanna, and Esses (1993) which suggests that attitudes toward gay and lesbian people have both cognitive and affective bases that uniquely contribute to the overall attitude. Further research should continue to examine how attitudes toward gay and lesbian people may have different bases for different people. The degree to which an individual possesses Right Wing Authoritarian personality traits appears to be an important variable affecting the bases for attitude change. Future studies should further explore this variable and attempt different forms of persuasion to determine what differential effects occur for low and high RWAs (see Altemeyer, 1994 for a discussion of methods used to reduce prejudice in RWAs.)
Practical Implications

Though it is still unclear how attitudes change toward gay and lesbian people, this study has some practical implications for implementing and evaluating attitude change in general. This study demonstrated the needed caution that should be used whenever interpreting large scale opinion polls. Though subtle increased support was detected by the opinion surveys on all three issues, the global measure did not reflect any changes for subjects in the experimental conditions. Public attitudes concerning civil rights or needed protection for lesbian and gay people are often independent of moral evaluations of homosexuality. Whereas, most Americans disapprove of homosexuality on moral grounds or consider it to be wrong, they also feel that lesbian and gay people should have equal employment opportunities and free speech rights (Herek, 1991).

Even though participants only read three articles and spent approximately 30 minutes doing so, a small but significant increase in support for gay and lesbian people occurred. Though the duration of change is unknown, it is encouraging to see that minimal attempts at education and attitude change can have some impact. The real difficulty lies in how to best implement attitude change efforts in the schools as well as the public at large, which is as much a political question as a psychological one. Further research into the cognitive and affective components of attitudes toward gay and lesbian people, as well as efforts to change these attitudes, is now needed.
APPENDIX A

Attitudes Toward Gay and Lesbian People Scale
Attitudes Toward Gay and Lesbian People

Instructions: The statements listed below describe various thoughts and feelings that different people have toward gay men and lesbian women. There are no right or wrong answers, only descriptions of how you might think or feel.

You have a choice of five responses. Your response indicates how closely each statement describes you and your thoughts and feelings at the present time. Answer each item as carefully and accurately as you can.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Aren't Sure or Neutral</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28) I believe that lesbian women should have the same civil rights as anyone else.  
29) If a lesbian woman initiated a conversation with me, I would feel distressed.*  
30) Gay men should not be allowed to be school teachers.*  
31) I would feel relaxed around a gay man.  
32) I would like to have lesbian friends as well as heterosexual friends.  
33) Lesbian women should not be allowed to work with children.*  
34) A gay sexual orientation is natural for some men.  
35) I would want to move out if I found out my roommate was a gay man.*  
36) A lesbian woman can be a good mother.  
37) One of the emotions I feel toward lesbian women is disgust.*  
38) Gay men should not have the same civil rights as heterosexual men.*  
39) I don't feel any hostility toward gay men.  
40) I would join an organization which included some lesbian members.  
41) I would not vote for a lesbian for public office even if she were the best candidate.*  
42) A gay man can be a good father.  
43) I might treat a gay man rudely because he is gay.*  
44) I am sympathetic toward lesbian women because of the discrimination they face.  
45) I would refuse to attend a party where lesbian women were present.*  
46) Gay men should be prevented from dancing with each other in public places.*  
47) If I heard someone ridicule a gay man, I would feel upset.  
48) I would feel comfortable working closely with a lesbian woman.  
49) I believe that it is okay to discriminate against lesbian women because of their sexual orientation.*  
50) I would hire a gay man if he were the best applicant for a job.  
51) If I were at a party which included gay men, I would feel nervous.*  
52) I would vote for legislation which guaranteed lesbian women the same rights as heterosexual women.  
53) If I found out that my roommate was lesbian, I would want to move out.*  
54) I would vote for a gay man in an election if I believed he was the best candidate.  
55) One of the emotions I feel toward gay men is disgust.*

* Indicates item is reverse-scored.
APPENDIX B

Post-Assessment Scales
Opinion Survey
Custody

Directions: Darken the space on your answer sheet that corresponds to your chosen response. Each statement is numbered, so please be sure that the statement number matches the item number on your answer sheet. There are no right or wrong answers. Use the following response format:

A  B  C  D  E  F  G
a great  less  somewhat  about the  somewhat  more  a great
deal less  less  same  more  deal more

In comparison to how you felt before reading the previous article, please indicate the degree to which you agree with the following statements:

6) State legislation that forbids lesbians from gaining custody of their children should be repealed.

   Right now, I agree with the above statement ____________________

7) Children should not be removed from their mothers solely because they are lesbian.

   Right now, I agree with the above statement ____________________

8) Homosexuality should not be used as a factor against child custody by a lesbian parent

   Right now, I agree with the above statement ____________________

9) In order to increase the number of family law lawyers who are competent to represent lesbian parents in court, law schools should provide specialized training in legal issues affecting lesbian women.

   Right now, I agree with the above statement ____________________

END SECTION 1
PLEASE TURN THE PAGE AND BEGIN SECTION 2
Opinion Survey
Suicide

Directions: Darken the space on your answer sheet that corresponds to your chosen response. Each statement is numbered, so please be sure that the statement number matches the item number on your answer sheet. There are no right or wrong answers. Use the following response format:

A  B  C  D  E  F  G
a great deal less somewhat about the somewhat more a great deal more
less less same more deal more

In comparison to how you felt before reading the previous article, please indicate the degree to which you agree with the following statements:

15) As part of their professional degree requirements, school personnel should receive sensitivity training to lesbian issues.
   Right now, I agree with the above statement ________________.

16) Support groups for lesbian high school students should be created and supported by local school boards.
   Right now, I agree with the above statement ________________.

17) Schools should enact clearly stated anti-discrimination policies that explicitly forbid homophobic harassment and encourage lesbian students, faculty, and staff to be visible.
   Right now, I agree with the above statement ________________.

18) Schools should be encouraged to develop library resources on lesbian subjects.
   Right now, I agree with the above statement ________________.

END SECTION 2
PLEASE TURN THE PAGE AND BEGIN SECTION 3
Opinion Survey
Violence

Directions: Darken the space on your answer sheet that corresponds to your chosen response. Each statement is numbered, so please be sure that the statement number matches the item number on your answer sheet. There are no right or wrong answers. Use the following response format:

A  B  C  D  E  F  G
a great deal less less somewhat about the somewhat more more a great deal more

In comparison to how you felt before reading the previous article, please indicate the degree to which you agree with the following statements:

24) Federal and state legislation should be enacted that facilitates the arrest and prosecution of perpetrators of hate crimes against lesbian women, enhances the criminal penalties, and authorizes the victims and their survivors to file civil suits against their assailants.

Right now, I agree with the above statement ____________________.

25) State and Federal agencies (e.g. the National Institute for Mental Health) should receive funding specifically designated for research into the extent and nature of hate crimes against lesbian women.

Right now, I agree with the above statement ____________________.

26) An immediate priority for Congress and the administration should be implementation of the Hate Crimes Statistics Act, which mandates the collection of statistics on bias crimes (including those motivated by prejudice against lesbian women), by the Department of Justice.

Right now, I agree with the above statement ____________________.

27) In cities where attacks against lesbian women frequently occur, local governments should support the development of procedures and programs for training police officers to recognize and respond to acts of violence towards lesbian women.

Right now, I agree with the above statement ____________________.

END SECTION 3
THIS COMPLETES THE READING PORTION
PLEASE CONTINUE
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APPENDIX C

Comprehension Questions for the Affect-based Readings
Comprehension Questions
Custody

Directions: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. Do not go back to the reading material. Darken the circle on your answer sheet that corresponds to the correct answer. There is only one correct answer per question. Please do not write in this booklet.

1) The two children involved in the custody battle were:
   A. Robby and Jonathan.
   B. sent to live with their mother for the year.
   C. almost teenagers.
   D. Patty and Jenny.
   E. None of the above.

2) Initially, Judge Kroninger favored Franco Benelli in the custody case because:
   A. Jeanne did not make enough money to support two children.
   B. he did not like Jeanne's lawyer.
   C. Jeanne disclosed she was lesbian to the public.
   D. the children wanted to live with their father.
   E. Both A and D are correct.

3) Soon after the court hearing, the boys’ father took them on vacation to:
   A. Vermont
   B. Germany.
   C. France.
   D. Florida.
   E. Italy.

4) In the end, Mary Morgan did not file a motion to have the children returned because:
   A. custody rulings of American courts have no jurisdiction in foreign countries.
   B. Judge Kroninger would not meet with her.
   C. Jeanne had run out of money.
   D. the statute of limitations ran out.
   E. they could not be found.

5) In the conclusion to this article:
   A. Paul was killed in an automobile accident.
   B. Jesse no longer spoke English.
   C. Jeanne was reunited with Jesse.
   D. Both A and C are correct.
   E. Both A and B are correct.
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Comprehension Questions

Suicide

Directions: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. Do not go back to the reading material. Darken the circle on your answer sheet that corresponds to the correct answer. There is only one correct answer per question. Please do not write in this booklet.

