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Chapter I

Review of the Literature

In 2003, 1,243 incidents of hate crime against the homosexual community were reported (FBI National Press Office, 2004). The frequency of hate crimes against homosexuals was ranked third, behind race and religion, accounting for 16.6% of the overall hate crimes reported. In addition, the frequency of hate crime murders against homosexuals was ranked first that year, accounting for 43% of the total hate crime murders (FBI National Press Office, 2004). When examining these results, one must keep in mind the fact that these statistics only account for those crimes reported to law enforcement agencies and thus neglect a large amount of hate crimes that go officially unreported each year (National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, 2005). The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs (2005) reported 3,252 incidents of hate crime against homosexuals in 2004. These incidents included, but were not limited to, murder, assault, vandalism, and intimidation acts. Furthermore, this organization found that 40% of homosexual adults considered themselves to be victims of hate violence at some point in their lives and that being a victim of hate violence was almost a universal experience for openly-gay youth (National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, 2005).

Anti-Discrimination Legislation

Currently in the United States, any type of discrimination based on race, ethnicity, age, handicap, gender, or religion is illegal. Consequently, individuals who are denied
public service, housing, or employment opportunity based upon one of these factors can legally obtain help in rectifying this discrimination (Silver, 1996). However, no such clause exists in protecting the rights of sexual minorities and as a result these individuals are still denied equal opportunities in many states across the nation. Among the most significant court cases examining discrimination against homosexuals was the case of *Boy Scouts of America v. Dale* (2000). Dale, a former Eagle Scout, had his adult membership revoked from the Boy Scouts of America when it was learned that he was an avowed homosexual and a gay rights activist. In June, 2000 the Supreme Court ruled that forcing the Boy Scouts of America to reinstate Dale’s membership violates their First Amendment right of expressive association and therefore the discrimination that Dale endured based upon his sexual orientation was not unconstitutional. In addition, legislation concerning the civil rights of homosexuals has come into the spotlight. In 2004, Massachusetts became the first state to extend marriage rights to same-sex couples. However, six months later a backlash from opponents came about as voters in eleven states approved a constitutional amendment defining marriage as an exclusively heterosexual institution (Roberts & Gibbons, 2004).

The current federal hate crime law, passed by Congress in 1968 (Title 18 U.S.C Section 245), allows federal investigation and prosecution of hate crimes based on race, religion, and national origin. However, among other variables, this legislation does not include hate crimes based on sexual orientation and therefore similar protection is not afforded to sexual minorities. Nonetheless, efforts have been made to rectify this situation. In response to the exclusion of sexual minorities in the current federal hate crime law, the Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act (LLEEA) was introduced into
Congress in May, 2005. This bill is designed to provide federal assistance to states and local jurisdictions to prosecute hate crimes against Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) individuals. Passing in the House of Representatives, this legislation is currently in the Senate.

Anti-Discrimination Legislation in the School System. Legislation has afforded many minority youth protection in the public school system. Amended in 1991, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits race or ethnicity discrimination, while Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 serves to protect students from gender discrimination in educational programs receiving federal funding. In addition, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 (EEOA) aims to protect linguistic minority students in American schools. Furthermore, the federal government has also encouraged educational services to target certain disadvantaged youth. For instance, Congress enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1965 in order to provide funds for educational programs that target economically disadvantaged youth (Russo, 2006).

In contrast to the above-mentioned legislation, anti-discrimination legislation has not been fully extended to sexual minority youth. However, there have been advances toward this end. In 1984, the federal government passed the Equal Access Act (EAA), which prohibited secondary school authorities from denying student organizations access to meeting space during noninstructional times. This legislation protects such organizations as the Gay/Straight student clubs (Russo, 2006). More significantly was the Supreme Court’s ruling in the case of Nabozny v. Podlesny (1996). A Wisconsin school district was being sued for not protecting a student from sexual harassment, in accordance with Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972. The controversial
element of this case was that the harassed student was openly gay. The ruling of this case clarified at the federal level that sexual harassment directed at lesbian and gay students is covered by Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 and therefore is illegal.

*Impact of legislation on attitudes.* Anti-discrimination legislation has been shown to contribute to more positive attitudes toward homosexuals (e.g. Landen & Innala, 2002; Monteith, 1993). In particular, Monteith (1993) argued that changes in the laws and norms concerning responses to stereotyped groups have contributed to individuals accepting and internalizing these low prejudiced attitudes. In other words, legislation that is favorable toward, and affords protection to, homosexuals can lead to heterosexuals accepting these favorable advances and thus adopting them themselves. Repeated communication of nonprejudicial messages, in the form of legislation and changes in norms, allows these favorable attitudes to be more readily accessible to the individuals in that society (Monteith, 1993).

In many western societies the policy towards homosexuals has begun to change. In the United States, homosexuality was officially removed from the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM) in 1973 as a diagnosable mental disorder. Since that time heterosexuals have demonstrated more favorable attitudes toward gay men and lesbians (see Kite & Whitley, 1996 for meta-analysis). In addition, the Swedish National Board of Health and Welfare removed homosexuality from the Swedish version of the international classification of diseases in 1979. Landen & Innala (2002) found that 20 years later, 67% of respondents did not consider homosexuality to be a disease, a substantial increase since a 1981 poll when 38% of the respondents did not consider
homosexuality to be a disease. The increase in positive attitudes is slow, but when examined over a number of years the increase in favorable attitudes is substantial.

**Sexual Prejudice / Homophobia**

Following the exclusion of homosexuality as a psychological disorder in 1973, society began to question why some heterosexuals harbored strong negative attitudes toward homosexuals (Herek, 2000). In order to account for this strong hatred, research began to increasingly utilize the term *homophobia*, a concept popularized in the early 1970s by George Weinberg (Herek, 2000). Weinberg coined the term *homophobia* to account for the individual antigay behaviors and attitudes in society (Weinberg, 1972). Homophobia, by definition, indicates a phobic reaction to gay men and lesbians (Haaga, 1991). However, research suggests that there is very little evidence to support the characterization of anti-gay responses as a phobia, but that they are better defined as a prejudice (Logan, 1996). Thus *sexual prejudice* is a contemporary term that has been recently used in place of the term *homophobia* (Herek, 2000).

Herek (2000) argued that the motivations underlying the development of sexual prejudice are vast. For some heterosexuals, sexual prejudice is rooted in fears associated with homosexuality that may have stemmed from the individual’s own unacceptable sexual desires. In other words, an individual’s own same-sex sexual impulses may engender a personal sense of discomfort and as a result that individual may develop negative attitudes toward homosexuals. In addition, Herek (2002) contended that the sexual prejudice of some heterosexuals develops out of negative or unpleasant interactions with homosexuals. Following these negative interactions, heterosexuals will generalize these attitudes and feelings to other homosexuals. Finally, the sexual
prejudice of some heterosexuals develops out of the perception that homosexuality represents values that stand in direct contrast to one’s own personal value system.

While sexual prejudice still exists in contemporary society, surveys have shown that its prevalence has begun to decrease. Although many heterosexuals in the United States hold negative attitudes toward homosexual behavior, these attitudes have become more favorable since the 1970s. According to the General Social Survey (GSS), 72.5% of respondents regarded homosexual behavior as “always wrong” in 1973, while 56% regarded it as “always wrong” in 1996 (Yang, 1997). However, despite this decrease in negative attitudes toward homosexual behavior, sexual prejudice still exists and is still implicated in antigay behaviors (e.g. Haddock & Zanna, 1998; Parrott, Zeichner, & Hoover, 2006).

Impact of Attitudes on the Well-Being of Sexual Minorities

According to DiPlacido (1998), living in a heterosexist society may impact the well-being of many sexual minorities by inflicting a significant degree of stress upon them. Specifically, an individual’s sexual minority status placed them at greater risk for stress related to long-term daily hassles, such as anti-gay jokes, and stress related to more serious negative life events, such as employment loss and anti-gay violence. Research has also shown that discrimination and negative experiences in society place gay men at risk for mental health problems (Meyer, 1995). Specifically, Meyer (1995) examined the role of minority stress in mental health problems for gay men. Minority stress is a term used to explain the turmoil and conflict that minority individuals experience with the social environment when minority values are juxtaposed with the dominant values of society (Meyer, 1995). In other words, the values held by homosexual individuals
usually stand in contrast to the dominant values held by society and as a result homosexual individuals experience both internal and external conflict and a heightened level of stress. In particular, Meyer (1995) found that gay men who had high levels of minority stress, including stigmatization and actual experiences of discrimination and violence, were two to three times more likely to suffer from high levels of distress. This distress, in turn, heightened their risk to develop a diagnosable mental disorder. In addition, Ross (1990) also found a significant relationship between a sexual minority’s life events and that individual’s mental health. Specifically, life events that are related to stigmatization based on sexual orientation were found to be significant predictors of psychological dysfunction. Furthermore, in homosexual youth, stressors such as verbal and physical assaults have been shown to be significantly related to academic problems, running away, prostitution, substance abuse, high-risk sexual behavior, and suicide (Rotheram-Borus et al., 1994; Rotheram-Borus et al., 1995; Savin-Williams, 1994, 1998).

Societal attitudes toward homosexuals may place internal stressors upon sexual minorities. Gonsiorek (1993) argued that sexual minorities may internalize the negative attitudes that society holds toward them. Once these attitudes are internalized, they may negatively affect the formation of the individual’s self-image and self-concept. Consequently, this internalization of negative societal attitudes has been linked to a host of problems including lack of self-confidence, overt self-hatred, relationship instability, depression, алкоголism and other substance abuse, and sexual dysfunction (Glaus, 1988; Gonsiorek, 1993; Meyer, 1995; Meyer & Dean, 1998).

Impact of Attitudes on Behavior. As demonstrated above, prejudicial behavior aimed at sexual minorities can have a significant impact upon their well-being. Hence, it is
important to examine these prejudicial behaviors aimed toward sexual minorities and to understand the influence that attitudes can have upon the prejudicial behaviors. Attitudes impact the manner in which social information is processed and consequently the social behavior of the individual (Fabrigar, Smith, & Brannon, 1999). This information processing and social behavior, in turn, influence the development of stereotypes and prejudices (Fabrigar et al, 1999). Research has indicated that sexual prejudice, in particular, is connected to anti-gay behavioral and emotional reactions (Parrott et al., 2006). Following exposure to a male-male erotic film or a female-female erotic film, individuals high in sexual prejudice reported increased negative affect relative to those individuals low in sexual prejudice (Kelley, Byrne, Greendlinger, & Murnen, 1997). Similarly, after viewing an erotic video involving two men, heterosexual men high in sexual prejudice reported greater increases in negative affect, anger, and anxiety relative to heterosexual men low in reported sexual prejudice (Bernat, Calhoun, Adams, & Zeichner, 2001). Furthermore, this study also found that the men high in sexual prejudice demonstrated increased levels of physical aggression toward a gay man, again relative to men low in sexual prejudice. These two groups, however, did not differ in the amount of physical aggression directed toward a heterosexual male (Bernat et al., 2001).

Additionally, Parrott and Zeichner (2005) found one's level of sexual prejudice to be positively associated with anger and physical aggression directed toward homosexual individuals. Thus, this subsequent research further strengthens the support for a relationship between attitudes toward sexual minorities and behaviors enacted toward them.
Based upon Berkowitz’s (1990, 1993) cognitive-associationistic theory, and utilizing the results discussed above, Parrott et al. (2006) showed that negative affect mediates the relationship between sexual prejudice and aggression that is demonstrated toward sexual minorities. The researchers showed that, after viewing a male-male erotic video, men high in reported sexual prejudice were more likely to detect and process anger-related cues in a lexical decision task than were men low in reported sexual prejudice. As such, the researchers argue that these processing biases may act as a “catalyst for aggression” in men high in sexual prejudice (Parrott et al., 2005, 13). Since evidence supports a relationship between attitudes toward sexual minorities and behaviors directed toward them, it is useful to identify the attitudes held toward gay men and lesbians to understand more effectively the hate violence and discriminatory behaviors that are aimed toward them.

**Impact of Attitudes upon Clinical Diagnoses and Treatment.** An extremely important manner in which one’s attitudes toward sexual minorities affect the behaviors enacted toward them is demonstrated in the process of clinically diagnosing and treating gay men and lesbians who seek treatment. Following the removal of homosexuality as a diagnosable mental disorder, the American Psychological Association (APA), in 1975, adopted the stance that “homosexuality per se implies no impairment in judgment, stability, reliability, or general social or vocational capabilities” (Conger, 1975, 633). Coinciding with this stance, research has shown that heterosexuals, homosexuals, and bisexuals display very few differences from one another in terms of overall psychological functioning and well-being (e.g. Gonsiorek, 1991; Rothblum, 1994). As described above, when differences are found among these individuals, such as increased risk of suicide
attempts, emotional distress, or substance abuse for homosexuals, research has shown that they are due primarily to the effects of stress related to the stigmatization of the individual based upon that individual’s sexual orientation.

Despite the data presented above, the stance adopted by the APA in 1975 has yet to be fully implemented into practice (e.g. Garnets et al., 1991; Greene, 1994). In particular, Garnets and colleagues (1991) found that 58% of psychologists surveyed indicated that they knew of incidents of inappropriate psychological care in the treatment of sexual minorities that did not coincide with the stance developed by APA in 1975. These incidents included the practitioner defining the client as “sick” or in need of change and also included instances in which the client’s sexual orientation diverted the therapist’s attention away from treating the client’s central problem. In outlining specific guidelines for conducting psychotherapy with sexual minorities, the APA identified three manners in which the assessment and treatment of lesbian and gay clients can be adversely affected by the therapist’s explicit or implicit negative attitudes toward sexual minorities (APA, 2000). First, the APA (2000) pointed out that when psychologists focus primarily on the sexuality of gay men and lesbians, the effectiveness of the psychotherapy can be compromised. Research has indicated that clinical judgments made about individuals may be affected by mere knowledge of the patient having engaged in homosexual encounters (e.g. Davidson & Friedman, 1981; Semp, 2003). For instance, Davidson and Friedman (1981) found that undergraduates were more likely to attribute problems such as sexual deviations to homosexual clients presenting with depression than to heterosexual clients who presented with the same problem. More specifically, the participants attributed the homosexual client’s difficulties to the client’s
homosexuality and were more likely to thoroughly study the individual’s sex life (Davidson & Friedman, 1981). In addition to clinical judgments made by a student sample, the influence of attitudes on professional clinical judgments has also been documented. Semp (2003) argued that the preponderance of information concerning the role of anti-homosexual bias (AHB) in clinical judgments on gay men and lesbians has shown that AHB does play a role in these judgments. That is to say, clinicians who demonstrate more bias toward homosexual individuals tend to allow this bias to affect their diagnosis and treatment of their homosexual clients. As in the undergraduate population, these clinicians tend to focus more on the client’s sexuality and are more likely to attribute the client’s difficulties to their sexual orientation (Semp, 2003).

