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Introduction

Matthew Shepard's feet were all that could be seen of him amid the sagebrush.

The 5-foot-2, 105 pound University of Wyoming freshman was found barely alive on October 7, lying on his back, his hands bound beneath him, his ankles tied with clothesline to a rustic log fence on a rocky plateau.

His head was distorted by 18 blows from fists and the butt of a handgun, his breathing labored from the blood that covered his face, clogged his nose and formed two large pools on the ground where he had lain for 18 hours.

He died five days later in a hospital in Fort Collins, Colorado (Black, 1999).

Police acknowledge that Matthew Shepard was robbed. However, the authorities stress that this was not simple larceny; Matthew Shepard was a victim of a hate crime - his killers targeted him because he was gay. The two accused, twenty-one year old products of a small college town known for its "Western roots and rough-and-tumble cowboy image" preyed upon Shepard because of his homosexuality, and in mocking hatred, pretended to be gay so that they might lure him from a bar to the sight of his brutal death (Black, 1999).

The grave violence perpetrated against Matthew Shepard is but one example of the "virulent, aggressive and hateful campaign of intimidation" being waged against homosexual individuals in contemporary America (Anonymous, 1999). As reported by
Reuter's Newswire, "serious anti-gay violence from murder to attacks with guns, clubs and knives" escalated in 1998 (Anonymous, 1999). The use of firearms against gays and lesbians reportedly rose 71 percent from 1997 to 1998, and a 47 percent increase was seen in assaults involving blunt weapons such as bats and clubs. In the words of Richard Haymes, spokesman for the National Coalition of Anti-Violence, "it seems that hateful thoughts too easily turn to violent actions, and these violent actions too frequently result in murder in our communities" (Anonymous, 1999).

Anti-gay brutality has been identified as one of the manifestations of homophobia, "the dread of being in close quarters with homosexuals" (Weinberg, 1972, p. 4). An obscure phenomenon, homophobia incorporates cognitive and affective processes that are cultivated through socialization into a culture that disfavors homosexuality. Much like other forms of social prejudice, homophobia functions to ease the accumulation and assimilation of novel information. Guided by mental representations such as schemas, prototypes, and stereotypes, a knowledge bank is accrued that governs impression formation. Once fixed, mental representations have the potential to temper the reconstructive processes that buttress one's current impressions of others.
Chapter I
Review of the Literature

Overview

The following review of literature is organized around topics of notability for the study of attitudes toward homosexuals. Published writings relevant to attitudes toward homosexuality are examined, as are works devoted to the mental representations that advance those attitudes. With respect to mental representations, the function of prototypes, schemas, and stereotypes are discussed, with accentuation on the bias that occurs when members of an outgroup are assumed to possess distinguishing traits. Particular attention is paid to the work of Snyder and Uranowitz (1978), who demonstrated that past knowledge can bias one's current impressions of others.

Attitudes Toward Homosexuality

Empirical evidence supports the existence of a general disapproval of homosexual relationships among heterosexual individuals (Donally, Donally, Kittleson, Fogarty, Procaccino, & Duncan, 1997; Laner & Laner, 1980; Nyberg & Alston, 1977; Pratarelli & Donaldson, 1997; Young & Whertvine, 1982). Attitudes toward homosexuality extend from "overt hostility, to social acceptance, to benign neglect" and, although individuals may accept homosexuality on a cerebral level, they may still "suffer from revulsion or negative affective responses when interacting with someone gay" (Forstein, 1988, p. 33). A multitude of diverse factors moderate attitudes toward homosexuality, including personal contact with gays and lesbians, self-reports of homosexual experience, and perceptions of peers’attitudes toward homosexuals (Haddock, Zanna, & Esses, 1993; Herek, 1984).
Religious beliefs and premarital sexual standards are also influential in shaping attitudes toward homosexuality. A general acceptance of sexual behavior among partners of the opposite gender has been positively correlated with acceptance of homosexual behavior (Jurich & Jurich, 1974; Young and Whertvine, 1982). Among heterosexual college students, participants who had more favorable attitudes toward both receiving and administering oral sex had less negative attitudes toward homosexual behavior (Young & Whertvine, 1982). Analogously, participants who engaged in both receiving and administering oral sex showed equally favorable attitudes toward homosexual behavior, as did respondents who were accepting of heterosexual intercourse.

Kite and Deaux (1987) discovered that stereotypes of homosexuals are based upon the assumption that homosexual individuals resemble their opposite-sex, heterosexual peers. In accordance with this finding, lesbian women were depicted as masculine, as having short hair, and as having positive attitudes toward other women. Gay men were described as possessing feminine attributes, including a high-pitched voice, and as being positive toward other men. A related study also established that gay men are perceived as being more easily identifiable than their female counterparts, thus they may be more vulnerable to the negative effects of labeling and stereotyping (Nyberg & Alston, 1977).

Although Haddock, Zanna, and Esses (1993) observed that women are more prone to support general stereotypes of homosexuals, it has been noted that men generally hold more negative attitudes toward gays and lesbians (Kerns & Fine, 1994; Luhrs, Crawford, & Goldberg, 1991; Pratarelli & Donaldson, 1997). Fornstein (1988) suggested that "intense homophobic feelings in men may stem from the association of homosexuality with
penetration, with being feminized” (p. 36). The power of this effect may be evident in Ellis and Vasseur’s (1993) finding that, although men and women express the most negative attitudes toward homosexuals of their own gender, the disdain expressed by men toward gay men greatly outweighs the disregard heterosexual women show for lesbians. Moreover, male homosexual behavior may generally be more offensive to Americans than female homosexual behavior. In the words of Nyberg and Alston (1977), female homosexual behavior is “more likely to be labeled erotic” whereas male homosexual behavior is more likely to be labeled “repugnant” (p. 544).

Lyons and Atwood (1994) established that negative impressions, grounded in stereotypes and cued behavior, endured despite evidence of laudable qualities. Subjects were asked to evaluate one excellently qualified candidate for a fourth grade teaching position based upon a variety of informal notes that were attached to the front of the job application. The notes were consistent in four applications, but a fifth application contained either a homosexual cue, a heterosexual cue, or no cue. Participants looked the most favorably upon the candidate to whom heterosexual cues had been assigned, and they were the least tolerant of the homosexually cued applicant. The results suggested that the presence of homosexually cued behavior may be a moderating factor in hiring decisions. As stated by Lyons et al. (1994), “subjects may have been forming impressions of the candidate based on cued behaviors considered typical of a group who are strongly stereotyped and stigmatized in our current society—excellent qualifications of the candidate are not enough to moderate the bias” (p. 338).

In a related study, Ellis and Vasseur (1993) discovered that subjects who described their prior exposure to homosexuals as negative, or who had no prior interaction, were
more likely to form a negative impression of a homosexual individual prior to a mock interview. Interviewers holding such negative impressions utilized a questioning strategy during the mock interview that focused on the candidate’s negative characteristics. The questioning strategy employed was also structured such that the interviewer’s pre-interview beliefs about the target individual were confirmed.

Homophobia

Homophobia has been linked to the processes of identity formation and socialization – factors that appear to be particularly salient to the development of anti-gay sentiment among men. According to Reiter (1991), the role ascribed to women of primary caregiver influences the development of differential personality structures in children, placing boys at greater risk for anti-gay feelings. Reiter’s work echoed that of Gilligan (1982), who saw boys’ core identities as more tenuous given that their original bond is with someone of the opposite sex. Unlike girls who establish their identity through attachment to the mother, boys must separate from their mother and distinguish themselves as being different from her in order to cultivate their identity. The cultural association of homosexuality with effeminate males further augments the risk for homophobia among men, as it “triggers primal fears of being undifferentiated from the mother, or essentially female” (Fornstein, 1988, p. 35).

Moreover, men are socialized to suppress feelings of affection toward friends of the same gender. Fornstein (1988) viewed homophobia as inevitable when same-sex erotic or affectional longings arise at age appropriate times and in the absence of positive homosexual models. Homo-affectional feelings may be interpreted as homosexual tendencies, igniting defenses such as reaction formation and repression. This appears to be
particularly true for heterosexual men who have difficulty relating to women emotionally, or sexually and men who have difficulty enduring ambiguity and inter-individual differences (Fornstein, 1988). Reaction formation may also nourish homophobic attitudes and behaviors in individuals who are doubtful of, or alarmed by, their own sexual predilections, as adopting an anti-gay disposition becomes a means of asserting one’s heterosexuality both to oneself and to others (Fornstein, 1988).

Furthermore, homosexual men may epitomize a challenge to the bedrock of society and the very heterosexual attributes that define the male identity (Weinberg, 1972). The ability to procreate is highly valued by American culture and historically, “any sexual behavior which did not lead to procreation was deplored” (Fornstein, 1988, p. 35). The assumption that gay individuals will be childless fuels the belief that life without vicarious immortality through biological reproduction is meaningless (Weinberg, 1972). Subsequently, homophobia may be an expression of both the fear of death, and the fear that individuals can elect to live without having children to give purpose to their lives (Weinberg, 1972). Gay men may also be perceived as free from the confines of expected societal norms, thus homophobia among heterosexual men may exemplify an underlying envy of the liberation presumed to be afforded to gay men.

Churchill (1967) viewed intolerance of homosexuality as a natural outgrowth of a sex-negative culture wherein the human sex drive is viewed as a threat to social organization. Fornstein (1988) advanced this theory, saying that individuals who do not assent to society’s prescribed values are assumed to be a threat to those values. Consequently, it is presumed that the values held by gay and lesbian individuals are not only different from, but less sound than the values espoused by conventional society.
Homophobia has also been assessed within the context of intergroup prejudice. This leading theory assumes that the roots of homophobia are similar in origin to those of other forms of social prejudice directed against members of groups with low levels of power (Ficarrotto, 1990). A test of the differential power of Churchill’s sexual conservatism theory against a more general theory of inter-group prejudice revealed that sexual conservatism and social prejudice are independent and equal predictors of anti-homosexual sentiment. Hence, for some people, homophobia may be rooted in a set of rigid beliefs and deep-seated negative feelings about human sexuality, whereas for others, a personality trend toward prejudice might be the culprit.

Mental Representations

Much like other forms of prejudice, homophobia thrives because it affords the perceiver a more stable and simple view of the social world (Heider, 1958; Kelley, 1972; Snyder and Uranowitz, 1978). Stability is achieved through the cultivation of attitudes, impressions, stereotypes, and group norms, all of which are examples of mental representations (Smith, 1998). The product of social convention and personal cognitive processes, mental representations are encoded as bits of information that an individual can “construct, retain in memory, and use in various ways” (Smith, 1998, p.391). Primarily utilized to navigate the social world, mental representations ensure that “people do not approach situations as neutral observers or recording devices; instead they bring their own wishes and expectations with them, potentially influencing what they notice and remember” (Smith, 1998, p. 394). Thus, the same attitude expressed by two different people toward the same object may serve distinct psychological functions for each person, depending upon their personal psychological needs (Herek, 1984).
Mental representations such as schemas and prototypes aid individuals in interpreting and predicting behavior by assigning stable traits and permanent characteristics to others. Based in part upon prior knowledge, mental representations facilitate the interpretation of new information by forging an organizational framework that aids the perceiver in filtering out nonessential information. The resultant knowledge bank directs judgment, appoints predicted values for unobserved attributes, and solidifies incomplete, convoluted perceptual input into a stable, coherent picture of the world and the self. The succeeding coagulate can be classified as a prototype, a schema, or a stereotype, each of which may be activated during impression formation.

Prototypes and Schemas

Prototypes and schemas are both abstract, general structures that represent a perceiver's knowledge about a category or concept. Smith (1998) defined a prototype as "an associated representation of the central tendency, average, or typical attribute values of the members of a category" (p. 407). A diffuse database, prototypes are considered an unorganized compilation of all known attributes of a particular class of beings or objects. Similarly, schemas incorporate all patterns of generic prior knowledge that serve an interpretive function. However, schemas represent category-relevant attributes and are considered to be internally organized. Given that both schemas and prototypes serve an interpretive function, the two concepts are often used interchangeably (Smith, 1998).

Free from temporal and contextual constraints, schemas determine the meaning of most unitary concepts (Smith, 1998). Schematic representations of group characteristics may exist at the level of broad social categories (i.e. gender or race), or they may be
isolated to specific subgroups (i.e. white urban resident). Regardless of the level of categorization, activated schemas serve as cues that expedite the retrieval of schema-consistent information. Representations are activated either through explicit thought about relevant subject-matter, or contact with associated information, and activation occurs in a manner that is all or none. Furthermore, schemas are autonomous entities such that the activation of one schema has no direct ramifications for other related schemas. Schemas are also variable in their level accessibility, and their effects are generally thought to transpire at the preconscious level.

**Self-Schemas**

Markus (1977) proposed that schemas encapsulate traits that are meaningful to the self. According to her, self-schemas govern the organization and processing of self-related information such that behavioral information that supports self-descriptions is easily accessible. As evidence, Markus (1977) cited the speed with which individuals with self-schemas endorse self-descriptive characteristics as compared to their aschematic peers. Evidence also exists to support increased recall for schema-consistent information, and individuals appear to be resistant to information that is incompatible with their self-conceptions (Markus, 1977; Smith, 1998). Markus further suggested that the existence of schemas relevant to a particular domain raises the individual to expert status regarding his/her ability to process information pertinent to that domain.

Dunning, Perie, and Story (1991) proffered that individuals create self-enhancing mental representations in order to maintain self-esteem. Research suggests that individuals focus selectively on the positive aspects of their behavior, and negative characteristics tend to be devalued (Lewicki, 1983; Markus, 1977; Shrauger & Patterson,
Undesirable traits are assumed to be outside the realm of one’s self-schemas, and the general meaning of shortcomings is likely modified to avoid damaging one’s self-image (Dunning, Perie, & Story, 1991; Lewicki, 1983). Moreover, “when asked to articulate the features most central to their conception of a desirable social category, people will tend to endorse those characteristics they believe they possess” (Dunning, Perie, & Story, 1991, p. 958). Real or imagined threats to the self are met with attempts to inflate the self-image, and the ideal self becomes the standard against which prototypes are compared during threatening situations (Nedenthal & Mordkoff, 1991).

Dunning, Perie, and Story (1991) further suggested that self-schemas influence the types of inferences individuals make about others. Favorable impressions of others are backed by the assumption that the target person shares the same “idiosyncratic strengths and weaknesses” as the evaluator, which supports the belief that well-liked individuals are similar to the perceiver and disliked individuals are dissimilar (Dunning, Story, & Perie, 1991, p. 958). Friends have been shown to have related self-schemas, and Deutch and Mackesy (1985) demonstrated that self-descriptive traits are rated more positively and endorsed more quickly when those traits are contained within friends’ self-schemas.