10) The author of this article is:

A. an old woman.
B. married.
C. hard of hearing.
D. a young lesbian.
E. a young man.

11) The main character of this article went to the library to get some books about:

A. marriage.
B. senility.
C. homosexuality.
D. gardening.
E. growing old.

12) The author's mother found a letter that was written:

A. in French.
B. 5 years ago.
C. by a close female friend.
D. by Elizabeth.
E. in red ink.

13) The author's father can best be described as:

A. confrontational.
B. supportive.
C. afraid.
D. confused.
E. hopeful.

14) In the editor's note, the reader learns that the author:

A. attempted suicide, but was not successful.
B. was able to reconcile with her parents.
C. was lesbian.
D. died after she was married.
E. died three days after taking an overdose of sleeping pills.
Comprehension Questions
Violence

Directions: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. Do not go back to the reading material. Darken the circle on your answer sheet that corresponds to the correct answer. There is only one correct answer per question. Please do not write in this booklet.

19) The individual charged and convicted of first degree murder in this incident was:
   A. Alex Wight.
   B. Stephen Roy Carr.
   C. also the author of the article.
   D. another police officer.
   E. Thomas Anthony Bradley.

20) This incident occurred:
   B. when it was raining.
   C. at nightfall.
   D. in 1970.
   E. in the woods of Wisconsin.

21) The stalker actually crossed path with his victims earlier in the day while on the trail.
   A. True
   B. False
   C. Not enough information is available to make a conclusion.

22) Before she lost consciousness, Rebecca said:
   A. “Stop the bleeding.”
   B. “I’m dying.”
   C. “I need medication.”
   D. “Don’t worry about me.”
   E. “I know the gunman.”

23) According to the article, the gunman’s lawyer tried to assert that the defendant:
   A. was mentally insane.
   B. did not intend to kill his victims.
   C. had been provoked due to the victims’ homosexuality.
   D. should go to a mental hospital.
   E. was too ill to go to prison.
APPENDIX D

Comprehension Questions for the Cognition-based Readings
Comprehension Questions

Custody

Directions: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. Do not go back to the reading material. Darken the circle on your answer sheet that corresponds to the correct answer. There is only one correct answer per question. Please do not write in this booklet.

1 ) Most of the research presented compared children in divorced gay father-headed families with children in:
   A. married heterosexual father-headed families.
   B. divorced heterosexual mother-headed families.
   C. divorced heterosexual father-headed families.
   D. married heterosexual mother headed families.
   E. None of the above.

2 ) A major category of fears about the effects of gay men as parents on children is:
   A. the children will be homosexual themselves.
   B. the children may experience difficulty in social relationships.
   C. the children will be less psychologically healthy.
   D. Both A and B are correct, but not C.
   E. A, B, and C are all correct.

3 ) Concerns about difficulties in personal development among children of gay men were:
   A. confirmed by the research results.
   B. challenged by the research results.
   C. neither confirmed or challenged.
   D. not investigated at all.
   E. not reported.

4 ) The percentage of children with gay fathers that turn out to be gay themselves is:
   A. 25%
   B. about the same as for children of heterosexual parents.
   C. 50%
   D. 2%
   E. unknown.

5 ) According to the article, gay fathers were less concerned than heterosexual fathers that their children have opportunities for good relationships with adult women.
   A. True
   B. False
   C. Not enough information was provided to make a conclusion.
Comprehension Questions
Suicide

Directions: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. Do not go back to the reading material. Darken the circle on your answer sheet that corresponds to the correct answer. There is only one correct answer per question. Please do not write in this booklet.

10) The research presented here focused mainly on:
   A. suicide of young lesbian women.
   B. suicide of young men in general.
   C. methods of suicide.
   D. suicide of young gay men.
   E. Both A and D are correct.

11) In comparison to youth in general, the rate of attempted suicide among young gay men is on the average:
   A. 2-3 times higher.
   B. declining.
   C. about the same.
   D. 15-20 times higher.
   E. unknown.

12) The leading cause of death among young gay men is:
   A. due to car accidents.
   B. suicide.
   C. drunk driving.
   D. lung disease.
   E. HIV infection.

13) According to the article, the following factor(s) can be used to explain the suicide rate among young gay men is:
   A. harassment in school.
   B. negative self-image.
   C. rejection by family.
   D. Only A and B are correct.
   E. A, B, and C are correct.

14) This article identifies young gay men as a part of two populations at serious risk of suicide:
   A. sexual minorities and men.
   B. men and youth.
   C. sexual minorities and youth.
   D. adults and sexual minorities.
   E. sexual minorities and the poor.
Comprehension Questions
Violence

Directions: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. Do not go back to the reading material. Darken the circle on your answer sheet that corresponds to the correct answer. There is only one correct answer per question. Please do not write in this booklet.

19) The research presented in this article focused mainly on:
   A. violence towards gay men.
   B. violence in New York.
   C. why violence occurs.
   D. violence towards lesbians.
   E. how gay men can protect themselves from violence.

20) This article implies that nationally, violence towards gay men is:
   A. decreasing.
   B. about the same as five years ago.
   C. on the rise.
   D. not a large problem.
   E. due to the spread of HIV.

21) The research presented focused mainly on violence that occurred:
   A. only in San Francisco.
   B. in major metropolitan areas.
   C. towards both gay men and lesbians.
   D. on the East Coast.
   E. in the late 1970s.

22) Factors that make it difficult to determine the extent of the violence include:
   A. underreporting by victims.
   B. lack of systematic data collection.
   C. false reporting.
   D. Both A and B are correct, but not C.
   E. A, B, and C are all correct.

23) One of the main organizations cited in this article that tracks reports of anti-gay violence nationally is:
   A. the CIA
   B. the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.
   C. the Human Rights Campaign Fund.
   D. Both A and B are correct.
   E. Both B and C are correct.
APPENDIX E

Comprehension Questions for the Control Readings
Comprehension Questions
Walt Disney Article

Directions: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. Do not go back to the reading material. Darken the circle on your answer sheet that corresponds to the correct answer. There is only one correct answer per question.

1. On opening day at Disneyland, it was so hot that:
   A. many park goers suffered heat stroke.
   B. women's heels got stuck on softening asphalt.
   C. people burned themselves on the metal rides.
   D. the park had to close early.
   E. All of the above.

2. According to a Disney spokesperson, the water fountains were not operational because:
   A. Disney turned the water off in order to sell more cold drinks.
   B. Disney had to choose between getting the toilets working or the drinking fountains.
   C. an employee forgot to turn the fountains on.
   D. Disney defaulted on the water bill.
   E. Disney was afraid that the water may be contaminated.

3. Disney got the idea for his theme park:
   A. by interviewing people across the country.
   B. from his wife.
   C. when he realized there were few rides he could do together with his two daughters.
   D. in a dream.
   E. after attending the opera with his two daughters.

4. When Disney realized he would be $6 million short:
   A. ABC television agreed to help finance the park.
   B. he sold 10,000 shares of Disney stock to raise revenue.
   C. opening day had to be delayed.
   D. employees offered to take a pay cut.
   E. None of the above.

5. According to the article, Walt Disney built four pavilions at New York's 1964-65 World's Fair in order to:
   A. raise revenues.
   B. entertain several heads of state.
   C. introduce Mickey Mouse to a worldwide audience.
   D. scare the competition.
   E. see if amusement parks would work in the East.
Comprehension Questions
Car Buying

Directions: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. Do not go back to the reading material. Darken the circle on your answer sheet that corresponds to the correct answer. There is only one correct answer per question. Please do not write in this booklet.

10) Generally, the author recommends the best time to buy a car is when:
   A. sales volume is high.
   B. you know exactly the car you want to purchase.
   C. business is slow.
   D. you can afford to pay in cash.
   E. the dealer tells you he cannot sell the car for less.

11) The best source of information about the business climate of a dealership is/are:
   A. service department personnel.
   B. the dealership manager.
   C. the sales staff.
   D. former customers.
   E. the Chamber of Commerce.

12) The author suggests that the following seasonal periods will give the customer an edge:
   A. February.
   B. Christmas.
   C. Summer.
   D. A and B are correct, but not C.
   E. A, B, and C are all correct.

13) A good time to shop for a car is:
   A. at the beginning of the month.
   B. at the end of the month.
   C. at the beginning or end of a week.
   D. From 3pm onwards, but not 2 hours before closing.
   E. all of the above.

14) The consumer should not expect to find a bargain during:
   A. a factory strike.
   B. new model introduction
   C. the Christmas season.
   D. A and B are correct.
   E. B and C are correct.
Comprehension Questions

Assertiveness

Directions: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. Do not go back to the reading material. Darken the circle on your answer sheet that corresponds to the correct answer. There is only one correct answer per question. Please do not write in this booklet.

19) According to the article, when faced with conflict, an individual can become either:
   A. assertive, aggressive, or non-aggressive.
   B. non-assertive, aggressive, or assertive.
   C. non-assertive, confused, or assertive.
   D. assertive, non-assertive, or enraged.
   E. non-assertive, unassertive, or assertive.

20) Non-assertiveness sometimes results in:
   A. passive aggressive behavior.
   B. sulking or crying.
   C. the “see-saw” pattern.
   D. blaming others.
   E. all of the above.

21) The author feels that aggressive behavior is:
   A. better than non-assertive behavior.
   B. worse than non-assertive behavior.
   C. a healthy way of releasing anger.
   D. sometimes appropriate if imminent danger exists.
   E. none of the above.