Consequently, these clinicians do not spend time on other issues that may be contributing more to the presenting problem of the client and thus do not offer the client the best care and treatment possible.

Secondly, the APA (2000) pointed out that when psychologists use heterosexual norms for their homosexual clients, treatment of that individual is compromised. When these heterosexual norms are applied to lesbian and gay clients’ identity, behavior, and relationships, the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that these clients have may be misinterpreted as deviant or undesirable (APA, 2000). In fact, it is pointed out that the theories, psychotherapeutic interventions, and even the language used in psychology all contain a heterosexual bias. For instance, Anderson (1996) argued that a heterosexist bias exists in working with lesbian clients who are substance abusers. Specifically, she stated that psychologists assume that the client’s relationships and family support will not be as effective in helping the substance-abusing individual as they would be if the client
was heterosexual. Furthermore, Brown (1989) identified three components that should be added to the psychological inquiry of gay men and lesbians in order to understand their full experience in this world. First, she argued that the component of biculturalism should be addressed. Gay men and lesbians are continually surrounded by two different cultures: a homosexual culture and a heterosexual culture. Most likely, these clients still have family members who are heterosexuals and they, themselves, probably lived as a heterosexual at some point in their life. Therefore, their life experiences have been shaped by two different and distinct cultures and psychologists must address this aspect. Secondly, Brown (1989) stated that marginality forms a gay man or lesbian’s experience and thus should be addressed by a psychologist. In almost all settings, a sexual minority is experienced as “the other”, someone who stands in contrast to the culture of heterosexuality. The impact of this “otherness” on identity formation and relationships should be assessed by the psychologist. Finally, Brown (1989) stated that normative creativity is something that defines the world of a sexual minority and thus should be examined. Unlike heterosexuals, homosexuals do not have any clear-cut guidelines of how to be a gay man or a lesbian. Consequently, sexual minorities make these rules up as they go along in order to define “normative behaviors” for homosexuals. Thus, being lesbian or being gay is something sexual minorities had to creatively invent themselves and the process of doing so should be targeted in psychotherapy.

Finally, APA (2000) stated that approaching treatment with a “sexual-orientation-blind” perspective can adversely affect the treatment of a sexual minority. When a psychologist takes a perspective that does not include the client’s sexual minority status, the client’s culturally-unique experience is denied. As a result, the psychologist is
uninformed about these unique experiences of the client and therefore does not fully understand the effects of stigmatization on the client. Consequently, a heterosexist bias pervades the treatment of the client.

As demonstrated above, the effect of one’s attitudes toward homosexuals can impact clinical decisions involving the diagnosis and treatment of gay men and lesbians. As the APA (2000) pointed out “when psychologists are unaware of their negative attitudes, the effectiveness of psychotherapy can be compromised” (APA, February 26, 2000). Thus, in the world of clinical psychology, similar to the broader community, identifying attitudes toward gay men and lesbians provides an inroad to understanding sexual prejudiced behavior.

Current Attitudes Toward Homosexuals

Although homosexuality has been removed as a diagnosis from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) since 1973, approximately 18% of men and 12% of women believe that homosexuals, regardless of their sex, are mentally ill (Herek, 2002). For heterosexual males, the presented percentage is not completely representative in that a discrepancy exists between their views of gay men and lesbians. In particular, 22% of heterosexual men believe gay men to be mentally ill, while 15% of heterosexual males believe lesbians to be mentally ill (Herek, 2002). In addition, Herek (2002) also found that 20% of heterosexual men believe that gay men molest or abuse children.

Negative attitudes concerning the civil rights of homosexuals exist. For instance, 50% of Americans favor a constitutional amendment banning marriage among gay couples (National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, 2004). Furthermore, if homosexuals
were permitted to marry, even more individuals, 61% of Americans, believe that homosexual marriages should not be offered the same rights as heterosexual marriages (National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, 2004). Negative attitudes toward protecting gay and lesbian rights in the workplace also exist. In particular, 35% of heterosexual men and 20% of heterosexual women are against passing a law that would prohibit employment discrimination against homosexuals (Herek, 2002). The prevalence of these beliefs illustrates the implications that negative heterosexual attitudes can have toward perpetuating the discrimination against gay men and lesbians.

**Heterosexuals’ Views of Gay Men and Lesbians.** Studies examining heterosexuals’ attitudes and evaluations of gay men and lesbians have shown that these attitudes are a product of the sex of the target, the sex of the respondent/perceiver, and the interaction of these two factors (e.g. Herek 1988, 2002; Kite & Whitley, 1996). More specifically, research has consistently demonstrated that a sex difference exists in heterosexuals’ attitudes toward homosexuals. In general, men display more negative attitudes toward homosexuals than women do (e.g. Herek, 2002; Kite, 1984; Whitley & Kite, 1995). This finding stems mostly from heterosexual men’s attitudes toward gay men, which are consistently more negative than their attitudes toward lesbians (e.g. Herek, 1988; Kite, 1984; Kite & Whitley, 1996). Furthermore, research has shown that gay men are rated more negatively on average than lesbians (Herek, 2002). Thus, heterosexual attitudes toward homosexuals are also a product of the homosexual individual’s sex. Finally, research has also revealed that heterosexuals express more negative attitudes toward homosexuals of their same sex than toward homosexuals of the opposite sex (Herek, 2002). Heterosexual women display more negative attitudes toward lesbians than toward
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gay men and as previously noted, heterosexual men display more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians. Thus, the interaction between the evaluator and the individual being evaluated also engenders the attitudes that heterosexuals hold toward gay men and lesbians.

The Sexuality of Gay Men and Lesbians

The obvious factor that differentiates heterosexuals and homosexuals from one another is their sexuality. Currently, heterosexuals are being exposed increasingly to the sexuality of gay men and lesbians. Dating shows such as MTV’s *Room Raiders* and *Next* now feature episodes with gay and lesbian couples and more television series, such as *Queer as Folk* and *The L Word*, primarily center their storyline on gay men and lesbians. In addition, heterosexuals are further exposed to the sexuality of gay men and lesbians through the press. Gay celebrities such as Ellen DeGeneres, Elton John, and Melissa Etheridge are open about their sexual orientation and openly display affection to their significant others.

The introduction of the AIDS epidemic is one of the events that brought the sexual behavior of homosexuals, especially gay men, into the public spotlight. A number of studies have examined personal characteristics of homosexuals in connection to HIV infection and risky sexual behavior in order to understand what characteristics make a homosexual individual more likely to engage in risky sexual behavior and therefore more likely to contract HIV (e.g. Evans, Bond, & MacRae, 1998; McCusker et al., 1990; Myers et al., 1992). While this research has been useful in identifying some of the individual characteristics that are linked to the sexual behavior of gay men and lesbians, it has only revealed half of the picture. It is also useful to examine the consequences of
this sexual behavior, in the form of the attitudes that are held about the sexual minority based upon that individual’s sexual behavior. As previously discussed, these attitudes influence how gay men and lesbians are treated, as they are related to the behaviors and actions of the individual who holds them (e.g. Benat et al., 2001; Parrott et al., 2005).

With sexual behavior being one of the primary distinguishing characteristics that differentiates homosexuals from heterosexuals, the attitudes of heterosexuals toward gay men and lesbians’ sexual behavior is important to examine. In contemporary society, it is heterosexuals who comprise a strong majority and, as such, it is heterosexuals who have a strong influence upon determining the norms of society. As previously discussed, once Massachusetts became the first state to allow same-sex marriages in 2004, there was a backlash by voters in 11 states in the form of outlawing same-sex marriages in those states (Roberts & Gibbons, 2004). Thus, the influence of what the majority believes and wants is powerful in that it can alter legislation and social norms. As mentioned previously, Monteith (1993) argued that changes toward low prejudice norms, concerning responses to stereotyped groups, contributes to individuals accepting and internalizing these low prejudiced attitudes. As a result, these changes to low prejudiced attitudes can lead to an increase in positive behaviors directed toward sexual minorities, as attitudes have been shown to influence behavior (e.g. Benat et al., 2001; Parrott et al., 2005). However, before changes in these attitudes toward the sexual behavior of gay men and lesbians can occur, they must first be identified and understood.

The Sexual Double Standard

As previously stated, sexuality is the factor that differentiates homosexuals from heterosexuals. Within this domain, one of the most-researched standards by which an
individual's sexual behavior is judged is the sexual double standard (e.g. Aubrey, 2004, Marks & Fraley, 2005, Milhausen & Herold, 1999). In past eras it was expected that women would not engage in any sexual behavior until marriage, while men were free to pursue as many sexual relationships as they wished and it is argued that these different expectations for men and women still exist in today's modern era. Reiss (1960) referred to this expectation as the orthodox double standard and today it is now known as the sexual double standard. Since the 1960s, this sexual double standard has been the focus of considerable research in the heterosexual population. Formally the sexual double standard holds that women are derogated for engaging in casual sexual activity, while men are rewarded for the same behavior. Over time, this idea of the sexual double standard eventually evolved into the view that women were permitted to engage in sexual relations only within the context of a committed and monogamous relationship, whereas men were allowed to engage in as many sexual relations as they wished (Milhausen & Herold, 1999).

The effect of the sexual double standard has been argued for and demonstrated in an array of domains. For instance, Hynie and Lydon (1995) showed that the sexual double standard existed when women judged a female target regarding her contraceptive behavior. In addition, Boone and Lefkowitz (2004) showed that attitudes toward the sexual double standard were significantly correlated with condom use and with alcohol use before or during sex. Furthermore, it has been argued that the sexual double standard is a prerequisite for the existence of prostitution, not only with respect to adult prostitution, but also for youth prostitution (Cusick, 2002).
The perpetuation of the sexual double standard has also been examined as research has tried to identify the avenues in which this information is transmitted to the youth population. Nolin and Petersen (1992) argued for the role of parent-child communication (or lack there of) in perpetuating the sexual double standard. Specifically, they contended that parents have ample communication with daughters, but lack communication with sons about family norms and what is expected of them in regards to sexual behavior. As a result of this lack of communication, sons are more influenced by and more susceptible to cultural messages about appropriate sexual behavior and thus perpetuate the sexual double standard (Nolin & Peterson, 1992). In addition to the role of parent-child communication, research has also examined the role of the media. Hartley and Drew (2001) conducted a content analysis of gendered messages in contemporary sex education films that were all aimed at adolescents. Through this content analysis, the researchers found that the films reinforced the sexual double standard by legitimizing male erotic desire and sexuality and minimizing female erotic desire and sexuality. Similarly, Aubrey (2004) conducted a content analysis of sexual consequences in television shows aimed at teenagers and found that negative consequences were more common in scenes in which female characters initiated sexual activities than in scenes in which male characters initiated sexual activities.

In examining the sexual double standard, research has begun to distinguish between the perception of it at the societal level, that is whether or not people believe it still exists in society, and the personal acceptance of it, that is how many individuals personally believe and apply the sexual double standard themselves when evaluating other individuals' sexual behavior (Marks & Fraley, 2005; Milhausen & Herold, 2001).
Research has revealed that the majority of individuals believe that the sexual double standard still permeates contemporary society (Milhausen & Herold, 2001) and recently, it has been shown that 85% of people in modern society believe that a sexual double standard for heterosexuals does exist (Marks & Fraley, 2005). Therefore, people perceive that the sexual double standard still exists at the societal level. However, evidence concerning the personal acceptance of it by individuals reveals more inconsistent results. Earlier research demonstrated support for the personal acceptance of the sexual double standard by individuals. For instance, Spreadbury (1982) found that women supported the sexual double standard, as they labeled other women’s sexual behaviors as more promiscuous than men’s sexual behaviors. Furthermore, Sprecher, McKinney, and Orbuch (1987) found that, while both men and women were rated more poorly if their first sexual experience happened at a young age, women were still rated more negatively than men. However, more contemporary research has demonstrated mixed results. O’Sullivan (1995) found that, while participants rated men and women who engaged in casual sexual relations more negatively than those who did not, evidence of a double standard was not found. Similarly, Gentry (1998) utilized a person perception task and found that individuals who had fewer sexual partners were rated more positively than those who had more sexual partners, but again no evidence of a double standard was found. However, as previously mentioned, the sexual double standard has been shown to exist when women judge the contraceptive behavior of a female target (Hynie & Lydon, 1995) and it has also been shown to exist in the interactions among adolescents (Cusick, 2002). In addition, Milhausen and Herold (2001) recently found evidence of a reverse double standard in which a number of men
evaluated the sexual behavior of other men more harshly than the sexual behavior of other women. In summary, the majority of people believe that the sexual double standard does exist for heterosexuals on a societal level; however, research has shown mixed results concerning the personal acceptance and application of it by individuals.

Examining the inconsistent evidence that exists with regards to the personal acceptance of the sexual double standard, Marks and Fraley (2005) have outlined three methodological limitations with previous research. First, they contended that demand characteristics existed in many of the studies. These studies require all participants to rate the appropriateness of sexual behaviors for both men and women, one right after the other. Therefore, participants will either answer in a socially appropriate manner by evaluating the male and female targets in an egalitarian manner or they will answer consistent with what they think the norm in society is. In other words, the participants will allow societal perceptions to dictate their answer instead of their own personal acceptance or rejection of the sexual double standard. Marks and Fraley (2005) pointed out that, since most individuals have preconceived notions about the sexual double standard at the societal level, research must minimize these demand characteristics.

Secondly, the researchers argued that many studies present sexual activity in a biased manner (Marks & Fraley, 2005). That is to say that the language used in the materials of these studies attached a negative context to the described activity or behavior by implying that it is wrong or abnormal. As a result, this biased wording leads to a biased evaluation of the person by the participant and, if a sexual double standard does exist, these biased evaluations may obscure its presentation.
A third methodological limitation that the researchers identified is that there is no differentiation in studies between attitudes and evaluations (Marks & Fraley, 2005). Attitudes toward sexual behavior tend to include general beliefs about the norms of society, while evaluations refer to the actual judgments made about specific individuals who engage in those sexual behaviors. One’s attitudes toward sexual behavior may be completely unrelated to the evaluations made about an individual engaging in that sexual behavior and therefore these two concepts must be differentiated from one another.