The ongoing conversation seen among friends has been pinpointed as the mechanism by which individuals cultivate their conceptions of themselves and others. It is through such interactions that constructs are exchanged and incorporated into schematic representations, and Kelly (1970) suggested that fellowship with others is a means of validating one’s own constructs. When friends were asked to describe a target person, greater overlap in schemas occurred after the target person was discussed, suggesting that participants used each other’s self-schemas when describing the person.
Moreover, membership in and affiliation with a gender group has been shown to augment the tendency to define oneself in a positive manner. Lorenzo-Coldi (1991) discovered that a subgroup of individuals surveyed viewed masculinity and femininity as lying on a continuum. The more participants utilized the continuum framework, the more they identified with their group and its norms, and the more the outgroup was perceived as homogenous. Additionally, Lorenzo-Coldi (1991) learned that women tend to use gender based schemas more than men. He suggested that this predilection may be a function of the social subordination of women which results in a need to quickly learn and translate information about their “superiors”. Similarly, it is advantageous for members of less privileged groups to know the ingroup’s characteristics, and subordinate groups tend to cultivate individuals who define themselves through holistic attributes that distinguish themselves from opposing groups. Lorenzo-Coldi (1991) also found that men and women used more gender-congruent than incongruent attributes to describe themselves, and that the content of individual’s self-descriptions were consistent regardless of the context.

**Stereotypes**

Mental representations such as schemas bridge gaps in available knowledge. Subsequently, they are instrumental to making rapid social judgments in the absence of appreciable information. Although schemas can be a valuable mental tool, the “uncritical use of this tool can lead to errors that have serious social consequences” (Gleitman, 1995, p 429). The simplification and generalization of schemas to entire groups of people result in stereotypes. When applied to minority groups, stereotypes are often negative, and
negative attitudes toward gays and lesbians are correlated with the acceptance of negative stereotypes (Herek, 1984).

Stereotypes are perpetuated through a perceiver-held expectation that members of a particular group will possess certain characteristics (Gleitman, 1995). In the words of Hamilton and Rose (1980), "stereotypic judgments can be viewed as expressing the perceiver's belief regarding a correlational relationship between two variables, one having to do with group membership and the other being a psychological attribute" (p. 833). Known as an "illusory correlation", Chapman (1967) originally suggested that perceivers' ability to process information may be biased by the expectation that two variables will co-occur.

Studies have established that subjects tend to overestimate the frequency with which associatively linked stimuli occur together. The strength of the expectancy-consistent bias was studied by Hamilton and Rose (1980), who presented subjects with sentences describing members of various occupations. The individuals depicted in the sentences were described by pairs of trait adjectives that were either consistent with stereotypic beliefs about the occupational groups, inconsistent with group stereotypes, or unrelated to group stereotypes. The results indicated that subjects erroneously believed that correlations between traits and occupations existed in the absence of any true relationship. Moreover, "the subjects came to perceive those relationships that would be expected on the basis of their stereotypic expectations, and as a result, their stereotypes in effect received confirmation in the absence of substantiating evidence" (Hamilton & Rose, 1980, p. 836).
Hamilton and Rose (1980) cited the availability heuristic and schema theory as two possible explanations for their findings in the before mentioned study. According to Tversky and Kahneman (1973), the availability heuristic refers to the strength of the associative bond between two factors. Pairs of traits that are associated via stereotypes can be easily retrieved from memory, therefore, estimates of their co-occurrence tend to be inflated. A second plausible rationale, schema theory dictates that information is more easily comprehended and recalled when it is related to an existing schema. Hence, new information that is related to existing stereotypic beliefs is likely to be "encoded more effectively and to be more readily retrieved from memory" than is information that is unrelated to existing stereotypes (Hamilton and Rose, 1980, p. 843),

The "attribute of infrequency of occurrence" has also been linked to the overestimation of relationships between categories of individuals and "particular types of behavior" (McArthur & Friedman, 1980, p. 615). Hamilton and Gifford (1976) uncovered an illusory correlation between minority groups and negative behavior by asking participants to evaluate members of two groups, Group A and Group B. Although members of both groups exhibited a ratio of nine desirable behaviors to four undesirable behaviors, twice as many references were made to Group A than to Group B. Participants created an illusory correlation between Group B (the "minority group") and negative behaviors such that the frequency of negative behaviors attributed to Group B were grossly overestimated. Moreover, subjects' overall rating of Group B was more negative than their rating of Group A.
The infrequency effect described by Hamilton and Gifford (1976) has been conceptualized as a “manifestation of a more general shared distinctiveness effect in which perceivers will overestimate the correlation between events that are both salient for any one of a number of reasons, one of which may be their infrequency” (Hamilton & Shannon, 1989; McArthur & Friedman, 1980, p. 616; Mullen & Johnson, 1990; Spears, van der Pligt, and Eiser, 1985). McConnell, Sherman, and Hamilton (1994) wrote of the “two cornerstones of distinctiveness-based interpretation” (p. 623). According to them, information that is infrequent or otherwise salient is subject to more extensive encoding during inception, hence this information is more readily available during judgment processes. Additionally, judgments are grounded in the information that is available at the time of retrieval – not in the impression formation processes that occur when the information is initially encoded. Subsequently, distinctive items carry excessive weight during judgment processes because they have been extensively encoded and are therefore retrieved from memory with greater ease. As a result, judgment is shaped by “biased perceptions in the form of illusory correlations” (McConnell, Sherman, & Hamilton, 1994, p. 415).

The distinctiveness effect has also been shown to govern estimates of co-occurrence when evidence of uniqueness is not immediately apparent (Hunt & McDaniel, 1993; McConnell, Sherman & Hamilton, 1980). McConnell, Sherman, & Hamilton (1980) proposed that illusory-correlation-formation is the result of a process of ongoing digestion of behavioral information. As new information is processed, existing bits of information may be reviewed and reconsidered, such that old information gains a distinctiveness that it did not have during encoding. This effect was evident in the works
of Snyder and Uranowitz (1978), Hirt (1990), and Hirt, Erickson, and McDonald (1993), who independently showed the effects of new circumstances and facts on the reevaluation of old information and the interpretation of previously presented information.

Spears, van der Pligt, and Eiser (1985) introduced the “roles of own attitude position and attitude extremity within the illusory correlation paradigm” (p. 865). These investigators introduced subjects to statements related to an issue about which they would likely harbor strong views - the building of nuclear power stations. Participants were presented with statements that portrayed both positive and negative views of nuclear power stations, and in some conditions the pro-nuclear statements formed the majority, and vice versa. Given that subjects were afforded the opportunity to identify with either the majority or minority position, the authors supposed that participants would experience ego-involvement with regard to the issue of nuclear power stations, resulting in greater polarization in their judgments of the stimuli. Additionally, it was hypothesized that the “self-relevant” nature of the attitude positions, in conjunction with the degree of commitment to the attitude position, would increase the likelihood that a specific attitude position would become more salient than other positions. Therefore, much like distinctive stimuli, salient attitudes were expected to be encoded more thoroughly and processed more easily (Markus, 1977; Spears et al., 1985).

As Spears et al. (1985) hypothesized, individual attitudinal characteristics were crucial to the illusory correlation process. The blending of salience and distinctiveness resulted in enhanced encoding, and the authors determined that “illusory correlation increases as a function of attitude extremity for minority-congruent attitude holders” (Spears et al., 1985, p. 873). Spears et al. (1985) applied their findings to social
psychological principles, saying that “ubiquitous white people might tend to associate infrequent black people with infrequent or extreme behaviors” (p. 874). In a related study, Gaertner and McLaughlin (1983) found that Caucasian subjects responded more quickly to positive trait words following the prime “white” than following the prime “black”. The authors deduced that the word “white” has stronger semantic links to positive concepts than the word “black”; a finding that has relevance for racial stereotyping and prejudice, and implications for sexual stereotyping as well.

However, studies of data-based (e.g. based in data in the absence of distinctiveness) processes and expectation-based processes indicate that data-based illusory correlations “can be overruled by expectations under some circumstances” (Berndsen, van der Pligt, Spears, & McGarty, 1996, p. 902). Berndsen, van der Pligt, Spears, and McGarty (1996) found that when “participants have the opportunity to compare their expectations with diagnostic information before they have the opportunity to judge the degree of covariation, they reported lower illusory correlations than participants who were not first able to test their expectations” (p. 900). The authors concluded that the interchange between prior expectations and factual data is the bedrock of covariation judgments. Berndsen et al. (1996) further equated the use of prior expectations with hypothesis testing, suggesting that illusory correlation “is not a product of distortion, but rather the result of meaning enhancement” (p. 911).

Group membership is a second factor that is closely tied to the germination of stereotypes. Ingroup members are typically favored over their outgroup counterparts, and “we evaluate them more positively and explain their behavior in a more flattering way than we do outgroup members” (Lindeman, 1997, p. 328; Mackie & Ahn, 1998). Positive
ingroup and negative outgroup behaviors are described in broad language, and applicable behaviors are assumed to be due to stable personality characteristics. Conversely, negative ingroup and positive outgroup behaviors are described in “narrow terms implying situational inconsistency” (Sherman, Klein, Laskey, & Wyer, 1998, p. 52). Moreover, perceivers categorize information about members of ingroups in a manner that is based upon individual persons and a large number of weakly associated characteristics. Outgroup members are categorized in a manner that is based upon a large number of strongly associated characteristics, the result of which is the presumption that members of the outgroup are homogeneous (Koomen & Dijker, 1997; Linville, Salovey, & Fischer, 1986; van Twuyer, & van Knippenberg, 1996; Young, van Knippenberg, Ellemers, & DeVries, 1995).

Given that perceivers both expect and desire the ingroup to be more favorable than the outgroup, high standards may be set for accepting evidence to the contrary (Sherman, et al, 1998). As already mentioned, positive ingroup and negative outgroup behaviors are seen as indicative of underlying dispositions; hence little evidence of such behaviors is required when making inferences about trait characteristics. Therefore, during the impression formation process, perceivers tend to rely upon stored trait information rather than actual memory for group behaviors (Sherman, et al. 1998).

Interestingly, members of the ingroup are not likely to be affected by the stereotypes of their group. The focus among members of the ingroup is on normative behaviors, and behaviors that are in accordance with ingroup norms have no special relevance for perceivers in the ingroup. Therefore, normative behaviors do not demand much attention or explanatory activity. However, behaviors that considerably deviate
from group norms are of interest to the perceiver; subsequently, they are processed more thoroughly than expectation-consistent behaviors.

**Mental Representations and Recall**

The effects of the expectations inherent to mental representation on memory have been studied, with mixed results. When existing knowledge serves as a primary source of rehearsal cues, a recall advantage for information consistent with the expectation has emerged (Cantor & Mischel, 1977; Cohen, 1981; Greenwald & Banaji, 1989). Meta-analytic studies imply that, when information about members of an existing social group varies in its consistency with stereotypic expectations, data that is consistent with the stereotype is more likely to be recalled at a later time (Fyock & Stangor, 1994).

Yet evidence also exists to suggest that behaviors that are inconsistent with the expectation are better recalled than consistent behaviors (Hastie & Kumar, 1979). As reported by Smith (1998), a meta-analysis of 54 experiments confirmed a sound advantage of inconsistent information for recall. However, the advantage of inconsistent information on recall faded or reverted when expectations were strong. The effect of inconsistent information on recall was also weakened when the information to be processed was complex, or the time allotted to processing the information was limited. Utilization of a memorization strategy rather than forming a coherent impression further impaired recall of inconsistent information, as did attempts to process information pertaining to a social group rather than a distinct individual.

Stangor and McMillan (1992) also showed a weak overall advantage for impression-inconsistent information on recognition tasks for information related to subject's expectations. However, the strength of the expectations and the subject’s intent
when processing the information significantly interacted with consistency. For example, expectation-inconsistent information had a smaller advantage when the expectation was pre-existing rather than created by the experimenter. Also, "whereas schema-incongruent information concerning the person may be better recalled than schema-congruent information, the opposite may be true when information relates to group members" (Spears, et al, 1986, p. 1133).

Koomen and Dijker (1997) discovered that the "use of outgroup stereotypes results in better encoding of stereotype-consistent than inconsistent information whereas the reverse holds true for ingroup stereotypes" (p. 598). They also found that stereotypes influence judgments of familiarity during recognition tasks such that stereotype-consistent information is recognized as being more familiar. As a result, individuals may be inferred to possess stereotype-consistent attributes in the absence of concrete evidence, as the stereotype, not individual characteristics, is the basis for judgment (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990; Fyock & Stangor, 1994). Moreover, ambiguous behaviors may be interpreted as clearly confirming the stereotype, although Fiske and Neuberg (1990) noted that a motivated perceiver may process information about an atypical group member in a more individuated fashion.

Clark, Martin, and Henry (1993) attributed changes in information at reconstruction to the use of divergent labels at encoding and retrieval. According to their model, contextual information about a target individual is condensed into a label during impression formation. The perceiver then creates a "category standard" which encompasses an "average of the values in the context in which the perceivers first encountered the target's behaviors and the context in which the perceivers attempt to
recall the behaviors" (Clark et al., 1993, p. 337). A link is established between the label and distinct behaviors which allows the perceiver to reconstruct the target's original behaviors at a later time. Reconstruction is altered when the category standard used by the perceiver during retrieval differs from that used during the initial encoding of behavior. Newly presented contextual information sets a new standard that influences the perceiver's recall of the target individual's actions. As a result, the perceiver may recall the target's behaviors as being more congruent with the retrieval standard than they actually are.

Snyder and Uranowitz (1978) suggested that "we construct a schematic representation of our past experience by piecing together remembered bits and pieces with new facts that we (knowingly or unknowingly) supply to flesh out or augment our emerging knowledge of the past" (p. 942). They further supposed that reconstructive processes perpetuate social stereotypes to the extent that individuals judiciously recover information that bolsters their current stereotypic interpretations of another person. In an effort to test their hypothesis, Snyder and Uranowitz (1978) presented 212 male and female undergraduates with a narrative describing the life of a woman named Betty K. Either immediately after this presentation, or one week later, subjects were given differential information about Betty K.'s sexual orientation. Recognition memory for actual events in Betty K.'s life was then appraised.

