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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Since its development, the attitudes toward lesbians and gay men scale (ATLG; Herek, 1984, 1988) has been utilized frequently in research assessing prejudicial attitudes toward homosexuals among university students. Reported results from these studies have been congruent in that participants reported increased tolerance (Hinrichs & Rosenberg, 2002; Korfhage; 2006; Pearl & Galupo, 2007). However, research examining discrimination experienced by lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) university students have found reported instances of verbal insult, physical threat, and physical assault occurring on campus grounds. This apparent discrepancy between self-reported attitudes and behaviors has been overlooked until recently. Employing stimulus resumes with the intent of applying for a fifth grade teaching position, the present quasi-experimental design study sought to examine hiring discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation of the applicants.

Review of the Literature

Why do people attribute negative attitudes and feelings toward those identified as homosexuals? In explaining the concept of causality relative to social behavior, Heider (1944) states that traits we use to describe people may also be used to describe acts in which a bad act is easily connected with a bad person. The acts or products of a person
are colored by the qualities of that person, and therefore if a person commits a bad act then he or she is judged as a bad person. Furthermore, if we are inclined to dislike a person, there exists a tendency to attribute his or her failures to his or her own person and his or her successes to luck or unfair practices. This attribution of causality was demonstrated when school children attributed poor performances to their unpopular classmates (Zillig, 1928; as cited by Heider, 1994). More recently, researchers have found that children associated obese children with being mean, stupid, ugly, lazy and unhappy. Among adults, obese adults were perceived as lazy, less competent, and lack self-discipline (Kraig & Keel, 2001; Puhl & Brownell, 2003; Puhl & Heuer, 2009).

Heider (1958) expanded his theory to include the notion that behavior is attributed chiefly to the person or environment and furthermore, behavior can be accounted for by either stable personality traits or environmental factors. Thus, in everyday life people attempt to find causes and or explanations for behaviors and events in order to attribute whether they are due to stable, internal, and enduring dispositions or to unstable, temporary, and external situations (Quist & Wiegand, 2002). The attempt to derive at an explanation allows us to view our world as a stable entity in which the future may be anticipated and controlled (Heider, 1958).

Guided by Heider’s attribution theory, Weiner, Perry and Magnusson (1988) investigated causal attributions toward stigmatized individuals by examining perceived controllability and stability of ten stigmas including Alzheimer’s disease, cancer, AIDS, child abuse, and drug use. They found stigmas associated with mental-behavioral origins
such as AIDS, child abuse, drug addiction and obesity were evaluated as controllable and unstable (reversible). With the exception of AIDS, these stigmas elicited low liking, no pity, anger, and reduced likelihood of helping. On the contrary, Alzheimer’s disease, blindness, cancer, and heart disease were perceived as uncontrollable and stable (irreversible) stigmas that elicited pity, liking, no anger, and increased likelihood of helping (Weiner et al., 1988).

Contrary to heart disease and Alzheimer’s disease, the etiology of homosexuality is still not fully understood, yet those identified as homosexuals have been charged with stigmas of expectations of sexual perversion, child molestation and abuse, sexual promiscuity, sexuality transmitted diseases, HIV and AIDS (Collani, Grumm, & Streicher, 2010; Courtenay-Quirk, Wolitski, Parsons, Gomez, 2006; Herek & Capitanio, 1999; Preston, D’Augelli, Kassab, & Starks, 2007). In past research when sexual orientation was perceived as controllable lifestyle choice and reversible, persons suspected of being LGB and those openly identified as LGB were evaluated negatively (King, 2001; Sakali, 2002; Tygart, 2000). In 1986, homosexuality was officially removed from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual Mental Disorders (DSM), which sent the message that homosexuality should no longer be attributed as a mental-behavioral and reversible disposition. This also reopened the discussion of the etiology of homosexuality.

The discourse of the etiology of homosexuality paved the way for further examination of related subjects of same-sex marriage, parental rights, adoption, and gay
and lesbian parenting. The on-going dialogue has been crucial for helping to provide formal and informal protections for LGB community, especially because public opinion often plays a central role in the development and passing of gay rights laws within our government (Lewis & Taylor, 2001). According to Lewis (1999), general public acceptance of gay and lesbian teachers is a strong predictor of state gay rights. Furthermore, Dejowski (1992) and Smith (1992) reported a decrease from the 1970s to 1980s in people’s readiness to limit the civil rights of sexual minorities. Treas (2002) reported that changes in attitudes toward gays and lesbians have been much greater than changes in attitudes toward premarital sex. Lewis and Taylor (2001) reported that in 1977, 27% of 3,500 respondents surveyed were in favor of hiring gay and lesbian elementary teachers; the percentage rose to 55% in 1998. For high school gay and lesbian teachers, the percentage rose from 47% in 1989 to 60% in 1998.

The drive for social egalitarianism created a shift in people’s attitudes toward the LGB community and researchers interested in examining this shift have generally employed the ATLG scale (Herek, 1988). The ATLG consists of two subscales, one pertaining to gay men (ATG) and one pertaining to lesbians (ATL). During the initial development of the 20-item version scale, the 10-item version was also formulated, which highly correlated with its counterpart ($r = .97$). Subsequently, the 5-item (1988) and 3-item (1995) versions were created for ease of usage in national telephone surveys. The shorter versions have been deemed reliable, valid, and recommended for most research (Herek, 1998). Items on the 3-item version read, 1) “I think male/female
homosexuals are disgusting,” 2) “Male/Female homosexuality is a natural expression of sexuality in men/women,” and 3) “Sex between two men/women is just plain wrong.” In all four versions of the scale, researchers are given the options of employing the 5, 7, or 9-point response format with anchors of *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree* (Herek, 1988).

Extensive research examining the construct validity of the ATLG has found that higher levels of negative attitudes toward lesbians and gay men positively correlated with higher levels of religiosity, conservatism, authoritarianism, social dominance, stricter adherence to traditional gender roles, and controllability of sexual orientation. Positive attitudes were found to be correlated with liberalism, more liberal sex-role attitudes, higher levels of education, and previous personal experience with LGB individuals (Goodman & Moradi, 2008; Herek, 1988; Herek & Capitanio, 1995; Hunrichs & Rosenber, 2002; Rainey, 2002; Yu, Xiao, & Xiang, 2011).

Among university students, past research has found increased tolerance toward individuals who identify as LGB. Hinrichs and Rosenberg (2002) administered the ATL and ATG scales among 692 heterosexual students attending a liberal arts university and they reported not only increased tolerance, but female participants reported higher levels of tolerance than males. Comparable results were reported by Korfhage (2006), Pearl and Galupo (2007). Additionally, experimental studies exploring hiring discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation have found no statistically significant discriminatory results.
Berger and Kelly (1981) constructed hypothetical resumes in response to actual job advertisements in newspapers. Two resumes were created in which one was male-gay implied and one was male-straight implied. The resumes were dispersed to 228 social work agencies throughout the United States. Based on responses from the agencies, they found no evidence of discrimination; the applicant’s admission of homosexual orientation did not rouse discriminatory treatment (Berger & Kelly, 1981). Horvath and Ryan reported similar results 22 years later in their 2003 study. They developed materials to assess hiring discrimination and manipulated variables gender, masculinity, femininity, and sexual orientation. Participants’ attitudes toward gays and lesbians were assessed with the ATL and ATG scales (Herek, 1988). Results showed that participants reported more tolerant attitudes and no hiring discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation among the different treatment conditions. These reported findings seem promising, yet they do not corroborate with results from research assessing levels of acceptance from the perspective of LGB individuals.

Discriminatory practices, including hiring, firing, demoting, and promoting practices on the basis of sexual orientation are quite prevalent. According to Levine and Leonard (1984), discrimination in the workplace can be classified as formal and informal. Formal discrimination refers to institutionalized practices which limit work benefits and awards received, including hiring decisions based on sexual orientation and policies that prohibit same-sex partners from receiving employment benefits. Informal discrimination
refers to negative acts and behavior expressed by fellow colleagues and managers that could result in loss of acceptance, respect, and credibility (Levine & Leonard, 1984). Within different professions, openly LGB employees reported being socially excluded, harassed, gossiped about, and ridiculed (McDermott, 2006; Miller, Forest, & Jurik, 2003). Gay male police officers reported their masculinity was questioned once their sexual orientation was known, and heterosexual officers made remarks suggesting the danger of gay and lesbian officers’ presence around children (Miller et al., 2003). Among the participants surveyed and or interviewed, the core reason for not “coming out” was fear. A “closeted” gay police officer illustrates this poignantly when he expressed, “You could get killed because of lack of backup if the other officers knew of your sexual orientation” (Miller et al., 2003, p. 373).

Among college atmosphere, hostility toward LGB students is quite prevalent. Rankin (2004) reported that approximately 60% of students conceal their sexual orientation in order to avoid intimidation, and undergraduates were more likely to experience harassments compared to staff and faculty members on campus. More recently, Gill, Morrow, Collins, Lucey, and Schultz (2010) reported 45% of 150 undergraduate students have heard the terms “faggot, dyke, and queer” being used, and 46% indicated that LGBT students would not feel safe attending their schools. These results are not unique and evidently do not substantiate the conclusion of increased tolerance.
In their effort to reconcile this discrepancy, Morrison and Morrison (2003) asserted that there has been a transformation from old-fashioned prejudice rooted in traditional religious moral beliefs and negative impressions of homosexuality to a modern subtle form of homonegativity with abstract concerns. For example, Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, and Magley (2007) postulated that heterosexism is believed to be rooted in the reinforcement of traditional gender norms; therefore, persons who deviate from such traditional gender roles, including LGB persons, become targets of heterosexist harassment. Heterosexist harassment (HH) refers to insensitive verbal and symbolic (non-assaultive) behaviors that communicate enmity among LGB as well as heterosexual students. Silverschanz et al. (2007) reasoned that one does not need to be identified as a sexual minority to be a target of HH due to the invisible nature of sexual identities. They surveyed 3,128 undergraduates of which 2,777 were heterosexuals and 351 were sexual minorities and found 30% of heterosexual students and 57% sexual minority students reported experiencing some incidences of HH on campus. Relative to ambivalent HH (e.g., overhearing others telling anti-LGB jokes) and personal HH (e.g., being called a “dyke”), sexual minority students had similar rates of ambivalent and personal HH, 53% and 47%, respectively. Heterosexual students reported higher levels of ambivalent than personal HH, 84% and 16%, respectively. Furthermore, diminish in well-being was found to be a function of additional types of HH. Students who had experienced ambivalent and personal HH fared the worst on anxiety, depression, academic respect, social acceptance,
instructor relations, and school avoidance compared to students who had experienced only ambivalent HH and those with no HH experience (Silverschanz et al., 2007).