Marks and Fraley (2005) argued that at the root of the sexual double standard is the idea that men and women are evaluated differently depending upon their sexual experience and, consequently, research should examine the evaluations that are made about individuals, with respect to their sexual behavior, and not just the attitudes concerning sexual behavior.

In order to rectify these methodological limitations of past studies, Marks and Fraley (2005) conducted their own study to assess whether or not individuals evaluate men and women differently based on the number of sexual partners they have had. This study utilized two different samples: an undergraduate student sample and an internet-based sample. Using a between-subjects design, the participants were presented a hypothetical public survey, in which a target’s sex and number of sexual partners was manipulated. The participants were told that this public survey was real and that an anonymous individual filled it out. The researchers then asked the participants to read through the survey and to rate the target on a number of evaluative dimensions that clustered into four subscales: values, peer popularity, power/success and intelligence (Marks & Fraley, 2005).
Marks and Fraley (2005) found evidence of the sexual double standard in the internet-based sample, but not in the student sample. In the internet-based sample, it was found that on the power/success domain, men were evaluated more positively as their number of sexual partners increased while women were evaluated more negatively as their number of sexual partners increased. This finding shows evidence for a strong sexual double standard in terms of evaluations concerning power/success. In addition, the internet-based sample demonstrated a weak sexual double standard on the intelligence domain as they evaluated both men and women more negatively as their number of sexual partners increased, but evaluated women significantly more negatively than men. No other evidence of a sexual double standard was found on the other domains in the internet-based sample and no evidence of it was found on any of the domains for the student sample. The authors contended that the domains associated with sexual stereotypes (power/success and intelligence) may be more sensitive to the sexual double standard than those domains that are not (peer popularity) (Marks & Fraley, 2005).
Chapter II
Rationale and Hypotheses

Violence and discrimination enacted toward gay men and lesbians continue to permeate society, as sexual minorities are the victims of a wide range of acts including employment discrimination, assault, and even murder (FBI National Press Office, 2004; National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, 2005). These direct actions contribute to the creation of a hostile environment that homosexuals must live in everyday. Less direct, although just as harmful, is the atmosphere of sexual prejudice that is created in society through the negative attitudes held toward sexual minorities (Herek, 2000). These negative attitudes not only help propel the negative actions and behaviors toward homosexuals (e.g. Bernat, Calhoun, & Adams, 2001; Parrott and Zeichner, 2005), but also negatively impact the psychological well-being of gay men and lesbians (DiPlacido, 1998). Furthermore, when gay men and lesbians seek psychological treatment in order to increase their well-being, the negative attitudes held toward these individuals by those treating them negatively impact the level of treatment they receive (e.g. Anderson, 1996; Semp, 2003). The American Psychological Association recognized this problem by stating that “when psychologists are unaware of their negative attitudes, the effectiveness of psychotherapy can be compromised” (APA, February 26, 2000). Thus, an awareness of negative attitudes toward sexual minorities is fundamental to the promotion of more effective means of assisting gay men and lesbians.
The sexuality of gay men or lesbians is the factor that primarily separates them from heterosexuals and accordingly attitudes toward this sexuality become important to examine. More specifically, assessing how the majority of the population, heterosexuals, view the sexuality of gay men and lesbians is useful because what the majority believes and wants can alter legislation and social norms (Roberts & Gibson, 2004). However, much of the psychological literature concerning attitudes toward sexuality has solely focused on heterosexual sexuality and thus is prejudiced against the experiences of sexual minorities.

In 1985, the APA Board for Social and Ethical Responsibility in Psychology (BSERP) brought together a Task Force on Non-Homophobic Research in order to educate psychologists about preventing homophobic bias in research (Burroughs, 1985 as cited in Herek, Kimmel, Amaro, & Melton, 2003). This task force focused on the problem of heterosexual bias in psychological research, which it defined as conceptualizing human experience in strictly heterosexual terms. More than 20 years later, areas of psychological research, including the sexual double standard, still contain this heterosexual bias (Herek et al., 2003). While Marks and Fraley (2005) were able to rectify many of the methodological limitations that existed in studies examining the sexual double standard, their study focused solely on the evaluations of heterosexual men and women's sexuality and thus is subject to this heterosexual bias. Similarly, all prior studies examining the sexual double standard have focused on the attitudes toward and evaluations of heterosexual men and women and to date no study exists that looks at this phenomenon in the homosexual population. Consequently, this research is limited in its
scope in that it does not allow for the generalization of its results to the population of gay men and lesbians.

In order to rectify this gap in the existing psychological literature, the proposed study aims to examine how heterosexuals view the sexuality of gay men and lesbians. More specifically, it looks to examine whether the sexual standards that heterosexuals hold gay men to are different from or the same as those standards to which heterosexuals hold lesbians.

The first four hypotheses of the proposed study were formulated based upon previous research. Sexual behavior is one facet that makes up an individual. As such, it is plausible to expect that trends found in the overall evaluations of homosexuals would also be seen in the evaluations of homosexuals' specific sexual behavior. As previously described, past studies examining heterosexual attitudes toward gay men and lesbians have shown that these attitudes are a product of the sex of the target, the sex of the respondent/perceiver, and the interaction of these two factors (e.g. Herek 1988, 2002; Kite & Whitley, 1996). Specifically, prior research has demonstrated that heterosexual men display more negative attitudes toward homosexuals than heterosexual women do (e.g. Herek, 2002; Kite, 1984; Whitley & Kite, 1995) and it is expected that the same finding will be shown in the proposed study. Furthermore, previous research has demonstrated that gay men are rated more negatively overall than lesbians (Herek, 2002). Based upon this finding, it is expected that gay men will be evaluated more negatively, in the proposed study, than lesbians based upon similar sexual behavior. In addition, prior research has shown that heterosexuals express more negative attitudes toward homosexuals of the same sex than toward homosexuals of the opposite sex (Herek,
2002). It is expected that this finding will be seen in the evaluations conducted in the proposed study.

The fifth hypothesis of the proposed study proposes a three-way interaction between the sex of the target, the sex of the participant, and the number of sexual partners the target reports having. The basis of this hypothesis is founded in a combination of the studies mentioned above. Previous studies have led to the expectation that the evaluations conducted in the proposed study will be affected by both an interaction between the sex of the target and the number of reported sexual partners as well as the interaction between the sex of the target and the sex of the participant. Therefore, it is hypothesized that all three of these factors will interact with one another in order to produce the evaluations conducted in the proposed study. However, given the lack of literature concerning the interaction of these factors, the fifth hypothesis will be non-directional.

Drawing upon previous research that has examined heterosexual views of gay men and lesbians, as well as the rationale mentioned above, the proposed study is guided by the following hypotheses:

H₁₁: Gay men are evaluated more negatively, overall, than lesbians on each individual domain (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence) and on a combination of the domains.

H₁₂: Gay men are evaluated more negatively when they have an increased number of sexual partners than are lesbians when they have an increased
number of sexual partners on each individual domain (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence) and on a combination of the domains.

H₃: Heterosexual men evaluate gay men more negatively, overall, than they evaluate lesbians on each individual domain (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence) and on a combination of the domains.

H₄: Heterosexual women evaluate lesbians more negatively, overall, than they evaluate gay men on each individual domain (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence) and on a combination of the domains.

H₅: The evaluations made by male and female participants significantly differ as a function of both the sex of the target and the number of sexual partners reported.

The null forms of each of the previously stated hypotheses will be tested at the $p = .05$ level of significance.
Participants

A power analysis was conducted to determine the appropriate number of participants to be included in the proposed study. The power analysis utilized an alpha level of .05, a desired power of 0.60, and an effect size of 0.09, based upon the $F$ values found in the study upon which the proposed study is based (Marks & Fraley, 2005). From this power analysis it was determined that the proposed study will include 168 participants, 21 in each of eight conditions.

Participants will be self-identified heterosexuals drawn from the undergraduate population at a mid-Western, liberal arts, and religiously-affiliated university. Approximately 60% of the students at this university identify themselves as Roman Catholic (see Appendix A for the complete distribution of religious denominations). Participants will be recruited through a sign-up sheet and will participate in either fulfillment of a course requirement or as an opportunity for course extra credit. Due to the likely possibility that the proposed study may be conducted over the course of two consecutive semesters, in order to obtain the desired number of participants, the sign-up sheets will be retained in order to ensure that the same student does not participate in the study twice. In addition, precautionary measures aimed at avoiding this situation will be taken during the second semester and will include an announcement to the students.
that they may not participate in this study if they participated in it last semester. This announcement will be done both verbally in their psychology classes by the researcher and in written form on the sign-up sheets that are posted. In the event that a student, who has previously participated in the study, arrives to participate in the study again, this student will be allowed to fill out the surveys, however the student’s responses will be shredded immediately following the participant’s completion of the study.

Design

A 2 (target sex) x 2 (participant sex) x 2 (number of lifetime sexual partners: 2 and 16) factorial design will be employed and a between-subjects design will be utilized in order to reduce potential demand characteristics. Therefore, there will be eight conditions in the proposed study. The proposed study will utilize four dependent variables: values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence. A group administration setting will be used and each participant will be randomly assigned to two of the factors: target sex and number of reported sexual partners. No random assignment will occur on the participant sex variable, as each participant’s sex (male or female) is predetermined. The random assignment of the participants on the other two factors will be determined by the experimenter randomly pulling out a condition number from a bowl as the participant enters and then assigning the participant to that condition. Although the administration is in a group format, spacing among participants during the administration will be adequate in order to provide the participants with anonymity. The focus of the study is on a sensitive topic, about which many participants may feel uncomfortable. Participants will be more likely to answer openly and honestly if they know that nobody can see their answers.
Number of Lifetime Sexual Partners. In manipulating the number of lifetime sexual partners that the target individual reports, the numbers 2 and 16 will be used to represent a small and large number of lifetime sexual partners, respectively. These numbers were selected based upon two sources: an initial collection of information from students who attend the university from which the sample of the proposed study will be drawn and from a previous study on which the proposed study’s methodology is drawn (Marks & Fraley, 2005). The initial information collection entailed a class assignment in which 136 students indicated, in an open-ended format, what they considered a small and what they considered a large number of lifetime sexual partners for either a lesbian or for a gay man. Half of the students filled out this information with respect to a lesbian and half filled out the information with respect to a gay man. The averages of these responses were then calculated (see Table 1). Furthermore, the presented numbers used by Marks & Fraley (2005) in their study were taken into consideration. Marks and Fraley (2005) utilized six numbers in their study: 0, 1, 3, 7, 12, and 19. The numbers that will be used in the proposed study (2 and 16) are not only a good representation of the averages obtained from the initial information collection, but are also approximate averages of the points used in the study conducted by Marks and Fraley (2005).

Materials

Hypothetical General Public Survey. A hypothetical general public survey that will be utilized in the proposed study was created by Marks and Fraley (2005). Instructions will be provided to the participants on the first page. The actual hypothetical general public survey will be on the second page and will be composed of five questions
Table 1

Means of Number of Sexual Partners Designated as Small and Large for Gay Men and Lesbians from Initial Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gay men</th>
<th>Lesbians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>16.91</td>
<td>16.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
followed by the typed standardized answers below each question (see Appendix B). The participant will be told that these questions and answers are from a section of a general public survey that was answered by an anonymous individual. Information concerning the target's sexual orientation and the target's sex will be provided in the demographic information at the top of the survey. In addition, this demographic information will also include the target's ID number and age. In following the methodology of Marks and Fraley (2005), the age of the target will be reported as 19, but the information concerning the target's ID number will be blackened out. Information regarding the target's lifetime sexual experience will be conveyed in the question “What is something not many people know about you?” The key response to this question will be “I've had sex with [number] [guys/girls]. I don't really have much to say about it. It's just sort of the way I've lived my life.”

Once the participants have read the presented section of the general public survey, they will then be asked to rate the target using 26 evaluative statements, which have previously been utilized in research examining the sexual double standard (Marks & Fraley, 2005) (see Appendix C). These 26 statements each fall into one of four subscales: values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence. In the previous study, these four subscales were extracted using principal components analysis with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization (Marks & Fraley, 2005). Participants will rate the target according to each statement on a 5 point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree). Scores for each subscale will be calculated by first reverse-scoring the items followed by an asterisk (see Appendix C) and then summing the scores of the statements that comprise each subscale.
Manipulation Check. A manipulation check will be used to ensure that the study’s manipulations were salient to the participant. This manipulation check will be comprised of three questions that ask the sexual orientation of the target in the general public survey, the sex of the target in the general public survey, and the number of people with whom the target reported having sex (see Appendix D). This manipulation check will be used as evidence to support the effectiveness of the study’s manipulations; however no participant will have their data excluded from analyses if they are unable to correctly answer these three questions.

Demographic Information Sheet. A demographic information sheet will be administered to the participants in order to obtain information about their sex, age, and sexual orientation (see Appendix E). The participant’s sexual orientation will be asked in order to ensure that all analyzed data is provided by self-identified heterosexuals. The data of participants who identify themselves as bisexual or homosexual will not be used in the study’s data analysis since this study’s focus is on heterosexual views of gay men and lesbians. The participants will be told that they do not have to fill in any information that they are not comfortable providing.

ATLG Scale. The participants will also be presented with and asked to fill out the Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men scale (Herek, 1988) (see Appendix F). This scale contains 20 statements and is comprised of two subscales: The Attitudes Toward Lesbians Scale (ATL) and the Attitudes Toward Gay Men Scale (ATG). The ATLG scale was selected because differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians can only be assessed with instruments that yield separate scores for attitudes toward gay men and for attitudes toward lesbians (Herek, 1988). However, most existing scales simply refer
to “homosexuals” in general when assessing these attitudes and research has shown that individuals tend to equate the term “homosexuality” with “male homosexuality” (Black & Stevenson, 1984; Herek, 1988). Therefore, separate scales are beneficial in examining the attitudes held toward both gay men and lesbians. In addition, the ATLG scale contains scoring procedures to distinguish respondents’ attitudes between the two groups, a feature that many of the other scales do not contain (Herek, 1988).