22) Assertive and aggressive behavior share the following qualities in common except:
   A. expressing yourself freely.
   B. standing up for your rights.
   C. working to satisfy your needs and wants.
   D. validating the rights and needs of others.
   E. all of the above.

23) The common myth(s) often associated with assertiveness is (are):
   A. Assertive people can get whatever they want.
   B. An assertive approach is not always the most effective solution.
   C. Assertiveness is always the best way to resolve a conflict.
   D. A and B are correct.
   E. A and C are correct.
APPENDIX F

Affect-Based Readings for the Custody Rights, Suicide Prevention, and Violence Themes
A lesbian mother in Oakland has lost a battle for custody of her two sons despite wide support from child advocacy groups and East Bay politicians. Following three closed hearings, Alameda County Superior Court Judge Gordon Minder has ruled that Franco Benelli be given custody of Jesse, 3, and Paul, 8.

Jeanne Jullion said the (younger) boy was taken from her home while she was in court seeking a stay on the order that gave custody of the child to his father. "We didn't even have a chance to say good-bye." Her husband, Franco Benelli, from whom she has been separated for two years, took the boy Monday with the aid of his attorney, Armin Horowitz, and a police officer, Jullion said. "He didn't even have his toys with him. He left without his shoes. They just whisked him out of the house."

Benelli was granted custody of Jesse in an order issued last Friday by Superior Court Judge Gordon Minder. Notice of the decision arrived on Monday, and Jullion promptly went to court to seek a stay. It was while she was gone, she said, that the child was taken.

The five participants resumed their places at the long table. Minutes crawled by slowly as they waited in silence for Judge Kroninger to at last emerge from his chambers. The appeal process was about to end.

BAM!

Mary Morgan, Jeanne's lawyer glanced at the final notes on each of the children and scooted back her chair to rise for her closing argument. Judge Kroninger interrupted her immediately.

"Now just a minute, counsel. I don't need to hear a lengthy reasoning about lesbianism," he stated defensively. "I don't care if the Petitioner's love object is a sewing machine. That's not relevant here."

A bit dazed by the bizarre nature of his analogy, Mary replied simply, "I was not planning to talk about lesbianism, Your Honor."

"Well", he continued shortly, "perhaps I can save you some time and energy by telling you what my considerations and opinions are so far and then, if you want to make some closing remarks, you may do so if you wish."

Mary sat back down next to Jeanne.
“I think there is no doubt that both parents are good parents. Both intelligent people, incomes relatively the same. Either parent is probably capable of raising these two boys. “The children,” he went on, “from the testimony that I’ve heard, appear to be doing reasonably well in the custody of their father.”

“I think what has tipped the scale in favor of Mr. Benelli,” and his voice began to rise, “was the Petitioner’s lack of good judgment in advertising her lesbian proclivity to the public at large. Your client did not exercise good judgment on behalf of her children by doing so,” he unbudgingly reprimanded.

“So, he concluded, “I have not really seen compelling reason to change custody and my opinion at the present is that custody of both children should remain with the father.

“Now, counsel, if you wish to make some closing remarks, you may do so.”

Jeanne could feel her husband, Franco, and Mr. Horowitz’s muffled congratulations to each other at her right. Mary slowly put the cap on her pen and looked at Jeanne. Jeanne felt her rise and begin speaking. She felt as if someone had placed the cold metal nozzle of a shotgun to her chest and pulled the trigger. Jeanne’s heart felt like a hawk, shot and falling, feathers twisting.

Jeanne could hear Mary’s voice...about Paul—a child who had been through many cultural changes in his life, without his mother in Italy at age 6, left continually with his grandparents while his father partied to all hours of the night, his father promising he would return to America in 11 days and gone three months, asking that he live with his mother during the school year and live with his father during the summers, in Italy if they wish...

Breath snorted loud and jagged through Jeanne’s nostrils. Her jaw locked, couldn’t hold any longer. Her chest heaved out of control, face felt wet. She took off her glasses, dropped them on the table loudly. Her face bent forward into her hands, no hope of controlling her chest’s wracking. She felt her partner’s hand grasp her arm, slipping tissues into her lap. She felt the judges eyes on her.

Jesse—Mary’s strong loud voice forged on—a child who had never been separated from his mother, whom two expert psychologists considered one of the most well adjusted children they had ever seen in 20 years of practice, who these experts had urged not be disrupted and removed from his mother, taken by the police and placed at age 4 with his father against his will, now doing only moderately well, the father’s
psychiatrist admitting he now has significant fears... of fire... of monsters... of the dark. This exceptionally secure child now stood for weeks in the corner of the play yard, not speaking or interacting with others.

"There is no reason, Your Honor, why he has to be made to cope with the stress of being separated from his mother...who wants him very much."

The courtroom was quiet as Mary sat down. Mr. Horowitz rose. Obviously feeling that he had won, he waxed magnanimous and conciliatory in his final remarks and quickly finished. Jeanne reached for her glasses and looked up at Judge Kroninger through greyed vision. The judge looked uncomfortable, slightly distressed.

"Well," he spoke with some hesitation, "as I said, I think both parents are probably fine parents and could raise these children. As the boys get older, I am sure that both will want to live with their father..." He paused indecisively and then continued.

"But perhaps the younger child, given his young age, is in need of the nurturing he was receiving from his mother. Perhaps the younger child, Jesse, should be returned to his mother for a certain period and the Court will re-examine this situation—let's say in June."

No, Jeanne grabbed Mary's arm, we can't go through this all over again in June.

Both lawyers argued further and both concurred in asking that the matter be resolved now.

"Then," Judge Kroninger spoke reluctantly and slapped his desk, "although in all my years on the bench I have never split custody of siblings, I order that custody of the minor child, Jesse, be awarded to the mother and custody of the minor child, Paul, be awarded to his father. I also declare this marriage null and void."

BAM!

"Now," he pressed on impatiently, "there does seem to be much community property to be disposed of..."

Mr. Horowitz rose to his feet.

"Your Honor, since this matter has at least been resolved, my client would like to ask the court's permission to take the children to Italy to visit his parents during his visitation with the children. Permission was denied last summer and my client has dutifully left Paul's passport in my possession per court order since the first hearing last February. I would ask that it now be returned to him and permission granted for him to take the children to visit his parents for the month of June."
"No," Jeanne whispered to Mary.

"I know," she replied, standing. "Your Honor, I would like to ask you to consider a moment the bitterness of this litigation. My client is very concerned that if allowed to take both children to Italy this summer, he will surely not return. His parents have financed his part of the litigation and will bring pressure to bear for them to remain."

"My client also does not think it is advisable for Jesse, considering the stress he has already incurred this year, to be taken to a foreign country that far away from her so soon. Due to these circumstances, she is asking that this trip be deferred to next summer."

"Oh, I think Jesse will do fine," the judge dismissed her reasoning, smiling. "You have been telling me what a strong child he is. No, they may go. The passports will be returned."

"Then, Your Honor," Mary persisted, "would you have the Respondent post bond as assurance that he will in fact return?"

"Oh no, if he's not going to come back, a sum of money isn't going to make any difference."

Mary pressed on with care not to jeopardize his custody decision. "Then, Your Honor, should he not return, would you then grant custody of both children to the mother?"

"Yes, counsel," he conceded, "I would. If he does not return, custody of both children will be granted to the mother."

Dates for their visit with their father were set and BAM! COURT IS ADJOURNED!

Six weeks had now passed since the day Jeanne took Paul and Jesse to the airport for their flight to Italy with their father. Jeanne was standing in the kitchen of her summer cottage as she waited for the local operator to put her call through to her mother.

"Hi, Mom. Has Franco called you?"

"No," her mother's voice replied slowly. "No, he didn't call us. He called your sister."

"Oh?" Jeanne hesitated momentarily. "What time are they getting in?"

"Well, Jeanne, they're not coming in. They're not coming back."

"Wha—? What do you mean, Mom, they're-not-coming-back?"
"That's right, Jeanne. I'm sorry. I guess he decided to keep both kids there, live there, in Italy. We went over to his apartment and his girlfriend, Lilli, was taking everything. The man next door bought the bunkbeds before he left, the woman downstairs thinks she's getting the car..."

The receiver went quiet, except for a roaring in her ears. She went out the back door, pushing the wooden screen door out of her way. Outside, her knees buckled and she doubled over in the long grass behind the house. One scream, then a second rang out in the still summer afternoon air.

The following morning, Mary Morgan walked into Judge Kroninger's chambers. He turned and said, "So, the rascal flew the coop."

Mary shook her dark curls slowly and handed him the manuscript of his statements in open court that if the father did not in fact return, custody of the older child would be transferred to the mother.

"Oh, I don't believe in changing custody as a form of punishing a parent. However, I suppose I would consider a motion if it was duly filed before me."