Snyder and Uranowitz (1978) discovered that participants judiciously affirmed events that were consistent with their understanding of Betty K. at the time their memory was tested. Moreover, the findings were equivalent regardless of whether participants learned of Betty K.'s sexual orientation immediately after reading the narrative, or after a week long intermission. Of additional interest, "participants were better able to
accurately identify those facts of Betty K’s life that confirmed stereotyped beliefs about sexuality” (p. 949). The authors concluded that this finding was the result of the interplay between stereotyped beliefs and genuine memory for actual events, and they noted that “when new information precipitates a shift in beliefs, knowledge of past events may serve as fertile ground for reconstructive processes that bolster and augment current impressions about another individual” (Snyder & Uranowitz, 1978, p. 942).
Chapter II
Rationale and Hypotheses

The recent upsurge in violence toward homosexuals (particularly gay men) is a graphic exposition of the fervor with which some individuals accost the issue of homosexuality. Gays and lesbians are prey to the mental representations harbored by persons they encounter, and an analysis of the literature indicates that homosexuals are assigned an inordinate amount of negative qualities. Much of the disapproval exhibited toward gays and lesbians can be traced to the unbridled reliance upon schemas and the assumption that a same-gender sexual preference co-occurs with specific, negative behavioral traits. Stereotypic representations of gays and lesbians are evident during impression formation, and mental representations of this kind are proliferated via the tendency for members of the ingroup to preferentially encode stereotype-consistent behavior.

The purpose of the proposed study is to investigate the immediate effect of newly presented homosexually-cued behavior on recognition memory. In order to assess the effects of both gay and lesbian cued behavior, the procedure devised by Snyder and Uranowitz (1978) will be expanded upon to include both a male and a female persona. As such, biographical narratives will be used to acquaint subjects with either a male or female character. Information within the case histories will not suggest any particular sexual orientation, and immediately after reading the narratives, participants will be given additional information about the target individual’s sexual preference. The effect of this manipulation on recognition memory for genuine information about the characters’ lives will then be assessed. The inclusion of a male character in the proposed study is designed
to appraise whether recognition memory is differentially affected by the introduction of gay versus lesbian homosexual behavior.

**Primary Hypotheses**

The proposed study is guided by the following primary hypotheses. Given that individuals have been shown to perceive patterns of evidence that substantiate their stereotypic beliefs, it is hypothesized that more stereotyped information will be remembered about the gay and lesbian forms of the stimulus materials than the heterosexual forms. Additionally, the disdain expressed toward gay men suggests that they may be more vulnerable to the negative effects of stereotypes than lesbian women. Thus, it is hypothesized that a significant interaction exists such that more stereotyped information will be remembered for the gay man than for the lesbian woman or the heterosexual man or woman.

**Subsidiary Hypotheses**

Homophobia and perceiver-held sexual attitudes may also mediate the effects of sexual orientation on memory. Empirical evidence suggests that homophobia emerges from rigid beliefs and negative attitudes about human sexuality, and it appears that some individuals exhibit a personality trend toward prejudice. Individuals who have more favorable attitudes toward sexual expression have been shown to be more accepting of homosexual behavior, and it is likely that participants who do not fear being in close contact with homosexuals look more favorably upon same-gender relationships. Hence, it is hypothesized that individuals who are more homophobic and more traditional in their sexual attitudes are more likely to remember stereotypic information about gays and
lesbians than individuals who are less homophobic and less traditional in their sexual attitudes.

The null forms of each of the primary and subsidiary hypotheses will be tested at the $p = .05$ level of significance.
Chapter III

Method

Participants

A power analysis was conducted to determine the appropriate number of participants to be included in the proposed study. The power analysis was based upon Snyder and Uranowitz's finding of $F(1, 116) = 10.34, p<0.002$. This finding converts to an $f$ of 0.633, which Rosenthal and Rosenow (1991) designate as a large effect size. In accordance with the power analysis, 80 participants, twenty in each of four conditions, will be included in this study.

Participants will be drawn from the undergraduate population at Xavier University, a mid-Western, liberal arts, and religious-affiliated university. Sixty-six percent of students at Xavier University are Catholic, and the distribution of religious denominations is presented in Appendix A. Participants will be recruited through a sign-up sheet, and an incentive of one chance in a raffle for ten, 10 dollar bills will be offered (see Appendix B). Demographic information will be collected from each participant, to include participants': age, gender, year in school, and political affiliation (see Appendix C). The descriptive statistics for each scale included in the materials section will be presented in a table for each level of demographic variable (see Table 1). The mean, standard deviation, and/or frequency data for each demographic variable will be included in the table. Information regarding participants' sexual orientation will be excluded as a demographic variable, as the benefits gained by making such a sensitive inquiry would not likely outweigh the cost to the participants.
Table 1

Proposed Demographic Statistics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Materials

Case History. Two case histories will be employed that are based upon the work of Snyder and Uranowitz (1978) (see Appendix D). The original case history, and other related materials, were procured from Mark Snyder and permission was granted to use the materials in the proposed study. Unless otherwise noted, Snyder and Uranowitz's (1978) materials will be used in their initial form.

The original case materials consist of a 746-word narrative documenting the life of a woman from birth through college and the choice of a profession (see Appendix D). Contained within the narrative is information pertinent to the character's early home life, her relationship with her parents, and her sexual life in high school and college. The narrative also contains "factual" information, such as the name of the town in which she lived. Snyder and Uranowitz (1978) constructed the case history to fit either a lesbian or heterosexual outcome, as evidenced by the inclusion of information such as the fact that she did not have a steady boyfriend in college, but she did date.

For use in the proposed study, the original case history was modified to accommodate a male persona (see Appendix D). As such, the name Betty K. was replaced with the name Bob K., and the content of the narrative was adjusted to make it more suitable for a male persona. Graduate students in a master's level education course and a doctoral level psychology course were recruited to appraise whether the two narratives (Betty K. and Bob K.'s) were parallel. The students were asked to read each narrative and to indicate whether they felt that the individuals depicted were equally happy, healthy, and adjusted. Participants were also asked to rate their confidence in their decision on a zero to ten scale, such that a rating of ten denoted utmost confidence.
Lastly, they were asked to indicate whether the information provided for Bob K. befit a college age male. Of the seventeen participants surveyed, fourteen felt that the case history devised for Bob K. paralleled the existing case history for Betty K. The average confidence rating was 9.17, and eleven of the seventeen participants believed that description of Bob K. was an accurate portrayal of a college aged man.

**Recognition Memory Measure.** A measure of recognition memory will also be utilized that is also based upon the work of Snyder and Uranowitz (1978) (see Appendix E). The original recognition memory measure contains 36 multiple choice questions that offer the respondent four potential answers: Three of the answers revolve around substantive information; the fourth allows participants to indicate if no relevant information was provided in the case history. The questions contained within the recognition memory measure tap into the Betty K.'s attitude toward individuals of the opposite gender, her dating habits, her upbringing, and her relationship with her parents.

Of the 36 questions posed in the recognition memory measure, 17 were identified by Snyder and Uranowitz (1978) as critical items that reflect respondents' stereotyped beliefs about sexuality (see Appendix F). The critical items were identified through a rating process wherein seven undergraduate rater-judges categorized the response alternatives contained within the recognition memory measure according to whether they were indicative of impending lesbianism, impending heterosexuality, or neutral with regard to sexuality. Response alternatives that were deemed to be stereotypically lesbian by four or more rater-judges were assigned a rating of three. Response alternative that were judged to be stereotypically heterosexual were assigned a rating of 1, and neutral response alternatives were assigned a rating of 2 (see Appendix F).
The critical items identified by the rater-judges reflect stereotyped beliefs about sexuality through the calculation of a stereotype score (the dependent variable) that can range from 1.00 (all answers are stereotypically heterosexual) to 3.00 (all answers are stereotypically lesbian). The stereotype score is computed by calculating the mean of the ratings for the questions the participant answered with a "non-d", or factual response. For example, if a respondent answered "d" (no information provided) for 4 of the 17 critical items, then his or her stereotype score is the mean of the ratings for the 13 "non-d" responses.

As with the case history a second recognition memory measure was devised to accommodate the inclusion of a male complement to Betty K. Questions that were suited to a direct transformation were altered. One question was not immediately translatable to Bob K., a question about wearing makeup in college, and a new question was derived for inclusion in the proposed study. Members of an undergraduate experimental psychology class and a doctoral level psychology class were asked to generate examples of an attribute that would imply a homosexual orientation in a male college student. Suggestions were compiled and viable options were included in a modified set of multiple choice questions that pertained to Bob K., the male fictional character designated as a counterpart to Betty K.

Members of an undergraduate psychology class were asked to read Bob K. and Betty K.'s case histories, and they were informed that the characters pursued homosexual lifestyles. The presentation of the narratives was counterbalanced to control for order effects, and carry-over effects were eliminated by presenting the first narrative at the beginning of the class hour and the second narrative at the end of the class hour.
Participants then completed recognition memory measures for each character. Mean responses for Betty K. versus Bob K. were compared to determine if they were significantly different, which would suggest that the ratings assigned by Snyder and Uranowitz (1978) would not apply to the new recognition memory measure. The ratings obtained were identical, suggesting that the recognition memory measure devised for Bob K. paralleled the recognition memory measure outlined for Betty K. Hence, the revised scale will be employed to determine the effect of the gay manipulation on participants’ recognition memory (see Appendix E).

**Sexual Attitude Scales.** In order to explore the possibility that the effect of the manipulation is influenced by the perceiver’s sexual attitudes, the Hendrick Sexual Attitude Scale (Hendrick, Hendrick, Slapion-Foote, & Foote, 1985) will be administered (see Appendix G). The HSAS is a 43-item scale that delineates four types of attitudes toward sexuality: Permissiveness, Sexual Practices, Communion (the belief that sex is the closest form of communication and the ultimate human interaction), and Instrumentality (a self-centered, physical orientation to sex). Items contained within this scale are rated on a 5-letter scale wherein: A = strongly agree; B = moderately agree; C = neutral; D = moderately disagree; and E = strongly disagree. For data analysis, the data are converted to a 5-point numerical scale such that a value of one is assigned to items that participants strongly agree with, a value of two is assigned to items which garner moderate agreement, etc.

Test-retest reliabilities for the before mentioned dimensions at a one month interval reportedly range from .66 (Instrumentality) to .88 (Permissiveness) (Adler & Hendrick, 1991). Moreover, in a study of 807 subjects, the standardized alphas were .94,
.71, .80, and .80 for the permissiveness, sexual practices, communion, and instrumentality sub-scales respectively (Hendrick, Hendrick, Slapion-Foote, & Foote, 1985.) The Permissiveness dimension has been identified as the strongest factor, and Hendrick & Hendrick (1987) reported that this scale accounts for 24.8 percent of the total variance. The remaining sub-scales account for 4.4 percent (Sexual Practices), 11.8 percent (Communion), and 5.7 percent (Instrumentality) of the total variance. Hendrick and Hendrick (1987) further reported that “although the factor loadings among the dimensions vary, 6 of the 8 Sexual Practice items, 9 of the 11 Communion items, and all 6 of the Instrumentality items were above .40, and a considerable number of items exceeded .50” (p. 508). Lastly, scores on the subscales tend to correlate with other measure of sex and love and sensation seeking (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1987).

Hudson, Murphy, and Nurius’s (1983) Sexual Attitude Scale will also be administered as an adjunct indicator of participants’ sexual attitudes (see Appendix H). The Sexual Attitude Scale (SAS) is a “25-item summated-category-partition scale that was designed to measure the extent to which an individual adheres to a liberal or a conservative orientation concerning sexual expression” (Hudson, Murphy, & Nurius, 1983, p. 259). Each item on the SAS is scored on a 5-point “agree-disagree” continuum, and with the exception of two items, all items are worded and scored such that a high score delineates a more liberal attitude toward sexual expression. Scores can range from 0 to 100, and the SAS has a neutral mid-point of 50. Hence, participants who score above 50 exhibit a more conservative orientation toward human sexual expression, and those who score below 50 exhibit a more liberal orientation.
The reliability of the SAS has been determined to consistently exceed an alpha coefficient of 0.90 (Hudson, 1997; Hudson, Murphy, & Nurius, 1983). Hudson, Murphy, and Nurius (1983) also found the SAS to have a discriminant validity coefficient of .73, which they decreed to be a lower bound estimate. Given this finding, the authors concluded that the SAS is a "valid measure of the degree to which an individual adheres to a liberal or conservative orientation concerning human sexual expression" (Hudson, et al., 1983, p. 265). Each item on the SAS has also been determined to significantly contribute to the SAS total score, and the correlations are reported to be sizable in their magnitudes (Hudson, 1997; Hudson, et al., 1983). The SAS has also been found to have good convergent and discriminative validity.

**Homophobia Scales.** Two measures of Homophobia (the Index of Attitudes Toward Homophobia and the Homophobia Scale) will be administered to assess to degree to which fear of being in close quarters with gays and lesbians effects recognition memory for stereotypically homosexual information. Much like the SAS, the Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980) is a 25-item summated -category -partition scale with a score range from 0 to 100 (see Appendix I). Individuals who have considerable dread of being in close quarters with homosexual men and women tend to obtain high scores on the Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals (IHP). Conversely, individuals who do not experience dread when in close quarters with gays and lesbians tend to score low on the IHP. The IHP has been reported to consistently achieve a coefficient alpha of at least .90 (Hudson, 1997; Hudson & Ricketts, 1980). Hudson and Ricketts (1983) found that the IHP has very high content and factorial validity, and the
IHP has also been said to consistently achieve validity coefficients of 0.60 or greater (Hudson, 1997).

Bouton, Gallaher, Garlinghouse, Leal, Rosenstein, and Young's (1987) Homophobia Scale will also be administered (see Appendix J). The Homophobia Scale contains seven statements that are scored on a 0 to 4 scale. Scores for the entire scale can range from 0 to 28, and high scores connote an “extremely negative attitude toward homosexuals” (Young, Gallaher, Marriott, & Kelly, 1993, p. 915). The Homophobia Scale has been reported to have a coefficient alpha of .89, and factor analysis of this scale found that 60.0% of variance was accounted for by a single factor (Bouton et al, 1987). Correlations between single items and the entire Homophobia Scale scores were also reported to be consistently high, with the median correlations equaling .76 and the lowest correlation equaling .72. Citing the scales reliability and “the large percentage of variance accounted for”, Bouton et al. (1987) proclaimed that the Homophobia Scale measures a single variable -- attitude toward homosexuals.