The ATLG scale has demonstrated acceptable levels of reliability and validity. Herek (1994) found satisfactory levels of internal consistency for the overall ATLG scale ($\alpha = .90$), as well as for both the Attitudes Toward Gay Men (ATG) subscale ($\alpha = .89$) and for the Attitudes Toward Lesbians (ATL) subscale ($\alpha = .77$). In addition, satisfactory alpha coefficients for alternate forms reliability were found for the ATLG scale, ATG subscale, and the ATL subscale (.96, .92, and .92, respectively). Construct validity analyses revealed that the ATG and the ATL subscales were significantly correlated with the construct validity measures. For instance, with respect to males, higher ATG and ATL subscale scores (more negative attitudes) were significantly correlated with variables such as “traditional sex role attitudes” and the “absence of positive past interactions with lesbians or gay men” (Herek, 1994, 211) In addition, for females, higher ATG and ATL subscale scores were significantly correlated with variables such as “endorsement of Christian fundamentalist beliefs” and “having few or no gay male friends” (Herek, 1994, 211).

The 20 statements of the ATLG scale are presented to the participant in a Likert format, with a five-point scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. Scores are calculated by summing the scores across items for each subscale. Reverse
scoring is used for some items as indicated in Appendix F. Total scores can range from 20 (extremely positive attitudes toward gay men and lesbians) to 100 (extremely negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbians) (Herek, 1984). This scale will aid in assuring that the eight groups, or conditions, of participants do not significantly differ from one another on their overall attitudes toward homosexuals.

Procedure

Once all the participants have arrived, an informed consent document will be distributed to each participant. The participants will not sign the informed consent forms, but instead will be told both orally and in written form that “completion of the questionnaires in the study will imply [their] informed consent.” No signatures will be obtained on these consent forms in order to ensure that there is no manner in which the participants’ names can be matched with their responses. All of the research materials in the study will be presented to the participants in a sealed envelope that is marked only with an identification number. The participants’ names, or any other identifying information, will in not be connected to this identification number.

The researcher will inform the participants that the present study is looking at how individuals form impressions of other people. They will be told that they will first be reading a section from a general public survey that was filled out by an anonymous individual. The participants will be told to form a complete impression of the person, with the prospect of answering questions about their reaction to the person once they have read the section of the survey. The participants will also be encouraged to pay close attention to the details in the survey in order to form the most complete picture of the person that they can. Following these instructions, the researcher will present to each
participant a sealed envelope containing the hypothetical general public survey (see Appendix B) and the evaluative ratings (see Appendix C). Once the participants have completed the contents of the first envelope, they will place their responses and all of the materials back in the envelope and return it to the researcher.

Next, the participants will be presented with another envelope containing the manipulation check. These envelopes will also only be marked with identification numbers for the purposes of identifying what set of materials were filled out by the same individual. Once the participants have answered the three questions about the anonymous individual that filled out the survey, they will place the material back in the envelope and return it to the researcher. The manipulation check will be administered to the participant immediately following the completion of the hypothetical general public survey part of the study in order to decrease the time allotted between reading the information in the survey and being asked to recall it. Decreasing this amount of time will, in turn, aid in decreasing the chance that the participant will either forget the information or not be able to recall it correctly.

Subsequently, the participants will be presented with a third envelope that will contain the demographics questionnaire. This envelope will also only be marked with an identification number. After completing this information, the participants will place the material inside the envelope and return it to the researcher.

Finally, the participants will be given a final envelope that will contain the ATLG scale. Likewise, this envelope will also only be marked with an identification number. Once the participants have completed this scale, they will place it inside the envelope and return it to the researcher.
Following the completion of their participation in the proposed study, the participants will be fully debriefed, both orally and in written form, and thanked for their participation.
Chapter IV
Proposed Analyses

Before directly testing any of the study’s hypotheses, an initial Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) will be computed on the participants’ Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men (ATLG) scale scores. The purpose of this test is to determine if the participant groups differ significantly from one another with respect to their overall attitudes toward homosexuals. The test will be conducted at the $p = .05$ level of significance and it is expected that no significant differences will exist between any of the groups. In the case that significant differences are found among the participant groups on the ATLG scale scores, the participants’ scores on this scale will be factored out in the analyses in order to control for this variable.

A 2 x 2 x 2 MANOVA will be computed to test the hypotheses of the proposed study. This three-way MANOVA will be tested at the $p = .05$ level of significance. The respective effect from the MANOVA will be discussed as it pertains to each hypothesis.

H₁: Gay men are evaluated more negatively, overall, than lesbians on each individual domain (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence) and on a combination of the domains.

In order to evaluate the first hypothesis, the potential main effect of target sex produced by the three-way MANOVA will be examined for the combination of domains (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence). If the multivariate statistic is significant for the combination of domains, the univariate effects for each
individual domain will be examined in order to evaluate the potential main effect of target sex for each individual domain. The multivariate test, as well as the subsequent univariate tests, will be tested at the $p = .05$ level of significance.

$H_{12}$: Gay men are evaluated more negatively when they have an increased number of sexual partners than are lesbians when they have an increased number of sexual partners on each individual domain (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence) and on a combination of the domains.

In order to evaluate this hypothesis the potential interaction between the sex of the target and the number of lifetime sexual partners reported by the target will be examined for the combination of domains (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence), that is, by the multivariate effect associated with the two-way interaction.

If the multivariate effect is significant, the univariate results will be examined in order to evaluate this potential interaction for each individual domain. The multivariate test and the subsequent univariate tests will be tested at the $p = .05$ level of significance. Post-hoc tests will be conducted following a significant interaction in order to evaluate the differences in the means among levels of one factor for each level of another factor. The post-hoc tests for this hypothesis will be tested at a $p = .05$ level of significance.

$H_{13}$: Heterosexual men evaluate gay men more negatively, overall, than they evaluate lesbians on each individual domain (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence) and on a combination of the domains.

In order to evaluate the third hypothesis the potential interaction between sex of participant and sex of target from the three-way MANOVA will be examined for the
combination of domains (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence). If the multivariate effect is significant, the univariate results will be examined in order to evaluate the potential interaction for each individual domain. The multivariate test, as well as the subsequent univariate tests, will be tested at the $p = .05$ level of significance. Next, in order to test this hypothesis post-hoc tests will be conducted following a significant interaction between participant sex and target sex in order to evaluate the differences in the means among levels of one factor for each level of another factor. The post-hoc tests will be tested at the $p = .05$ level of significance.

$H_{14}$: Heterosexual women evaluate lesbians more negatively, overall, than they evaluate gay men on each individual domain (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence) and on a combination of the domains.

The fourth hypothesis will be tested in the same manner as the third hypothesis. In order to evaluate this hypothesis the potential interaction between sex of participant and sex of target will be examined for the combination of domains (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence). If the multivariate effect is significant, the univariate results will be examined in order to evaluate the potential interaction for each individual domain. The multivariate test and the subsequent univariate tests will be tested at the $p = .05$ level of significance. Next, in order to test this hypothesis post-hoc tests will be conducted following a significant interaction between participant sex and target sex in order to evaluate the differences in the means among levels of one factor for each level of another factor. The post-hoc tests will be tested at the $p = .05$ level of significance.
H$_{1.5}$: The evaluations made by male and female participants significantly differ as a function of both the sex of the target and the number of sexual partners reported.

The fifth hypothesis will be evaluated by examining the potential three-way interaction between target sex, participant sex, and number of lifetime sexual partners reported by the target from the three-way MANOVA for the combination of domains (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence). If the multivariate effect is significant, the univariate results will be examined in order to evaluate the potential three-way interaction for each individual domain. The multivariate test and the subsequent univariate tests will be tested at the $p = .05$ level of significance. Next, in order to test this hypothesis post-hoc tests will be conducted following a significant three-way interaction between participant sex, target sex, and number of lifetime reported sexual partners in order to evaluate the differences in the means among levels of one factor for each level of the other factors. The post-hoc tests will be tested at the $p = .05$ level of significance.

In the case that significant differences are found among the participant groups on the ATLG scale scores, a three-way MANCOVA, instead of a three-way MANOVA, will be conducted to test all of the previously stated hypotheses in order to factor out, and thus control for, the participants' ATLG scale scores. The three-way MANCOVA will be tested at the $p = .05$ level of significance and all follow-up univariate tests and post-hoc tests will be tested at the $p = .05$ level of significance as well.
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Enrollment by Religious Affiliation  
Spring Semester 2006  
Xavier University, Office of the Registrar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Banner Code</th>
<th>Undergraduate Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>5.07%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>5.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>BU</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciples of Christ</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopalian</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3.91%</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Christian</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>12.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-Christian</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Protestant</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox Catholic</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>2,268</td>
<td>60.80%</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>40.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to Disclose</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>22.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,730</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>2,764</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,268 of 3,234 = 70.1%</td>
<td>1,120 of 1,752 = 63.9%</td>
<td>3,388 of 4,986 = 68.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Hypothetical General Public Survey and Instructions

Instructions:
On the next page there is a section from a General Public Survey questionnaire that was recently issued. In that section, a member of the general public answered five questions about themselves. Please read the person's answers and think about them for a moment. After you have read the person's answers, you will be asked to answer several questions (using a 1 to 5 scale) about your impressions of the person.
ID No. ________________________________
Age 19 ________________________________
Sex [Male/Female] ________________________________
Sexual Orientation Homosexual

Please describe some of your hobbies.

I like birdwatching. I started when I was about 8 years old. My grandfather took me out into the forest one day, and taught me how to use binoculars to watch them, and I've been hooked ever since. I also like to ski. I don't get to very often because it's hard to find the time anymore, but I take every chance I get to go skiing.

Tell us about your career aspirations.

I would like to become a writer someday. I feel I have pretty good ideas and I have a talent for putting those ideas on paper. I'm not sure if I'd like to be a journalist or a freelance writer, but I know I want to cover current events and how they affect things. Like editorial type stuff.

Describe some of your fears.

Well, as far as tangible things, I'm scared of snakes and reptiles like snakes. I also kind of have a fear of heights. As far as intangible things, I fear failing at my goals and not being a success. I want to do the things I want to do, and the thought of not being able to do them scares me.

What is something not many people know about you?

I've had sex with [#] [guys/girls]. I don't really have much to say about it. It's just kind of the way I've lived my life.

How do you see yourself?

I see myself as a theorist more than a sensor. I internalize a lot of things and I think abstractly about them. I don't really even have to try to think abstractly about things, it just sort of happens. That's about all.
APPENDIX C

Evaluative Statement Ratings Sheet

Please answer the following questions regarding the person you just read about using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral / Mixed</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This person would make a good leader............. 1———-2———-3———-4———-5

2. *This person is a failure. ......................... 1———-2———-3———-4———-5

3. This person would make someone a good husband/wife........................................ 1———-2———-3———-4———-5

4. I could be friends with this person. ............. 1———-2———-3———-4———-5

5. *This person is dishonest. ......................... 1———-2———-3———-4———-5

6. This person will have a good job. ............... 1———-2———-3———-4———-5

7. This person has lots of friends. ................ 1———-2———-3———-4———-5

8. *This person makes a lot of mistakes. ........ 1———-2———-3———-4———-5

9. *No one likes this person......................... 1———-2———-3———-4———-5

10. This person is trustworthy.......................... 1———-2———-3———-4———-5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral / Mixed</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. People like this person. ...................................... 1---2---3---4---5
12. This person will make a lot of money............... 1---2---3---4---5
13. This person is intelligent. .............................. 1---2---3---4---5
14. This person is respectful. ............................... 1---2---3---4---5
15. This person will hold a job with lots of power...... 1---2---3---4---5
16. *This person is immoral. ................................. 1---2---3---4---5
17. *I would not like to know this person. .............. 1---2---3---4---5
18. This person influences others. .......................... 1---2---3---4---5
19. This person would make someone a good boyfriend/girlfriend............................... 1---2---3---4---5
20. This person performs well in everything he/she does ........................................... 1---2---3---4---5
21. This person is fun at parties. ............................. 1---2---3---4---5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral / Mixed</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. This person will be in charge of many people. .................. 1---------2---------3---------4---------5

23. This person is successful. ............................................. 1---------2---------3---------4---------5

24. This person is physically attractive. ............................ 1---------2---------3---------4---------5

25. This person did well in school. ...................................... 1---------2---------3---------4---------5

26. This person is popular. ................................................. 1---------2---------3---------4---------5

*indicates reverse scoring for that item
APPENDIX D

Manipulation Check

Please answer the following questions regarding the General Public Survey you read by circling your response or writing in your response (as appropriate) in the provided space.

1) What is the sex (gender) of the person who filled out the General Public Survey you read?

   MALE       FEMALE

2) What is the sexual orientation of the person who filled out the General Public Survey you read?

   BISEXUAL   HETEROSEXUAL   HOMOSEXUAL

3) How many sexual partners did the person you read about in the General Public Survey report having? ________________________
APPENDIX E

Demographic Information Sheet

Please complete the following demographic information about yourself by circling the appropriate response to each section.