In view of the fact that custody rulings of American courts have no legal weight in Italy, no motion was filed. By September Jesse no longer spoke any English and later could not apparently recall close playmates of his in California. Whenever Jeanne called, Franco told her that the boys were not available. She questioned whether he gave them the gifts she sent for their birthdays or at Christmas time. Two years later, Paul was killed in an auto wreck when the car his father was driving crossed into the path of an oncoming vehicle. Jeanne has not had direct contact with Jesse to this day in time.
I can’t really say when I first figured out that I was lesbian. I’ve always known that I was just a little different from most other kids. I often imagined being close to other girls in some special way. That scared me. I liked them the way they seemed to like boys. I was sure that something was very wrong with me. I wasn’t afraid of boys, but I was scared out of my mind when it came to girls.

At age fourteen, I went into deep hiding. I didn’t know what the closet was at the time, but when I found it, I went deep inside and locked the door behind me. I hid what I felt from the world, because I knew people would think that I was sick and that I needed help. SHAME. FAILURE. These words passed through my head every day...along with others that weren’t so pleasant. I thought that it might be a strange phase. I didn’t have a word for the way I felt. “Different” wasn’t good enough for me. I felt like I was the only person in the world who ever thought of being with someone of the same sex. I thought it was wrong to imagine myself with a friend in intimate situations. It made me a “pervert” in society’s eyes. I was angry that I turned out this way. I knew my feelings weren’t normal. I was very afraid. I kept hoping that I would wake up one day and be boy-crazy. It never happened.

When I finally figured out what being lesbian was and that there was no way out of it, I cried. I saw myself as this terrible thing that nobody would ever like. Nothing has ever made me hate myself as much as being lesbian. I went through a time when I thought suicide was the only thing that would help.

I’ll be honest. I live in a small town. In Kansas, coming out is like committing suicide. So I tried to go out with guys. It didn’t seem to work, though. People still thought I was a lesbian. I got beaten up at school, and they trashed my locker. There was nothing that I could do.

Then I fell in love with my best friend. I tried to tell her about it one night. I guess that was a mistake. I lost that friendship...and many others. At school the next day, she made it seem like I had attacked her in her bedroom.
I want to know why people hate lesbians and gay men so much. No matter where you go, you'll find a bigot. I've tried very hard, but it's hard to be nice to people who call you "queer" or "dyke." It really hurts. I don't see why everyone thinks that gay people are perverts.

I went to the library to get some books on homosexuality and lesbianism. Talk about a major hassle. I couldn't find the books on the shelves. I had to go to the front desk and ask someone to get the book for me, because they hide books like that behind the front desk in a little room. I asked her why the books were hidden, and she gave me this lecture about why books on homosexuality had to be out of sight. She spoke in a loud voice and stressed the word "homosexuality." Of course people heard. I tried to check out One Teenager in Ten, but the librarian gave me such a hard time and asked so many questions that I finally gave up on trying to get the book. She seemed very pleased to have won the battle. When I left the library, she gave me a real dirty look. So now, every time I'm there, I return the favor.

I came out to my family...but not on purpose. My mom was snooping around my room and found a letter that was written by a close female friend. The letter was sweet; she had used my nickname and there were hints that we were romantically involved. (We weren't). All hell broke loose. My father had always said that no queer would live in his house. He calls anyone who's different a queer. He couldn't believe that his only daughter was a dyke. That's how he saw me: a dyke. That's how he saw me: a dyke.

My mother freaked. She said that it had to be some kind of a phase. She told me it would pass soon enough. I wanted to believe her, but I knew better. When it didn't go away like she hoped, my mother got really depressed and blamed herself for making me this way. She had known that I wasn't a person who liked being touched—but now I was saying I was lesbian. She took me to a psychiatrist and prayed for the best. She wanted the doctor to "fix" me.

My father doesn't really have much to say to me. When I'm around, he always gets in a good lesbian joke or two just for laughs. He puts dykes down the most. He thinks they're just trying to prove a point and says they do "God-awful" things to each other. I am no longer my father's little girl. I honestly believe that I am nothing to him. I never knew that I could feel this alone inside.

I've lost the support of my family and my friends. I can try hard to make new friends, but my family is lost. Coming out didn't feel like a good move. In fact, it felt like the worst thing I could have done.
I can’t wait to graduate and get out of this town. I just want to lead a normal life with someone I care about who truly cares about me. I’ve felt a lot of hate coming towards me, and it’s gotten harder and harder to trust anyone. I need to know that there is hope; maybe being lesbian won’t always be considered a terrible thing.

I now have three other friends who think being lesbian is fine. They even ask questions so they can understand me a little better. I’m trying not to be so hard on myself now. It’s not the end of the world; for some coming to understand that you are gay or lesbian is just the beginning. It’s good to know that some gay teens do get the support of their family and friends. I know a lot of them wind up where I am or worse.

Editor’s note: Shortly after this was written, Elizabeth attempted suicide and died three days later after taking an overdose of sleeping pills.
The first bullet: When the first bullet hit me, my arm exploded. My brain could not make the connection fast enough to realize I had been shot. I saw a lot of blood on the green tarp on which we lay and thought for a split second about earthquakes and volcanoes. But they don't make you bleed. Rebecca knew. She asked me where I had been shot. We had encountered a stranger earlier that day who had a gun. We both knew who was shooting us. Perhaps a second passed.

The second bullet: When the second bullet hit my neck I started to scream with all my strength. Somehow the second bullet was even more unbelievable than the first.

The third bullet: The third bullet came and I now know hit the other side of my neck. By then I had lost track of what was happening or where we were except that I was in great danger and it was not stopping.

The fourth bullet: I now know a fourth bullet hit me in the face. Rebecca told me to get down, close to the ground.

The fifth bullet: The fifth bullet hit the top of my head. I believe Rebecca saw that even lying flat I was vulnerable and told me to run behind a tree.

The sixth bullet: The sixth bullet hit Rebecca in the back of her head as she rose to run for the tree.

The seventh bullet: The seventh bullet hit Rebecca's back as she ran. It exploded her liver and caused her to die.

The eighth bullet missed.

It is not surprising that Stephen Roy Carr believed us both dead. He shot to kill. The neck. The head. The back. A single bolt action rifle that he loaded, shot, and unloaded eight times. Surely he believed us both dead or he would have used more of the 27 rounds of ammunition he left in his haste to get away.

He shot from where he was hidden in the woods, 85 feet away, after he stalked us, hunted us, spied on us. Later his lawyer tried to assert that our sexuality provoked him. He shot us because he identified us as lesbians. He was a stranger with whom we had no connection.

He shot us and left us for dead.
It was May 13, 1988, the second day of a three-day backpacking trip on the Appalachian Trail in south central Pennsylvania. Rebecca had driven up from Blacksburg, Virginia, where she was finishing her last semester of a master's program in business at Virginia Tech. She was becoming a great success in the academic world, having papers accepted at conferences in her field and receiving numerous offers for placements in Ph.D. programs. These achievements were a surprise to her, though not to those who loved her. She was not yet accustomed to academic recognition. Rebecca Wight was 28 years old, of Puerto Rican/Iranian/Anglo heritage. She had grown up in a variety of countries around the world; her father was a diplomat with the U.S. government.

A painful divorce and the subsequent death of her mother left Rebecca, the oldest of three sisters, with tremendous survival skills, ambition, and hope—though not always with the confidence and discipline she wished for. Her relationship with me was her first acknowledged lesbian love, a reality that, I think, she celebrated with mixed emotions. In Virginia she was cautious about public expressions of affection, fearful of rejection from her conservative academic community.

At the time of our trip, I was 31 years old; a White, Jewish lesbian who had come out in college in the late 1970s. I was firmly embedded in a strong women's community in Ithaca, New York, and was seasoned to the political and emotional realities of lesbianism in “progressive” America. I was committed to liberation and willing to take some risks, though also aware of the need for discretion in a homophobic culture. In May 1988, I was temporarily based in Ithaca, where I was scrambling to earn money to go back to Virginia Tech to finish graduate school in architecture. My relationship with Rebecca had been interrupted by my acceptance of a fellowship abroad to do research for my thesis. I had returned from Israel in February and we were in the midst of figuring out long-distance love. We had seen each other two weeks earlier, when I was in Virginia. We were feeling close and wonderful. Our plan had been to hike for a few days and then drive to Washington, D.C., to celebrate the birthday of Rebecca's youngest sister. The weather was fine, with the delightful May sunshine and warmth. Compared with the rock climbing and hang gliding of Rebecca's past, the trip was simple and designed for a few pleasant days.

We had no premonition, no warning that the world as we knew it was about to be irretrievably shattered. There was only life as we all are accustomed to expect. The days before had been filled with overheated car engines, school and money pressures, long distance phone calls, and occasional stomachaches. Even our two brief exchanges with the
stranger on the trail, though disturbing, had seemed of little consequence. Early in the
morning he wanted cigarettes; later he asked if we were lost. We never saw him again.
We thought he was a strange character, a “creep,” but we had no clues that he was
planning to murder us. No clue that, after we saw him continue south on the trail, as we
headed east on a side trail, he would circle back around to ensure that our paths
intersected once again, this time with him hidden. From that position, on a glorious
sunny Friday afternoon, he lay with his rifle. After he watched us make love and have
fun, he exploded our world with his hate and his bullets.

We could not have known that this tall, thin, unkempt, gangly man could so lack
respect for human life as to shoot to kill. Murder had not yet become a word in my
vocabulary. I had been sheltered from such horrendous realities, whether by economic
privilege, by race, or by living in the United States. Anti-gay murder was just a concept
without names or faces. Anti-gay violence was a problem of harassment, not a matter of
life and death.