Two sexual attitude scales and two measures of homophobia will be administered so that a multitrait-multimethod matrix (Campbell & Fiske, 1959) of interactions can be constructed (see Table 2). Multitrait-multimethod matrices depict every inter-correlation that emerges when multiple traits are measured via multiple methods. Such matrices allow for the measurement of the same and differing traits while bypassing the possibility that extreme correlations are due to the traits’ basis in a common method of measurement, rather than to convergent or discriminant validity. Thus, the examiner is afforded greater confidence that the trait under investigation, is actually being measured.
Table 2

A Prototypical Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>Method 1</th>
<th>Method 2</th>
<th>Method 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method 1 B1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method 2 A2</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.57)</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method 3 A3</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.56)</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - The validity diagonals are the three sets of italicized values. The reliability diagonals are the three sets of values in parentheses. This above figure shows a Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix for three concepts (traits 1, 2, & 3), each of which is measured by three separate methods (A, B, & C). The matrix only depicts correlations, and given that it is a square, symmetric matrix, only the lower half of it is needed. Correlations are grouped into three kinds of shapes: diagonals, triangles, and blocks. The reliability diagonal can also be thought of as a monotrait-monomethod correlation, or the correlation of the measure with itself. The validity diagonals represent correlations between measures of the same trait using different measures. Hence, the validity diagonals are considered monotrait-heteromethod correlations.

The Multitrait-multimethod Matrix also depicts heterotrait-monomethod and heterotrait-heteromethod triangles. Heterotrait-monomethod triangles show correlations among measures that share the same method of measurement. If the heterotrait-monomethod correlations are high, it is because measuring different traits with the same method results in correlated measures. Heterotrait-heteromethod triangles are correlations that differ both in trait and in method. Because neither trait nor method are shared in these triangles, these correlations are expected to among the lowest in the matrix.

Monomethod and heteromethod blocks appear in the matrix as well. The former refers to all of the correlations that share the same method of measurement, and there are as many blocks as there are methods of measurement. The latter refers to all correlations that do not share the same method of measurement (Campbell & Fiske, 1959, p. 82).
Procedure

At the onset, participants will receive a consent form, the conditions of anonymity, and their freedom to withdraw without penalty will be explained (see Appendix K). The consent form will be collected separately from the research materials to ensure that participants’ names are not matched with their responses, and they will be asked to refrain from writing their names on the research materials. A black marker will be used to fill in the signature lines provided by the SAS and IHP. Consent forms will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in the Interpersonal Communications Lab at Xavier University.

In accordance with the procedure outlined by Snyder and Uranowitz (1978), participants will be told that in order to “investigate the way individuals form impressions of other people” they will be reading a narrative about an individual’s life, with only “names and places ... changed to conceal the person’s identity” (p. 943). Participants will be asked to “form a complete impression of the person” with the prospect of answering “questions about your reaction to this person” at the end of the session (Snyder & Uranowitz, 1978, p. 943). Participants will then be randomly assigned to one of four experimental conditions (male-heterosexual, male-homosexual, female-heterosexual, or female-homosexual), and asked to read the respective vignettes.

At the end of the vignettes participants will learn new information about Betty K. or Bob K.’s sexuality. Participants in the lesbian condition will learn that:

During her senior year, Betty met a lesbian woman who introduced her to homosexual activity. Betty felt exhilarated and that she had finally found herself, and went on to a successful medical career
living with her lesbian mate (Snyder & Uranowitz, 1978, p. 943).

Participants in the gay condition will learn that:

During his senior year, Bob met a gay man who introduced him to homosexual activity. Bob felt exhilarated and that he had finally found himself, and went on to successful medical career living with his gay mate.

Participants in the female heterosexual label condition will learn that:

During her senior year, Betty met a man who introduced her to sexual activity. Betty felt exhilarated and that she had finally found herself. She married this man and went on to have a successful medical career living with her husband (Snyder & Uranowitz, 1978, p.943)

Participants in the male heterosexual label condition will learn that:

During his senior year, Bob met a woman who introduced him to sexual activity. Bob felt exhilarated and that he had finally found himself. He married this woman and went on to have a successful medical career living with his wife.

Immediately following the information about the character's sexuality will be a statement instructing participants to respond to questions relating to the passage. Upon completion of this task, participants will be asked to respond to the two Sexual Attitude Scales and the two Homophobia Scales, and demographic information will be collected. In order to equalize routine order effects, the sexual attitude and homophobia scales will be presented in a manner consistent with a counterbalanced design such that some
participants will complete the sexual attitude scales prior to completing the homophobia scales and vice versa.

Upon completion of the research materials, participants will be given a debriefing form which contains a brief synopsis of the proposed study (see Appendix L). The use of deception will be addressed, and the examiner’s phone number will be supplied should participants have any questions or concerns regarding the study. Additionally, the names and phone numbers of two on-campus counseling centers will be made available to participants in the event that they would like to speak to a professional regarding any issues that may have emerged as a result of their exposure to the research materials.
Chapter IV

Results

The proposed study poses the following primary hypotheses:

1. More stereotyped information will be remembered about the gay and lesbian forms of the stimulus materials than the heterosexual forms, as measured by participants' stereotype-recall scores on the 17 critical items delineated by Snyder and Uranowitz (1978).

2. An interaction effect exists such that more stereotyped information will be remembered for the gay persona than for the lesbian persona or either heterosexual persona.

The effects of each of the before mentioned factors will be assessed singly and in combination via an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

In addition to the two primary hypotheses, a subsidiary hypothesis dedicated to the effects of homophobia and the perceiver's sexual attitudes on memory for sexually oriented material will be tested. In accordance with this supposition, it is presumed that individuals who harbor homophobic attitudes and who are more traditional in their attitudes toward sexual expression are more likely to remember stereotypic information about gays and lesbians.

The subsidiary hypothesis will be examined via a Multiple Regression Analysis, which will be computed to examine the extent to which the prediction of memory errors is enhanced by the inclusion of sexual attitudes and homophobia scores. Specifically, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis will be computed wherein the criterion variable is comprised of participants' stereotype-recall scores. The first set in the equations contains
the dummy codes for the two independent variables (i.e. stimulant sex and sexual orientation) and the second set in the equation contains the two sexual attitude scores and the two homophobia scores (unless these scores are highly correlated, in which case only one sexual attitude score and one homophobia score will be used). The prediction will be supported if the increment in $R^2$ for the second set in the equation is statistically significant.
Chapter V

Discussion

Confirmation of the primary hypotheses would suggest that participants embraced stereotype-consistent information about gays and lesbians when reflecting upon their impressions of a gay or lesbian individual. Such an outcome would imply that stereotype-congruent information was endorsed as being familiar, a finding that would befit published literature on schematic representations and illusory correlations.

The tendency to erroneously associate a class of individuals with particular behavioral traits is well established, and evidence of such an occurrence in the proposed study could be a function of distinctiveness. Gays and lesbians are often perceived as having gender-incongruent traits and imperfect values which, in combination with their sexual preferences, likely augments their perceived uniqueness (Churchill, 1967; Kite & Deaux, 1987). When participants learn new information about Betty or Bob K.’s sexuality, encoded bits of information may be reconsidered such that old information gains a distinctiveness that did not exist during encoding. Distinct information exudes greater influence upon judgment processes than non-distinct information, hence more negative or stereotype-consistent behaviors may be remembered for the gay and lesbian personas.

The fact that many heterosexual individuals have strong attitudes about homosexual behavior could also contribute to the substantiation of the primary hypotheses. Information pertinent to the perceiver’s salient attitudes is also subject to more in-depth processing, and participants who exhibit homophobic attitudes are likely to be conservative in their attitudes toward sexual expression, hence they will likely have
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strong views about gays and lesbians. The maintenance of extreme views augments any
tendency toward illusory correlations, thereby providing an additional rationale for any
stereotype-confirming biases that may appear in the proposed study.

However, one cannot limit the impact of mental representations such as schemas,
stereotypes and their resultant illusory correlations to the domain of cognition. Those
attitudes which emerge from mental representations translate into behaviors and actions,
the extreme of which too often result in human tragedy. The recent wave of anti-gay
violence and the death of Matthew Shepard are painful reminders of society’s propensity
to attribute negative behaviors and stereotypes to distinctive groups; and more sadly, they
are a graphic example of the ease with which “hateful thoughts . . . turn to violent actions”
(Anonymous, 1999).
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Chapter VI

Dissertation

Abstract

The relationship between social cognition and impression formation was investigated through an examination of the immediate effects of newly presenting homosexually-cued behavior on recognition memory. Participants read an elaborate case history depicting the life of either a woman named Betty K. or a man named Bob K. Immediately after reading the case history, participants learned that the character they read about either pursued a heterosexual lifestyle or a homosexual lifestyle. The impact of this information on recognition memory was then assessed. Information regarding participants' beliefs about sexual expression and the degree to which they adhered to homophobic beliefs was also collected as a means of grasping the effect of these variables on recognition memory for information considered stereotypic of homosexual men and women. The results indicated that main effects for sexual orientation, participant gender, and character gender were not significant. However, an interaction between participant gender and character gender emerged such that male participants attributed more stereotypes to the female stimulus persona than to the male stimulus persona. Additionally, participants who were more conservative in their views regarding sexual practices made a significant number of memory errors when reflecting upon the stimulus persons about whom they read.
Homosexually-Cued Behavior and Impression Formation

Empirical evidence supports the existence of a general disapproval of homosexual relationships among heterosexual individuals (Donally, Donally, Kittleson, Fogarty, Procaccino, & Duncan, 1997; Laner & Laner, 1980; Nyberg & Alston, 1977; Pratarelli & Donaldson, 1997; Young & Whertvine, 1982). Attitudes toward homosexuality extend from "overt hostility, to social acceptance, to benign neglect", and although individuals may accept homosexuality on a cerebral level, they may still suffer from negative affective responses when interacting with someone who is gay (Fornstein, 1988, p. 33).

A multitude of factors moderate attitudes toward homosexuality, including personal contact with gays and lesbians, self-reports of homosexual experiences, perceptions of peers' attitudes toward gays and lesbians, and attitudes toward sexual expression among heterosexual partners (Haddock, Zanna, & Esses, 1993; Herek, 1984; Jurich & Jurich, 1974; Young & Whertvine, 1982). Among heterosexual college students, individuals who had more favorable attitudes toward engaging in both receiving and administering oral sex had less negative attitudes toward homosexual behavior (Young & Whertvine, 1982).

Homophobia, the fear of being in close quarters with someone who lives a homosexual lifestyle, is another factor that must be considered when examining impression formation and attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women (Churchill, 1967). Affixed in religious beliefs and a sex-negative culture wherein the human sex drive is viewed as a threat to social organization, a homophobic society presumes that the values held by gays and lesbians are not only different from, but less sound than the values espoused by conventional society (Churchill, 1967; Fornstein, 1988). Sexual conservatism and social
prejudice have been found to be independent, yet equal, predictors of anti-homosexual sentiment (Ficarroto, 1990). Hence, for some individuals, homophobia may be rooted in a set of rigid beliefs and deep-seated negative feelings about human sexuality, whereas for others, a personality trend toward prejudice may be the culprit.

Much like other forms of prejudice, homophobia thrives because it affords the perceiver a more stable and simple view of the social world (Ficarroto, 1990; Heider, 1958; Snyder & Uranowitz, 1978). The schemas that guide the interpretation and prediction of behavior encapsulate traits that are meaningful to the self such that behavioral information that supports self-description is easily accessible (Markus, 1997). Self-enhancing mental representations bolster self-esteem, as undesirable traits are assumed to be outside the realm of one's self-schemas (Dunning, Perie & Story, 1991; Lewicki, 1983; Markus, 1977, Shrauger & Patterson, 1974).

Mental representations such as schemas bridge gaps in available knowledge, therefore they are instrumental in making rapid social judgments in the absence of appreciable information. Favorable impressions of others are backed by the assumption that the target person shares the same strengths and weaknesses as the evaluator, hence well-liked individuals are thought to be similar to the perceiver and disliked individuals are thought to be dissimilar (Dunning, Story, & Perie, 1991). The unbridled reliance upon mental representations can lead to errors that have grave social consequences, as the generalization of schemas to entire groups of people results in stereotypes. When applied to minority groups, stereotypes are often negative, and the proliferation of negative attitudes toward gays and lesbians is correlated with the acceptance of negative stereotypes (Herek, 1984).
Stereotypes of homosexual men and women tend to be based upon the assumption that gays and lesbians resemble their opposite-sex, heterosexual peers, with gay men perceived as being more easily identifiable than their female counterparts (Kite & Deux, 1987). Whereas women are more prone to support both positive and negative stereotypes of homosexual men and women, men generally hold more negative attitudes toward their homosexual peers (Fornstein, 1988; Haddock, Zanna, & Esses, 1993; Kerns & Fine, 1994; Luhrs, Crawford, & Goldberg, 1991, Pratarelli & Donaldson, 1997). The power of this effect is evident in Ellis and Vasseur’s (1993) finding that, although men and women express the most negative attitudes toward homosexual behavior among members of their own gender, the disdain expressed by heterosexual men toward gay men greatly outweighs the disregard heterosexual women show for lesbians.

Stereotypes are perpetuated through a perceiver-held belief that members of a particular group will possess certain characteristics (Gleitman, 1995). Known as an “illusory correlation”, it has been suggested that perceivers’ ability to process information may be biased by the expectation that two variables will co-occur (Chapman, 1967). The formation of illusory correlations is reinforced when the perceiver is confronted with information that is distinctive or that arouses salient attitudes (Spears, van der Plight, & Eiser, 1985). Such information is encoded more thoroughly than non-distinct or benign information, making it more easily accessible during impression formation (Markus, 1977; Spears et al., 1985). Information pertaining to minority groups is considered by the perceiver to be distinctive and it may activate salient attitudes for some perceivers. This in part accounts for the tendency to overestimate the relationship between categories of individuals and “particular types of behaviors” (McArthur & Friedman, 1980, p. 615).
Hamilton and Gifford (1976) uncovered an illusory correlation between minority groups and negative behaviors, such that the frequency of negative behaviors attributed to minority groups was grossly overestimated.

Group membership is another factor that is closely tied to the germination of stereotypes. In-group members are typically favored over their out-group counterparts, therefore their behavior tends to be explained in a more flattering way (Lindeman, 1997, Mackie & Ahn, 1998; Sherman, Klein, Laskey, & Wyer, 1998). Out-group members are categorized in a manner that is based upon a large number of strongly associated characteristics, the result of which is the presumption that out-group members are homogenous (Koomen, & Dijker, 1997; Linville, Salovey, & Fischer, 1986; van Twuyer, & van Knippenberg, 1998; Young, van Knippenberg, Ellemers, & de Vries, 1995). Given that perceivers both expect and desire in-group members to be judged more favorably than out-group members, high standards are set for accepting evidence to the contrary (Sherman, et. al. 1998).