SEX:  M  F

AGE:  17  18  19  20  21  22  23  24  25

Other (please indicate) ____________________

SEXUAL ORIENTATION:  Bisexual  Heterosexual  Homosexual
APPENDIX F

Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men (ATLG) Scale

Read each of the following statements carefully. For each statement indicate how much you agree with each statement (by circling the appropriate number) using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral / Mixed</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Lesbians just can’t fit into our society. 1-----2------3------4------5

2. *Male homosexual couples should be allowed to adopt children the same as heterosexual couples. 1-----2------3------4------5

3. *A woman’s homosexuality should not be a cause for job discrimination in any situation. 1-----2------3------4------5

4. I think male homosexuals are disgusting. 1-----2------3------4------5

5. Female homosexuality is detrimental to society because it breaks down the natural divisions between the sexes. 1-----2------3------4------5

6. Male homosexuals should not be allowed to teach school. 1-----2------3------4------5

7. *State laws regulating private, consenting lesbian behavior should be loosened. 1-----2------3------4------5

8. Male homosexuality is a perversion. 1-----2------3------4------5

9. Female homosexuality is a sin. 1-----2------3------4------5
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral / Mixed</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. *Just as in other species, male homosexuality is a natural expression of sexuality in human men. 1-----2-------3-------4-------5

11. The growing number of lesbians indicates a decline in American morals. 1-----2-------3-------4-------5

12. If a man has homosexual feelings, he should do everything he can to overcome them. 1-----2-------3-------4-------5

13. *Female homosexuality in itself is no problem, but what society makes of it can be a problem. 1-----2-------3-------4-------5

14. *I would not be too upset if I learned that my son was a homosexual. 1-----2-------3-------4-------5

15. Female homosexuality is a threat to many of our basic social institutions. 1-----2-------3-------4-------5

16. Homosexual behavior between two men is just plain wrong. 1-----2-------3-------4-------5

17. Female homosexuality is an inferior form of sexuality. 1-----2-------3-------4-------5

18. The idea of male homosexual marriages seems ridiculous to me. 1-----2-------3-------4-------5

19. Lesbians are sick. 1-----2-------3-------4-------5

20. *Male homosexuality is merely a different kind of lifestyle that should not be condemned. 1-----2-------3-------4-------5

* indicates reverse scoring for that item
Chapter V: Dissertation

Abstract

The subject of numerous research studies, the sexual double standard formally states that men are rewarded for engaging in casual sexual activity, while women are derogated for the same behavior. Although research has indicated a strong belief in contemporary society that the sexual double standard still exists, the research literature has yielded mixed results about its existence and application. Despite the abundance of studies focusing on the sexual double standard, all of these studies contained a heterosexual bias, as they only examined the presence or absence of the sexual double standard in the heterosexual population. To determine whether a sexual double standard exists with regard to the homosexual population, 174 heterosexual, undergraduate participants evaluated homosexual experimental targets described in scripts that manipulated the targets' sex and number of lifetime sexual partners. Results showed that although the participants' attitudes toward gay men were significantly more negative than their attitudes toward lesbians, the participants did not utilize the sexual double standard in their evaluations, as they rated both gay men and lesbian experimental targets in a similar negative manner as their number of reported sexual partners increased. These results suggest that although the amount of sexual activity influences evaluations of homosexuals, gay men and lesbians are not held to different sexual standards by the heterosexual population. Reasons for and implications of this noted disconnect between the participants' attitudes and evaluations are discussed.
Broadening the Concept of the Sexual Double Standard: Assessing Heterosexual Attitudes and Evaluations of Gay Men and Lesbians’ Sexuality

Violence and discrimination enacted toward gay men and lesbians continue to permeate society, as sexual minorities are the victims of a wide range of acts including employment discrimination, assault, and even murder (FBI National Press Office, 2004; National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, 2005). These direct actions contribute to the creation of a hostile environment that homosexuals must live in everyday. Less direct, although just as harmful, is the atmosphere of sexual prejudice that is created in society through the negative attitudes held toward sexual minorities (Herek, 2000). These negative attitudes not only help propel the negative actions and behaviors toward homosexuals (Bernat, Calhoun, & Adams, 2001; Parrott and Zeichner, 2005), but also negatively impact the psychological well-being of gay men and lesbians (DiPlacido, 1998). Furthermore, when gay men and lesbians seek psychological treatment in order to increase their well-being, the negative attitudes held toward these individuals by those treating them negatively impact the level of treatment they receive (Anderson, 1996; Semp, 2003). The American Psychological Association (APA) recognized this problem by stating that “when psychologists are unaware of their negative attitudes, the effectiveness of psychotherapy can be compromised” (APA, February 26, 2000). Thus, in the world of clinical psychology, similar to the broader community, identifying attitudes toward gay men and lesbians provides an inroad to understanding sexual prejudiced behavior, as well as promoting a more effective means of assisting gay men and lesbians.
Heterosexuals' Views of Gay Men and Lesbians

Studies examining heterosexuals' attitudes and evaluations of gay men and lesbians have shown that these attitudes are a product of the sex of the target, the sex of the respondent/perceiver, and the interaction of these two factors (Herek 1988, 2002; Kite & Whitley, 1996). More specifically, research has consistently demonstrated that a sex difference exists in heterosexuals' attitudes toward homosexuals. In general, men display more negative attitudes toward homosexuals than women do (Herek, 2002; Kite, 1984; Whitley & Kite, 1995). This finding stems mostly from heterosexual men's attitudes toward gay men, which are consistently more negative than their attitudes toward lesbians (Herek, 1988; Kite, 1984; Kite & Whitley, 1996). Furthermore, research has shown that gay men are rated more negatively on average than lesbians (Herek, 2002). Thus, heterosexual attitudes toward homosexuals are also a product of the homosexual individual's sex. Finally, research has also revealed that heterosexuals express more negative attitudes toward homosexuals of their same sex than toward homosexuals of the opposite sex (Herek, 2002). Heterosexual women display more negative attitudes toward lesbians than toward gay men and, as previously noted, heterosexual men display more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians. Thus, the interaction between the evaluator and the individual being evaluated also engenders the attitudes that heterosexuals hold toward gay men and lesbians.

The Sexual Double Standard

The obvious factor that differentiates heterosexuals and homosexuals from one another is their sexuality and, as such, the attitudes of heterosexuals toward gay men and lesbians' sexual behavior are important to examine. One of the most researched
standards by which an individual's sexual behavior is judged is the sexual double standard, the view that women are permitted to engage in sexual relations only within the context of a committed and monogamous relationship, whereas men are allowed to engage in as many sexual relations as they wish (Aubrey, 2004; Marks & Fraley, 2005; Milhausen & Herold, 1999).

Research examining the sexual double standard, similar to other areas of research, continues to contain a heterosexual bias. In 1985, the APA Board for Social and Ethical Responsibility in Psychology (BSERP) brought together a Task Force on Non-Homophobic Research in order to educate psychologists about preventing heterosexual bias in research, which it defined as conceptualizing human experience in strictly heterosexual terms (Burroughs, 1985 as cited in Herek, Kimmel, Amaro, & Melton, 2003). However, more than 20 years later, this line of research continues to utilize heterosexuals as its sole focus.

Recently, research has shown that 85% of people in modern society believe that a sexual double standard for heterosexuals does exist at the societal level (Marks & Fraley, 2005). However, evidence concerning the personal acceptance of it by individuals reveals inconsistent results. Earlier research demonstrated support for the personal acceptance of the sexual double standard by individuals. For instance, Spreadbury (1982) found that women supported the sexual double standard, as they labeled other women's sexual behaviors as more promiscuous than men's sexual behaviors. Furthermore, Sprecher, McKinney, and Orbuch (1987) found that, while both men and women were rated more poorly if their first sexual experience happened at a young age, women were still rated more negatively than men. However, more contemporary research has
demonstrated mixed results. O'Sullivan (1995) found that, while participants rated men and women who engaged in casual sexual relations more negatively than those who did not, evidence of a double standard was not found. Similarly, Gentry (1998) utilized a person perception task and found that individuals who had fewer sexual partners were rated more positively than those who had more sexual partners, but again no evidence of a double standard was found. However, the sexual double standard has been shown to exist when women judge the contraceptive behavior of a female target (Hynie & Lydon, 1995) and it has also been shown to exist in the interactions among adolescents (Cusick, 2002). In addition, Milhausen and Herold (2001) found evidence of a reverse double standard in which a number of men evaluated the sexual behavior of other men more harshly than the sexual behavior of other women. In summary, the majority of people believe that the sexual double standard does exist for heterosexuals on a societal level; however, research has shown mixed results concerning the personal acceptance and application of it by individuals.

Examining the inconsistent evidence that exists with regards to the personal acceptance of the sexual double standard, Marks and Fraley (2005) outlined three methodological limitations with previous research. First, they contended that demand characteristics existed in many of the studies, as participants were required to rate the appropriateness of sexual behaviors for both men and women, one right after the other. As a result, participants either answered in a socially appropriate manner by evaluating the male and female targets in an egalitarian manner or they answered consistent with what they thought the norm in society is. In other words, the participants allow societal
perceptions to dictate their answer instead of their own personal acceptance or rejection of the sexual double standard.

Secondly, the researchers argued that many studies present sexual activity in a biased manner, as the language used in the materials of these studies attached a negative context to the described activity or behavior by implying that it is wrong or abnormal (Marks & Fraley, 2005). As a result, this biased wording leads to a biased evaluation of the person by the participant and, if a sexual double standard does exist, these biased evaluations may obscure its presentation.

A third methodological limitation that the researchers identified is that there is no differentiation in studies between attitudes and evaluations (Marks & Fraley, 2005). Attitudes toward sexual behavior tend to include general beliefs about the norms of society, while evaluations refer to the actual judgments made about specific individuals who engage in those sexual behaviors. One’s attitudes toward sexual behavior may be completely unrelated to the evaluations made about an individual engaging in that sexual behavior and therefore these two concepts must be differentiated from one another. Marks and Fraley (2005) argued that at the root of the sexual double standard is the idea that men and women are evaluated differently depending upon their sexual experience and, consequently, research should examine the evaluations that are made about individuals, with respect to their sexual behavior, and not just the attitudes concerning sexual behavior.

In order to rectify these methodological limitations of past studies, Marks and Fraley (2005) conducted their own study to assess whether or not individuals evaluated men and women differently based on the number of sexual partners they have had.
Utilizing two different samples (an undergraduate student sample and an internet-based sample), the researchers had participants rate heterosexual targets, whose sex and number of sexual partners were manipulated, on four different domains (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence). Marks and Fraley (2005) found evidence of the sexual double standard in the internet-based sample, but not in the student sample. In the internet-based sample, evidence for a strong sexual double standard in terms of evaluations concerning power/success was found, as men were evaluated more positively as their number of sexual partners increased while women were evaluated more negatively as their number of sexual partners increased. In addition, the internet-based sample demonstrated a weak sexual double standard on the intelligence domain, as participants evaluated both men and women more negatively as their number of sexual partners increased, but evaluated women significantly more negatively than men. No other evidence of a sexual double standard was found on the other domains in the internet-based sample and no evidence of it was found on any of the domains for the student sample. The authors contended that the domains associated with sexual stereotypes (power/success and intelligence) may be more sensitive to the sexual double standard than those domains that are not (peer popularity) (Marks & Fraley, 2005).

While Marks and Fraley (2005) were able to rectify many of the methodological limitations that existed in studies examining the sexual double standard, their study focused solely on the evaluations of heterosexual men and women's sexuality and thus is subject to the heterosexual bias. Similarly, all prior studies examining the sexual double standard have focused on the attitudes toward and evaluations of heterosexual men and women and, to date, no study exists that looks at this phenomenon with regard to the
homosexual population. Consequently, this research is limited in its scope in that it does not allow for the generalization of its results to the population of gay men and lesbians.

In order to rectify this gap in the existing psychological literature, the current study aimed to examine how heterosexuals view the sexuality of gay men and lesbians. More specifically, it examined whether the sexual standards that heterosexuals hold gay men to are different from or the same as those standards to which heterosexuals hold lesbians.

Method

Participants

One-hundred eighty-one undergraduates at a mid-Western, liberal arts, and religiously-affiliated university voluntarily participated in the study. Over 60% of students attending this university identify themselves as Roman Catholic. The data of participants who identified themselves as bisexual or homosexual were not used in the study’s data analyses since this study’s focus is on heterosexual views of gay men and lesbians. In addition, the data of participants who did not answer every item were also not used in the study’s analyses. As such, data from seven participants were not used in the study’s analyses due to missing data (two participants), self-identification as homosexual (three participants), or self-identification as bisexual (two participants). As a result, the final sample of this study was comprised of 174 self-identifying heterosexual participants (87 men and 87 women, $M = 20.26$ years, $SD = 1.737$ years). Participants were recruited through the psychology department participant pool and participated in either fulfillment of a course requirement or as an opportunity for course extra credit. All
participants were treated in accordance with the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (American Psychological Association, 1992).

Design

A 2 (target sex) x 2 (participant sex) x 2 (number of lifetime sexual partners: 2 and 16) factorial design was employed and a between-subjects design was utilized in order to reduce potential demand characteristics. Therefore, there were eight conditions in the current study. The current study utilized four dependent variables: values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence. A group administration setting was used and each participant was randomly assigned to two of the factors: target sex and number of reported sexual partners. No random assignment occurred on the participant sex variable, as each participant’s sex (male or female) was predetermined. The random assignment of the participants on the other two factors was determined by the experimenter randomly pulling out a condition number from a bowl as the participant entered and then assigning the participant to that condition. Although the administration was in a group format, spacing among participants during the administration was adequate in order to provide the participants with anonymity. The focus of the current study was on a sensitive topic, about which many participants may have felt uncomfortable. Participants would be more likely to answer openly and honestly if they knew that nobody could see their answers. In addition, instructions read to the participants prior to the beginning of the study indicated that they did not have to answer any item they did not feel comfortable answering and that they were not to put their name on any materials, including the consent form, so that their name would in no way be connected to their responses (see Appendix A).
Number of Lifetime Sexual Partners. In manipulating the number of lifetime sexual partners that the target individual reported, the numbers 2 and 16 were used to represent a small and large number of lifetime sexual partners, respectively. These numbers were selected based upon two sources: an initial collection of information from students who attend the university from which the sample of the current study was drawn and from a previous study on which the current study's methodology was drawn (Marks & Fraley, 2005). The initial information collection entailed a class assignment in which 136 students indicated, in an open-ended format, what they considered a small and what they considered a large number of lifetime sexual partners for either a lesbian or for a gay man. Half of the students filled out this information with respect to a lesbian and half filled out the information with respect to a gay man. The averages of these responses were then calculated for gay men (small: 2.47; large: 16.91) and for lesbians (small: 2.64; large: 16.63). Furthermore, the presented numbers used by Marks & Fraley (2005) in their study were taken into consideration. Marks and Fraley (2005) utilized six numbers in their study: 0, 1, 3, 7, 12, and 19. The numbers used in the current study (2 and 16) are not only a good representation of the averages obtained from the initial information collection, but are also approximate averages of the points used in the study conducted by Marks and Fraley (2005).

Materials

Hypothetical General Public Survey. The hypothetical general public survey utilized in the study contained five questions followed by the typed standardized answers below each question and was taken from Marks and Fraley (2005) (see Appendix B). The participant was told that these questions and answers were from a section of a
general public survey that was answered by an anonymous individual. Information concerning the target’s sexual orientation and the target’s sex was provided in the demographic information at the top of the survey. In addition, this demographic information also included the target’s ID number and age. In following the methodology of Marks and Fraley (2005), the age of the target was reported as 19 and the information concerning the target’s ID number was blackened out in order to appear to protect the anonymity of the respondent. Information regarding the target’s lifetime sexual experience was conveyed in the question “What is something not many people know about you?” The key response to this question was “I’ve had sex with [number] [guys/girls]. I don’t really have much to say about it. It’s just sort of the way I’ve lived my life.”