The research by Silverschanz et al. (2007) contributed novel insight to the prevalence of subtle heterosexist harassment occurring on campus grounds. Yet, they did not assess the subtle and covert form of negative attitudes which Morrison and Morrison (2003) called modern homonegativity. Aforementioned, Morrison and Morrison (2003) asserted that the observance of the increased tolerance of homosexuality may be misleading by employing reactive attitudinal measures, particularly the ATLG scale, that do not accurately assess modern homonegativity. Due to a lack of a contemporary instrument that could accurately capture the essence of modern homonegativity and guided by McConahay’s (1983) conceptualization of modern racism, Morrison and Morrison (2003) developed a model of modern homonegativity.

McConahay (1983) proposed that racism has transformed from overt and blatant attitudinal and behavioral expressions of racial prejudice to a subtle and covert form. McConahay theorized that modern racists deny the existence of discrimination towards Blacks, believe Blacks are too aggressive in changing the status quo, demands made by Blacks are unfair, and prestigious institutions give Blacks unwarranted attention. In conducting his research assessing modern racism, McConahay (1986) referenced Katz (1981) and Gaertner and Dovidio (1981) who posited that ambivalent people overreact to Blacks by behaving more negatively in situations that foster negative behavior and more positively in situations that foster positive behaviors. From this framework, McConahay
constructed three different resumes and participants were instructed to play the part of a personnel director for a large corporation looking to hire someone for its management-training program. The resumes were comparable in content, and the stimulus resume included either a photograph of a White or Black applicant. In the negative context participants evaluated the stimulus resume first without anchors for comparison and in the positive context participants rated the stimulus resume last. McConahay (1983) found that compared to participants in the positive context, participants in the negative context and those with higher scores on the modern racism scale (MRS) increasingly rated the Black candidate more favorably than the White candidate. Conversely, participants who scored lower on the MRS indicated less ambivalence, indicating race was not relevant when making their hiring decisions.

Motivated by McConahay’s (1983) research, Morrison and Morrison (2003) fashioned their theorized framework of modern homonegativity after modern racism. Within modern homonegativity, Morrison and Morrison (2003) postulated that university students’ prejudicial attitudes toward LGB individuals has transformed from biblical injunctions and moral obligations to concerns that are more abstract. These concerns include the following, 1) gays and lesbians are making unnecessary demands for changes in the status quo (e.g., right to be legally married, spousal benefits), 2) discrimination against gays and lesbians no longer exists, and 3) gays and lesbians exaggerate the importance of their sexuality which prevents them from assimilating into mainstream culture (Morrison & Morrison, 2003).
In their effort to measure this new observance, Morrison and Morrison (2003) constructed a measure called the Modern Homonegative Scale (MHS). During the initial development of the scale, they consulted with gay and lesbian graduate students who helped develop a preliminary 50-item scale using a 5-point response format (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). This scale, along with two questions pertaining to political conservatism and religiosity, were administered to 353 undergraduate participants. From their results, 25 items were removed and the remaining 25 items were analyzed using principal component analysis with oblique rotation. Items with loadings of at least .30 or higher were kept. The final product was a 12-item scale (e.g., “Gay men/Lesbians use their sexual orientation so that they can obtain special privileges,” “Celebrations such as ‘Gay Pride Days’ are ridiculous because they assume that an individual’s sexual orientation should constitute a source of pride.”), which achieved a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .91 and average item-total correlations of .63 for males and .65 for females. Additionally, the MHS positively correlated with political conservatism and religiosity (Morrison & Morrison, 2003).

In their second study, Morrison and Morrison (2003) explored the dimensionality of the MHS and examined the MHS relative to social desirability bias. They constructed a gay men version (MHS-G; e.g., “Gay men have all the rights they need”) and a lesbian version (MHS-L; e.g., “Lesbians have all the rights they need”), which along with the old fashioned homonegativity scale and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSD Form C; Reynolds, 1982), were administered to 308 undergraduate participants.
They found a one-factor solution using maximum likelihood factor analysis with oblique rotation, with the MHS-G accounting for 45% and the MHS-L accounting for 47% of the total variance. Additionally, all the residuals were less than .10, supporting the unidimensionality of the MHS-G and MHS-L. The results also supported their claim that the MHS was conceptually distinct from the old-fashioned homonegativity scale, and uncorrelated with social desirability bias (Morison & Morrison, 2003). In comparison to the ATG and ATL short forms (Herek, 1988), males’ and females’ average response to items on the MHS-G and MHS-L were significantly greater than on the ATG and ATL short forms, indicating that the MHS was more sensitive than the ATLG in assessing modern prejudicial attitudes toward gay men and lesbians.

In regards to construct validity of the MHS, higher levels of modern homonegativity positively correlated with political conservatism, religiosity, and modern sexism, but not with social desirability bias (Morison & Morrison, 2003). Contrary to the construct validity of the ATLG scale, which has been solidified by previous research on religiosity, conservatism, authoritarianism, and other theoretically related constructs, the MHS and its relationships with related constructs has yet to be thoroughly examined. For the present research, related attitudinal constructs include modern sexism in the forms of hostile sexism and benevolent sexism, fear of negative evaluation, social desirability bias, internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice, religious affiliation, religiosity, and political orientation will be examined.
Also established within the literature is the strong association between negative attitudes toward homosexuals and sexism, signifying that individuals with negative attitudes toward homosexuals also harbor sexist attitudes (Henley & Pincus, 1978; Nagoshi et al., 2008). These findings led researchers to conclude that both negative attitudes toward homosexuals and sexism stem from the patriarchal social structure which upholds specific traditional gender roles for men and women (Capezza, 2007). More specifically, prior findings suggest that negative attitudes toward homosexuals is due to heightened levels of masculinity, and individuals who strictly adhere to traditional gender role ideology reported greater negative attitudes, which develop when threatened by those who violate traditional gender norms (Basow & Johnson, 2000; Capezza, 2007; Cotton-Huston & Waite, 2000; Goodman & Moradi, 2008; Korfhage, 2006; Parrott, Adams, & Zeichner, 2002).

Sexism has generally defined as hostility towards women, gay men, and those who deviate from traditional gender norms; however, Glick and Fiske (1996) theorized two distinct forms of sexism, which they refer to as hostile (HS) and benevolent (BS). BS is interpreted as positive affects toward women in traditional gender roles in which women are viewed as moral and need of protection and which reinforce the notion that women are weak and less competent (Capezza, 2007; Glick & Fiske, 1996). Sexism and negative attitudes toward homosexuals have been explored parallel to one another, yet the relationship between HS, BS, and modern homonegativity has yet to be examined. A
significant correlation between modern sexism and modern homonegativity would contribute to the construct validity of the MHS.

The theory of internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice would also be valuable in expanding the construct validity of MHS. Plant and Devine (1998) posited that there are two separate sources of motivation underlying people’s desire to evade a prejudiced response. Items on the internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice (Plant & Devine, 1998) were constructed to reflect internal motivation (IM) in which individuals are personally motivated to be nonprejudiced and nonprejudice standards are self-imposed, and external motivation (EM) where individuals are more concerned with social context and nonprejudice standards are imposed by significant others (Plant & Devine, 1998). With respect to prejudice towards Blacks and LGB, individuals with higher levels of prejudicial attitudes expressed higher levels of EM and lower IM (Lemm, 2006; Plant & Devine, 1998), and individuals with higher levels of IM and lower EM expressed less implicit bias because they were better at detecting appropriate responses and showed less activation of biased associations (Amodio, Devine, & Harmon-Jones, 2008; Devine, Plant, Amodio, Harmon-Jones & Vance, 2002; Gonsalkorale, Sherman, Allen, Klauer, & Amodio, 2011). However, in events where individuals failed to respond without prejudice, higher levels of IM were associated with guilt and self-criticism, whereas higher levels of EM were associated with threatened affect and expectation of being reprimanded by others (Butz & Plants, 2009; Higgins, 1987). Although a comprehensive discussion of IM and EM is beyond the scope of this
present research, IM and EM will be examined relative to modern homonegativity.

A thorough search of databases including PsychInfo, PsycArticles, and Academic Search Premier resulted in a dearth of studies conducted to assess heterosexual students’ fear of negative evaluation (FNE; Leary, 1983) and social desirability bias (MCSD; Reynolds, 1982) relative to prejudicial attitudes toward homosexuals. The FNE scale measures the degree the respondents feel about possibly being evaluated negatively and the MSCD scale assesses the respondents’ tendencies to respond in a socially desirable manner. Morrison and Morrison (2003) found no relationship between modern homonegativity and social desirability bias. Theoretically, FNE and MCSD should strongly associate with IM and EM to respond without prejudice because if individuals with higher levels of EM are mainly concerned with social context and nonprejudice standards are imposed by significant others, then they should also report higher levels of FNE and MCSD. Thus, FNE, MCSD, IM, EM, HS, BS will be examined in terms of modern homonegativity.

Lastly, Morrison and Morrison (2003) reasoned that because there are no convincing theoretical reasons why religion and political orientations are not associated with modern homonegativity, demographic characteristics, including religious attendance, religiosity and political orientation will also be examined.
Purpose of the Study

Guided by McConahay’s (1983) methodology and Morrison and Morrison’s (2003) MHS, the present quasi-experimental design study, using stimulus resumes and a job description for a fifth grade teaching position, sought to examine hiring discrimination based on sexual orientation of the applicants. Modern homonegative attitudes were also measured in hopes of bridging the discrepancy from past findings. The purpose of the present investigation was threefold: 1) to examine the effects of ambiguity on modern homonegativity as it applies to hiring judgments of straight, gay, and lesbian applicants, 2) to examine the attribution effects of assigning masculine and feminine traits to heterosexual and homosexual applicants, 3) to examine modern homonegativity relative to related constructs including ambivalent sexism in the form of hostile sexism and benevolent sexism, fear of negative evaluation, social desirability bias, internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice, religious affiliation, religiosity, and political orientation.