During the moments of the shooting, Rebecca’s ability to think and function was
astonishing. I know that in the next few minutes, the last of her life, she saved my life.
Her thinking and instructions got me out of his range and behind the tree. We both made
it behind the tree, and the shooting stopped. Rebecca slumped against the tree trunk,
needing its support. She was fading, losing her vision and her ability to communicate in
this world. In my panic and disbelief, I asked her over and over again what to do. Already
starting to lose consciousness, she looked at me and told me quite simply and calmly,
“Claudia, stop the bleeding.” At that moment, a transition happened. I began to stop my
intense bleeding. My brain started to function again, very clearly. Rebecca very
definitely let go and began to die.

I could not have articulated it, but deep inside I began to realize how badly
wounded she was and that she would not be able to walk. I knew we desperately needed
help. I knew that only three people knew of the shooting: He who had done it, who would
surely tell no one that two women lay dying in the woods; Rebecca, who could no longer
stand or speak; and me. I went for help.

Somehow, knowing that the situation was urgent, I forced myself to leave
Rebecca’s side. I never saw her again. If I had stayed, I surely would have died as well.

I walked in terror, shock, and ripping pain, never knowing if he would appear. I
walked to get help for Rebecca, with a survival instinct that I don’t understand. I
followed a map. Although it was a very long way, sometimes uphill on an unkept trail, I
didn’t stop. I know now that it was nearly four miles, and it took several hours. Darkness came. Finally, I reached a road. Two young men stopped their car to my flashlight signal, and took me to Shippensburg, Pennsylvania, the closest town with any police and emergency help. The State Police responded immediately with the search that found Rebecca’s body later that night. Simultaneously, I was taken by helicopter to Hershey Medical Center, where I had emergency surgery. Miraculously, I survived the five bullet wounds with no permanent debilitating conditions. The surgeons and many others on the medical staff told me repeatedly how close I had come to death: Four of the bullets hit within a fraction of an inch from fatality.

During the next two weeks, the State Police conducted an intensive investigation that led to the capture of Stephen Roy Carr. Later, the district attorney of Adams County successfully prosecuted the murderer, but not before his defense attorney sought to inflame the case with his assertion of provocation. I was lucky. Carr was convicted of first-degree murder in October of 1988 and later sentenced to life in prison with no possibility of parole. Since then, I have learned that many escape with reduced sentences or are never brought to justice.

Perhaps the only antidote to the horror of the shooting has been the response. Whether legal, medical, emotional, personal, or distant, it has been filled with human compassion and generosity. From the moment I awoke from surgery, I was helped 24 hours a day with the shock, pain, terror, and grief. My every need was cared for, an effort that required extraordinary love and commitment on the part of my community. Help and support came from every direction and continue even now.

I remember distinctly, as I walked alone on the trail after the shooting, how intensely silent were the normal forest sounds after the explosions of the gunshots. I wondered if the birds were communicating about the horror they had witnessed that afternoon. Less than a week later, thunderstorms covered our campsite with water, washing away the blood, cleaning the area of the violence. Although the gunshots have for the most part quieted in my mind; though my wounds have healed; though I now speak widely of the homophobia that destroyed and the stole the life of my lover, a sister, a daughter, a friend; I will always walk with an awareness of the tragedy I knew on that silent trail.
APPENDIX G

Cognition-based Readings for the Custody Rights, Suicide Prevention, and Violence Themes

Three major categories of fears about effects of gay men as parents on children are reflected in judicial decision making about child custody in public policies:

1. Children brought up by gay fathers will show disturbances in sexual orientation. For instance, it is feared that children brought up by gay fathers will themselves become gay or lesbian, an outcome that the courts view as undesirable.

2. Children raised by gay fathers will be less psychologically healthy than children growing up in homes with heterosexual parents. Courts have expressed concern that children in the custody of gay men as parents will be more vulnerable to mental breakdown and/or that they will have more adjustment difficulties and behavior problems.

3. Children who have gay men as parents may experience difficulties in social relationships. For example, judges have expressed concern that children living with gay fathers may be stigmatized, teased, or otherwise traumatized by peers.

Because such negative assumptions have often been used in judicial decisions when child custody has been denied to gay men, they provide an important reason for research. The available research findings are summarized regarding these three categories of fears.

Comparisons between Children of Gay Men as Parents and Children of Heterosexual Parents

Systematic research on the children of gay men as parents did not begin to appear in major professional journals until 1983 and most of the available research has been published more recently. For purposes of comparison, most of the research compares children in divorced gay father-headed families with children in divorced heterosexual father-headed families.
Sexual Orientation

A number of investigators have studied the impact of having a gay man as a parent on the sexual orientation of their children. Golobok (1983) assessed the heterosexual versus homosexual interests of older children in their sample. There were nine children of gay fathers and 11 children of heterosexual fathers for whom this assessment was done. Many children reported definite heterosexual interests, and there were no significant differences between children of homosexual and heterosexual fathers.

Huggins (1989) interviewed 36 youngsters, who were 13 to 19 years of age; 18 were children of gay fathers and 18 had fathers who were heterosexual in orientation. No child of a gay father identified as lesbian or gay, but one child of a heterosexual father did.

Miller (1985) studied a group of gay fathers, who had a total of 48 offspring ranging in age from 16-25. There were 21 daughters and 27 sons. According to fathers’ reports, three sons were gay and one daughter was lesbian. Thus, about 8% of the offspring of this group of gay men were themselves gay or lesbian in orientation, a figure which is within expected percentages in the population at large.

Another study involving interviews with the young adult sons and daughters of gay parents was reported by Paul (1986). In the interview, respondents were asked to report on their own sexual orientation. Of the 34 respondents (aged 18-25), one identified herself as lesbian, and two as gay men. Thus, about 9% of the sample identified themselves as gay or lesbian. Again, this figure was within the normal range of variability in the population.

Space does not permit all the studies to be reviewed here, but they all yield similar results. Although studies have assessed over 300 offspring of homosexual men as parents in 12 different samples, no evidence has been found for significant disturbances of any kind in the development of sexual orientation among these individuals.

Other Aspects of Personal Development

Studies of other aspects of personal development among children of gay parents have assessed a broad range of characteristics. Among these have been assessments of behavior problems, personality, self-concept, moral judgment, and intelligence. Golobok (1983) collected ratings of children on a wide array of behavioral and
emotional problems. The scales included such problems as hyperactivity, unsociability, emotional difficulty, and conduct problems. None of the comparisons between children of gay and heterosexual fathers was statistically significant.

**Self Concept.** Two different investigations have studied self-concepts of children of gay fathers. Puryear (1983) studied self-concepts among 15 elementary school aged children of gay men and 15 children of heterosexual men. More recently Huggins (1989) studied self-concept among adolescent offspring of gay versus heterosexual fathers. Self-concepts were within the normal range in both studies, and neither study reported any significant differences between the two groups in any aspect of self-concept.

**Moral Judgment.** The development of moral judgment among teenaged offspring of gay and heterosexual fathers was studied by Rees (1979). Rees assessed maturity of moral judgment using the adolescents' responses to hypothetical moral dilemmas. There were no differences in moral maturity between the children of gay versus heterosexual fathers. Green and his colleagues (1986) assessed intelligence among children of heterosexual and homosexual fathers. Using standardized individual tests of intelligence, Green reported that all of the children they tested had scores within a normal range. There were no differences in intelligence between children of gay and heterosexual fathers.

In summary, concerns about difficulties in personal development among children of gay male parents are not sustained by results of existing research. As was true for sexual orientation, studies of other aspects of personal development—such as self-concept, moral judgment, and intelligence—revealed no significant differences between children of gay and heterosexual parents. On the basis of existing evidence, fears that children of gay men as parents suffer deficits in personal development appear to be without empirical foundation.

**Social Relationships**

Studies assessing potential differences between children of gay versus heterosexual fathers have sometimes included assessments of children's social relationships. Because of fears that children of gay fathers might encounter difficulties
among their peers, the most common focus of attention has been on peer relations, but some information on children's relationships with adults is also available. To evaluate fears about disrupted social relationships among children of gay men as parents, the relevant findings are described in this area.

Relationships with Other Children. As would be expected, Golobok (1983) reported that most children in their study named a predominantly same-sex peer group. In addition, the overall quality of children's peer relations was rated by the investigators as very good in most cases. There were no significant differences between children of gay and heterosexual fathers in any of the outcomes.

Green and his colleagues (1986) asked children to rate their own popularity among same-sex and among opposite-sex peers, and they also asked fathers to rate their children's social skills and popularity among peers. Results showed that most fathers rated their children's social skills in a positive manner, and there were no differences between reports about their children given by gay and heterosexual fathers. In addition, self-reports of children of gay fathers did not differ from those of the offspring of heterosexual fathers.