*Evaluative Statements Rating Sheet.* The evaluative statements rating sheet utilized in the current study asked the participant to rate the target using 26 evaluative statements that have previously been utilized in research examining the sexual double standard (Marks & Fraley, 2005) (see Appendix C). Marks & Fraley (2005) selected these 26 items from a larger pool of 50 evaluative items that past sexual double standard research showed to be sensitive to sexual information. Using principal components analysis with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization, Marks & Fraley (2005) extracted four subscales (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence) and reduced the initial 50 items to the final 26 evaluative items used in their study, as well as in the current study. Items that were dropped either did not load cleanly on a single subscale or did not load well on any of the four subscales (Marks & Fraley, 2005). Of the final 26 items eight items loaded onto the values subscale, six items loaded onto
the popularity with peers subscale, eight items loaded onto the power/success subscale, and four items loaded onto the intelligence subscale. Participants rated the target according to each evaluative item on a 5 point scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 5 = *Strongly Agree*). Scores for each subscale were calculated by first reverse-scoring the items followed by an asterisk (see Appendix C) and then summing the scores of the statements that comprise each subscale. Therefore the range of scores for the values subscale is eight to 40, the range for the popularity with peers subscale is six to 30, the range for the power/success subscale is eight to 40, and the range of scores for the intelligence subscale is four to 20. Higher scores on each subscale indicated greater possession of the qualities described by the respective subscale.

*Manipulation Check.* A manipulation check was used to ensure that the study’s manipulations were salient to the participant. This manipulation check was comprised of three questions that asked (1) the sexual orientation of the target in the general public survey, (2) the sex of the target in the general public survey, and (3) the number of people with whom the target reported having sex (see Appendix D). This manipulation check was used as evidence to support the effectiveness of the study’s manipulations.

*Demographic Information Sheet.* A demographic information sheet was administered to the participants in order to obtain information about their sex, age, and sexual orientation (see Appendix E). The participant’s sexual orientation was asked in order to ensure that all analyzed data were provided by self-identified heterosexuals.

*ATLG Scale.* The Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men scale (Herek, 1988) contains 20 statements and is comprised of two subscales: The Attitudes Toward Gay Men Scale (ATG) and the Attitudes Toward Lesbians Scale (ATL) (see Appendix F).
The ATLG scale was selected because differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians can only be assessed with instruments that yield separate scores for attitudes toward gay men and for attitudes toward lesbians (Herek, 1988). However, most existing scales simply refer to “homosexuals” in general when assessing these attitudes and research has shown that individuals tend to equate the term “homosexuality” with “male homosexuality” (Black & Stevenson, 1984; Herek, 1988). Therefore, separate scales are beneficial in examining the attitudes held toward both gay men and lesbians. In addition, the ATLG scale contains scoring procedures to distinguish respondents’ attitudes between the two groups, a feature that many of the other scales do not contain (Herek, 1988).

The ATLG scale has demonstrated acceptable levels of reliability and validity. Herek (1994) found satisfactory levels of internal consistency for the overall ATLG scale ($\alpha = .90$), as well as for both the Attitudes Toward Gay Men (ATG) subscale ($\alpha = .89$) and for the Attitudes Toward Lesbians (ATL) subscale ($\alpha = .77$). In addition, satisfactory alpha coefficients for alternate forms reliability were found for the ATLG scale, ATG subscale, and the ATL subscale (.96, .92, and .92, respectively). Construct validity analyses revealed that the ATG and the ATL subscales were significantly correlated with the construct validity measures. For instance, with respect to men, higher ATG and ATL subscale scores (more negative attitudes) were significantly correlated with variables such as “traditional sex role attitudes” and the “absence of positive past interactions with lesbians or gay men” (Herek, 1994, p. 211). In addition, for women, higher ATG and ATL subscale scores were significantly correlated with variables such as “endorsement of
Christian fundamentalist beliefs” and “having few or no gay male friends” (Herek, 1994, p. 211).

Each of the 20 statements of the ATLG scale are presented in a Likert format, with a five-point scale ranging from (1) “strongly disagree” to (5) “strongly agree”. Scores are calculated by summing the scores across items for each subscale. Reverse scoring was used for some items, as indicated in Appendix F. Total scores can range from 20 (extremely positive attitudes toward gay men and lesbians) to 100 (extremely negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbians) (Herek, 1994).

Procedure

Prior to beginning the current study, approval for this research was obtained from Xavier University’s Institutional Review Board (see Appendix G).

The current study was administered in a group format. An informed consent document was distributed to each participant at the beginning of the study (see Appendix H). The participants did not sign the informed consent form, but instead were told both orally and in the consent form that “completion of the questionnaires in the study will imply [their] informed consent.” Given the sensitive nature of the study, great care was taken to ensure the anonymity of the participants’ responses. No signatures were obtained on the consent forms in order to ensure that there was no manner in which the participants’ names could be matched with their responses. All of the research materials in the study were presented to the participants in a sealed envelope that was marked only with an identification number. The participants’ names, or any other identifying information, were not connected to the identification numbers.
The researcher informed the participants that the study examined how individuals form impressions of other people (see Appendix A). The participants were told that they would first be reading a section from a general public survey that was filled out by an anonymous individual. The researcher encouraged the participants to form a complete impression of the person, with the prospect of answering questions about their reaction to the person once they had read the section of the survey. The participants were also encouraged to pay close attention to the details in the survey in order to form the most complete picture of the person that they could. Following these instructions, the researcher presented a sealed envelope containing the hypothetical general public survey and the evaluative statements rating sheet to each participant. Once each participant had completed the contents of the first envelope and placed the responses and materials back in it, the researcher exchanged it with the next envelope. The researcher did not wait for all participants to complete each set of envelopes, but instead provided participants with new envelopes on an individual basis.

Next, each participant was presented with another envelope containing the manipulation check. These envelopes were also only marked with identification numbers for the purposes of identifying the sets of materials filled out by the same individual. Once the participant answered the three questions about the anonymous individual who filled out the survey and placed the material back in the envelope, the envelope was returned to the researcher. The manipulation check was administered to the participant immediately following the completion of the hypothetical general public survey and the evaluative statements rating sheet in order to decrease the time allotted between reading the information in the survey and being asked to recall it. Decreasing this amount of
time, in turn, aided in decreasing the chance that the participant would either forget the information or not be able to recall it correctly. None of the participants had their data excluded from analyses due to incorrect responses on the manipulation check.

Subsequently, each participant was presented with a third envelope that contained the demographic information sheet. This envelope was also only marked with an identification number. After completing this information, the participant then placed the material inside the envelope and returned it to the researcher.

Finally, each participant was given a final envelope that contained the ATLG scale. Likewise, this envelope was also only marked with an identification number. After completing this scale, the participant placed it inside the envelope and returned it to the researcher.

Following the completion of participation in the current study, each participant was individually debriefed, both orally and in written form (see Appendix I), as the researcher stated that the current study examined how impressions and evaluations of individuals are created based upon several personal variables. The participant was then thanked for participating in the current study and encouraged to contact the principle investigator or faculty advisor with any questions or concerns.

Results

An examination of the participants’ responses to the manipulation check indicated that eight out of the 174 participants were unable to correctly answer all three questions (4.6%). However, as previously stated, the data gathered from these participants was still included in the current study’s analyses.
Before directly testing any of the study's hypotheses, an initial Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was computed on the participants' Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men (ATLG) scale scores. As a result of the 2 (participant sex: male, female) x 2 (target sex: male, female) x 2 (number of reported lifetime sexual partners: 2, 16) research design, the current study's sample was comprised of eight different participant groups. The purpose of the initial ANOVA on the participants' ATLG scale scores was to determine if these participant groups differed significantly from one another with respect to their overall attitudes toward homosexuals. The ANOVA indicated that no significant differences existed among the participant groups' ATLG scale scores, $F(7, 166) = 2.043, p = .053$. As such, the participants' scores on this scale were not factored out of the analyses. Further analyses revealed that a significant difference existed between the overall ATLG scale scores of male and female participants, as male participants rated gay men and lesbians, overall, significantly more negatively ($M = 49.08, SD = 18.17$) than did female participants ($M = 41.17, SD = 15.29$), $F(1,176) = 9.875, p = .009$, a trend that has been documented in past literature (Herek, 2002; Kite, 1984; Whitley & Kite, 1995) (see Figure 1). This significant difference is attributable to the fact that male participants' ATG scale scores ($M = 27.69, SD = 10.78$), and therefore their ratings of gay men, were significantly higher than the female participants' ATG scale scores ($M = 21.59, SD = 7.86$), $F(1,172) = 18.206, p < .001$. No significant difference existed between the male ($M = 21.59, SD = 7.86$) and female ($M = 20.09, SD = 7.15$) participants' ATL scale scores, $F(1,172) = 1.719, p = .192$. In addition, analyses revealed that a significant difference existed between the participants' ATG subscale scores ($M = 24.57, SD = 10.10$) and their ATL subscale scores ($M = 20.84, SD = 7.53$), as
participants’ attitudes toward gay men were significantly more negative than their attitudes toward lesbians, \( t(354) = 3.951, p < .001 \) (see Figure 2).

A 2 (sex of participant) x 2 (sex of target) x 2 (number of reported sexual partners) MANOVA was computed in order to test the null form of the study’s hypotheses. This three-way MANOVA was tested at the \( p = .05 \) level of significance. The respective results of the MANOVA will be discussed in association to each specific hypothesis.

**H1**: Gay men are evaluated more negatively, overall, than lesbians on each individual domain (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence) and on a combination of the domains.

In order to evaluate the first hypothesis, the potential main effect of target sex produced by the three-way MANOVA was examined for the combination of domains (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence) and was found to be nonsignificant, \( F(4, 163) = .553, p = .697 \) (see Table 1). Therefore, participants’ evaluations of gay men and lesbians did not significantly differ from one another on a combination of the domains examined and as such the null hypothesis was accepted. Because the multivariate effect was not significant, the univariate results were not examined.

**H2**: Gay men are evaluated more negatively when they have an increased number of sexual partners than are lesbians when they have an increased number of sexual partners on each individual domain (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence) and on a combination of the domains.
In order to evaluate this hypothesis, the potential interaction between the sex of the target and the number of lifetime sexual partners reported by the target was examined for the combination of domains (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence), that is, by the multivariate effect associated with the two-way interaction. The interaction among these two variables was found to be nonsignificant, $F(4, 163) = .135, p = .969$ (see Table 1). Therefore, the evaluations of gay men and lesbians did not significantly differ from one another on a combination of the examined domains when the target reported an increased number of sexual partners. As a result, the null hypothesis was accepted. Because the multivariate effect was not significant, the univariate results were not examined.

$H_3$: Heterosexual men evaluate gay men more negatively, overall, than they evaluate lesbians on each individual domain (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence) and on a combination of the domains.

In order to evaluate the third hypothesis, the potential interaction between sex of participant and sex of target from the three-way MANOVA was examined for the combination of domains (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence) and was found to be nonsignificant, $F(4, 163) = 1.565, p = .186$ (see Table 1). As such, heterosexual men's overall evaluations of gay men and lesbians did not significantly differ from one another on a combination of the examined domains. As a result, the null hypothesis was accepted. Because the multivariate effect was not significant, the univariate results were not examined.

$H_4$: Heterosexual women evaluate lesbians more negatively, overall, than they evaluate gay men on each individual domain (values, popularity with peers,
power/success, and intelligence) and on a combination of the domains.

The fourth hypothesis was tested in the same manner as the third hypothesis. In order to evaluate this hypothesis, the potential interaction between sex of participant and sex of target was examined for the combination of domains (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence) and was found to be nonsignificant, $F(4, 163) = 1.565, p = .186$ (see Table 1). Therefore, heterosexual women’s overall evaluations of gay men and lesbians did not significantly differ from one another on a combination of the examined domains. As a result, the null hypothesis was accepted. Because the multivariate effect was not significant, the univariate results were not examined.

$H_4$: The evaluations made by male and female participants significantly differ as a function of both the sex of the target and the number of sexual partners reported.

The fifth hypothesis was evaluated by examining the potential three-way interaction between target sex, participant sex, and number of lifetime sexual partners reported by the target from the three-way MANOVA for the combination of domains (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence). This interaction was found to be nonsignificant, $F(4, 163) = 2.057, p = .089$ (see Table 1). As such, the evaluations of homosexual targets made by male and female participants did not significantly differ as a function of the sex of the target and the number of sexual partners the target reported. As a result, the null hypothesis was accepted. Because the multivariate effect was not significant, the univariate results were not examined.
**Exploratory Research Findings**

The $2 \times 2 \times 2$ MANOVA revealed a significant main effect of number of reported lifetime sexual partners, $F(4, 163) = 5.610, p < .001$, for a combination of the domains (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence) (see Table 1). Specifically, targets who reported having 16 sexual partners were evaluated more negatively, overall, than targets who reported having two sexual partners. Because the multivariate effect was found to be significant, the univariate results were examined. Univariate analyses revealed a significant main effect of number of reported sexual partners for the popularity with peers subscale, $F(1, 166) = 16.227, p < .001$, and for the intelligence subscale, $F(1, 166) = 5.690, p = .018$ (see Table 2). Specifically, targets who reported having 16 sexual partners were evaluated more positively on the popularity with peers subscale and more positively on the intelligence scale than targets who reported having two sexual partners (see Table 3).

Although male and female participants' attitudes toward homosexuals, as evidenced by the ATLG scale, significantly differed, the $2 \times 2 \times 2$ MANOVA did not produce a main effect of participant sex for the combination of domains (values, popularity with peers, power/success, and intelligence), $F(4, 163) = 2.138, p = .078$ (see Table 1). As such, the overall evaluative ratings of gay men and lesbian targets made by heterosexual male participants did not significantly differ from those overall evaluative ratings made by heterosexual female participants.

**Discussion**

Prior to the current study, no research study had examined the presence of the sexual double standard with regard to the homosexual population. Instead, the literature
has greatly debated its presence in the heterosexual population and has yielded mixed results. The present study extended this line of research regarding the sexual double standard to gay men and lesbians. In addition, the present study sought to rectify the limitations of the previous research, as outlined by Marks and Fraley (2005), which included the presence of demand characteristics, the use of biased language, and a lack of differentiation between attitudes and evaluations. Published literature underscores the importance of examining heterosexual attitudes and evaluations of gay men and lesbians, as they impact not only the psychological well-being of homosexuals, but they also negatively impact the treatment gay men and lesbians receive when they seek psychological services (DiPlacido, 1998; Parrott & Zeichner, 2005; Semp, 2003). As such, the evaluations of heterosexual participants were examined in the current study.