It has further been supposed that reconstructive processes perpetuate social stereotypes to the extent that individuals judiciously recover information that bolsters their current stereotypic interpretation of another person (Hirt, 1990; Hirt, Erickson, & McDonald, 1993; Snyder & Uranowitz, 1978). Seeking to test this hypothesis, Snyder and Uranowitz (1978) presented two-hundred and twelve male and female undergraduates with a narrative describing the life of a woman named Betty K. Either immediately after this presentation, or one week later, subjects were given differential information about Betty K.'s sexual orientation. Recognition memory for actual events in Betty K.'s life was then appraised.
Snyder and Uranowitz (1978) discovered that participants judiciously affirmed events that were consistent with their understanding of Betty K. at the time their memory was tested. Moreover, “participants were better able to accurately identify those facts of Betty K.'s life that confirmed stereotyped beliefs about sexuality” (p. 949). The authors noted that as “new information precipitates a shift in beliefs, knowledge of past events may serve as fertile ground for reconstructive processes that bolster and augment current impressions about another individual” (Snyder & Uranowitz, 1978, p. 942).

The recent upsurge in violence toward gay men is a graphic exposition of the degree to which attitudes toward homosexual lifestyles impact contemporary society. Of interest in the present study was the effect of homosexually-cued behavior on impression formation. In order to assess the effects of both gay and lesbian cued behavior, the procedure devised by Snyder and Uranowitz (1978) was expanded upon to include both a male and a female persona. The inclusion of a male character in this study was designed to appraise whether recognition memory is differentially affected by the introduction of gay versus lesbian behavior.

Given that individuals have been shown to perceive patterns of behavior that substantiate their stereotypic beliefs, it was hypothesized that more stereotyped information is remembered about the gay and the lesbian forms of the stimulus materials than the heterosexual forms. Additionally, the magnitude of the disdain expressed toward gay men suggests that they may be more vulnerable to the negative effects of stereotypes than lesbian women. Thus, it was hypothesized that a significant interaction exists such that more stereotyped information is remembered about the gay man than for the lesbian woman or for the heterosexual man or woman.
Of additional interest was whether homophobia and perceiver-held sexual attitudes moderate the effects of sexual orientation on recognition memory. Individuals who harbor more favorable attitudes toward sexual expression have been shown to be more accepting of homosexual behavior, and it is likely that participants who do not fear being in close contact with homosexuals look more favorably upon same-gender relationships. Hence, it was hypothesized that individuals who are more homophobic and more traditional in their sexual attitudes, are more likely to remember incorrect, stereotypic information about gay men and lesbians than individuals who are less homophobic and less traditional in their sexual attitudes.

Method

Participants

One-hundred thirty-six male and female undergraduates at Xavier University, a mid-Western, liberal arts, and religious-affiliated university, participated in the study. Participants were recruited through a sign-up sheet, and an incentive of one chance in a raffle for ten, 10 dollar bills was offered. Demographic information was collected from each participant to include participants’ age, gender, year in school, and political affiliation. The descriptive statistics for each demographic variable is included in Table 3. The standards for the treatment of research participants as outlined in the “Ethical Principles of Psychologists & Code of Conduct” were followed (American Psychological Association, 1992).

Materials
Case History

Two case histories were employed that were based upon the work of Snyder and Uranowitz (1978). The original case history, and other related materials, were procured from Mark Snyder and permission was granted for their use in this study. Unless otherwise noted, Snyder and Uranowitz's (1978) materials were used in their original form.

The original case materials consisted of a 746-word narrative documenting the life of a woman from birth through college and the choice of a profession. Contained within the narrative was information pertinent to the character's early home life, her relationship with her parents, and her sexual life in high school and college. The narrative also contained "factual" information, such as the name of the town she lived in and the names of the schools she attended. Snyder & Uranowitz (1978) constructed the case history to fit either a heterosexual or a lesbian outcome, as evidenced by the inclusion of information such as the fact that the character did not have a steady boyfriend in college, but that she did date.

For use in this study, the original case history was modified to accommodate a male persona. As such, the name Betty K. was replaced with the name Bob K., and the content of the narrative was adjusted to make it more suitable for a male persona.

Graduate students in a master's level education course and a doctoral level psychology course were recruited to appraise whether the narrative devised for Bob K. was parallel to the existing narrative depicting Betty K. The students were asked to read each narrative and to indicate whether they felt that the individuals depicted were equally happy, healthy, and adjusted. Participants were also asked to rate their confidence in their decision, and to
state whether they felt that the information provided for Bob K. befit a college-age male. A survey of participants indicated that the case history devised for Bob K. was gender and age appropriate, and the narrative was deemed to be an appropriate counterpart to the existing case history describing Betty K.

**Recognition Memory Measure**

A measure of recognition memory was also utilized that was based upon the work of Snyder and Uranowitz (1978). The original recognition memory measure contained 36 multiple choice questions that offered the respondent four potential answers: Three of the answers revolved around substantive information; the fourth allowed participants to indicate if no relevant information was provided in the case history. The questions contained within the recognition memory measure tapped into the character’s attitude toward individuals of the opposite gender, her dating habits, her upbringing, and her relationship with her parents. Of the 36 questions posed in the recognition memory measure, 17 were identified by Snyder and Uranowitz (1978) as critical items that reflect respondents’ stereotyped beliefs about sexuality (see Appendix M).

As with the case history, a second recognition memory measure was devised to accommodate the inclusion of a male complement to Betty K. Questions that were suited to a direct transformation were altered. One question was not immediately translatable to Bob K., a question about wearing make-up in college. Subsequently, members of an undergraduate experimental psychology class and a doctoral level psychology class were asked to generate examples of an attribute that implied a homosexual orientation in a male college student. Suggestions were compiled and viable options were included in a
modified set of multiple choice questions that pertained to Bob K., the male fictional character designated as a counterpart to Betty K.

To test the viability of the modified recognition memory measure, members of an undergraduate psychology class were furnished with Bob K. and Betty K.'s case histories, and they were informed that the characters pursued homosexual lifestyles. The presentation of the narratives was counterbalanced to control for order effects, and carry-over effects were eliminated by presenting the first narrative at the beginning of the class hour and the second narrative at the end of the class hour. Participants then completed recognition memory measures for each character. Mean responses for Betty K.'s recognition memory measure and Bob K.'s recognition memory measure were compared to determine if they were significantly different. The ratings obtained were identical, suggesting that the ratings assigned by Snyder and Uranowitz (1978) applied to the new recognition memory measure.

**Sexual Attitude Scales**

**Hendrick Sexual Attitude Scale.** In order to explore the possibility that the effect of the manipulation was influenced by the perceiver's sexual attitudes, the Hendrick Sexual Attitude Scale (Hendrick, Hendrick, Slapion-Foote, & Foote, 1985) was administered. The HSAS is a 43-item scale that delineates four types of attitudes toward sexuality: Permissiveness, Sexual Practices, Communion (the belief that sex is the closest form of communication and the ultimate human interaction), and Instrumentality (a self-centered, physical orientation to sex). Items contained within this scale are rated on a 5-letter scale wherein: A = strongly agree; B = moderately agree; C = neutral; D = moderately disagree; and E = strongly disagree. For statistical analysis, the data are
converted to a 5-point numerical scale such that a value of one is assigned to items that participants strongly agree with, a value of two is assigned to items which garner moderate agreement, etc.

Test-retest reliabilities for the before mentioned dimensions at a one month interval reportedly ranged from .66 (Instrumentality) to .88 (Permissiveness) (Adler & Hendrick, 1991). Moreover, in a study of 807 subjects, the standardized alphas were .94, .71, .80, and .80 for the permissiveness, sexual practices, communion, and instrumentality sub-scales respectively (Hendrick, Hendrick, Slapion-Foote, Foote, 1985). The Permissiveness dimension has been identified as the strongest factor, and Hendrick and Hendrick (1987) reported that this scale accounts for 34.8 percent of the total variance. The remaining sub-scales account for 4.4 percent (Sexual Practices), 11.8 percent (Communion), and 5.7 percent (Instrumentality) of the total variance. Hendrick and Hendrick (1987) further reported that “although the factor loadings among the dimensions vary, 6 of the 8 Sexual Practices items, 9 of the 11 Communion items, and all 6 of the Instrumentality items were above .40, and a considerable number of items exceeded .50” (p.508). Lastly, scores on the subscales tend to correlate with other measures of sex, love, and sensation seeking (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1987).

Sexual Attitude Scale. Hudson, Murphy, and Nurius’s (1983) Sexual Attitude Scale was also administered as an adjunct indicator of participants’ sexual attitudes. The Sexual Attitude Scale (SAS) is a “25-item summated-category-partition scale that was designed to measure the extent to which an individual adheres to a liberal or a conservative orientation concerning sexual expression” (Hudson, Murphy, & Nurius, 1983, p. 259). Each item on the SAS is scored on a 5-point “agree-disagree” continuum,
and the majority of items are worded and scored such that a high score delineates a more liberal attitude toward sexual expression. Scores can range from 0 to 100, and the SAS has a neutral mid-point of 50. Hence, participants who score above 50 exhibit a more conservative orientation toward human sexual expression, and those who score below 50 exhibit a more liberal orientation.

The reliability of the SAS has been determined to consistently exceed an alpha coefficient of 0.90 (Hudson, 1997, Hudson, Murphy, & Nurius, 1983). Hudson, Murphy, and Nurius (1983) also found the SAS to have a discriminant validity coefficient of .73, which they decreed to be a lower bound estimate. Given this finding, the authors concluded that the SAS is a “valid measure of the degree to which an individual adheres to a liberal or conservative orientation concerning human sexual expression” (Hudson et al., 1983, p.265). Each item on the SAS has also been determined to significantly contribute to the SAS total score, and the correlations are reported to be sizable in their magnitudes (Hudson, 1997, Hudson et al., 1983). The SAS has also been found to have good convergent and discriminative validity.

**Homophobia Scales**

**Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals.** Two measures of Homophobia were administered to assess the degree to which fear of being in close quarters with gay men and lesbians effects recognition memory for stereotypically homosexual information. Much like the SAS, the Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980) is a 25-item summated-category-partition scale with a score range from 0 to 100. Individuals who have considerable dread of being in close quarters with homosexual men and women tend to obtain high scores on the Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals.
Conversely, individuals who do not experience dread when in close quarters with gays and lesbians tend to score low on the IAH. The IAH has been reported to consistently achieve a coefficient alpha of at least 0.90 (Hudson, 1997; Hudson & Ricketts, 1980). Additionally, Hudson and Ricketts, (1980) found the IAH to have high factorial validity. The IAH has also been said to consistently achieve validity coefficients of 0.60 or greater (Hudson, 1997).

Homophobia Scale. Bouton, Gallaher, Garlinghouse, Leal, Rosenstein, and Young’s (1987) Homophobia Scale was also administered. The Homophobia Scale contains seven statements that are scored on a 0 to 4 scale. Scores for the entire scale can range from 0 to 28, and high scores connote an “extremely negative attitude toward homosexuals” (Young, Gallaher, Marriott, & Kelly, 1993, p. 915). The Homophobia Scale has been reported to have a coefficient alpha of 0.89, and factor analysis of this scale found that 60.0 percent of variance was accounted for by a single factor (Bouton et al., 1987). Correlations between single items and entire Homophobia Scale scores were also reported to be consistently high, with the median correlations equaling 0.76 and the lowest correlation equaling 0.72.

Two sexual attitudes scales and two measures of homophobia were administered so that a multitrait-multimethod matrix of interactions could be constructed (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). Multitrait-multimethod matrices depict every inter-correlation that emerges when multiple traits are measured via multiple methods. Such matrices allow for the measurement of the same and differing traits while bypassing the possibility that extreme correlations are due to the traits’ basis in a common method of measurement, rather than to convergent or discriminant validity. Inspection of the matrix indicates that the amount
of redundancy among the two measures of sexual attitudes and the two measures of homophobia was minimal (see Appendix N).

**Procedure**

In accordance with the procedure outlined by Snyder and Uranowitz (1978), participants were told that in order to “investigate the way individuals form impressions of other people” they would be reading a narrative about an individual’s life, with only “names and places . . . changed to conceal the person’s identity” (p.943). Participants were asked to “form a complete impression of the person” with the prospect of answering “questions about your reaction to this person” at the end of the session (Snyder & Uranowitz, 1978, p. 943). Participants were then randomly assigned to one of four experimental conditions (male-heterosexual, male-homosexual, female-heterosexual, or female-homosexual), and asked to read the respective vignettes.

At the end of the vignettes, participants learned new information about Betty K. or Bob K.’s sexual orientation. Participants in the lesbian condition learned that:

During her senior year, Betty met a lesbian woman who introduced her to homosexual activity. Betty felt exhilarated and that she had finally found herself, and went on to a successful medical career with her lesbian mate (Snyder & Uranowitz, 1978, p. 943).

Participants in the gay condition learned that:

During his senior year, Bob met a gay man who introduced him to homosexual activity. Bob felt exhilarated and that he had finally found himself, and went on to a successful medical career with his gay mate.
Participants in the female heterosexual condition learned that:

During her senior year, Betty met a man who introduced her to sexual activity. Betty felt exhilarated and that she had finally found herself. She married this man and went on to have a successful medical career living with her husband (Snyder & Uranowitz, 1978, p. 943).

Participants in the male heterosexual condition learned that:

During his senior year, Bob met a woman who introduced him to sexual activity. Bob felt exhilarated and that he had finally found himself. He married this woman and went on to have a successful medical career living with his wife.

Immediately after learning of the character's sexual orientation, participants were asked to respond to questions relating to the case history. Upon completing this task, participants filled out the two sexual attitude scales and the two homophobia scales. Demographic data were also collected. In order to equalize routine order effects, the sexual attitude scales and the homophobia scales were presented in a manner consistent with a counterbalanced design, such that some participants completed the sexual attitudes scales prior to completing the homophobia scales and vice versa.

**Results**

The results will be discussed in association to each specific hypothesis. Snyder and Uranowitz's (1978) original procedure was altered, as the planned dependent variable, mean stereotype recall score, was non-significant for all analyses. In order to avoid a possible Type II error, the dependent variable was modified to reflect a total stereotype score as a means of augmenting the variability within the measure (see Appendix M).
A 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of variance was conducted to assess whether more stereotyped information is remembered about the gay and lesbian forms of the stimulus materials than the heterosexual forms, as measured by participants' stereotype recall scores. The means and standard deviations for total recall score as a function of the three factors (sexual orientation, participant gender, and gender of the stimulus persona) are presented in Appendix O. The ANOVA indicated no significant main effects for sexual orientation, \( F(1, 125) = .000, p = .993 \), participant gender, \( F(1, 125) = .002, p = .960 \), or character gender, \( F(1, 125) = 1.31, p = .254 \). These findings indicate that neither the gender of the participant, the gender of the character the participant read about, nor the sexual orientation of the character singly acted upon the number of stereotype recall errors that were made.