Relationships with Other Adults. Harris and Turner (1986) studied 13 gay fathers and 14 heterosexual single fathers most of whom had custody of their children. In all, the respondents had 39 children, who ranged in age from 5-31 years. The male parents described their relationships with their children in generally positive terms, and there were no differences between gay and heterosexual male parents in this regard. The majority of the gay parents reported that they did not feel that their homosexuality had created social problems for their children. Gay fathers also cited advantages of their homosexuality for their children, such as:

1. Facilitating acceptance of their own sexuality
2. Augmenting tolerance and empathy for others
3. Increasing exposure to new viewpoints
One significant difference between gay and heterosexual fathers was that heterosexual parents were more likely to say that their children's visits with the other parent presented problems for them.

Kirkpatrick and her colleagues (1990) were the first to investigate children's contacts with adult women in gay father versus heterosexual father homes. They reported that gay fathers in their sample were more concerned than heterosexual fathers that their children have opportunities for good relationships with adult women. Referring to further findings from this study, Kirkpatrick (1987) also indicated that gay fathers had more adult female family friends and included female relatives more often in their children's activities than did heterosexual fathers.

Overall, then, results of research to date suggest that children of gay parents have normal relationships with peers and that their relationships with adults of both sexes are also satisfactory. In fact, the findings suggest that children in custody of gay fathers have more frequent contact with their mothers than do children in custody of divorced heterosexual fathers. The picture of gay fathers' children that emerges from results of existing research is thus one of general engagement in social life with peers, with mothers, and with fathers' adult friends—both female and male, both homosexual and heterosexual.
Gay Male Suicide

Suicide is the leading cause of death among young gay men. They are a part of two populations at serious risk of suicide: sexual minorities and the young. Agency statistics and coroner reports seldom reflect how suicidal behavior is related to sexual orientation or identity issues. The literature on youth suicide has virtually ignored the subject. Research in recent years, however, with young and adult gay men has revealed a serious problem with cause for concern.

High Rate of Suicidality

There is a high rate of suicidality (feelings and thoughts connected to suicide) among gay men. Two studies completed in the late 1970's document the problem and reflect the paucity of research conducted prior the mid 1980's:

1. Jay and Young (1977) found that 40% of gay males surveyed had either attempted or seriously contemplated suicide.

2. Bell and Weinberg (1978) similarly found that 35% of gay men had either seriously considered or attempted suicide.

3. Gay males were six times more likely to make an attempt than heterosexual males.

4. A majority of the suicide attempts by gay men took place at age 20 or younger with nearly one-third occurring before age 17.

Gay male youth have been a hidden population within the adolescent and young adult age group. Those programs and studies able to document suicidality in young gay men have found they have a high rate of suicidal feelings and behavior that places them at substantially greater risk of taking their own lives compared to other youth. Statistics from the Institute for the Protection of Gay and Lesbian Youth in New York, the University of Minnesota Adolescent Health Program in Minneapolis, Roesler and Deisher in Seattle, and the Los Angeles Suicide Prevention Center consistently show that 20-
35% of young gay men interviewed have made suicide attempts. Researchers from Minneapolis, Los Angeles, and San Francisco found that more than 505 of the 1500 gay male youth they interviewed experienced symptoms related to suicide including serious depression and suicidal feelings.

The Larkin Street Youth Center (1984) in San Francisco found that among their client population of homeless youth:

1. 65% of young gay men compared to 19% of heterosexual youth reported ever being suicidal.

2. Gay male youth had a rate of suicide nearly 3.5 times greater than other youth.

The Los Angeles Suicide Prevention Center (1986), in an unpublished study, found that the suicide attempt rate for young gay men is more than three times higher than that of heterosexual youth; their rate of suicidality is more than twice that of other youth.

Impact of Societal Oppression

Young gay males face the same risk factors for suicidal behavior that affect other youth. These include family problems, breaking up with a partner, social isolation, school failure, and identity conflicts. However, these factors assume greater importance when the youth has a gay orientation. Jay and Young (1977) found that 53 percent of gay males surveyed believed their suicide attempts involved their homosexuality. Bell and Weinberg report that 58 percent of gay males felt their first suicide attempts were related to the fact that they were homosexual. Suicide attempts by young gay men are even more likely to involve conflicts around their sexual orientation because of the overwhelming pressures they face in coming out at an early age.

Negative Self-Image. Young gay men face problems in accepting themselves due to internalization of a negative self-image and the lack of accurate information about homosexuality during adolescence. Gay male youth face extreme physical and verbal abuse, rejection and isolation from family and peers. They often feel totally alone and socially withdrawn out of fear of adverse consequences. As a result of these pressures,
gay youth are more vulnerable than other youth to psychosocial problems including substance abuse, chronic depression, school failure, early relationship conflicts, being forced to leave their families, and having to survive on their own prematurely. Each of these problems presents a risk factor for suicidal feelings and behavior among gay male youth.

**Rejection by Family.** Many families are unable to reconcile their child’s sexual identity with moral and religious values. Huckleberry House (1984) in San Francisco, a runaway shelter for adolescents, found that gay youth reported a higher incidence of verbal and physical abuse from parents and siblings than other youth. They were more often forced to leave their homes as “throwaways” rather than running away on their own. In a study of young gay males, Remafedi (1985) found that half had experienced negative parental response to their sexual orientation with 26 percent forced to leave their home because of conflicts over their sexual orientation. Gay male youth comprise as much as 20 percent of all youth living on the streets in this country.

**Harassment in School.** Openly gay youth or those “suspected” of being so can also expect harassment and abuse in junior high and high schools. The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, in a nationwide survey, found that 45% of gay males had experienced verbal or physical assault in secondary schools. The shame of ridicule and fear of attack makes school a fearful place to go resulting in frequent absences and sometimes academic failure. Remafedi (1985) reports 28 percent of his subjects were forced to drop out because of conflicts about their sexual orientation.

**Placement of Gay Youth.** Gay youth also face discrimination in contacts with the juvenile justice system and foster and group home placements. Many families and group homes refuse to accept or keep an adolescent if they know he is gay. A report by the San Francisco Juvenile Justice Commission found that gay male youth stay under state custody longer than other youth awaiting placement because of a lack of appropriate program resources. Many programs are unable to address the concerns or affirm the identity of a gay adolescent.
Conclusion

A basic lack of information about gay male suicide exists though the research base is beginning to grow. It is clear that young gay men are 2 to 3 times more likely to attempt suicide than other young people and may comprise up to 30 percent of completed youth suicides annually. Further research can be the foundation for greater recognition of the problem and the allocation of resources designed to address it. Hopefully, the work completed in recent years will serve as the beginning to the end of suicide among young gay men.

Since the birth of the modern gay liberation movement in the 1960s, a large body of data on anti-gay violence and other victimization has developed. Thousands of episodes—including defamation, harassment, intimidation, assault, murder, vandalism, and other abuse—have been reported to police departments and local and national organizations. Many thousands more incidents have gone unreported. Numerous empirical studies, many of them unpublished, also have shown the problem of anti-homosexual violence to be widespread. Most of this research has focused exclusively on violence towards gay men.

First National Study

The first national study focusing exclusively on anti-gay violence was conducted by the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force in 1984. The study sampled a total of 2,074 gay men in eight U.S. cities: Boston, New York, Atlanta, St. Louis, Denver, Dallas, Los Angeles, and Seattle. Among those surveyed:

a) 19% reported having been punched, hit, kicked, or beaten at least once in their lives because of their sexual orientation
b) 44% had been threatened with physical violence
c) 94% had experienced some type of victimization (including being verbally abused, physically assaulted, abused by police, assaulted with a weapon, having property vandalized, being spat upon, being chased or followed, or being pelted with objects)
d) 84% knew other gay men who had been victimized because of their sexual orientation.

Many respondents had been multiply victimized. For example, 92% of those who were the targets of anti-gay epithets noted that they had experienced such harassment “more than once” or “many times.” More than two thirds (68%) of those who had been
threatened with violence and nearly half (47%) of those who had been physically assaulted reported multiple experiences of such episodes.

The threat of anti-gay violence had a major impact on the attitudes and behavior of those surveyed by the NGLTF: 83% of the men believed that they might be victimized in the future, and 62% said that they feared for their safety. Also, 45% reported having modified their behavior to reduce the risk of attack. For example, they took a self-defense class, avoided certain locations, or avoided physical contact with friends or lovers in public places.

Other Surveys

Other surveys of anti-gay violence and harassment, representing eight U.S. cities, nine states and six regional or national samples are also available. Although sample characteristics, geographic locations, and sampling strategies varied considerably, all of the surveys found harassment and violence to be widespread. Of those that reported rates of specific types of victimization, the median proportion of respondents who were verbally harassed was 80%:

a) 44% were threatened with violence  
b) 33% had been chased or followed  
c) 25% were pelted with objects  
d) 19% experienced vandalism  
e) 17% were physically assaulted  
f) 13% were spat upon  
g) 9% experienced an assault with an object or weapon.

Many of the gay men who were surveyed also reported that they fear anti-gay harassment and violence and that they anticipate such victimization in the future.

Anti-Gay Homicide

Whereas the data discussed above are drawn from surveys of victims, information on homicides cannot be obtained through such a method. Consequently, little is known about the prevalence of anti-gay homicide. Altogether, 62 homicides involving
gay victims were reported to the NGLTF by local organizations for the year 1989. Of these, 15 were classified as unambiguously anti-gay by local groups or police. The remaining 47 murders were identified as “gay related” (i.e., killings in which the victim's sexual orientation appeared to have been a relevant factor but the motivation was uncertain and anti-gay prejudice was not clearly manifested). Many of these and other homicides documented in recent years appeared to have been sex related. Some showed signs of having been committed by serial murderers. The number of anti-gay or gay-related murders reported to the NGLTF was 70 in 1988, 64 in 1987, 80 in 1986 and 20 in 1985. These figures are believed to sharply underestimate the magnitude of the problem.