Hypotheses

It is hypothesized that (1) participants will choose to hire the female/straight-implied/high GPA applicant condition compared to all other conditions. (2) Participants will attribute higher levels of masculinity to male/straight-implied than male/gay-implied conditions. (3) Participants will attribute higher levels of femininity to female/straight-implied than female/lesbian-implied conditions. (4) Due to effect of ambiguity, participants with higher MHS scores will choose to hire the gay-implied applicant with
ambiguous credential (average GPA of 2.8) compared to straight-implied conditions. (5) Higher levels of modern homonegative attitudes is hypothesized to be positively correlated with fear of negative evaluation, external motivation to respond without prejudice, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, higher levels of religiosity, frequent religious attendance, and conservative political orientation. Higher levels of modern homonegative attitudes is hypothesized to be inversely correlated with internal motivation to respond without prejudice, lower levels of religiosity, and infrequent religious attendance. Lastly, modern homonegative attitudes is predicted to be unassociated with social desirability bias.
Chapter 2

METHOD

Overview

The general purpose of this quasi-experimental research study was to examine the effects of modern homonegative attitudes toward hiring decisions of homosexual applicants using stimulus resumes with the intent of applying for a fifth grade teaching position. This study was a between subjects 2x2x2 design; the independent variables investigated were sexual orientation of the applicant (gay/lesbian-implied or straight implied), sex of the applicant (male or female), GPA level of the applicant (average or high). The dependent variables were participants’ evaluation of the applicant’s suitability for the job, and attributing masculine and feminine traits to the applicant. Related self-report constructs of modern homonegativity, fear of negative evaluation, modern sexism, social desirability bias, internal and external motivation to respond without prejudices, and demographic characteristics were assessed. Participants were assigned to one of eight treatment conditions.

Participants

Participants were 261 undergraduate students from a public urban university located in Northern California who were recruited from the Psychology Department participant pool. For their involvement, participants received research credit toward satisfying a course requirement. There were 56 (21.5%) males and 205 (78.5%) females.
with an overall mean of 21 years of age ($SD = 4.52$), and ranging from 17 to 60 years. The sample was 36.8% Caucasian ($n = 96$), 23% Latino ($n = 60$), 21.5% Asian/Asian-American ($n = 56$), 5% African/American ($n = 13$), 1.9% Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders ($n = 5$), 1.1% American Indian ($n = 3$), 5.3% other ($n = 14$), and 1.5% ($n = 4$) who did not indicate their ethnicity (see Table 1).

**Stimulus Materials**

Employing the stimulus resume strategy from McConahay (1983), a resume with the intention of applying for the fifth grade teaching position was created to serve as the stimulus. The resume was constructed using sample resumes and assistance from a clinical and two social psychologists. The resume listed six sections: personal information, objectives, education and credentials, areas of competencies, honor activities and experience, and key contributions. Three variables on the stimulus resume were manipulated: sex of the applicant (female/male), sexuality of the applicant (homosexually-implied/heterosexually-implied), and level of the applicant’s GPA (average/high). The combination of the three independent variables resulted in a total of eight different treatment conditions (Appendices D – K).

The sex of the applicant was manipulated by listing the name Christopher Schulze or Christine Schulze for the male and female applicant, respectively. The sexuality independent variable was manipulated by listing that the applicant was the Vice-President of the Gay and Lesbian Student Association for the homosexual-implied
Table 1

*Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N = 261)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian-American</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely Heterosexual</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Heterosexual</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Homosexual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely Homosexual</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once a week</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very liberal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Conservative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Totals of percentages are not equal to 100 for every characteristic due to rounding of numbers.
applicant, or Vice-President of the Student Red Cross Association for the heterosexual-implied applicant. The GPA level independent variable was manipulated by listing either “Graduated with a GPA of 3.7, Dean’s Academic Honors Award,” or “Graduated with a GPA of 2.8” with no mention of award. Overall, eight different treatment conditions were constructed as follows: (1) Christopher Schulze, Vice-President of the Gay and Lesbian Student Association, and 3.7 GPA level with award. (2) Christopher Schulze, Vice-President of the Gay and Lesbian Student Association, and 2.8 GPA level, (3) Christopher Schulze, Vice-President of the Student Red Cross Association, and 3.7 GPA level with award. (4) Christopher Schulze, Vice-President of the Student Red Cross Association, and 2.8 GPA level. (5) Christine Schulze, Vice-President of the Gay and Lesbian Student Association, and 3.7 GPA level with award. (6) Christine Schulze, Vice-President of the Gay and Lesbian Student Association, and 2.8 GPA level. (7) Christine Schulze, Vice-President of the Student Red Cross Association, and 3.7 GPA level with award. (8) Christine Schulze, Vice-President of the Student Red Cross Association, and 2.8 GPA level. All other information on the eight versions of the resume was kept constant.

A two-page job description for a fifth grade teaching position was created to accompany the stimulus resume. The description listed the required training, education, licenses as well as basic function, duties, working conditions, and benefits. The two-page job description was created based on actual job listings. All participants received a copy
of the exact same two-page job description regardless of treatment condition (Appendix C).

**Dependent Measures**

**Judgment Task Survey**

The Judgment Task Survey (JTS; Harrison, 2003) is a 12-item survey and was used to measure the participants’ evaluation of the applicants’ qualification for the job (e.g., Item 1 reads, “I feel this person would make a good candidate for the job in question,” 12 reads, “I would hire this person for the job”). The items are rated on a 7-point response format (1 = very little, 7 = very much). Higher scores indicate favorably attitudes toward applicant and would likely to hire. The JTS has been reported to achieve alpha coefficient of .79 (Harrison, 2003). In the current study, the JTS achieved an alpha coefficient of .96 and mean of 42.20 (SD = 20.84) (Appendix L).

**Personal Attributes Questionnaire**

The Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974) is a 24-item questionnaire in which participants evaluate themselves in terms of masculine, feminine, and androgynous traits. For the purpose of the present study, the 16-item version pertaining to masculine and feminine traits was used and participants were instructed to evaluate masculinity and femininity of the applicant on the resume, not themselves. Items on the masculine subscale reflect masculine traits in which men are generally stereotyped to possess and are desired by both men and women and they are: independent, active, competitive, can make decisions easily, never give up easily, self-
confident, superior, stand up well under pressure. Items on the feminine subscale reflect traits that women are stereotyped to possess and are desired by both women and men and they are: emotional, able to devote self completely to others, gentle, helpful to others, kind, aware of feelings of others, understanding of others, warm in relations with other). Each trait rated on a 7-point response format and the traits themselves serve as anchors (e.g., Item 3, “Very passive/Very active,” item 13, “Not at all understanding of others/Very understanding of others”). High scores on the masculine subscale indicate high level of masculinity or instrumentality and high scores on the feminine subscale indicate high level of femininity or expressivity. Both the masculine and feminine subscales have moderate to high reliability coefficients of .79 and .87, respectively; however, the convergent validity coefficients for the masculine and feminine subscales were .60 and .66, which support the construct validity of the PAQ (Choi, 2004). In the present research the masculinity subscale achieved a reliability coefficient of .76 (M = 41.52, SD = 6.81) and .79 (M = 44.21, SD = 6.86) for the femininity subscale. Furthermore, in relation to the attitudes toward women (ATS) scale, males who score high on M scale found to be less egalitarian whereas men high on F scale were more in favor of egalitarianism; the reverse was found for females (Spence & Helmreich, 1979) (Appendix M).

**Additional Measures**

**Modern Homonegative Scale**

The *Modern Homonegative Scale* (MHS; Morrison & Morrison, 2003), is a 12-item
scale with two versions, one pertaining to gay men (MHS-G) and one pertaining to lesbians (MHS-L). The MHS measures contemporary prejudicial attitudes held by “liberal” individuals toward gay men and lesbians. The MHS-G and MHS-L versions share identical language except one version references gay men and one version references lesbians (e.g., MHS-G, “Many gay men use their sexual orientation so that they can obtain special privileges,” MHS-L, “Many lesbians use their sexual orientation so that they can obtain special privileges.”). For the purpose of the present study, the gay men and lesbians versions were combined in which all 12 items referenced gay men and lesbians. All participants received identical measures regardless of their treatment conditions (e.g., “Many gay men and lesbians use their sexual orientation so that they can obtain special privileges”). Items are rated on a 5-point response format (1 = I strongly disagree, 5 = I strongly agree). Total scores range from 12 to 60 and higher scores indicate greater modern prejudicial attitudes toward homosexuals. The MHS-G and MHS-L is reported to achieve reliability coefficients of .91 and .89 for males and females, respectively (Morrison & Morrison, 2003). Additionally, factor analysis revealed that the MHS is unidimensional and positively correlated with political conservatism, religious behavior, and modern sexism (Morrison & Morrison, 2003). Comparable to Morrison and Morrison’s (2003) reported reliability coefficient, the MHS achieved an alpha coefficient in the current study of .90 ($M = 29.39, SD = 9.80$) and an average item response of 2.45.

In comparison with the distinguished scale attitudes toward lesbians scale short-
form (ATL-S) and gay men scale-short-form (ATG-S) (Herek, 1988), both male and female participants scored significantly higher on the MHS-G and MHS-L, suggesting that the MHS is a better measure of contemporary attitudes toward homosexuals (Morrison & Morrison, 2003) (Appendix N).

**Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale Brief Version**

The *Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale Brief Version* (FNE; Leary, 1983), is a 12-item scale adapted from the original 30-item Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale by Watson and Friend (1969). The items reflect the degree the respondents feel about possibly being evaluated negatively (e.g., “I am usually worried about what kind of impression I make,” “If I know someone is judging me, it has little effect on me”). Items are rated on a 5-point response format (1 = *not at all characteristic of me*, 5 = *extremely characteristic of me*). Scores range from 12 to 60 points and higher scores indicate greater fear of negative evaluation. The Brief-FNE 12-item version has a high correlation of .96 with the original 30-item version and has an interitem reliability alpha of .90 among undergraduate students. Currently, the FNE achieved reliability alpha of .90 (\(M = 33.66, SD = 10.41\)). The scale has been shown to moderately correlate with the SAD-anxiety and SAD-avoidance subscales, as well as the Interaction Anxiousness Scale (Leary, 1983) (Appendix O).