Furthermore, the second hypothesis posited that an interaction effect exists such that more stereotyped information is remembered for the gay persona than for the lesbian persona or either heterosexual persona. The results of the univariate analysis of variance previously described were examined to determine if an interaction exists between the stimulus character's gender and his/her sexual orientation. No significant interaction was found between sexual orientation, participant gender, and character gender, \( F(1, 125) = 1.165, p = .283 \).

Notwithstanding, an incidental finding surfaced in the form of an interaction between the gender of the participant and the gender of the character, \( F(1, 215) = 3.825, p = .053 \). As is evident in Appendix P, male participants made the most total errors for the female character and the least total errors for the male character. In contrast, female
participants made a mid-range number of total memory errors for both the male and the female characters.

Lastly, the third hypothesis stated that individuals who harbor homophobic attitudes and who are more traditional in their attitudes toward sexual expression are more likely to remember stereotypic information about gays and lesbians. A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict the total memory error score from scores on the primary independent variables (character sex and sexual orientation), the two measures of sexual attitudes (the HSAS and the SAS) and the two measures of homophobia (the IAH and the Homophobia Scale). The variance contributed by the primary independent variables was non-significant ($R^2 = .011, p = .486$). The increment of $R^2$ contributed by the set of attitude scales was also non-significant ($R^2_{inc} = .055, p = .393$).

Discussion

The study detailed herein examined the effect of newly presented homosexually-cued information on recognition memory. Two primary and one subsidiary hypotheses were investigated. It was supposed that more incorrect, stereotyped information would be remembered about the gay and lesbian forms of the stimulus materials than the heterosexual forms, and that an interaction effect exists such that more incorrect, stereotyped information would be remembered for the gay persona than for the lesbian persona or either heterosexual persona. Additionally, it was presumed that participants who harbored homophobic attitudes and who were more traditional in their attitudes toward sexual expression would be more likely to remember stereotypic information about the gay and lesbian stimuli.
Published literature regarding impression formation underscores the importance of mental representations (such as schemas and stereotypes) as stabilizing forces during judgment processes. Inherent to mental representations are beliefs about the co-occurrence of particular types of behaviors - the result of which can lead to false assumptions about particular groups of individuals. Homosexual men and women have shown to be subject to suchillusory correlations, and it has been advanced that gay men may be particularly vulnerable given that they are perceived as being more easily identifiable than their lesbian counterparts. Augmenting the reported risk to gay men is that fact that heterosexual men have been shown to exhibit particular disdain toward gay men. Attitudes toward sexual expression and attitudes toward homosexuality have also implicated in the impression formation process.

The findings of this study deviate from previous research. In isolation, neither the gender of the participant nor the gender of the stimulus persona emerged as a significant factor in the commission of memory errors. Furthermore, the sexual orientation of the stimulus persona was a non-significant factor. The findings further diverge from the literature with regard to the tendency for male participants to make more stereotypic attributions about gay men. The results of this study indicated that male participants exhibited more stereotyped beliefs about both female stimuli than the male stimuli. Additionally, while it was expected that participants' scores on measures of sexual attitudes and measures of homophobia would predict memory errors, this did not occur.

An apparent shortcoming of the study present here is the disproportionate number of male versus female participants. Additionally, the dependent variable (total stereotype memory score) may not have been strong enough to detect the effects of homosexually-
cued behavior on impression formation. Future studies may benefit from including a large number of male participants, and from exploring other measures of attitude formation, as a measure of memory errors may not be the only way to detect bias.

The presentation of information regarding sexual orientation may also be problematic, given that the information was introduced apart from the narrative. Separating the materials may have induced bias, as participants may have become mindful of the constructs under investigation. Moreover, presenting such information at the end of the narrative seems unnatural in contemporary times, when information about sexuality is typically at the forefront. Lastly, the recognition memory measure may be a more accurate indicator of participants' reading comprehension and retention, rather than stereotyped beliefs about sexuality.
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Appendix A

Enrollment by Religious Affiliation - Xavier University
### Enrollment by Religious Affiliation
**Fall Semester, 1998-99**  
Xavier University, Office of the Registrar  
(Source: Matrix - Religion, September 10, 1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CID Code</th>
<th>Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Catholic</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2,444</td>
<td>63.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopalian</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moslem</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant, Other</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Other</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to Disclose</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>17.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | 3,855 | 100.00% | 2,552 | 100.00% | 6,407 | 100.00%

*NOTE: The Catholic percentages, exclusive of the categories "Declined to Disclose" & "Unknown," are as follows:

- Undergraduate: 2,444 of 3,195 = 76.49%
- Graduate: 958 of 1,800 = 53.22%
- All Students: 3,402 of 4,995 = 68.10%
Appendix B

Sign-Up Sheet

Name of Study: ______________________

Experimenter: ______________________

Phone # of Experimenter: ____________

If you need to cancel, please notify the experimenter at the number listed above at least 24 hours in advance.

Date: _________________

Time: _________________

Room: _________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Phone #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please fill out a reminder slip
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Experiment</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Name of Experiment</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Name of Experiment</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call 24 hrs in advance to cancel or reschedule (561-4730)</td>
<td>Call 24 hrs. in advance to cancel or reschedule (561-4730)</td>
<td>Call 24 hrs. in advance to cancel or reschedule (561-4730)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Call 24 hrs in advance to cancel or reschedule (561-4730)
Appendix C

Demographic Information

Please fill out the following questions about yourself.

Age ________ Sex ____M _____F Year in School ______________

Political Affiliation _____ Republican _____ Democrat _____ Independent

Note: The above questions will be presented to participants at the end of the Homophobia Scale (see Appendix J).
Appendix D

Case Histories
In this experiment, I am interested in the way individuals form impressions of other people. You will read a story of one individual’s life. Names and places have been changed to conceal the person’s identity. What I want you to do is to read the story of the person’s life and think about what this person is like. Try to form a complete impression of the person. For example, what are his or her likes and dislikes, personality characteristics, wants and needs, etc.? Later in the session, I will ask you questions about your reaction to this person. Your task is simply to develop as full and complete an understanding as you can of this person.

IMPORTANT: It is very important that any impression you form of this person come from you alone, without the influence of anyone else. I am interested in how impressions of people are formed by individuals, and I want only your own feelings and beliefs to be reflected in the ratings I will take later in the session. Therefore, I must ask that you not discuss any aspect of this experiment with anyone until the semester is over. (This period of time is necessary since that is about how long the experiment will be held.) Any change in your impressions or another person’s impressions as a result of discussion would seriously damage my ability to interpret the results of the experiment. I must ask that you not discuss this experiment even with persons not in the experiment, since they may inadvertently influence your impressions. Please help me get as valid and meaningful data as I can by avoiding all temptations to discuss the case history until the semester is over. I will be glad to answer any questions you may have about any part of the experiment at the end of the semester.
Case History

Betty K. grew up in an urban environment on the West Coast. She had a stormy childhood, since her parents were fighting most of the time. Her father, an engineer, was a mean man who abused her and her mother. Finally, one day when Betty was 8 years old, her mother took her and her baby brother from their West Coast home and moved to the Midwest to get away from her father.

After that, Betty’s life became more tranquil. She and her mother and brother lived happily in a suburban home in the city of Midvale. Her mother worked as a legal secretary and made enough money so that Betty’s family was fairly well off financially. Betty enjoyed going to movies as a child, and particularly liked Tarzan pictures. At Redwood School, where she went for most of her elementary education, her favorite teacher was Miss Brock, who gave Betty much encouragement and would have a great impact on Betty’s high motivation to do well academically.

Betty made lots of friends and began to attend functions like camping out with her girl friends in her early teens. At this time she also became particularly close to one girl named Patty. The two spent a lot of time together throughout junior high and high school. Although most of their girl friends began dating when they were 16 or 17, Betty and Patty, who weren’t particularly attractive physically, only went out on a few dates with boys, and when they did it was usually together on double dates.

At Lincoln High School, Betty had a crush on her sophomore geometry teacher, Mr. Griffin, for a while. She never told anyone about this, not even Patty. For a time, Betty felt rejected because he showed no special interest in her. After about 2 months, however, she got over her crush.
Betty, who was always near the top of her high school class academically, decided to go to college after graduation on the advice of her guidance counselor, Mrs. Pennington. She had thought of becoming a doctor, but hadn't yet really decided. Mrs. Pennington advised Betty to wait as long as possible before definitely deciding on a career and to take a wide variety of courses at college to see exactly where her interests lay.

When she entered college at Mullin University, a school with about 15,000 students, she lived in a coed dorm, and got along great with her roommate, Joan. She also became very close with several of the other girls who lived on her floor, and they would all frequently talk late into the night. During these sessions, Betty would often find herself revealing some of her most intimate secrets, and the other girls would do the same. She really enjoyed the intimacy she felt with these close friends. They would often go out and do things as a group, for instance, attend art museums and plays.

She also started dating guys more often than she did in high school. She would go out on dates just about every weekend, and had some really good times on those dates. She went out steadily with one guy named David, an art major, for about 6 months, but he was more like a close friend than anything else. He was much more serious about the relationship than she was, so she decided to cut it off. She couldn't really see her relationship with any man as anything more than friendship. While she liked her male friends, she found that she communicated much better with her female friends. She could "be herself" with them, and not have to make an effort to impress them or win their approval, as she did with men.

Betty had a hard time deciding on a major. Joan, her roommate, seemed quite engrossed in her major, psychology, but Betty was equally interested in so many things,
she didn’t know which one to pick. She finally decided on biochemistry, since if she
wanted to go to medical school it would probably help her. Also, she did very well in her
biochemistry classes.

By the time she reached her junior year of college, Betty had to decide what to do
with her life. Late in her junior year, she decided to devote her full time to a medical
career, assuming her grades were good enough to get into medical school. Being a
woman of high ability and high motivation, she is likely to be highly successful in her
career.
I would like you to know several other facts about Betty K.'s life:

During her senior year, Betty met a man who introduced her to sexual activity. Betty felt exhilarated and that she had finally found herself. She married this man and went on to a successful medical career living with her husband. She found life in general very satisfying.

Please do not turn back to any previous pages in this booklet.
I would like you to know several other facts about Betty K.'s life:

During her senior year, Betty met a lesbian who introduced her to homosexual activity. Betty felt exhilarated and that she had finally found herself, and went on to a successful medical career living with her lesbian mate. She found life in general very satisfying.

Please do not turn back to any previous pages in this booklet.
Case History

Bob K.
In this experiment, I am interested in the way individuals form impressions of other people. You will read a story of one individual’s life. Names and places have been changed to conceal the person’s identity. What I want you to do is to read the story of the person’s life and think about what this person is like. Try to form a complete impression of the person. For example, what are his or her likes and dislikes, personality characteristics, wants and needs, etc.? Later in the session, I will ask you questions about your reaction to this person. Your task is simply to develop as full and complete an understanding as you can of this person.

IMPORTANT: It is very important that any impression you form of this person come from you alone, without the influence of anyone else. I am interested in how impressions of people are formed by individuals, and I want only your own feelings and beliefs to be reflected in the ratings I will take later in the session. Therefore, I must ask that you not discuss any aspect of this experiment with anyone until the semester is over. (This period of time is necessary since that is about how long the experiment will be held.) Any change in your impressions or another person’s impressions as a result of discussion would seriously damage my ability to interpret the results of the experiment. I must ask that you not discuss this experiment even with persons not in the experiment, since they may inadvertently influence your impressions. Please help me get as valid and meaningful data as I can by avoiding all temptations to discuss the case history until the semester is over. I will be glad to answer any questions you may have about any part of the experiment at the end of the semester.
Case History

Bob K. grew up in an urban environment on the West Coast. He had a stormy childhood, since his parents were fighting most of the time. His father, an engineer, was a mean man who abused him and his mother. Finally, one day when Bob was 8 years old, his mother took him and his baby brother from their West Coast home and moved to the Midwest to get away from his father.

After that, Bob's life became more tranquil. He and his mother and brother lived happily in a suburban home in the city of Midvale. His mother worked as a legal secretary and made enough money so that Bob's family was fairly well off financially. Bob enjoyed going to movies as a child, and particularly liked Tarzan pictures. At Redwood School, where he went for most of his elementary education, his favorite teacher was Miss Brock, who gave Bob much encouragement and would have a great impact on Bob's high motivation to do well academically.

Bob made lots of friends and began to attend functions like camping out with his boy friends in his early teens. At this time he also became particularly close to one boy named Pat. The two spent a lot of time together throughout junior high and high school. Although most of their boy friends began dating when they were 16 or 17, Bob and Pat, who weren't particularly attractive physically, only went out on a few dates with girls, and when they did it was usually together on double dates.

At Lincoln High School, Bob had a crush on his sophomore geometry teacher, Mrs. Griffin, for a while. He never told anyone about this, not even Pat. For a time, Bob felt rejected because she showed no special interest in him. After about 2 months, however, he got over his crush.
Bob, who was always near the top of his high school class academically, decided to go to college after graduation on the advice of his guidance counselor, Mr. Pennington. He had thought of becoming a doctor, but hadn’t yet really decided. Mr. Pennington advised Bob to wait as long as possible before definitely deciding on a career and to take a wide variety of courses at college to see exactly where his interests lay.

When he entered college at Mullin University, a school with about 15,000 students, he lived in a coed dorm, and got along great with his roommate, Jim. He also became very close with several of the other guys who lived on his floor, and they would all frequently hang-out late into the night. Bob and his buddies joked and played video games, and he really enjoyed the camaraderie he felt with his friends. They would often go out and do things as a group, for instance, attend basketball games.

He also started dating girls more often than he did in high school. He would go out on dates just about every weekend, and had some really good times on those dates. He went out steadily with one girl named Mary, an art major, for about 6 months, but she was more like a close friend than anything else. She was much more serious about the relationship than he was, so he decided to cut it off. He couldn’t really see his relationship with any woman as anything more than friendship. While he liked his female friends, he found that he communicated much better with his male friends. He could “be himself” with them, and not have to make an effort to impress them or win their approval, as he did with women.

Bob had a hard time deciding on a major. Jim, his roommate, seemed quite engrossed in his major, psychology, but Bob was equally interested in so many things, he didn’t know which one to pick. He finally decided on biochemistry, since if he wanted to
go to medical school it would probably help him. Also, he did very well in his biochemistry classes.