Violence on the Upswing?

Although the pervasiveness of anti-gay violence has been clearly demonstrated, questions remain about whether attacks are on the upswing. During the 1980s, gay community organizations documented a dramatic increase in episodes ranging from harassment to homicide. The number of anti-gay incidents reported by local groups to the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force increased from 2,042 in 1985 to 7,031 in 1989. Lack of systematic data collection throughout most of the United States and underreporting by victims, however, prevent an accurate measurement of the full extent of the problem. This, in conjunction with changes in the number of groups reporting to the NGLTF each year, has made it difficult to gauge how the national scope of the problem has changed over time. Although the number of tabulated incidents has more than tripled in a five-year period, it is unclear to what extent this increase reflects greater victimization or improved documentation by local groups across the country.

Several gay victim assistance agencies and police departments also have documented an increase in anti-gay violence reports in recent years, an indication that the problem may be growing in some locales. For example, between 1984 and 1990, the New York Gay and Lesbian Anti-Violence Project experienced a nearly threefold rise in clients who had been the victims of anti-gay crimes from 176 to 507. According to the New York City Bias Incident Investigating Unit (BIIU), there was a 79% increase in the number of reported anti-gay crimes in 1988, a 9% increase in 1989, and a 117% increase in 1990.
During 1990 alone, recorded anti-gay episodes increased dramatically in Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, Minneapolis/St. Paul, New York, and San Francisco. In comparison with 1989, attacks reported to gay victim service agencies in 1990 rose by:

a) 11% in Chicago  
b) 20% in Los Angeles  
c) 29% in San Francisco  
d) 65% in New York City  
e) 75% in the Boston area, and  
f) 133% in Minneapolis/St. Paul.

Altogether, 1,588 incidents were documented in all six cities—an increase of 42%. Although police in the six cities recorded only 265 anti-gay crimes, this figure is 70% higher than the number documented in 1989.

Greater reporting by victims and other factors may account for some of the rise in reports in 1990, but the magnitude of the increases in every city suggests there was a growth in actual level of violence. A recent report by the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force showed the reports of violence to be dramatically increasing: 1,898 reports of anti-gay incidents in five major metropolitan cities in 1992 represented a 172% increase over five years of reporting. Given that cities as geographically diverse as these recorded increases in 1990, it is likely that many other U.S. communities also experienced a similar upswing.

Survey data provide still more evidence that anti-gay violence is increasing, at least in certain areas. According to a longitudinal study of gay men in New York City, the proportion of respondents who experience some form of anti-gay violence increased from 9% in 1985 to 14% in 1990. During this period, rates of victimization fluctuated, dropping as low as 7% in 1986 and rising as high as 17% in 1988.

In Philadelphia, gay men surveyed in 1986-1987 experienced criminal violence twice the rate of those surveyed in 1983-1984. Whereas 24% of the gay men surveyed in Philadelphia had been victims of criminal violence in a 12-month period spanning 1983-1984, 46% of the gay men surveyed in that city during 1986-1987 had experienced criminal violence in the 12 months prior to completing the survey. The authors attribute the increase partly to having obtained a more representative sample in the later study and partly an actual rise in levels of victimization during the three year period.
Conclusion

Due to limitations of the research, the actual extent of anti-gay violence and other victimization is unclear now and will remain so until additional research has been conducted using more representative samples. Although more research is needed to better understand the scope and nature of anti-gay violence and victimization, there is ample evidence to show that the problem is severe. The sheer number of incidents reported in these studies indicates a growing need to respond quickly to this situation.
APPENDIX H

Example of a Control Reading
Three Basic Types of Behavior

Conflict arises whenever the satisfaction of your needs and wants interferes with those of someone else. Since everyone’s needs and wants are different, conflict is a natural and healthy part of all human relationships. If you find this type of normal conflict difficult, it can be a major source of difficulty. When faced with conflict you can become non-assertive, aggressive, or assertive. Understanding the difference between these three different approaches is the first step to effective conflict resolution.

Non-Assertive Behavior

The goal of non-assertive behavior is to avoid conflict. When you are non-assertive you place the needs and wants of others ahead of your own. You allow others to make the choices for you and take advantage of you. When most or all conflict is approached non-assertively, it is called general non-assertiveness. When non-assertiveness is restricted to a limited number of situations it is called situational non-assertiveness. Situational non-assertiveness is much more common than general non-assertiveness. Situational non-assertiveness usually involves authority figures, such as supervisors, teachers, and parents or people you are close to, such as a friend or spouse.

One common myth is non-assertive people are always “passive.” While passive people are usually non-assertive, people who are active and enjoy interacting with others can also be non-assertive. Whenever you do not stand up for your rights or do not work to satisfy your needs and wants because they conflict with the rights or needs of others, you are being non-assertive. While this is appropriate in some situations, the frequent, habitual use of non-assertive behavior usually causes loss of self-respect and self-esteem. It is difficult to think well of yourself when your needs are not being met and others are disregarding your dignity and rights.

Non-assertiveness sometimes results in passive aggressive behavior. This is “getting back” at someone indirectly such as by forgetting an important commitment or
being late. When people are unable to fulfill needs and wants in a direct manner, they sometimes resort to sulking or crying. Others develop a “see-saw” pattern in which they swing back and forth between non-assertive and aggressive behavior. People with a general non-assertive pattern often blame others for their problems and refuse to take responsibility for the quality of their lives. They may even play the role of martyr.

Whenever you choose non-assertive behavior, you choose definite irritation within yourself instead of possible irritation to others. Because a non-assertive response encourages unwanted behavior from others, it blocks improvement in undesirable situations. In fact, it guarantees that relationships and events will remain the same.

Aggressive Behavior

The goal of aggressive behavior is to gain control of power. When you are aggressive, you express needs and wants freely but in a hostile, tactless, or angry manner. You stand up for your own rights and work to satisfy your needs and wants. However, the rights, needs, and wants of others are ignored whenever they interfere with what you want.

In most situations, aggressive behavior is equally as self-defeating as non-assertive behavior. People who are the object of aggressive behavior usually feel like they are being attacked. Sometimes this intimidates them and they do what the aggressive person wants. Other times, aggressive behavior causes others to become hostile and resist cooperating with or helping the aggressive person. In either case, aggressive people are usually avoided. As a result, aggressive people are often troubled about their inability to make or keep friends as are shy people. Sometimes, after mistreating others or failing to solve an interpersonal conflict in a satisfying manner, they feel guilt and rejection.

Assertive Behavior

The goal of assertive behavior is to resolve conflicts in a way that is satisfying for both you and others. When you are assertive you express problems, feelings, needs, and wants in a way that is both self-satisfying and socially effective. You respect the
rights and dignity of both yourself and others. There is a personal focus on “reasonable compromise” rather than on winning. Solutions are sought which will make everyone feel good.

Many people think that aggressive and assertive behavior are the same. The confusion may come from the fact that much is said in books and workshops about changing non-assertive behavior into assertive behavior while little is said about changing aggressive behavior into assertive behavior. Assertive and aggressive behavior both involve expressing yourself freely, standing up for your rights, and working to satisfy your needs and wants. However, an aggressive approach ignores the rights, needs, and wants of others while the opposite is true of an assertive approach.

Roadblocks and Myths

One common roadblock to being assertive is anger. The angrier you are, the more aggressive you will be. Another common roadblock to assertiveness is irrational thinking. There are many irrational beliefs about assertiveness that can keep you from asserting yourself. Irrational thinking that blocks assertiveness can also be generated by an excessive need for approval, a fear of being incompetent, or a fear of losing control.

Two common myths often associated with assertiveness are: being assertive is always the best way to resolve a conflict, and assertive people can get whatever they want. While an assertive approach is usually best, it is not always the most appropriate or most effective way to resolve a conflict. There are occasional situations where aggressive behavior is appropriate, such as when there is imminent danger to life or property, or when a person or group will only respond to an aggressive approach. There are also occasional situations where non-assertive behavior is appropriate. These usually involve situations where the cost of asserting yourself in terms of time, energy, or resulting negative consequences outweighs the benefits you would receive.

As you become more assertive, you find assertiveness occasionally makes situations worse. At other times it has no effect. However, in most situations, an assertive style is the most effective and gratifying way to bring about positive change. Even when no change takes place, you usually feel better for having spoken up. The main question to consider when deciding whether you want to be assertive is, “Do I wish to risk the possibility of irritating others, or do I choose to definitely irritate myself by
holding my feelings in and doing nothing?" In making that choice it helps to remember
that when you use a truly assertive style, those who matter won't mind, and those who do
mind seldom matter.
APPENDIX I

Rater Instructions
Directions: To the best of your ability, please rate the following materials on the basis to which you believe they are mainly cognition- or affect-based. Use the following definitions as a guide for rating the materials:

Affect-based material attempts to elicit emotions, feelings and drives in the individual.