**Ambivalent Sexism Inventory**

The *Ambivalent Sexism Inventory* (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996) is a 22-item multidimensional construct inventory designed to assess two facets of contemporary
sexism against women. The first facet refers to sexist antipathy or hostile sexism (HS) and the second is subjective positive orientation toward women or benevolent sexism (BS). HS occurs when an individual uses derogatory characterizations of women to assert and justify male dominance, exploit women as sexual objects, and maintain traditional gender roles (e.g., “When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against”). BS refers to when male individuals use a more subtle approach of the justification of male dominance by feeling protective and affectionate toward women. For example, a man offers to help without being asked by the woman. His action implicitly implied that the woman was not capable of doing the task herself, and he is surprised and hurt when the woman rejects his help because she thought he was being patronizing (e.g., “Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility”) (Glick & Fiske, 1997). The 22 items are rated on a 6-point response format (0 = disagree strongly, 5 = agree strongly). The HS and BS subscales may be scored separately and scores range from zero to 55 for each subscale; higher score on each subscale indicate greater levels of HS or BS.

Among undergraduates the ASI has reported means ranging from 2.46 to 2.96 and reliability coefficients from .83 to .92. The HS and BS subscales have alpha reliability coefficients from .80 to .92 and .75 to .85, respectively (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Currently, the HS and BS achieved reliability coefficients of .80 ($M = 24.97$, $SD = 9.30$) and .77 ($M = 28.54$, $SD = 9.27$), respectively. HS and BS have been found to be moderately positively correlated for women and undergraduate men but not for older men; Glick and
Fiske reasoned that older men may base their attitudes on personal histories rather than traditional beliefs (Appendix P).

**Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability-Short Form**

The *Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability-Short Form* (MCSD-Form C; Reynolds, 1982) is a 13-item version scale adapted from the original 33-item Marlowe-Crowne-social desirability scale developed by Crowne and Marlowe (1960). The 13-item version constructed by Reynolds (1982) assesses the respondents’ tendencies to respond in a socially desirable manner. Items rated true or false ("I sometimes feel resentful when I don’t get my way," “No matter who I’m talking to, I’m always a good listener"). Scores may range from 13 to 26 and higher scores indicate greater levels of social desirability. The 13-item version has a reported reliability level of .76, comparable to the original version and item to total score correlations ranging from .32 to .47 (Reynolds, 1982). For the present research, the scale reported a reliability coefficient of .70 ($M = 6.69$, $SD = 2.96$) (Appendix Q).

**Internal and External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Scale**

The *Internal and External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Scale* (IM/EM; Plant & Devine, 1998) is a 10-item scale designed to assess respondents’ source of motivation to respond without prejudice against Black people. The five-item internal motivation subscale (IM) measures prejudice rooted in values and beliefs (e.g., “I attempt to act in non-prejudiced ways toward Black people because it is personally important to me”). The five-item external motivation subscale (EM) measures prejudice rooted in
conventional social norms and standards (e.g., “If I acted prejudiced toward Black people, I would be concerned that others would be angry with me”). In their research examining gender differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians, Ratcliff, Lassiter, Markman, and Snyder (2006) altered the items to assess internal and external motivation specific for gay men and lesbians, in doing so did not alter the original two-factor solution described by Plant and Devine (1998). Additionally, the IM and EM subscales have been examined in terms of gays and lesbians as target groups and achieved reliability coefficients of .71 and .84, respectively, and were proven to be valid and reliable for studies examining prejudice towards homosexuals (Gouveia, de Souza, Vione, Cavalcanti, dos Santos, & de Medeiros, 2011). Thus, adopting their strategy for the present study, the items were modified to reference gay men and lesbians (e.g., “I attempt to act in non-prejudiced ways toward gay and lesbian people because it is personally important to me,” and “If I acted prejudiced toward gay and lesbian people, I would be concerned that others would be angry with me”). Items were rated on a 9-point response format (1 = strongly disagree, 9 = strongly agree). Respondents’ scores on IMS and EMS are averaged for each subscale and scores range from five to 45, with higher scores denoting higher levels of internal or external motivation. The IM and the EM have reliability coefficients of .81 and .82, respectively (Plant & Devine, 1998). Presently, the IM and EM subscales achieved reliability coefficients of .79 (MV = 36.25, SD = 8.23) and .72 (MV = 22.33, SD = 9.09), respectively. It has been reported that people who are low in prejudice score higher on the IM, additionally, EM was found to be related to social

**Demographic Questionnaire**

Lastly, all participants completed a post-research demographic questionnaire that included religious attendance, religiosity and political orientation questions. Participants were asked to indicate their religious attendance ranging from more than once a week, once a week, once a month, occasionally, or never. Scores range from 1 to 5 and lower scores reflect more frequent religious service attendance. Levels of religiosity range from not at all, somewhat, slightly, or very; scores range from 1 to 4 with higher scores indicating higher levels of religiosity. Political orientation scores range from very liberal, liberal, moderate, conservative, or very conservative; scores range from 1 to 5 and higher scores reflect higher levels of conservatism. Single-item measures of political orientation and religiosity have been found to be valid and reliable (Morrison & Morrison, 2003).

**Procedure**

All participants ($N = 261$) were recruited from the Psychology Department research website. When participants signed up for the study, they were informed of the date, time, and location of data collection. For their involvement, participants received one half hour out of the three research hours required for lower division psychology courses.

When participants entered the room they were asked to sign-in by providing their first name, last name, email, and date in order to correctly assign credit after the session. Participants were then required to read and sign consent forms notifying them that they
would receive a packet of material containing some demographic questions and some inventories pertaining to such topics as homosexuality, authoritarianism, religiosity, social equality, and desirability. The consent form also notified them that their participation was voluntary and they could withdraw at any point during the study if they felt uncomfortable. Signed consent forms were collected and placed in a separate envelope to ensure they could not be traced back to the experimental materials of individual participants. Participants were assured of their anonymity and confidentiality by randomly assigning them different subject numbers. No identifying information was connected to their data.

Using randomized block design, participants were divided into homogenous groups of eight; the first eight participants were assigned to group one, the second group of eight participants to group two, and so on. Within each block, each participant was randomly assigned to one of eight treatment conditions. Each participant was given a blue folder and were instructed to open the folder consisting of a two-page job description for a fifth grade teaching position and a resume. Participants were then asked to think of themselves as the administrator looking to fill the fifth grade teaching position. Following, participants were given four to five minutes to examine the information about the candidate applying for the job position as well as the job description and were told they would be asked questions about their content. The researcher then set the clock for approximately four to five minutes.

After careful examination of the resume, each participant was handed two
surveys, the JTS and PAQ, and were orally instructed that these surveys pertained to the applicant. Once done, they were told to place the surveys into the blue folder and close it as a signal that they completed the surveys. Next, each participant was handed another series of surveys in random order. The packet of surveys included the MHS, Brief-FNE, ASI, MC-Form C, IMS/EMS, and demographic questions. For this portion, participants were orally instructed that these surveys are self-report and therefore they should respond as openly and honestly as possible. When done, participants were asked to place the packet of surveys into the blue folder and close the folder.

To address concerns regarding whether participants studied the information sufficiently, participants were given a half sheet of paper containing seven questions. Some questions were fill in the blanks (e.g., what was the name of the applicant?), and some had answer choices (e.g., what was the sex of the applicant? Male or female?). They were instructed to complete questions from memory. Subsequently, participants were asked to collect their personal belongings and to step outside to be debriefed. Participants were orally debriefed about the purpose of the study, which was to examine the effect of modern homonegativity on hiring homosexual applicants. They were also informed of the eight treatment conditions and they had been randomly assigned to their conditions. Participants were then given a copy of the debriefing sheet, which include the purpose, hypotheses, and supporting research, as well as psychological services contact information and the researcher’s contact information if they would like further information or later had questions. Participants were thanked for participating and
dismissed. Each session was approximately 30 minutes long. All hard copies of the raw data collected were securely maintained in a sealed box and kept in a locked research lab.
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RESULTS

Data Screening

Prior to performing statistical analyses to test study hypotheses, all variables were screened for possible violations of coding errors, missing values, outliers, and statistical assumptions using statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS, Version 17). Frequencies, Explore, and One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) procedures were used for this purpose. Two hundred and sixty-one cases were screened for missing values on 10 variables (hirability ratings, masculine attribute, feminine attribute, fear of negative evaluation, internal motivation to respond without prejudice, external motivation to respond without prejudice, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, social desirability bias, and modern homonegativity). Frequencies analysis revealed three missing values for hiring variable, two missing for modern homonegative, and one missing for social desirability bias. All cases with missing values represented less than 5% of the total cases therefore missing values were amended by analysis-by-analysis deletion in subsequent analyses.

Univariate outliers were screened using descriptive statistics analysis to generate standardized values. Results revealed one outlier for masculine, two for feminine, and two for modern homonegativity. The issue was addressed by adjusting each outlier one unit smaller or larger than the previous case, fitting in the distribution in order to maintain
their place in the extreme level, but within a normal distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007, p. 77).

**Analysis of Variance Assumptions**

Normality of the data distributions were screened visually as well as through Explore analysis in SPSS. Figures 1, 2, and 3 represent the distributions for dependent variables hirability ratings, masculine attributes and feminine attributes, respectively. Hirability ratings were measured by the JTS consisting of 12 items with scores ranging from 12 to 84 and higher scores indicate more likely to hire. Participants reported a mean of 42.20 ($SD = 20.84$), above the median of 36.5. The analysis revealed a skewness value of .40, indicating a positively skewed distribution in which high concentration of scores within the lower hiring end, and negative kurtosis statistics of -1.20, indicating a platykurtic distribution.