As exploratory research, the present study sought to examine whether a sexual double standard exists in heterosexual evaluations of gay men and lesbians, given a defined sexual history of a small or large number of sexual partners. Results from this study found no evidence to support the notion that a sexual double standard exists in heterosexual evaluations of gay men and lesbians, but results did reveal that both gay men and lesbian targets were evaluated more negatively if they reported a larger number of sexual partners. A similar finding for heterosexual men and women targets was obtained by Marks and Fraley (2005) in their undergraduate sample. Their results suggested a more negative evaluation for heterosexual men and women targets as the target reported increasingly more sexual partners. In the current study, although the amount of sexual activity influenced evaluations of homosexuals, gay men and lesbians were not held to different sexual standards. A direct statistical comparison cannot be
made between the mean evaluation scores obtained in the current study and those obtained in the undergraduate sample used by Marks and Fraley (2005) due to the use of different numbers of reported sexual partners used in the two studies. However, a simple side-by-side comparison of these means reveals that the means obtained in the current study are lower, and therefore are indicative of more negative evaluations, than the means obtained from Marks and Fraley's (2005) undergraduate sample. This difference may be due to the sexual orientation of the target as the targets in Marks and Fraley's (2005) study were heterosexual, while the targets in the current study were homosexual. As such, the targets may have been evaluated more negatively in the current study than in the previous study for the simple fact that they were homosexual. Another reason for this difference may be the nature of the samples obtained. The undergraduate sample obtained in the previous study was taken from a large, Midwestern, public university, while the sample obtained in the current study was taken from a small, Midwestern, religiously-affiliated university. As a result, attitudes toward sexuality and sexual behavior may differ among these two groups.

In the current study, two subscales accounted for the significant effect of the target's sexual history on the manner in which he/she was evaluated: popularity with peers and intelligence. First, homosexual targets who reported a large number of sexual partners were evaluated as being more popular with their peers than targets who reported a smaller number of sexual partners. This finding supports the relationship between sexual activity and popularity with peers in that engaging in sexual activity with a large number of partners is related to being more well-liked and accepted within one's peer group. Secondly, homosexual targets who reported a large number of sexual partners
were evaluated higher on the intelligence subscale than targets who reported a smaller number of sexual partners. In contrast to the current finding, past research has found that an increase in a heterosexual individual’s number of sexual partners tends to be associated with lower intelligence (Marks & Fraley, 2005). It is unclear as to why the current finding deviates from this past research. Similar to the current study, Marks and Fraley (2005) discovered that the effect of the heterosexual target’s sexual history on her/his evaluations was accounted for by the popularity with peers subscale and the intelligence subscale. However, Marks and Fraley (2005) also found that the values subscale accounted for this effect as well, in that heterosexual targets who reported a larger number of sexual partners were evaluated as having fewer values than targets who reported a smaller number of sexual partners. This finding was not found in the current study among evaluations of gay men and lesbians, although it is again unclear why this was the case.

An increased vulnerability to contracting AIDS may have been an influential variable in yielding the significant effect of the homosexual targets’ sexual histories on their evaluations made by heterosexuals. The introduction of the AIDS epidemic brought the sexual behavior of homosexuals, and especially gay men, into the spotlight. As a result, it is necessary to consider this factor as a possible influence of the participants’ evaluations toward sexual minorities. While research has not specifically assessed this role, it has supported the notion that attitudes toward homosexuals and attitudes toward AIDS patients are related. Price and Hsu (1992) found that negative attitudes toward homosexuals were a strong predictor of an individual’s support for harsh restrictions of persons with AIDS. As a result, participants may have believed that gay men and
lesbians with many sexual partners are deserving of negative evaluations, as they are putting themselves at a greater risk of contracting AIDS.

Because the sexual double standard was not applied in evaluating the sexual behavior of gay men and lesbians, one may then argue that the sex of a homosexual individual does not effect how heterosexuals evaluate her/him. If a heterosexual evaluates homosexuals in a negative manner, it is not going to matter to that person if the homosexual is a man or woman. Instead, in making these judgments, heterosexuals appear to focus mainly on the sexual orientation of the individual. If it is determined that the sexual orientation is homosexual, that information is enough to influence the evaluations and judgments and the person’s sex does not seem to add any additional information.

Replicating previous research (Herek, 2002), the current study found that attitudes toward gay men were significantly more negative than attitudes toward lesbians, as evidenced by the participants’ scores on the ATLG scale. However, the results of the current study revealed that evaluations of gay men and evaluations of lesbians were not significantly different. Therefore, there appears to be a disconnect between the heterosexual participants’ attitudes toward and evaluations of gay men and lesbians. While the participants revealed more negative attitudes toward gay men than toward lesbians, these attitudes did not translate into more negative evaluations of gay men in comparison to lesbians. This finding mainly stems from the fact that attitudinal ratings of gay men made by heterosexual men were significantly more negative than the attitudinal ratings of gay men made by heterosexual women and the attitudinal ratings of lesbians made by heterosexual men. However, the evaluations of gay men made by heterosexual men did not significantly differ from the evaluations of gay men made by heterosexual
women or the evaluations of lesbians made by heterosexual men. As such, heterosexual men's negative attitudes toward gay men did not translate into similar negative evaluations of them. Prior research has found evidence of this disconnect between attitudes and evaluations in an array of domains including evaluations of the elderly (Castelli, Zecchini, Deamicis & Sherman, 2005) and evaluations of racial minorities (Son Hing, Chung-Yan, Grunfeld, Robichaud & Zanna, 2005). Two possible explanations are offered to explain this disconnect between the participants' attitudes and evaluations. One possibility is that individuals can be objective in making evaluations concerning other people. Though individuals may harbor negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbians, they can make evaluations concerning homosexuals without letting these attitudes dictate the evaluations. This possibility has ramifications concerning real-world events such as the job hiring process, as it may be possible for a heterosexual personnel manager, who holds negative attitudes toward homosexuals, to still be objective in evaluating potential homosexual job applicants. A second possibility to explain the noted disconnect between the participants' attitudes and evaluations is that the participants are overcompensating on their evaluations because of guilty feelings about their negative attitudes. In other words, harboring negative attitudes leads to feelings of guilt experienced by heterosexuals and as a result, heterosexuals then overcompensate for these negative attitudes by making more positive evaluations about gay men and lesbians. Schmitt, Behner, Montada, Muller, and Muller-Fohrbrodt (2000) found that participants' guilt was the strongest predictor of their willingness to aid a non-privileged member of society (i.e. women and racial minorities) gain an advantage in the organizational hiring process. As such, the guilt experienced by heterosexuals who hold negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbians, may be a very influential variable leading to
overcompensation by the heterosexuals and thus more positive evaluations of gay men and lesbians. This disconnect between the participants' attitudes and evaluations serves to confirm Marks and Fraley's (2005) argument about the need to separately assess individuals' attitudes and evaluations, as these two concepts may be unrelated to one another.

Limitations and Future Directions of Research

Given the sensitive nature of the current study, one potential threat to its validity may have been the presence of demand characteristics. However, great care was taken to ensure the anonymity of the participants' responses and therefore the validity of the study in this respect. As such, it is believed the obtained results are a valid indicator of the participants' attitudes toward and evaluations of gay men and lesbians.

The current study's sample is limited to undergraduate self-reported heterosexual participants. Compared with the general population, research has shown that college students have less crystallized attitudes, stronger cognitive skills, more education, and a less formulated sense of self (Atwater, 1983; Rubenstein, 1983). As such, the sample is not entirely representative of the greater population and thus has limited generalizability. The aim of future research should be to examine whether heterosexuals in the general population utilize the sexual double standard in their evaluations of gay men and lesbians.

A second limitation of the current study is that the sample of participants was taken from a religiously-affiliated university in which over 60% of the students that attend this university identify themselves as Roman Catholic. Past research has shown that greater identification with a religion, including Roman Catholicism, is associated with greater moral strictness including more negative attitudes toward homosexuality (Phillips & Harding, 1985). To date research has not fully examined the specific role of
Catholic identification on the development of attitudes toward sexual minorities in the United States; however, an examination of the British Social Attitudes Survey that was distributed in 1989 revealed that non-religious affiliated individuals hold significantly more liberal and positive views toward homosexuality and sexual minorities than individuals who are affiliated with a particular religion (Hayes, 1995). This study also found though that self-identified Catholic respondents held more liberal views toward homosexuality than Anglicans and other Protestants (Hayes, 1995). Therefore, the attitudes and evaluations made by the participants of the current study may not be representative of the greater population that contains a different religious composition. As such, the aim of future research should again be to examine whether or not the sexual double standard is utilized by individuals of the greater population in evaluating the sexual behavior of gay men and lesbians.

A third limitation of the current study is that it solely focused on the evaluations made by self-reported heterosexuals. While it is important to examine heterosexual evaluations toward homosexuals, as outlined previously, it also is important to examine homosexual evaluations of other gay men and lesbians. Do homosexuals utilize a double standard in evaluating the sexual behavior of other gay men and lesbians? This line of research is needed in order to allow for comparisons of heterosexual and homosexual attitudes and evaluations of gay men and lesbians' sexual behavior. Do these two groups evaluate the sexual behavior of gay men and lesbians similarly or are different standards used by heterosexuals and homosexuals in their evaluations?

Finally, future studies should also look to more closely examine the disconnect noted in the current study between heterosexuals' attitudes and their evaluations of homosexuals. What are the reasons to account for the fact that heterosexuals' negative
attitudes, and especially heterosexual men's negative attitudes, toward homosexuals do not translate into more negative evaluations of gay men and lesbians? One reason may be that the instruments used to assess these attitudes and evaluations, the ATLG scale and the target evaluative statements rating sheet respectively, assess different types of responses from the participants. Utilizing statements such as "Lesbians are sick" and "Male homosexuality is a perversion", with which a respondent is to indicate whether or not he/she agrees, the ATLG scale appears to pull for a more affective response than the evaluative statements rating sheet. The previously mentioned statements may possibly arouse different emotions and feelings within the participants that then become infused into the responses they provide. In contrast, the evaluative statements rating sheet, with items such as "This person would make a good leader" and "This person is popular", appears to elicit a more cognitive response that involves greater utilization of the participants' thoughts rather than their feelings and emotions. Therefore, the disconnect between attitudes and evaluations noted in the current study may be a product of the different types of responses being elicited. Whereas negative attitudes are generated as a result of the emotions and feelings stirred up and drawn out by the types of items used, the evaluations did not involve statements that brought up these emotional reactions and as such the evaluations were not as negative in nature. Future research should look to examine this possibility more closely by investigating whether or not measures that examine attitudes and ones that examine evaluations pull for different types of responses in participants.
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Table 1

**Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Target Evaluations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Sex (PS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.518</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Sex (TS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Target’s Partners (TP)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.610*</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS x TS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.565</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS x TP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.846</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS x TP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS x TS x TP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.057</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001.
Table 2

Follow-up Analysis of Variance for Target Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Sex (PS)</td>
<td>Values Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Popularity with Peers Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power/Success Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.740*</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligence Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.622</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Sex (TS)</td>
<td>Values Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Popularity with Peers Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power/Success Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligence Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.466</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Target’s Partners (TP)</td>
<td>Values Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.402</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Popularity with Peers Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.227**</td>
<td>&gt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power/Success Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.680</td>
<td>.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligence Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.690*</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS x TS</td>
<td>Values Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Popularity with Peers Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power/Success Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligence Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.005*</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS x TP</td>
<td>Values Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Popularity with Peers Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.921</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power/Success Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligence Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.144</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS x TP</td>
<td>Values Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Popularity with Peers Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power/Success Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligence Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS x TS x TP</td>
<td>Values Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.461*</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Popularity with Peers Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power/Success Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligence Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01
Table 3