By the time he reached his junior year of college, Bob had to decide what to do with his life. Late in his junior year, he decided to devote his full time to a medical career, assuming his grades were good enough to get into medical school. Being a man of high ability and high motivation, he is likely to be highly successful in his career.
I would like you to know several other facts about Bob K.'s life:

During his senior year, Bob met a woman who introduced him to sexual activity. Bob felt exhilarated and that he had finally found himself. He married this woman and went on to a successful medical career living with his wife. He found life in general very satisfying.

Please do not turn back to any previous pages in this booklet.
I would like you to know several other facts about Bob K.'s life:

During his senior year, Bob met a gay man who introduced him to homosexual activity. Bob felt exhilarated and that he had finally found himself, and went on to a successful medical career living with his gay mate. He found life in general very satisfying.

*Please do not turn back to any previous pages in this booklet.*
Appendix E

Recognition Memory Measures
Circle the correct answer for each question about the life of Betty K., whose case history you read. In the space next to the question, fill in the degree to which you are confident that you have answered that question correctly. Use the following scale to rate your confidence:

0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Not at all sure I have answered the question correctly
50% sure I have answered the question correctly
100% sure I have answered the question correctly

If you cannot remember the correct answer for a question, circle a, b, or c and fill in a low degree of confidence using the above scale. Option d should only be used if you believe the information asked for in the question was not provided in the case history of Betty K. It should not be used as an “I don’t know” or “none of the above” response. It does not mean you can’t remember the right answer, but that you believe the answer was not contained in the story you read about Betty K. Remember, circle the letter of your answer, and write the number indicating your confidence that you answered the item correctly in the space beside the question.

_____ 1. Betty’s childhood was
   a. stormy
   b. tranquil
   c. stormy at first, then tranquil
   d. no information provided

_____ 2. Betty’s father
   a. was abusive
   b. died when Betty was 3
   c. was a lawyer
   d. no information provided

_____ 3. During college, Betty went out with men
   a. often
   b. seldom
   c. never
   d. no information provided
4. Betty and her family moved to the Midwest when Betty was  
   a. 3 years old  
   b. 8 years old  
   c. 12 years old  
   d. no information provided

5. Betty lived in the town of  
   a. Midfield  
   b. Midvale  
   c. Middlebury  
   d. no information provided

6. Physically, Betty was  
   a. very attractive  
   b. not particularly attractive  
   c. rather unattractive  
   d. no information provided

7. In high school, Betty  
   a. occasionally dated men  
   b. never went out with men  
   c. went steady  
   d. no information provided

8. The name of Betty’s high school was  
   a. Lincoln High School  
   b. Midvale High School  
   c. Midwest High School  
   d. no information provided

9. Betty’s roommate at college was named  
   a. Jane  
   b. June  
   c. Joan  
   d. no information provided

10. At college, Betty wore make-up  
    a. often  
    b. occasionally  
    c. never  
    d. no information provided
11. Betty was
   a. extremely intelligent
   b. moderately intelligent
   c. below average in intelligence
   d. no information provided

12. In high school, Betty had a crush on
   a. the captain of the football team
   b. her sophomore geometry teacher
   c. no one
   d. no information provided

13. During college, Betty realized that
   a. she disliked men
   b. she wanted to get married as soon as possible
   c. she could only see men as friends
   d. no information provided

14. The name of Betty’s high school guidance counselor was
   a. Mrs. Pennington
   b. Mrs. Griffin
   c. Mrs. Lincoln
   d. no information provided

15. Her guidance counselor advised Betty to
   a. become a doctor
   b. major in psychology
   c. wait as long as possible before deciding on a major
   d. no information provided

16. Betty’s roommate at college was
   a. a lesbian
   b. sexually promiscuous
   c. very withdrawn socially
   d. no information provided

17. Betty’s best friend during high school was named
   a. Patty
   b. Mary
   c. Bobbi
   d. no information provided
18. At college, Betty went out with a man named
   a. Bob
   b. David
   c. she did not go out with any men
   d. no information provided

19. Betty always wore clothes that were
   a. very flattering
   b. very unflattering
   c. very colorful
   d. no information provided

20. Betty’s major in college was
   a. psychology
   b. microbiology
   c. biochemistry
   d. no information provided

21. At college, Betty was very intimate friends with
   a. several girls but no guys
   b. several guys but no girls
   c. some girls and some guys
   d. no information provided

22. Betty would engage in athletic activity
   a. often
   b. occasionally
   c. never
   d. no information provided

23. At college, Betty would often go with her close friends to
   a. art museums
   b. baseball games
   c. bars
   d. no information provided

24. At college, Betty lived in
   a. an all female dorm
   b. a coed dorm
   c. a mostly female dorm
   d. no information provided
25. In her decision as to whether to marry or pursue a career, Betty was
   a. sure she wanted to get married
   b. sure she wanted to pursue a career
   c. ambivalent about which way to go
   d. no information provided

26. During college, Betty was
   a. sexually promiscuous
   b. sexually permissive with only a few people
   c. desirous of becoming sexually active
   d. no information provided

27. Socially, Betty was
   a. closed, and would reveal no personal information to anyone
   b. open, and freely revealed personal information to many people
   c. somewhat open, would reveal personal information only to her close female friends
   d. no information provided

28. The name of the college Betty attended was
   a. Midvale College
   b. Mullins University
   c. Midwestern University
   d. no information provided

29. Betty felt more relaxed around
   a. females
   b. males
   c. she was equally relaxed with females and with males
   d. no information provided

30. Betty went to elementary school at
   a. Lincoln School
   b. Midvale School
   c. Redwood School
   d. no information provided

31. At college, Betty went out on dates with men
   a. once a month
   b. never
   c. just about every weekend
   d. no information provided
32. Physically, Betty was
   a. short and stocky
   b. tall and slender
   c. tall and athletic
   d. no information provided

33. Betty’s brother’s name was
   a. David
   b. Joey
   c. Billy
   d. no information provided

34. Betty thought of becoming a doctor because
   a. her mother wanted her to become one
   b. her guidance counselor wanted her to become one
   c. her father was a doctor
   d. no information provided

35. On her college entrance examinations, Betty
   a. did very well
   b. received average scores
   c. did poorly
   d. no information provided

36. Betty K.
   a. met a man during her senior year at college and eventually married him
   b. met a lesbian during her senior year at college and eventually lived with her
   c. neither of the above
   d. no information provided
Recognition Memory Measure

Bob K.
Circle the correct answer for each question about the life of Bob K., whose case history you read. In the space next to the question, fill in the degree to which you are confident that you have answered that question correctly. Use the following scale to rate your confidence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>50% sure I have answered the question correctly</td>
<td>100% sure I have answered the question correctly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you cannot remember the correct answer for a question, circle a, b, or c and fill in a low degree of confidence using the above scale. Option d should only be used if you believe the information asked for in the question was not provided in the case history of Bob K. It should not be used as an “I don’t know” or “none of the above” response. It does not mean you can’t remember the right answer, but that you believe the answer was not contained in the story you read about Bob K. Remember, circle the letter of your answer, and write the number indicating your confidence that you answered the item correctly in the space beside the question.

_____ 1. Bob’s childhood was
   a. stormy
   b. tranquil
   c. stormy at first, then tranquil
   d. no information provided

_____ 2. Bob’s father
   a. was abusive
   b. died when Bob was 3
   c. was a lawyer
   d. no information provided

_____ 3. During college, Bob went out with women
   a. often
   b. seldom
   c. never
   d. no information provided
4. Bob and his family moved to the Midwest when Bob was
   a. 3 years old
   b. 8 years old
   c. 12 years old
   d. no information provided

5. Bob lived in the town of
   a. Midfield
   b. Midvale
   c. Middlebury
   d. no information provided

6. Physically, Bob was
   a. very attractive
   b. not particularly attractive
   c. rather unattractive
   d. no information provided

7. In high school, Bob
   a. occasionally dated women
   b. never went out with women
   c. went steady
   d. no information provided

8. The name of Bob’s high school was
   a. Lincoln High School
   b. Midvale High School
   c. Midwest High School
   d. no information provided

9. Bob’s roommate at college was named
   a. John
   b. Jamie
   c. Jim
   d. no information provided

10. At college, Bob wore an earring
    a. often
    b. occasionally
    c. never
    d. no information provided
11. Bob was
   a. extremely intelligent
   b. moderately intelligent
   c. below average in intelligence
   d. no information provided

12. In high school, Bob had a crush on
   a. the captain of the cheerleading squad
   b. his sophomore geometry teacher
   c. no one
   d. no information provided

13. During college, Bob realized that
   a. he disliked women
   b. he wanted to get married as soon as possible
   c. he could only see women as friends
   d. no information provided

14. The name of Bob's high school guidance counselor was
   a. Mrs. Pennington
   b. Mrs. Griffin
   c. Mrs. Lincoln
   d. no information provided

15. His guidance counselor advised Bob to
   a. become a doctor
   b. major in psychology
   c. wait as long as possible before deciding on a major
   d. no information provided

16. Bob's roommate at college was
   a. gay
   b. sexually promiscuous
   c. very withdrawn socially
   d. no information provided

17. Bob's best friend during high school was named
   a. Pat
   b. Mark
   c. Bobby
   d. no information provided
18. At college, Bob went out with a woman named
   a. Jenny
   b. Mary
   c. he did not go out with any women
   d. no information provided

19. Bob always wore clothes that were
   a. very flattering
   b. very unflattering
   c. very colorful
   d. no information provided

20. Bob's major in college was
   a. psychology
   b. microbiology
   c. biochemistry
   d. no information provided

21. At college, Bob was very intimate friends with
   a. several guys but no girls
   b. several girls but no guys
   c. some guys and some girls
   d. no information provided

22. Bob would engage in athletic activity
   a. often
   b. occasionally
   c. never
   d. no information provided

23. At college, Bob would often go with his close friends to
   a. art museums
   b. basketball games
   c. bars
   d. no information provided

24. At college, Bob lived in
   a. an all male dorm
   b. a coed dorm
   c. a mostly male dorm
   d. no information provided
25. In his decision as to whether to marry or pursue a career, Bob was
   a. sure he wanted to get married
   b. sure he wanted to pursue a career
   c. ambivalent about which way to go
   d. no information provided

26. During college, Bob was
   a. sexually promiscuous
   b. sexually permissive with only a few people
   c. desirous of becoming sexually active
   d. no information provided

27. Socially, Bob was
   a. closed, and would reveal no personal information to anyone
   b. open, and freely revealed personal information to many people
   c. somewhat open, would reveal personal information only to his close male friends
   d. no information provided

28. The name of the college Bob attended was
   a. Midvale College
   b. Mullins University
   c. Midwestern University
   d. no information provided

29. Bob felt more relaxed around
   a. males
   b. females
   c. he was equally relaxed with males and with females
   d. no information provided

30. Bob went to elementary school at
   a. Lincoln School
   b. Midvale School
   c. Redwood School
   d. no information provided

31. At college, Bob went out on dates with women
   a. once a month
   b. never
   c. just about every weekend
   d. no information provided
32. Physically, Bob was
   a. short and stocky
   b. tall and slender
   c. tall and athletic
   d. no information provided

33. Bob’s brother’s name was
   a. David
   b. Joey
   c. Billy
   d. no information provided

34. Bob thought of becoming a doctor because
   a. his mother wanted him to become one
   b. his guidance counselor wanted him to become one
   c. his father was a doctor
   d. no information provided

35. On his college entrance examinations, Bob
   a. did very well
   b. received average scores
   c. did poorly
   d. no information provided

36. Bob K.
   a. met a woman during his senior year at college and eventually married her
   b. met a gay man during his senior year at college and eventually lived with him
   c. neither of the above
   d. no information provided
### Appendix F

Critical Items - Recognition Memory Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1           | Betty’s childhood was  
|             | a) stormy (3)  
|             | b) tranquil (1)  
|             | c) stormy at first, then tranquil (2)  
|             | d) no information provided  |
| 2           | Betty’s father  
|             | a) was abusive (3)  
|             | b) died when Betty was 3 (2)  
|             | c) was a lawyer (2)  
|             | d) no information provided  |
| 3           | During college, Betty went out with men  
|             | a) often (1)  
|             | b) seldom (2)  
|             | c) never (3)  
|             | d) no information provided  |
| 6           | Physically, Betty was  
|             | a) very attractive (1)  
|             | b) not particularly attractive (2)  
|             | c) rather unattractive (3)  
|             | d) no information provided  |
| 7           | In high school, Betty  
|             | a) occasionally dated men (2)  
|             | b) never went out with men (3)  
|             | c) went steady (1)  
<p>|             | d) no information provided  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10          | At college, Betty wore make-up  
  a) often (1)  
  b) occasionally (2)  
  c) never (3)  
  d) no information provided |
| 12          | In high school, Betty had a crush on  
  a) the captain of the football team (1)  
  b) her sophomore geometry teacher (1)  
  c) no one (3)  
  d) no information provided |
| 13          | During college, Betty realized that  
  a) she disliked men (3)  
  b) she wanted to get married as soon as possible (1)  
  c) she could only see men as friends (3)  
  d) no information provided |
| 16          | Betty’s roommate at college was  
  a) a lesbian (3)  
  b) sexually promiscuous (2)  
  c) very withdrawn socially (2)  
  d) no information provided |
| 18          | At college, Betty went out with a man  
  named  
  a) Bob (1)  
  b) David (1)  
  c) she did not go out with any men (3)  
  d) no information provided |
| 19          | Betty always wore clothes that were  
  a) very flattering (1)  
  b) very unflattering (3)  
  c) very colorful (2)  
  d) no information provided |
21 At college, Betty was very intimate friends with
   a) several girls but no guys (3)
   b) several guys but no girls (1)
   c) some girls and some guys (2)
   d) no information provided

22 Betty would engage in athletic activity
   a) often (3)
   b) occasionally (2)
   c) never (1)
   d) no information provided

24 At college, Betty lived in
   a) an all female dorm (3)
   b) a coed dorm (1)
   c) a mostly female dorm (2)
   d) no information provided

29 Betty felt more relaxed around
   a) females (3)
   b) males (1)
   c) she was equally relaxed with females and with males (2)
   d) no information provided

31 At college, Betty went out on dates with men
   a) once a month (2)
   b) never (3)
   c) just about every weekend (1)
   d) no information provided

32 Physically, Betty was
   a) short and stocky (3)
   b) tall and slender (2)
   c) tall and athletic (3)
   d) no information provided
Appendix G

Hendrick Sexual Attitude Scale
Listed below are several statements that reflect different attitudes about sex. For each statement fill in the response that indicates how much you agree or disagree with that statement. Some of the items refer to a specific sexual relationship, while others refer to general attitudes and beliefs about sex. Whenever possible, answer the questions with your current partner in mind. If you are not currently dating anyone, answer the questions with your most recent partner in mind. If you have never had a sexual relationship, answer in terms of what you think your responses would most likely be.