Kolmogorow-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests of normality of dependent variable hirability ratings across the levels of sex, sexuality, and GPA were statistically significant ($p < .05$), indicating a violation of normality assumption. Similar results were found for dependent variable feminine attributes, but not for masculine attributes. Homogeneity of variance assumption was tested through One-Way ANOVA procedure. Results revealed non-significant statistics indicating homogeneity of variance, with the exception of dependent variable hirability ratings across GPA levels ($p = .03$).
Figure 1. The overall distribution of dependent variable hirability ratings of the eight treatment conditions based on responses from $N = 261$ participants. Lower scores indicate less likely to hire and higher scores indicate more likely to hire.
Figure 2. The overall distribution of dependent variable attribution of masculine traits of the eight treatment conditions based on responses from $N = 261$ participants. Lower scores indicate less masculine and higher scores indicate more masculine.
Figure 3. The overall distribution of dependent variable attribution of feminine traits of the eight treatment conditions based on responses from $N = 261$ participants. Lower scores indicate less feminine and higher scores indicate more feminine.

**Hypothesis 1**

It was hypothesized that participants would choose to hire the female/straight-implied/high GPA applicant condition compared to all other conditions. To test hypothesis 1, hirability ratings of the eight applicants were analyzed by means of a three-
way between subjects ANOVA with independent variables, sex (male versus female), sexuality (heterosexual versus homosexual), and GPA level (high 3.7 versus average 2.8). Results showed a non-significant interaction effect of Sex x Sexuality x GPA level, $F(1, 250) = 1.31, p = .25$. Participants did not show hiring preference for female/straight-implied/high GPA applicant condition compared to other treatment conditions (Figure 4 & Table 2).

Figure 4

![Means Hirability Ratings of Heterosexual & Homosexual Applicants for 5th Grade Teacher Position](chart)

*Figure 4.* Mean ratings represent participants’ average hirability ratings for each of the eight treatment conditions.
Table 2

*Means and Standard Deviations for Hirability Ratings Variable for the Eight Treatment Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Male/Gay/3.7</td>
<td>40.69</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male/Straight/3.7</td>
<td>38.39</td>
<td>19.93</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Male/Gay/2.8</td>
<td>42.21</td>
<td>20.18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Male/Straight/2.8</td>
<td>40.24</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Female/Lesbian/3.7</td>
<td>37.39</td>
<td>22.74</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Female/Straight/3.7</td>
<td>48.94</td>
<td>23.83</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Female/Lesbian/2.8</td>
<td>44.65</td>
<td>18.10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Female/Straight/2.8</td>
<td>44.67</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypotheses 2 and 3**

It was hypothesized that participants would attribute higher levels of masculinity to the male/straight-implied than male/gay-implied conditions, and participants would attribute higher levels of femininity to the female/straight-implied than female/lesbian-implied conditions, respectively. To test hypotheses 2 and 3, two separate two-way between-subjects ANOVAs were computed for each dependent variable, attribution of masculine traits and attribution of feminine traits, across the levels of independent variables sex and sexuality. For attribution of masculine traits, results revealed non-
significant interaction effect Sex x Sexuality, $F(1, 257) = 1.52, p = .22$. Participants did not attribute higher levels of masculinity to the male/straight-implied applicant conditions than the male/gay-implied applicant conditions (Table 3). Hypothesis 3 of attribution of feminine traits, results also revealed non-significant interaction effect Sex x Sexuality, $F(1, 257) = 1.53, p = .22$. Participants did not attribute higher levels of femininity to the female/straight-implied applicant conditions than female/lesbian-implied applicant conditions (Table 4).

Table 3

*Means and Standard Deviations for Attribution of Masculine Traits for the Eight Treatment Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Male/Gay</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male/Straight</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Female/Lesbian</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Female/Straight</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 4**

It was hypothesized that due to the effect of ambiguity, participants with higher MHS scores would more likely choose to hire the gay-implied applicant with ambiguous credential (average GPA of 2.8) than the straight-implied conditions. Prior to testing hypothesis 4, participants with reported higher and lower levels of modern
Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Attribution of Feminine Traits for the Eight Treatment Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Male/Gay</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male/Straight</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Female/Lesbian</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Female/Straight</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Homonegativity scores were grouped into quartiles. The first group consisted of 67 participants with reported scores from 12 to 22 points (M = 17.31, SD = 3.34). Second group with 66 participants with reported scores from 23 to 29 points (M = 26.29, SD = 2.14). Third group with 72 participants with scores from 30 to 36 points (M = 33.19, SD = 1.90). Fourth group with 54 participants with reported scores from 37 to 56 (M = 43.11, SD = 5.93). To test hypothesis 4, a three-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted for hirability ratings by means of independent variables sexuality, GPA level, and fourth quartile of MHS. Results revealed non-significant interaction effect of Sexuality x GPA Level x Higher levels of MHS, F(3, 16) = .77, p = .53, suggesting participants with higher levels of MHS did not show hiring preference for gay/lesbian-implied applicant conditions with ambiguous credential (average GPA of 2.8) compared to straight-implied applicant conditions (see Table 5).
Table 5

*Analysis of Variance Results for Interaction Effects of Sex, Sexuality, GPA, and Higher Levels of MHS on Hirability Ratings, Attribution of Masculine Traits, and Attribution of Feminine Traits*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hirability Ratings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Sexuality x GPA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>565.94</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>433.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality x GPA x Higher Levels of MHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>393.12</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>508.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attribution of Masculine Traits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Sexuality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attribution of Feminine Traits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Sexuality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 5**

It was hypothesized that higher levels of modern homonegative attitudes would positively correlate with fear of negative evaluation, external motivation to respond
without prejudice, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, higher levels of religiosity, frequent religious attendance, and conservative political orientation. Higher levels of modern homonegative attitudes would inversely correlate with internal motivation to respond without prejudice, lower levels of religiosity, and infrequent religious attendance. Lastly, modern homonegative attitudes would show no association with social desirability bias.

To test hypothesis 5, bivariate correlations were conducted for the following variables: MHS, FNE, MCSD, IM and EM to respond without prejudice, HS, BS, religiosity, religious attendance, and political orientation. Results revealed higher levels of MHS positively correlated with EM to respond without prejudice, $r(259) = .14, p < .05$, HS, $r(259) = .28, p < .01$, BS, $r(259) = .22, p < .01$, and conservative political orientation, $r(254) = .45, p < .01$, two-tailed. Higher levels of MHS inversely correlated with IM to respond without prejudice, $r(259) = -.64, p < .01$, and lower frequency of religious service attendance, $r(258) = -.38, p < .01$, two-tailed. No associations were found between MHS and FNE, MCSD, and religiosity (Table 6 & Table 7).

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations, and Scores Range for Modern Homonegative Scale and Related Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. MHS</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>29.39</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>12-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. BFNE</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>33.66</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>12-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MCSD</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MHS</td>
<td>BFNE</td>
<td>MCSD</td>
<td>EMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>IMS</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rel. Attend</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Religi</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Political Or</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MHS = Modern Homonegative Scale; BFNE = Brief Fear of Negative Evaluation; MCSD = Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability; EMS = External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice; IMS = Internal Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice; HS = Hostile Sexism; BS = Benevolent Sexism.

Table 7

Correlations for Modern Homonegative Scale and Related Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BFNE</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MCSD</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.27**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>IMS</td>
<td>-0.64**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01  *p < .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>0.08</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>0.32**</th>
<th>-0.01</th>
<th>-0.10</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Rel. Attendance</td>
<td>-0.38**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Religiosity</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Political Orien.</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>-0.30**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.26**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **Coefficients are significant at the $p < .01$. *Coefficients are significant at the $p < .05$. MHS = Modern Homonegative Scale; BFNE = Brief Fear of Negative Evaluation; MCSD = Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability; EMS = External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice; IMS = Internal Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice; HS = Hostile Sexism; BS = Benevolent Sexism.
Chapter 4

DISCUSSION

The present research explored the effects of ambiguity on modern homonegativity as it applies to hiring judgments of homosexual, heterosexual, male and female applicants. Also examined were the attribution effects of assigning masculine and feminine traits to heterosexual and homosexual applicant conditions, as well as modern homonegativity relative to related constructs of modern sexism, fear of negative evaluation, social desirability bias, internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice, religious affiliation, religiosity, and political orientation. Findings and implications are addressed here according to the research hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that participants would most likely choose to hire the female/straight-implied/high GPA applicant condition compared to other treatment conditions. The interaction effect from the three-way between-subjects ANOVA did not support this hypothesis and indicating no discrimination of hiring on the basis of sexual orientation. The present findings support the research by Horvath and Ryan (2003) who found non-significant differences in average ratings of heterosexuals versus lesbians and gay men, women versus men, and masculine versus feminine applicants. However, the present findings contradict Regan and Ramirez’s (2000) results who found that the heterosexual female applicant was preferred to the heterosexual male and homosexual male and female applicants for a full-time childcare position. Moreover, participants
indicated they felt more comfortable leaving their children with the heterosexual female compared to homosexual male and female, and heterosexual male applicants.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that participants would attribute higher levels of masculinity to the male/straight-implied applicant conditions than the male/gay-implied applicant conditions. Similarly, hypothesis 3 predicted that participants would attribute higher levels of femininity to the female/straight-implied applicant conditions than the female/lesbian-implied applicant conditions. Neither of the hypotheses was confirmed. Participants did not attribute higher levels of masculinity to the male/straight-implied than the male/gay-implied conditions, nor did participants attribute higher levels of femininity to the female/straight-implied than the female/lesbian-implied conditions.

These results contradict findings by Blashill and Powlishta (2009) who replicated previous research by Kite and Deaux (1987). In their 1987 research, Kite and Deaux found gay men were perceived more feminine than heterosexual males, and lesbians were perceived more masculine than heterosexual females. Twenty years later in 2009, Blashill and Powlishta replicated the study and found congruent results in that gay males were perceived as more feminine than lesbians and heterosexual males and lesbians were attributed higher levels of masculinity than heterosexual females. Furthermore, Weichselbaumer (2002) sent out resumes in response to job postings and found that the feminine-straight-female applicant was 60.82% successful in securing interview invitation, whereas the masculine-lesbian-female applicant was 47.95% successful.
Hypothesis 4 predicted that due to effect of ambiguity, participants with higher MHS scores would more likely choose to hire the gay-implied applicant with ambiguous credential (average GPA of 2.8) compared to straight-implied conditions. Hypothesis 4 was not confirmed; participants with higher levels of modern prejudice attitudes toward homosexuals did not show hiring preference for the gay/lesbian-implied applicants with ambiguous credential (average GPA of 2.8) compared to the straight-implied applicants.