Cognition-based material requires the individual to process beliefs, knowledge and thoughts.

Please use the following 2 scales to make your ratings:

This reading material is ______________ affect-based:

1  2  3  4  5
Minimally  Somewhat  Equally Predominantly Almost entirely
cognitive/

This reading material is ______________ cognition-based:

1  2  3  4  5
Minimally  Somewhat  Equally Predominantly Almost entirely
affective/
APPENDIX J

Participant Instructions
General Directions

Please read the following materials carefully. You have been given three different articles to read. After each article, please respond to the two sets of questions that follow. One set is designed to test your comprehension while the other asks you to give an opinion. You may not return to the reading once you have started the quiz.

Use the ScanTron sheet to record your responses. Make sure that the question number in your packet corresponds to the item number on the ScanTron sheet. IMPORTANT NOTE: Notice that the answer sheet is divided into a top half and a bottom half. You complete the first three columns of the top half and then move to the bottom half (starting with #31). Failure to do this will invalidate your responses! Please be careful.

Once you have responded to the questions for the first article, continue on to the next article and follow the same procedures as before. Please do not skip forward through any readings.

DO NOT RETURN TO ANY PREVIOUS READINGS OR QUESTION ITEMS ONCE THEY HAVE BEEN COMPLETED. Please complete all items. ScanTron sheets with missing responses are not useable. At the end, please return your materials to the assistant.

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE AND BEGIN
APPENDIX K

Participant Debriefing Sheet
Participant Debriefing Sheet

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact that emotional or cognitive material has on changing attitudes toward gay and lesbian people. One third of the participants read materials that were written to elicit feelings or emotions towards gay men and lesbians. Another third read material that was cognitive in nature (facts and figures) on the same topics. Some of you read about gay men, while others read about lesbian women. The rest of the participants read material that was unrelated to lesbians or gay men.

In some cases, it was necessary to change the gender (gay or lesbian) of the character or subject matter in order to provide the same information to everyone. The next section provides you with the corrected information.

Violence Theme

**Cognitive Condition.** Participants in this group read a report about violence towards gay men or lesbians. The statistics in this report are accurate, but actually apply to gay men and lesbians as a whole, not to either group individually. In general, due to their increased visibility, gay men are victims of hate crimes to a much greater degree than are lesbian women.

**Emotional Condition.** Participants in this category read a story entitled, "Eight Bullets." The events described actually happened to two lesbian women a few years ago. Claudia Brenner, the survivor, is now a nationally known speaker and advocate of civil rights for gay and lesbian people.

Youth Suicide Theme

**Cognitive Condition.** Participants in this group read a section of a report on youth suicide commissioned by the Bush administration. Some members of Congress attempted to suppress this report due to its discussion of the high suicide rate amongst gay and lesbian teens. The statistics in this report are also accurate, but actually apply to young gay men and lesbians as a whole, not to either group individually. The actual report did not differentiate between gay men or lesbians. On the average, more women attempt suicide each year than men. However, more men actually complete suicide.

**Emotional Condition.** Participants in this category read a true story written by a young teen for a book entitled: "Two Teenagers in Twenty: Writings by Gay and Lesbian Youth." The author was a young lesbian teenager who lived in Kansas until her suicide attempt and eventual death.

Custody Theme

**Cognitive Condition.** Participants in this group read parts of a literature review conducted by Charlotte Patterson which summarized research into gay parenting. The actual research was conducted using various samples of divorced lesbian and
heterosexual mothers. Though many gay men may fight for custody of their children or attempt to adopt, very few are ever granted custody within the legal system.

**Emotional Condition.** Participants in this category read about a court battle between two parents who each fought for the custody of their two sons in Oakland, CA. This was an actual court case which involved a lesbian woman and her ex-husband. For the purpose of this experiment, the ending was modified. In actuality, the mother made several attempts to see her children in Italy. She was successful eventually, and did get limited visitation with both boys, though neither of them were able to return home with her.

Those of you who did not read any of the above articles were in the control condition and your responses will be compared with those participants in the emotional and cognitive groups.

The experimental hypothesis is based on the probability that negative attitudes toward gay and lesbian people are primarily feeling-based. Therefore, positive emotional material will be more effective in changing attitudes than cognitive-based material. Please do not share this information with other students who may be asked to participate in this research at a later date.

If you would like further information or have any questions about this experiment, please contact Will Froilan at 771-8150, the principal investigator, Thomas M. Brounk, at (314) 935-5980 or the research advisor, Dr. Nancy Betz, 292-4166. If you would like counseling related service, please call Ohio State's Counseling and Consultation Service at 292-5766.
APPENDIX L

Cell Sizes, Means and ANOVA Summary Tables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Subject</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Gay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Means and Cell Totals for All Readings (Combined)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2317.54</td>
<td>2317.54</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.8514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3611.41</td>
<td>1805.71</td>
<td>17.32</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.53</td>
<td>53.53</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.4744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>415.04</td>
<td>207.52</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.51</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.8276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender<em>Target</em>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>225.66</td>
<td>112.83</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.3406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>24402.45</td>
<td>104.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>31068.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Gender = Subject's Gender  
  b Target= Lesbian or Gay Stimulus  
  c Group = Affect, Cognition, or Control Condition

Table 11. ANOVA Summary Table for All Readings: DV=Combined Opinion Surveys
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Subject</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Gay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Means and Cell Totals for Violence Opinion Survey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>201.35</td>
<td>201.35</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.4253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>318.23</td>
<td>159.12</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.5434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80.82</td>
<td>40.41</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.0639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.7893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender<em>Target</em>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32.51</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.3282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>3397.45</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>4051.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. ANOVA Summary Table for Violence Topic: DV=Violence Opinion Survey
### Reading Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Subject</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th></th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Gay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.10 (20)</td>
<td>3.00 (21)</td>
<td>3.19 (21)</td>
<td>3.40 (20)</td>
<td>2.31 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.81 (22)</td>
<td>3.60 (20)</td>
<td>3.94 (20)</td>
<td>3.50 (20)</td>
<td>2.72 (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 14. Means and Cell Totals for Suicide Opinion Survey*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>248.17</td>
<td>248.17</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td>.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.8032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>634.30</td>
<td>317.15</td>
<td>16.48</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.3819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.7434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.64</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.6010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender<em>Target</em>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.47</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.5882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>4522.81</td>
<td>19.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>5472.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. ANOVA Summary Table: DV=Suicide Opinion Survey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Subject</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th></th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.30 (20)</td>
<td>2.93 (21)</td>
<td>2.94 (21)</td>
<td>3.31 (20)</td>
<td>2.74 (21)</td>
<td>2.79 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.91 (22)</td>
<td>4.05 (20)</td>
<td>3.92 (20)</td>
<td>3.58 (20)</td>
<td>2.94 (22)</td>
<td>3.04 (20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 16. Means and Cell Totals for Custody Opinion Survey*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>322.95</td>
<td>322.95</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.9311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>342.56</td>
<td>171.28</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.8259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68.70</td>
<td>34.35</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.8216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender<em>Target</em>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.52</td>
<td>31.76</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.1285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>3605.65</td>
<td>15.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>4410.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. ANOVA Summary Table: DV= Custody Opinion Survey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Subject</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>Gay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18. Means and Cell Totals for Composite AGLP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>46.69</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.7788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.3721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.7366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.1728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.9405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender<em>Target</em>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.1158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>120.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>150.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 19.** ANOVA Summary Table: DV=Entire AGLP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Subject</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. Means and Cell Totals for AGLP: Target=Gay Men
Table 2. ANOVA Summary Table: DV= Attitudes toward Gay Men subscale of the AGLP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.33</td>
<td>25.33</td>
<td>45.32</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.7176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>.0058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>66.50</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 124 98.19
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Subject</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 22. Means and Cell Totals for AGLP: Target=Lesbian*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>.0035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.6420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.7581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>64.52</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>70.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 23. ANOVA Summary Table: DV=Attitudes toward Lesbian Women subscale of the AGLP*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Subject</th>
<th>Reading Group</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24. Means and Cell Totals for AGLP: Target=Gay Men, Affective Component
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.55</td>
<td>32.55</td>
<td>48.20</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.7621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>.0058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>81.03</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>121.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. ANOVA Summary Table: DV=Affective Component of Attitudes Toward Gay Men Subscale of the AGLP
### Table 26. Means and Cell Totals for AGLP: Target=Gay Men, Cognitive Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Subject</th>
<th>Reading Group</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Type III Sum of Squares</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>F value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>32.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>70.43</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>94.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 27.* ANOVA Summary Table: DV=Cognitive Component of Attitudes Toward Gay Men Subscale of the AGLP
### Gender of Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 28. Means and Cell Totals for AGLP: Target=LGBT, Affective Component*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.2938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.5539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.6020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>82.81</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>85.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29. ANOVA Summary Table: DV=Affective Component of Attitudes Toward Lesbian Women Subscale of the AGLP
### Table 30. Means and Cell Totals for AGLP: Target=Lesbian, Cognitive Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Subject</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>12.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>65.97</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>80.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31. ANOVA Summary Table: DV=Cognitive Component of Attitudes Toward Lesbian Women Subscale of the AGLP
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