For each statement:

A = Strongly agree with the statement
B = Moderately agree with the statement
C = Neutral - neither agree or disagree
D = Moderately disagree with the statement
E = Strongly disagree with the statement

1. I do not need to be committed to a person to have sex with him/her. _________
2. Casual sex is acceptable. _________
3. I would like to have sex with many partners. _________
4. One-night stands are sometimes very enjoyable. _________
5. It is okay to have ongoing sexual relationships with more than one person at a time. _________
6. It is okay to manipulate someone into having sex as long as no future promises are made. _________
7. Sex as a simple exchange of favors is okay if both people agree to it. _________
8. The best sex is with no strings attached. _________
9. Life would have fewer problems if people could have sex more freely. _________
10. It is possible to enjoy sex with a person and not like that person very much. _________
11. Sex is more fun with someone you don't love. _________
12. It is all right to pressure someone into having sex. _________
13. Extensive premarital sexual experience is fine. _________
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14. Extramarital affairs are all right as long as one’s partner doesn’t know about them.

15. Sex for its own sake is perfectly all right.

16. I would feel comfortable having intercourse with my partner in the presence of other people.

17. Prostitution is acceptable.

18. It is okay for sex to be just good physical release.

19. Sex without love is meaningless.

20. People should at least be friends before they have sex together.

21. In order for sex to be good, it must also be meaningful.

22. Birth control is part of responsible sexuality.

23. A woman should share responsibility for birth control.


25. Sex education is important for young people.

26. Using “sex toys” during lovemaking is acceptable.

27. Masturbation is all right.

28. Masturbating one’s partner during intercourse can increase the pleasure of sex.

29. Sex gets better as a relationship progresses.

30. Sex is the closest form of communication between two people.

31. A sexual encounter between two people deeply in love is the ultimate human interaction.

32. Orgasm is the greatest experience in the world.

33. At its best, sex seems to be the merging of two souls.

34. Sex is a very important part of life.
35. Sex is usually an intensive, almost overwhelming experience.

36. During sexual intercourse, intense awareness of the partner is the best frame of mind.

37. Sex is fundamentally good.

38. Sex is best when you let yourself go and focus on your own pleasure.

39. Sex is primarily the taking of pleasure from another person.

40. The main purpose of sex is to enjoy oneself.

41. Sex is primarily physical.

42. Sex is primarily a bodily function, like eating.

43. Sex is mostly a game between males and females.
Appendix H

Sexual Attitude Scale
SEXUAL ATTITUDE SCALE (SAS)

Name:__________________________  Today's Date:__________________________

This questionnaire is designed to measure the way you feel about sexual behavior. It is not a test, so there are no right or wrong answers. Answer each item as carefully and as accurately as you can by placing a number beside each one as follows.

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither agree nor disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree

1.____ I think there is too much sexual freedom given to adults these days.
2.____ I think that increased sexual freedom undermines the American family.
3.____ I think that young people have been given too much information about sex.
4.____ Sex education should be restricted to the home.
5.____ Older people do not need to have sex.
6.____ Sex education should be given only when people are ready for marriage.
7.____ Pre-marital sex may be a sign of a decaying social order.
8.____ Extra-marital sex is never excusable.
9.____ I think there is too much sexual freedom given to teenagers these days.
10.____ I think there is not enough sexual restraint among young people.
11.____ I think people indulge in sex too much.
12.____ I think the only proper way to have sex is through intercourse.
13.____ I think sex should be reserved for marriage.
14.____ Sex should be only for the young.
15.____ Too much social approval has been given to homosexuals.
16.____ Sex should be devoted to the business of procreation.
17.____ People should not masturbate.
18.____ Heavy sexual petting should be discouraged.
19.____ People should not discuss their sexual affairs or business with others.
20.____ Severely handicapped (physically and mentally) people should not have sex.
21.____ There should be no laws prohibiting sexual acts between consenting adults.
22.____ What two consenting adults do together sexually is their own business.
23.____ There is too much sex on television.
24.____ Movies today are too sexually explicit.
25.____ Pornography should be totally banned from our bookstores.
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Appendix I

Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals
INDEX OF ATTITUDES TOWARD HOMOSEXUALS (IAH)

Name: ________________________________________________________ Today’s Date: ______________________

This questionnaire is designed to measure the way you feel about working or associating with homosexuals. It is not a test, so there are no right or wrong answers. Answer each item as carefully and as accurately as you can by placing a number beside each one as follows.

1 = Strongly Agree
2 = Agree
3 = Neither agree nor disagree
4 = Disagree
5 = Strongly disagree

1. ____ I would feel comfortable working closely with a male homosexual.
2. ____ I would enjoy attending social functions at which homosexuals were present.
3. ____ I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my neighbor was homosexual.
4. ____ If a member of my sex made a sexual advance toward me I would feel angry.
5. ____ I would feel comfortable knowing that I was attractive to members of my sex.
6. ____ I would feel uncomfortable being seen in a gay bar.
7. ____ I would feel comfortable if a member of my sex made an advance toward me.
8. ____ I would be comfortable if I found myself attracted to a member of my sex.
9. ____ I would feel disappointed if I learned that my child was homosexual.
10. ____ I would feel nervous being in a group of homosexuals.
11. ____ I would feel comfortable knowing that my clergyman was homosexual.
12. ____ I would be upset if I learned that my brother or sister was homosexual.
13. ____ I would feel that I had failed as a parent if I learned that my child was gay.
14. ____ If I saw two men holding hands in public I would feel disgusted.
15. ____ If a member of my sex made an advance toward me I would be offended.
16. ____ I would feel comfortable if I learned that my daughter's teacher was a lesbian.
17. ____ I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my spouse or partner was attracted to members of his or her sex.
18. ____ I would feel at ease talking with a homosexual person at a party.
19. ____ I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my boss was homosexual.
20. ____ It would not bother me to walk through a predominantly gay section of town.
21. ____ It would disturb me to find out that my doctor was homosexual.
22. ____ I would feel comfortable if I learned that my best friend of my sex was homosexual.
23. ____ If a member of my sex made an advance toward me I would feel flattered.
24. ____ I would feel uncomfortable knowing that my son's male teacher was homosexual.
25. ____ I would feel comfortable working closely with a female homosexual.
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Appendix J

Homophobia Scale
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by placing a check mark on the appropriate line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Homosexuals contribute positively to society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Homosexuality is disgusting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Homosexuals are just as moral as heterosexuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Homosexuals should have equal civil rights.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Homosexuals corrupt young people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Homosexuality is a sin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Homosexuality should be against the law.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please answer the following questions about yourself.

Age ________  Sex ____M ____F  Year in School ________________

Political Affiliation _____ Republican _____ Democrat _____ Independent
Appendix K

Consent to Participate

You are being asked to participate in a project conducted at Xavier University. The investigator will explain to you the purpose of the project, the procedure to be used, and the potential benefits and risks of participation. You may ask the investigator any questions you may have to help you understand the project. A basic explanation of the project is written below. Please read this explanation and discuss with the researcher any questions you may have.

After hearing the explanation, having your questions answered and reading this form you may agree to participate by signing this form and returning it to the investigator. If you prefer not to participate in this project, you can decline to sign this form, and you will be excused. If you agree, please read the case history enclosed in the manila envelope and answer the questions as directed. Return all project materials to the manila envelope. A copy of this consent form is also included in the manila envelope, and you are welcome to take it with you for your record and interest. Return the manila envelope to the collection point.

1. **Nature and Purpose of the Project:** This study examines the manner in which individuals form impressions of other people. Some of the questions are very personal, and might be distressing to some people. The personal nature of some of the questions is necessary in order to examine this very personal topic.

2. **Explanation of Procedure:** Once you read and sign this consent form, you will return it to the investigator. Then, you may begin reading the case materials enclosed in the manila envelope. The case history includes a narrative about an individual’s life with only the names and places changed to protect their identity. Please form a complete impression of the person about whom you read, as you will be asked to answer questions regarding your reaction to this person. Once you have read the case history and completed the questions that follow it, you are to put the narrative and questionnaires back into the manila envelope and return the envelope to the investigator.

3. **Discomfort and Risks:** The nature of some of the questions included in this project may be uncomfortable to answer. Some may even find the questions to be distressful or even painful.

4. **Benefits:** Research in the area of impression formation will aid scientists and practitioners in better understanding the manner in which individuals make judgments about others. Additionally, some participants will receive extra credit toward a course that are currently enrolled in. Extra credit is provided at the discretion of the course instructor.

5. **Anonymity:** The consent form and case materials will never be matched. Case materials will be assigned a number and all data will be reported in a group format; at no time will responses be reported individually.

6. **Refusal/Withdrawal:** You are under no obligation to participate and you should feel free not to fill out the forms contained within the packet. If at any point while completing the project materials, you decide you no longer want to participate, you may stop. Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from the University. Anyone who agrees to participate in this study is free to withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty.

I understand that it is not possible to identify all potential risks in an experimental procedure, and I believe that reasonable safeguards have been taken to minimize both the known and unknown risks.

__________________________  __________________________
Signature                                      Date
Appendix L

Subject Debriefing

The purpose of the study you completed was to examine whether knowing someone’s sexual orientation influences what is remembered about him or her. Past research suggests that particular behaviors are assumed to occur together, and that stereotypes affect the manner in which participants such as yourself, recall information about minority groups.

Given the sensitive nature of the topics under investigation, some deception was involved in conducting this study. We regret having to use any deception at all, but feel that the exact nature of the study had to be concealed in order to minimize the occurrence of biased responses.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact Kara E.A. Marciani, M.S. at 561-4730, or Cynthia L. Crown, Ph.D. (dissertation chair) at 745-1094. Given the personal nature of this study you may have experienced some discomfort. If you would like to talk to a professional in regard to any experiences or issues you may have had in response to the research materials please consider utilizing the area resources listed below. These facilities offer free or reduced fee psychological counseling services to Xavier students. Thank you for your participation.

Kara E.A. Marciani, M.S.  Cynthia L. Crown, Ph.D.
Xavier University  Professor of Psychology
                             Dissertation Chair

Xavier University
Health and Counseling Center  745-3022
Psychological Services  745-3531
Appendix M

The Identification and Scoring of Critical Items

Snyder and Uranowitz (1978) identified the critical items through a rating process wherein seven undergraduate rater-judges categorized the response alternatives contained within the recognition memory measure according to whether they were indicative of impending lesbianism, impending heterosexuality, or neutral with regard to sexuality. Response alternatives that were deemed to be stereotypically lesbian by four or more rater-judges were assigned a rating of three. Response alternatives that were judged to be stereotypically heterosexual were assigned a rating of one, and neutral response alternatives were assigned a rating of two.

As devised by Snyder and Uranowitz (1978), the critical items identified by rater-judges reflect stereotyped beliefs about sexuality through the calculation of a stereotype score with a range from 1.00 (all answers are stereotypically heterosexual) to 3.00 (all answers are stereotypically lesbian). The stereotype score is computed by calculating the mean of the ratings for the questions participants answered with a “non-d” or factual response. For example, if a respondent answered “d” (no information provided) for 4 of the 17 critical items, then the stereotype score is the mean of ratings for the 13 “non-d” responses.

For use in this study, a total stereotype score was used as the dependent variable. The total stereotype score is computed by adding participants’ ratings on the critical items they answered with a “non-d” or factual response. For example, if a respondent answered “d” (no information provided) for 4 of the 17 critical items, then his or her total stereotype score consists of the total of the ratings for the 13 “non-d” responses. High total
stereotype scores reflect responses that are stereotypically homosexual, whereas low total stereotype scores reflect responses that are stereotypically heterosexual.
Appendix N

Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix of Interactions
### Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix of Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sexual Attitude Scale</th>
<th>Hendrick Sexual Attitude Scale - Permissiveness</th>
<th>Hendrick Sexual Attitude Scale - Communion</th>
<th>Hendrick Sexual Attitude Scale - Sexual Practices</th>
<th>Hendrick Sexual Attitude Scale - Instrumentality</th>
<th>Hendrick Sexual Attitude Scale - Toward Homosexuals</th>
<th>Hendrick Sexual Attitude Scale - Homophobia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Attitude Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.351**</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>.550**</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>.403**</td>
<td>.478**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hendrick Sexual Attitude</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale - Permissiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.351**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.134</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>0.271**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale - Communion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.134</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.207*</td>
<td>.258**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
## Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix of Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sexual Attitude</th>
<th>Hendrick Sexual Attitude Permissiveness</th>
<th>Hendrick Sexual Attitude Communion</th>
<th>Hendrick Sexual Attitude Sexual Practices</th>
<th>Hendrick Sexual Attitude Instrumentality</th>
<th>Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals</th>
<th>Homophobia Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hendrick Sexual Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale - Sexual Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.550**</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td>.430**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendrick Sexual Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale - Instrumentality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>.271**</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.403**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.207*</td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.778**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Attitude Scale</th>
<th>Hendrick Sexual Attitude Scale</th>
<th>Hendrick Sexual Attitude Scale</th>
<th>Hendrick Sexual Attitude Scale</th>
<th>Hendrick Sexual Attitude Scale</th>
<th>Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals</th>
<th>Homophobia Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permissiveness</td>
<td>Communion</td>
<td>Sexual Practices</td>
<td>Instrumentality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.258**</td>
<td>0.430**</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
<td>0.778**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
Appendix O

Descriptive Statistics for Total Memory Score as a Function of Sexual Orientation, Participant Gender, and Gender of the Stimulus Persona

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Participant Gender</th>
<th>Character Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22.40</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.71</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.05</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.89</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22.88</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.11</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.53</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptive Statistics for Total Memory Score as a Function of Sexual Orientation, Participant Gender, and Gender of the Stimulus Persona

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Participant Gender</th>
<th>Character Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.41</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.29</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22.61</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.68</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.51</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix P

Interaction Between Participant Gender and Character Gender

![Graph showing interaction between participant gender and character gender. The graph displays mean total error scores for male and female participants across different character genders. The x-axis represents character gender (male and female), the y-axis represents mean total error score (21.5 to 25). Two lines are plotted: one for male and one for female, each with different slopes indicating different error scores for each gender.]
Table 3

Demographic Statistics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20.54</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100 Female*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td>44 Republican</td>
<td>33 Democrat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Two participants did not provide information regarding their gender.

*Twelve participants did not provide information regarding their political affiliation.