Hypothesis 5 predicted that higher levels of modern homonegative attitudes would positively correlate with fear of negative evaluation, external motivation to respond without prejudice, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, higher levels of religiosity, more frequent religious attendance, and conservative political orientation. Furthermore, higher levels of modern homonegative attitudes would inversely correlate with internal motivation to respond without prejudice, lower levels of religiosity, and infrequent religious attendance. Lastly, modern homonegativite attitudes would show no association with social desirability bias.

Results revealed higher levels of modern homonegative attitudes positively correlated with external motivation and negatively correlated with internal motivation, suggesting people with higher levels of modern homonegative attitudes were externally, not internally, motivated to respond without prejudice. This supports Plant and Devine’s (1998) assertion that internally motivated individuals have more positive and less negative attitudes; conversely, externally motivated individuals have less positive and more negative attitudes toward homosexuals. More importantly, higher levels of internal
motivation does not necessarily equate to absence of prejudiced attitudes (Plant & Devine, 1997).

In regards to hostile and benevolent sexism, results indicated people who hold modern homonegative attitudes also harbor sexist attitudes. These results are consistent with Glick and Fiske’s (1997) findings that hostile sexism was related to negative affect and stereotyping of nontraditional women and benevolent sexism was related to positive affect and stereotyping of traditional women.

Surprisingly, no relationship was found for modern homonegativity and religiosity, but a significant relationship was found for religious service attendance. The significant relationship result supports previous research that individuals with higher levels of homonegative attitudes attend religious services more frequently than individuals with lower levels of homonegative attitudes (Morrison & Morrison, 2003). Lastly, no associations were found for modern homonegative attitudes with social desirability bias and fear of negative evaluation therefore corroborates Morrison and Morrison’s claim that the MHS is not a reactive measure compared to the ATLG (Herek, 1988).

**Study Weaknesses and Limitations**

There are several weaknesses and limitations of the current research that must be acknowledged. Data were collected from undergraduate students living within Sacramento or Sacramento areas, indicating results may represent regional findings and or unique to the institution. Generalizing beyond the sample may be problematic.
Furthermore, participants’ demographic information is not representative of the general population; 79% of participants were females and 37% were Caucasians. The underrepresented groups were male participants, African-Americans, and sexual minorities.

Additionally, instead of administering two separate versions of MHS, one pertaining to gay men and one pertaining to lesbians, the 12 items were modified to reference gay men and lesbians, which may have affected the scales’ performance. For example, a negative attitude about gay men may have been masked by a more positive attitude about lesbians. Furthermore, in comparison to Morrison and Morrison’s (2003) research, their male participants reported means of 41.9 ($SD = 9.1$) and 42.8 ($SD = 9.7$), and females reported means of 37.3 ($SD = 10.1$), 38.8 ($SD = 8.5$) on the MHS-G and MHS-L. Presently, the 261 participants in the current study reported an MHS mean of 29.4 ($SD = 9.8$), which implies two possible explanations. Participants in the current study are indeed more tolerant of gay men and lesbians, or items on the MHS are too reactive (e.g., “Gay men/lesbians have become far too confrontational in their demands for equal rights,” “In today’s tough economic times, Americans’ tax dollars should not be used to support gay men/lesbians’ organizations”), thereby do not capture the subtleness, covert, and abstract concerns pertaining to and defined as modern prejudicial attitudes toward homosexuals.

Sample issues are also possible explanations for the null results. Of 261 participants, 79% ($n = 205$) were female and 37% ($n = 96$) were Caucasian. Past research
has consistently found females to be more tolerant of gays and lesbians than males
(Cullen, Wight, & Alessandri, 2002; Herek, 1988; Kite & Whitley, 1996, 1998; Hinrichs &
Rosenberg, 2002; Morrison & Morrison, 2003; Nelson & Krieger, 1997; Finlay & Walther,
2003; Newman, 2002). Basow and Johnson (2000) posited that men who are concern
about their masculinity often fear and avoid situations in which their masculinity will be
questioned, including interaction and acceptance of homosexuals. As for women,
homophobia is not a defensive reaction. Furthermore, all participants were university
students and past research has shown that individuals with higher levels of education
were generally more tolerant of homosexuals. Higher levels of education has been linked
to more positive attitudes as results of social experiences outside the classroom, as well
as students’ involvement in diversity coursework such as ethnic studies and women’s
studies (Lambert, Ventura, Hall, & Cluse-Tolar, 2006). Students who enrolled in such
coursework were 26% more likely to show greater acceptance of LGB relationships than
students who did not (Jayakumar, 2009). Additionally, in the current research higher
number of participants ($n = 85$, 33%) self-identified as liberal or very liberal than
conservative and very conservative ($n = 51$, 20%).

Another weakness is the effectiveness of the independent variables. All else
remaining constant, the manipulated independent variables were sex, sexual orientation,
and GPA level. The sex of the applicant within each condition was evident by listing a
female name for female applicants and a male name for male applicants. Participants
were asked to indicate the sex of the applicant from two answer choices, male or female.
Of a total of 261, 238 participants (91%) correctly identified the sex of the applicant to which they were randomly assigned. The sexual orientation variable was not as salient; participants were asked to indicate the sexual orientation of the applicant from two answer choices, straight or gay, of which 184 participants (71%) correctly identified the sexual orientation of their applicants. Heterosexual and homosexual applicants were differentiated solely on their involvement in either the Gay and Lesbian Student Association or the Student Red Cross Association. Thus, participants were only able to assume the sexual orientation of their applicants. Furthermore, 239 participants (92%) correctly identified the GPA levels of their applicants. Though the percentages of correctly answered are high, answers to these questions were provided in the form of multiple choice. Furthermore, high and average GPA levels were piloted among 30 undergraduate psychology students whom reported high and average GPA utilized in the present research. It might be possible that students perceived the average GPA of 2.8 to be a positive outcome rather than negative.

Moreover, since all other information listed, as well as font, style, and type of paper the resumes were printed on were kept constant, participants had very limited information regarding the characteristics, qualities, and personalities of their assigned applicant. Thus, the effects of attribution of masculine and feminine traits did not yield significant results. Furthermore, skewness and kurtosis statistics for all dependent variables indicated violations of the normality assumption. Transformation of the
variables did not yield overall improvement. Moreover, dependent variable hirability ratings had a very large standard deviation of 20.84, indicating high level of variance.

Beyond the aforementioned sampling and methodological weaknesses, a theoretical weakness is the applicability of laboratory research results from university students to working professionals. Heterosexual university students may not personally feel the impact of positive or negative consequences of hiring discrimination, therefore may not feel compel to act as a hiring administrator seriously. Overall, accounting for weaknesses of the present research, results suggest that this particular methodology is ineffective in tapping into or capturing modern homonegativity.

**Recommendations**

Future research examining hiring prejudicial attitudes toward homosexuals should construct the resumes to be less comparable (e.g., lowering the average GPA level) because, aforementioned, ambivalent people overreact by behaving more negatively in situations that foster negative behavior and more positively in situations that foster positive behaviors. Additionally, the design of the study should be a within-subjects design in which each participant rank the hirability of all applicants, as compared to evaluating just one applicant.

Moreover, future research should further develop the theory of modern homonegativity by identifying and evaluating specific abstract concerns that encompasses this theory, relative to the theorized framework of microaggressions. Microaggressions are generally defined as subtle verbal and behavioral communications
of prejudice and discrimination, in forms of snubs, dismissive looks, gestures, and tones, toward minority, stigmatized, and disadvantaged individuals through meaningful and innocuous tactics (Constantine, 2007; Constantine & Sue, 2007; Shelton & Delgado-Romero, 2011). Analogous to modern homonegativity, microaggressions are covert and subtle, remarks such as “what are you?” to a biracial person, “you speak so well” to a Black person, or “what do you think this issue has to do with your sexuality?” to a gay person, may seem harmless, but for individuals receiving these messages, they communicate invalidation and intellectual inferiority (Shelton & Delgado-Romero, 2011). Microaggressions often leave the receivers feeling confused, powerless, angry, damaged self-esteem, and pressured to stand up (Sue, Capodilupo, & Holder, 2008).

The theory of microaggression is more fully developed as compared to modern homonegativity. Microaggressions and modern homonegativity have yet to be explored together; however, research examining microaggressions relative to sexual orientation has been conducted but has generally employed qualitative methodologies. Future research should examine these related constructs in parallel using qualitative as well as quantitative methodologies in measuring innocuous verbal and behavioral cues.

Another recommendation is the examination of tolerance and acceptance. Both ATLG and the MHS assess levels of tolerance, not levels of acceptance, of gay men and lesbians. Tolerance is defined as willingness to tolerate or put up with, whereas acceptance is favorable acceptance and approval. A search through PsychInfo, PsycArticles, and Academic Search Premier Databases revealed that no studies have yet
to explore these two construct in relation to assessing attitudes toward homosexuals, and no existing measures, as accepted and psychometrically sound as the ATLG, has been developed to assess levels of acceptance of homosexuals or homosexuality. Thus, any development of measures assessing prejudicial attitudes should focus on acceptance and tolerance.

Lastly, Morrison and Morrison (2003) noted that, based on their results, it should not be assumed that just because there has been an increased in tolerance toward sexual minorities does not necessarily equate to decrease in old-fashion prejudice outside the university environment. The ATLG scale has been proven repeatedly to be a valid and reliable measure of prejudicial attitudes toward gay men and lesbians and remains valid and reliable for research within such contexts.
APPENDIX A

Consent Form

I hereby agree to participate in research that will be conducted by Kim D. Nguyen, a graduate student in psychology, and Dr. Marya Endriga, a professor of Psychology. In this research, I will receive a packet of material containing some demographic questions and some inventories pertaining to such topics as homosexuality, authoritarianism, religiosity, social equality, and desirability.

The research will take place in one of the research rooms on the second floor of Amador Hall and will require 30 minutes of my time.

I understand that I will receive one half-hour of credit toward satisfying the Psychology Department’s research participation requirement by participating in this study.

I understand that I may not personally benefit from participating in this research, but it is hoped that the research may lead to a better understanding of relations between people.

Although some questions may make me feel uncomfortable, I understand that I may skip any question. I also understand that I may discontinue my participation at any time without any penalty other than loss of research credit and that the investigator may discontinue my participation at any time.