Means and Standard Error for Target Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Source Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant Sex (PS)</strong></td>
<td>Values Subscale</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.848</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.881</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Popularity with Peers Subscale</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.823</td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.892</td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power/Success Subscale</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.658</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.803</td>
<td>.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligence Subscale</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.180</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.254</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Sex (TS)</strong></td>
<td>Values Subscale</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.876</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.854</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Popularity with Peers Subscale</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.873</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.841</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power/Success Subscale</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.725</td>
<td>.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.736</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligence Subscale</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.252</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.182</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Source Category</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Target's Partners (TP)</td>
<td>Values Subscale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.890</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.839</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Popularity with Peers Subscale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.722</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.992</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power/Success Subscale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.691</td>
<td>.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.769</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligence Subscale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.148</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.287</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS x TS</td>
<td>Values Subscale</td>
<td>Male x Male</td>
<td>2.844</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x Female</td>
<td>2.852</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Male</td>
<td>2.908</td>
<td>.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Female</td>
<td>2.855</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Popularity with Peers Subscale</td>
<td>Male x Male</td>
<td>2.865</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x Female</td>
<td>2.780</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Male</td>
<td>2.882</td>
<td>.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Female</td>
<td>2.902</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power/Success Subscale</td>
<td>Male x Male</td>
<td>2.663</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x Female</td>
<td>2.653</td>
<td>.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Male</td>
<td>2.787</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Female</td>
<td>2.818</td>
<td>.478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Source Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PS x TS (cont.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intelligence Subscale</strong></td>
<td>Male x Male</td>
<td>3.224</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x Female</td>
<td>3.080</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Male</td>
<td>3.224</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Female</td>
<td>3.284</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PS x TP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Values Subscale</strong></td>
<td>Male x 2</td>
<td>2.866</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x 16</td>
<td>2.831</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x 2</td>
<td>2.915</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x 16</td>
<td>2.848</td>
<td>.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Popularity with Peers Subscale</strong></td>
<td>Male x 2</td>
<td>2.641</td>
<td>.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x 16</td>
<td>3.004</td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x 2</td>
<td>2.803</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x 16</td>
<td>2.980</td>
<td>.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Power/Success Subscale</strong></td>
<td>Male x 2</td>
<td>2.630</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x 16</td>
<td>2.687</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x 2</td>
<td>2.753</td>
<td>.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x 16</td>
<td>2.852</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Intelligence Subscale</strong></td>
<td>Male x 2</td>
<td>3.153</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x 16</td>
<td>3.201</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x 2</td>
<td>3.142</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x 16</td>
<td>3.366</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Source Category</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS x TP</td>
<td>Values Subscale</td>
<td>Male x 2</td>
<td>2.897</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x 16</td>
<td>2.855</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x 2</td>
<td>2.884</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x 16</td>
<td>2.824</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Popularity with Peers</td>
<td>Male x 2</td>
<td>2.717</td>
<td>.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x 16</td>
<td>3.030</td>
<td>.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x 2</td>
<td>2.727</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x 16</td>
<td>2.955</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power/Success Subscale</td>
<td>Male x 2</td>
<td>2.681</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x 16</td>
<td>2.769</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x 2</td>
<td>2.702</td>
<td>.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x 16</td>
<td>2.770</td>
<td>.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligence Subscale</td>
<td>Male x 2</td>
<td>3.170</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x 16</td>
<td>3.335</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x 2</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x 16</td>
<td>3.239</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Source Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS x TS x TP</td>
<td>Values Subscale</td>
<td>Male x Male x 2</td>
<td>2.908</td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x Male x 16</td>
<td>2.781</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x Female x 2</td>
<td>2.824</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x Female x 16</td>
<td>2.881</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Male x 2</td>
<td>2.886</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Male x 16</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Female x 2</td>
<td>2.943</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Female x 16</td>
<td>2.767</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Popularity with Peers</td>
<td>Male x Male x 2</td>
<td>2.638</td>
<td>.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x Male x 16</td>
<td>3.092</td>
<td>.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x Female x 2</td>
<td>2.644</td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x Female x 16</td>
<td>2.917</td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Male x 2</td>
<td>2.796</td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Male x 16</td>
<td>2.968</td>
<td>.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Female x 2</td>
<td>2.811</td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Female x 16</td>
<td>2.993</td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Source Category</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS x TS x TP (cont.)</td>
<td>Power/Success Subscale</td>
<td>Male x Male x 2</td>
<td>2.658</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x Male x 16</td>
<td>2.669</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x Female x 2</td>
<td>2.602</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x Female x 16</td>
<td>2.705</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Male x 2</td>
<td>2.705</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Male x 16</td>
<td>2.869</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Female x 2</td>
<td>2.801</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Female x 16</td>
<td>2.835</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligence Subscale</td>
<td>Male x Male x 2</td>
<td>3.261</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x Male x 16</td>
<td>3.300</td>
<td>.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x Female x 2</td>
<td>3.046</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male x Female x 16</td>
<td>3.114</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Male x 2</td>
<td>3.080</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Male x 16</td>
<td>3.369</td>
<td>.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Female x 2</td>
<td>3.205</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female x Female x 16</td>
<td>3.364</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Larger subscale scores indicate more positive ratings on the respective subscale, while smaller subscale scores indicate more negative ratings on the respective subscale. Means are reported as average rating per evaluative item in each scale to allow for comparisons among scales.
Figure Caption

Figure 1. Participants’ mean ATLG scale and subscale scores as a function of participant sex. Higher scores indicate more negative attitudes.

Figure 2. Participants’ mean ATLG scale and subscale scores.
Appendix A

Participant Instructions for Study

Hello and thank you for your time today in attending the Impression Formation study. The completion of this study will take approximately 30 minutes.

In front of you, you will see a consent form that explains to you the purpose and procedures of the study, the confidentiality of the study, your right to withdrawal from the study at any time without penalty, and any benefits, discomfort, or risks associated with this study. You do not need to sign or put your name anywhere on the consent form as completion of the questionnaires in this study will serve as an indicator of your informed consent. The consent form is for you to keep for your records. Please take time to read the consent form now and when you are finished please turn over the form to let me know you are done. [Time allotted for all participants to read consent form.]

The information you provide in today’s study will be completely anonymous, as your name will in no way be tied to the information and answers you provide. As such, please do not put your name on any forms you will be given today. During today’s study you do not have to answer any questions that you do not feel comfortable answering, but instead may leave them blank. You also have the right to withdrawal from this study at any time without any penalty.

The current study is examining the manner in which individuals form impressions of other people. You will be presented with a section of a general public survey that was filled out by an anonymous individual. I would like you to read through the survey, including the individual’s answers. As you read through the answers be sure to pay attention to the details so that you may use them to create a vivid picture of this person. After reading the section of the general public survey, you will be asked to answer some questions regarding your impressions of the individual whose survey you just read. Following these questions, you will also be asked to fill out a few more questionnaires. All materials in this study will be presented to you one at a time in closed envelopes. Once I pass out the first envelope to you, I ask that you take out the materials, complete them, and then return the materials to the inside of the envelope and close the envelope. I will then come by and pick up this envelope and bring you the second envelope. This procedure will continue with each set of materials until you have finished.

If you have any questions during the study please come up to the podium to ask me so that I may clear them up for you. Does anyone have any questions at this time? [Respond to students’ questions]

I will now pass out the first set of envelopes.
APPENDIX B

Hypothetical General Public Survey and Instructions

Instructions:
On the next page there is a section from a General Public Survey questionnaire that was recently issued. In that section, a member of the general public answered five questions about themselves. Please read the person’s answers and think about them for a moment. After you have read the person’s answers, you will be asked to answer several questions (using a 1 to 5 scale) about your impressions of the person.
Please describe some of your hobbies.

I like birdwatching. I started when I was about 8 years old. My grandfather took me out into the forest one day, and taught me how to use binoculars to watch them, and I've been hooked ever since. I also like to ski. I don't get to very often because it's hard to find the time anymore, but I take every chance I get to go skiing.

Tell us about your career aspirations.

I would like to become a writer someday. I feel I have pretty good ideas and I have a talent for putting those ideas on paper. I'm not sure if I'd like to be a journalist or a freelance writer, but I know I want to cover current events and how they affect things. Like editorial type stuff.

Describe some of your fears.

Well, as far as tangible things, I'm scared of snakes and reptiles like snakes. I also kind of have a fear of heights. As far as intangible things, I fear failing at my goals and not being a success. I want to do the things I want to do, and the thought of not being able to do them scares me.

What is something not many people know about you?

I've had sex with [#] [guys/girls]. I don't really have much to say about it. It's just kind of the way I've lived my life.

How do you see yourself?

I see myself as a theorist more than a sensor. I internalize a lot of things and I think abstractly about them. I don't really even have to try to think abstractly about things, it just sort of happens. That's about all.
APPENDIX C

Evaluative Statements Rating Sheet

Please answer the following questions regarding the person you just read about using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral / Mixed</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This person would make a good leader. .................. 1---2---3---4---5

2. *This person is a failure. .......................... 1---2---3---4---5

3. This person would make someone a good husband/wife. .................. 1---2---3---4---5

4. I could be friends with this person. .................. 1---2---3---4---5

5. *This person is dishonest. .......................... 1---2---3---4---5

6. This person will have a good job. .................. 1---2---3---4---5

7. This person has lots of friends. .................. 1---2---3---4---5

8. *This person makes a lot of mistakes. .................. 1---2---3---4---5

9. *No one likes this person. .......................... 1---2---3---4---5

10. This person is trustworthy. .................. 1---2---3---4---5
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral / Mixed</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. People like this person. ...................................... 1-2-3-4-5

12. This person will make a lot of money ..................... 1-2-3-4-5

13. This person is intelligent. ................................. 1-2-3-4-5

14. This person is respectful. ................................. 1-2-3-4-5

15. This person will hold a job with lots of power ......... 1-2-3-4-5

16. *This person is immoral. ................................. 1-2-3-4-5

17. *I would not like to know this person ............... 1-2-3-4-5

18. This person influences others ......................... 1-2-3-4-5

19. This person would make someone a good boyfriend/girlfriend ............................ 1-2-3-4-5

20. This person performs well in everything he/she does ............................................. 1-2-3-4-5

21. This person is fun at parties. .......................... 1-2-3-4-5
22. This person will be in charge of many people. ........................................ 1---------2---------3---------4---------5

23. This person is successful. .................................................. 1---------2---------3---------4---------5

24. This person is physically attractive......................................... 1---------2---------3---------4---------5

25. This person did well in school................................................. 1---------2---------3---------4---------5

26. This person is popular........................................................... 1---------2---------3---------4---------5

*indicates reverse scoring for that item
APPENDIX D

Manipulation Check

Please answer the following questions regarding the General Public Survey you read by circling your response or writing in your response (as appropriate) in the provided space.

1) What is the sex (gender) of the person who filled out the General Public Survey you read?

   MALE       FEMALE

2) What is the sexual orientation of the person who filled out the General Public Survey you read?

   BISEXUAL   HETEROSEXUAL   HOMOSEXUAL

3) How many sexual partners did the person you read about in the General Public Survey report having? ________________________
APPENDIX E

Demographic Information Sheet

Please complete the following demographic information about yourself by circling the appropriate response to each section.

SEX: M F

AGE: 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

Other (please indicate) ____________________

SEXUAL ORIENTATION: Bisexual Heterosexual Homosexual
APPENDIX F

Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men (ATLG) Scale

Read each of the following statements carefully. For each statement indicate how much you agree with each statement (by circling the appropriate number) using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral / Mixed</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Lesbians just can’t fit into our society.

2. *Male homosexual couples should be allowed to adopt children the same as heterosexual couples.

3. *A woman’s homosexuality should not be a cause for job discrimination in any situation.

4. I think male homosexuals are disgusting.

5. Female homosexuality is detrimental to society because it breaks down the natural divisions between the sexes.

6. Male homosexuals should not be allowed to teach school.

7. *State laws regulating private, consenting lesbian behavior should be loosened.

8. Male homosexuality is a perversion.

9. Female homosexuality is a sin.
10. *Just as in other species, male homosexuality is a natural expression of sexuality in human men.  

11. The growing number of lesbians indicates a decline in American morals.  

12. If a man has homosexual feelings, he should do everything he can to overcome them.  

13. *Female homosexuality in itself is no problem, but what society makes of it can be a problem.  

14. *I would not be too upset if I learned that my son was a homosexual.  

15. Female homosexuality is a threat to many of our basic social institutions.  

16. Homosexual behavior between two men is just plain wrong.  

17. Female homosexuality is an inferior form of sexuality.  

18. The idea of male homosexual marriages seems ridiculous to me.  

19. Lesbians are sick.  

20. *Male homosexuality is merely a different kind of lifestyle that should not be condemned.  

* indicates reverse scoring for that item
July 27, 2006

Ms. Erica Lennon
2365 Madison Rd., Apt 212
Cincinnati, OH 45208

Dear Ms. Lennon:

The IRB received your revised consent form for your protocol #0402-1, Broadening the Concept of the Sexual Double Standard: Assessing Heterosexual Attitudes and Evaluations of Gay Men and Lesbians' Sexuality. The study has been determined to meet criteria for the Exempt from Review category. Now that the informed consent form has been revised as requested, your protocol is approved as exempt research.

Please notify the IRB when the project is complete using the Progress Report Form available through the IRB link on Xavier's portal.

We wish you success with your project!

Sincerely,

Kathleen J. Hart, Ph.D.
Interim Chair

cc: Dr. Cindy Crown, ML 6511
APPENDIX H

Consent Form

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE

You are being given the opportunity to volunteer to participate in a project conducted through Xavier University. This study is being conducted by Erica Lennon, M.A. (513-871-0665) under the discretion of Dr. Cynthia Crown (513-745-1094) in the Department of Psychology at Xavier University. If you have any questions at any time during the study you may contact Ms. Lennon, Dr. Crown, or the Chair of Xavier University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (513) 745-3278. A basic explanation of the project is written below. Please read through this explanation and discuss with the researcher any questions you may have. You should keep this form.

1. Nature and Purpose of the Project: This study examines the manner in which individuals form impressions of other people. You will be asked to read a section from a recent general public survey that was filled out by an individual. After reading through the survey you will be asked questions about your impressions of this individual.

2. Why You Were Selected: You are being asked to volunteer to participate because you are an undergraduate student at Xavier University. There are no other selection criteria.

3. Explanation of Procedures: Once you read this consent form and have all your questions answered, you will be presented with a manila envelope that contains a completed section of a recent general public survey filled out by an anonymous individual. The identification number on this form has been blackened out in order to protect the individual's identity. Once you have read the survey and completed the questions that follow it, you are to put the survey and questionnaire sheet back into the manila envelop and return the envelope to the investigator. Next, you will be presented with three additional manila envelopes, one at a time, that contain a questionnaire pertaining to the survey you read, a questionnaire pertaining to yourself, and a questionnaire pertaining to your overall attitudes toward individuals. When you have completed each questionnaire, you are to place it back in the manila envelope and return it to the investigator. Completion of all the materials for this study should take 30 minutes.

4. Discomfort and Risks: No more than minimal risk is anticipated as a result of your participation in this study, although the nature of some of the questions included in this project are personal and may be uncomfortable to answer. You may elect not to answer any questions you wish.

5. Benefits: You will derive no direct benefit from participating in this study.

6. Confidentiality: Your name will not appear on any piece of collected material in this study. Therefore, your name will in no way be able to be linked to the responses you provide. All materials will be kept in a locked file cabinet in Elet Hall, and all analyses and presentation of the data will be done in group format.

7. Compensation: You may receive either course credit or class extra credit in exchange for your participation in this study; however this is done at the discretion of the psychology faculty member, and is not managed by this investigator.

8. Refusal / Withdrawal: Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from the University. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty, and you may choose not to answer any questions for any reason.

Xavier University requires that you give your informed consent. Completion of the questionnaires in this study will serve as an indicator of your informed consent.

THE DATA APPROVAL STAMP ON THIS CONSENT FORM INDICATES THAT THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY XAVIER UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD. THIS APPROVAL IS VALID FOR ONE YEAR.
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APPENDIX I

Debriefment Form

DEBRIEFING OF PARTICIPANTS

The study you participated in is examining how impressions are formed about individuals based upon several personal variables. The magnitude of the effect of these personal variables on impression formation will be assessed.

Please feel free to contact the principle investigator or the faculty advisor at the emails and phone numbers listed below if you have any questions or concerns regarding your participation in this study or if you wish to know the results of study.

Thank you for your participation.

Erica Lennon, M.A.
Principle Investigator
lennon@xavier.edu
(513) 871-0665

Cynthia Crown, Ph.D
Faculty Advisor
crown@xavier.edu
(513) 745-1094