This information was explained to me by Kim Nguyen. I understand that she will answer any questions I may have now or later about this research. Kim Nguyen can be reached at kymnguye@gmail.com.

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
APPENDIX B

Debriefing

Purpose

The purpose of this investigation was threefold: (a) to examine the effects of varying levels of types of ambiguity about sexual orientation on homonegative attitudes toward an individual, (b) to examine the effect of various levels and forms of ambiguity about sexual orientation, gay and lesbian, on the hiring decisions, and (c) to examine similar constructs (e.g., sexism, fear of negative evaluation, social desirability, and motivation to control prejudice) in relation to modern homonegativity.

Hypotheses and Supporting Research

In 1983 McConahay conducted a study exploring modern racism and discrimination against Black Americans because he believed that racism did not disappear but rather transformed from old-fashioned, blatant form to a contemporary, covert form of racism. In 2002, Morrison and Morrison adopted McConahay’s (1983) work in regards to contemporary homonegative attitudes towards gay men and lesbian women. Morrison and Morrison (2002) developed the Modern Homonegativity Scale (MHS) to better measure people's attitudes toward gay men and lesbians.

In the present study I wanted to examine the participants’ evaluation and hiring decisions of gay and lesbian applicants as compare to heterosexual applicants for a fifth grade teaching position, as well as examining the relationships of modern homonegativity and related constructs including fear of negative evaluation, sexism, social desirability, and internal and external motivation to control prejudice. I hypothesized that (1) participants who score higher on the MHS will be more likely to hire the female applicant with high GPA and rate this applicant more favorably (more qualified) than the straight-implied male applicant with high GPA as well as the gay-implied applicant with high GPA, (2) participants who score higher on the MHS will evaluate more positively (more likely to hire, attribute more masculine characteristics, and more qualified) towards the straight-implied male applicant with high GPA compare to the gay-implied applicant with high GPA, (3) participants who score high on the MHS will rate the gay-male-implied applicant with the ambiguous credentials (average GPA) more positively compare to the straight-male-implied applicant with ambiguous credentials (average GPA), (4) participants who score higher on the MHS will attribute more feminine characteristics (e.g., caring, gentle, sensitive) toward the straight-implied female applicant compare to the lesbian-implied female applicant, (5) participants who score higher on the MHS will attribute more masculine characteristics (e.g., bold, competitive, independent) toward the straight-implied male applicant compare to the gay-implied male applicant, (6) participants who score lower on the MHS will show no hiring preference for the straight-implied applicant, female applicant, or gay-implied applicant, and (7) MHS is predicted to be positively correlated fear of negative evaluation, sexism, social desirability, and external motivation to control prejudice.

To test my hypotheses, I used stimulus resumes that were different in whether the applicant was gay/lesbian-implied or straight-implied, male-implied or female-implied, and high GPA level or average GPA level. I also used self-report surveys about the applicant and
research participant. Once all the data are collected, the data analysis will involve pooling the
data from the participants. I will then perform the statistical analyses to test my hypotheses.

**Psychological Services**

If you have experienced any personal distress caused by the content or materials in
this research and want to talk to someone, counseling services are available through the
Student Health Center free of charge. Please contact Psychological Counseling Services at
278-6416 for assistance.

**Contact Information**

The results of this study will be available the last week of the current semester. If you
would like further information about this study or have questions regarding this study, please
contact kymnguye@gmail.com at your convenience.
APPENDIX C

5th Grade Teacher Job Description

SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Lincoln Elementary School
3324 Glenmoor Drive
Sacramento, CA 95827-2400

Make a difference in the world! Join the faculty at Lincoln Elementary School.
To keep pace with the phenomenal growth in our area we are seeking a self-motivated individual who will be responsible for teaching a 5th grade class of up to 30 students!

Key attributes to describe a teacher at our school include: (1) instructional expert; (2) student advocate; (3) relentless achiever; (4) continuous learner; (5) critical thinker; (6)...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Description TITLE</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>FLSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Certificated Non-Management (SCTA)</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERIES</th>
<th>JOB CLASS CODE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0303 Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0330 Middle</td>
<td>0344 K-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK YEAR:</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>184 Days</td>
<td>Assigned School Site or Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SALARY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-12 and Preschool Teacher Salary Schedule T, Adult Education Teacher Salary Schedule R/N, or Hourly Adult Education Teacher Salary Schedule R1/N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOARD APPROVAL:</th>
<th>BOARD REVISION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03-15-73</td>
<td>08-07-08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board of Education
effective communicator; (7) problem solver; and (8) people person with excellent interpersonal skills.

**BASIC FUNCTION:**
Under direction, to plan, carry out, and evaluate instructional activities for both groups and individual students, as appropriate for the assigned segment and subject area(s).

**REPRESENTATIVE DUTIES:** (Teachers may perform any combination of the functions listed in the job/evaluation specification.)
1. Engage and support all students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies to respond to students’ diverse needs.
2. Create and maintain effective environments for student learning by planning and implementing classroom procedures and routines that support student learning and positive behaviors.
3. Plan instruction and design learning experiences for all students by sequencing instructional activities and materials for student learning.
4. Assess and evaluate student learning to guide instruction, and communicate progress with students, families, and appropriate staff.
5. Contribute to the teaching and learning environment by fulfilling extra duties as assigned, attending required meetings, maintaining resources and equipment, and assisting in maintaining acceptable student behavior outside of classroom.

**TRAINING, EDUCATION, AND EXPERIENCE:**
Bachelor’s degree from an accredited university, and demonstrated success, either in prior teaching, student teaching, and/or related experiences, in meeting the intellectual, emotional, and physical needs of pupils, is required.

**LICENSES AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS:**
The minimum requirement is a valid California teaching credential authorizing service in the assigned segment and subject area(s), English Language Authorization, and No Child Left Behind (NCLB) compliant, if applicable.

**WORKING CONDITIONS:**
SAMPLE ENVIRONMENT:
Classroom or outdoor activity

**SAMPLE PHYSICAL ABILITIES:**
- Hear and speak to teach
- Make presentations
- Exchange information in person and on the telephone
- Dexterity of hands and fingers to operate a computer keyboard
- See to read, prepare documents and reports, and view a computer monitor;
- Sit or stand for extended periods of time;
- Bend at the waist, reach overhead, above the shoulders, and horizontally to retrieve and store files;
- Lift light objects.

**BENEFITS:**
We offer competitive salaries; a full benefits package including medical, dental and vision insurance; a 401(k) with matching employer contributions; tuition discount; and educational assistance.
APPENDIX D

Condition Male/Gay-Implied/High GPA 3.7

Christopher Schulze
1948 Geary Blvd, No. 4|San Francisco, CA 91436
Home Phone 415-327-0394|E-mail: C.Schulze@gte.net

Certified Elementary School Teacher
Certified elementary teacher with a passion for education and is eager to start a full-time teaching career. Strong interpersonal skills to build strong bond with students, parents, and faculty in hope to inspire quality education; deeply committed to learning, teaching, and the success of the students.

EDUCATION AND CREDENTIALS

♦ Bachelor of Arts in Education, 2009
University of California, San Francisco

♦ Graduated with a GPA of 3.7, Dean’s Academic Honors Award

♦ Multiple Subjects Teaching Credential, 2010

CORE COMPETENCIES

♦ Creative Lesson Planning
♦ Mentoring & Motivating
♦ Textbook Review & Selection
♦ Parental Communication & Involvement
♦ Hands-on Instruction
♦ Curriculum Development
♦ Instructional Best Practices
♦ Classroom Management & Discipline
♦ Cultural Sensitivity
♦ Student Assessment

HONOR ACTIVITIES & EXPERIENCE

♦ Camp Counselor (July 2009 – Present)

♦ Vice-President of the Gay & Lesbian Student Association (Sept. 2008 – June 2009)

♦ Peer Tutor (March 2007 – December 2007)
Was hired as a part-time peer tutor to assist students with their writing assignments in all academic subject areas; left peer tutoring position (on excellent terms) at the end of the 2007 academic year. Joined the Gay and Lesbian Student Association on campus at the return of the following academic year and was enthusiastically promoted to the position of Vice President of the association until graduation from the university. Presently is a camp counselor.

Key Contributions:

♦ Help students organize and edit their writing assignments.
♦ Conduct one-on-one tutoring in English composition.
♦ Promote awareness of Gay and Lesbian issues at large by supporting the development of all students.
♦ Provide support to the students and staff of the Gay and Lesbian Student Association and promote the mission of the association.
♦ Responsible for being an active part of all camp activities: canoeing excursion, a state-of-the-art challenge course, basketball, tennis, beach volleyball, campfires, hiking trails, social activities, and overall camp experience.
♦ Provide leadership and support to follow counselors.
APPENDIX E

Christopher Schulze
1948 Geary Blvd, No. 4|San Francisco, CA 91436
Home Phone 415-327-0394|E-mail: C.Schulze@gte.net

Certified Elementary School Teacher

Certified elementary teacher with a passion for education and is eager to start a full-time teaching career. Strong interpersonal skills to build strong bond with students, parents, and faculty in hope to inspire quality education; deeply committed to learning, teaching, and the success of the students.

EDUCATION AND CREDENTIALS

- Bachelor of Arts in Education, 2009
  University of California, San Francisco
- Graduated with a GPA of 2.8
- Multiple Subjects Teaching Credential, 2010

CORE COMPETENCIES

- Creative Lesson Planning
- Mentoring & Motivating
- Textbook Review & Selection
- Parental Communication & Involvement
- Hands-on Instruction
- Curriculum Development
- Instructional Best Practices
- Classroom Management & Discipline
- Cultural Sensitivity
- Student Assessment

HONOR ACTIVITIES & EXPERIENCE

- Camp Counselor (July 2009 – Present)
- Vice-President of the Gay & Lesbian Student Association (Sept. 2008 – June 2009)
- Peer Tutor (March 2007 – December 2007)

Was hired as a part-time peer tutor to assist students with their writing assignments in all academic subject areas; left peer tutoring position (on excellent terms) at the end of the 2007 academic year. Joined the Gay and Lesbian Student Association on campus at the return of the following academic year and was enthusiastically promoted to the position of Vice President of the association until graduation from the university. Presently is a camp counselor.

Key Contributions:

- Help students organize and edit their writing assignments.
- Conduct one-on-one tutoring in English composition.
- Promote awareness of Gay and Lesbian issues at large by supporting the development of all students.
- Provide support to the students and staff of the Gay and Lesbian Student Association and promote the mission of the association.
- Responsible for being an active part of all camp activities: canoeing excursion, a state-of-the-art challenge course, basketball, tennis, beach volleyball, campfires, hiking trails, social activities, and overall camp experience.
- Provide leadership and support to fellow counselors.
APPENDIX F

Condition Male/Straight-Implied/High GPA 3.7

Christopher Schulze
1948 Geary Blvd, No. 4|San Francisco, CA 91436
Home Phone 415-327-0394|E-mail: C.Schulze@gte.net

Certified Elementary School Teacher

Certified elementary teacher with a passion for education and is eager to start a full-time teaching career. Strong interpersonal skills to build strong bond with students, parents, and faculty in hope to inspire quality education; deeply committed to learning, teaching, and the success of the students.

EDUCATION AND CREDENTIALS

♦ Bachelor of Arts in Education, 2009
  University of California, San Francisco
♦ Graduated with a GPA of 3.7, Dean’s Academic Honors Award
♦ Multiple Subjects Teaching Credential, 2010

CORE COMPETENCIES

♦ Creative Lesson Planning
♦ Mentoring & Motivating
♦ Textbook Review & Selection
♦ Parental Communication & Involvement
♦ Hands-on Instruction
♦ Curriculum Development
♦ Instructional Best Practices
♦ Classroom Management & Discipline
♦ Cultural Sensitivity
♦ Student Assessment

HONOR ACTIVITIES & EXPERIENCE

♦ Camp Counselor (July 2009 – Present)
♦ Vice-President of the Student Red Cross Association (Sept. 2008 – June 2009)
♦ Peer Tutor (March 2007 – December 2007)

Was hired as a part-time peer tutor to assist students with their writing assignments in all academic subject areas; left peer tutoring position (on excellent terms) at the end of the 2007 academic year. Joined the Student Red Cross Association on campus at the return of the following academic year and was enthusiastically promoted to the position of Vice President of the association until graduation from the university. Presently is a camp counselor.

Key Contributions:

♦ Help students organize and edit their writing assignments.
♦ Conduct one-on-one tutoring in English composition.
♦ Promote awareness of Gay and Lesbian issues at large by supporting the development of all students.
♦ Provide support to the students and staff of the Gay and Lesbian Student Association and promote the mission of the association.
♦ Responsible for being an active part of all camp activities: canoeing excursion, a state-of-the-art challenge course, basketball, tennis, beach volleyball, campfires, hiking trails, social activities, and overall camp experience.
♦ Provide leadership and support to fellow counselors.
APPENDIX G

Condition Male/Straight-Implied/Average GPA 2.8

Christopher Schulze
1948 Geary Blvd, No. 4|San Francisco, CA 91436
Home Phone 415-327-0394|E-mail: C.Schulze@gte.net

Certified Elementary School Teacher

Certified elementary teacher with a passion for education and is eager to start a full-time teaching career. Strong interpersonal skills to build strong bond with students, parents, and faculty in hope to inspire quality education; deeply committed to learning, teaching, and the success of the students.

EDUCATION AND CREDENTIALS

- Bachelor of Arts in Education, 2009
  University of California, San Francisco
- Graduated with a GPA of 2.8
- Multiple Subjects Teaching Credential, 2010

CORE COMPETENCIES

- Creative Lesson Planning
- Mentoring & Motivating
- Textbook Review & Selection
- Parental Communication & Involvement
- Hands-on Instruction
- Curriculum Development
- Instructional Best Practices
- Classroom Management & Discipline
- Cultural Sensitivity
- Student Assessment

HONOR ACTIVITIES & EXPERIENCE

- Camp Counselor (July 2009 – Present)
- Vice-President of the Student Red Cross Association (Sept. 2008 – June 2009)
- Peer Tutor (March 2007 – December 2007)

Was hired as a part-time peer tutor to assist students with their writing assignments in all academic subject areas; left peer tutoring position (on excellent terms) at the end of the 2007 academic year. Joined the Student Red Cross Association on campus at the return of the following academic year and was enthusiastically promoted to the position of Vice President of the association until graduation from the university. Presently is a camp counselor.

Key Contributions:

- Help students organize and edit their writing assignments.
- Conduct one-on-one tutoring in English composition.
- Promote awareness of Gay and Lesbian issues at large by supporting the development of all students.
- Provide support to the students and staff of the Gay and Lesbian Student Association and promote the mission of the association.
- Responsible for being an active part of all camp activities: canoeing excursion, a state-of-the-art challenge course, basketball, tennis, beach volleyball, campfires, hiking trails, social activities, and overall camp experience.
- Provide leadership and support to fellow counselors.
APPENDIX H

Condition Female/Lesbian-Implied/High GPA 3.7

Christine Schulze
1948 Geary Blvd, No. 4|San Francisco, CA 91436
Home Phone 415-327-0394|E-mail: C.Schulze@gte.net

Certified Elementary School Teacher

Certified elementary teacher with a passion for education and is eager to start a full-time teaching career. Strong interpersonal skills to build strong bond with students, parents, and faculty in hope to inspire quality education; deeply committed to learning, teaching, and the success of the students.

EDUCATION AND CREDENTIALS

♦ Bachelor of Arts in Education, 2009
  University of California, San Francisco
♦ Graduated with a GPA of 3.7, Dean’s Academic Honors Award
♦ Multiple Subjects Teaching Credential, 2010

CORE COMPETENCIES

♦ Creative Lesson Planning
♦ Mentoring & Motivating
♦ Textbook Review & Selection
♦ Parental Communication & Involvement
♦ Hands-on Instruction
♦ Curriculum Development
♦ Instructional Best Practices
♦ Classroom Management & Discipline
♦ Cultural Sensitivity
♦ Student Assessment

HONOR ACTIVITIES & EXPERIENCE

♦ Camp Counselor (July 2009 – Present)
♦ Vice-President of the Gay & Lesbian Student Association (Sept. 2008 – June 2009)
♦ Peer Tutor (March 2007 – December 2007)

Was hired as a part-time peer tutor to assist students with their writing assignments in all academic subject areas; left peer tutoring position (on excellent terms) at the end of the 2007 academic year. Joined the Gay and Lesbian Student Association on campus at the return of the following academic year and was enthusiastically promoted to the position of Vice President of the association until graduation from the university. Presently is a camp counselor.

Key Contributions:

♦ Help students organize and edit their writing assignments.
♦ Conduct one-on-one tutoring in English composition.
♦ Promote awareness of Gay and Lesbian issues at large by supporting the development of all students.
♦ Provide support to the students and staff of the Gay and Lesbian Student Association and promote the mission of the association.
♦ Responsible for being an active part of all camp activities: canoeing excursion, a state-of-the-art challenge course, basketball, tennis, beach volleyball, campfires, hiking trails, social activities, and overall camp experience.
♦ Provide leadership and support to fellow counselors.
APPENDIX I

Condition Female/Lesbian-Implied/Average GPA 2.8

Christine Schulze
1948 Geary Blvd, No. 4 | San Francisco, CA 91436
Home Phone 415-327-0394 | E-mail: C.Schulze@gte.net

Certified Elementary School Teacher
Certified elementary teacher with a passion for education and is eager to start a full-time teaching career. Strong interpersonal skills to build strong bond with students, parents, and faculty in hope to inspire quality education; deeply committed to learning, teaching, and the success of the students.

EDUCATION AND CREDENTIALS
♦ Bachelor of Arts in Education, 2009
  University of California, San Francisco
♦ Graduated with a GPA of 2.8
♦ Multiple Subjects Teaching Credential, 2010

CORE COMPETENCIES
♦ Creative Lesson Planning
♦ Mentoring & Motivating
♦ Textbook Review & Selection
♦ Parental Communication & Involvement
♦ Hands-on Instruction
♦ Curriculum Development
♦ Instructional Best Practices
♦ Classroom Management & Discipline
♦ Cultural Sensitivity
♦ Student Assessment

HONOR ACTIVITIES & EXPERIENCE
♦ Camp Counselor (July 2009 – Present)
♦ Vice-President of the Gay & Lesbian Student Association (Sept. 2008 – June 2009)
♦ Peer Tutor (March 2007 – December 2007)

Was hired as a part-time peer tutor to assist students with their writing assignments in all academic subject areas; left peer tutoring position (on excellent terms) at the end of the 2007 academic year. Joined the Gay and Lesbian Student Association on campus at the return of the following academic year and was enthusiastically promoted to the position of Vice President of the association until graduation from the university. Presently is a camp counselor.

Key Contributions:
♦ Help students organize and edit their writing assignments.
♦ Conduct one-on-one tutoring in English composition.
♦ Promote awareness of Gay and Lesbian issues at large by supporting the development of all students.
♦ Provide support to the students and staff of the Gay and Lesbian Student Association and promote the mission of the association.
♦ Responsible for being an active part of all camp activities: canoeing excursion, a state-of-the-art challenge course, basketball, tennis, beach volleyball, campfires, hiking trails, social activities, and overall camp experience.
♦ Provide leadership and support to fellow counselors.
APPENDIX J

Condition Female/Straight-Implied/High GPA 3.7

Christine Schulze
1948 Geary Blvd, No. 4|San Francisco, CA 91436
Home Phone 415-327-0394|E-mail: C.Schulze@gte.net

Certified Elementary School Teacher
Certified elementary teacher with a passion for education and is eager to start a full-time teaching career. Strong interpersonal skills to build strong bond with students, parents, and faculty in hope to inspire quality education; deeply committed to learning, teaching, and the success of the students.

EDUCATION AND CREDENTIALS
♦ Bachelor of Arts in Education, 2009
  University of California, San Francisco
♦ Graduated with a GPA of 3.7, Dean’s Academic Honors Award
♦ Multiple Subjects Teaching Credential, 2010

CORE COMPETENCIES
♦ Creative Lesson Planning
♦ Mentoring & Motivating
♦ Textbook Review & Selection
♦ Parental Communication & Involvement
♦ Hands-on Instruction
♦ Curriculum Development
♦ Instructional Best Practices
♦ Classroom Management & Discipline
♦ Cultural Sensitivity
♦ Student Assessment

HONOR ACTIVITIES & EXPERIENCE
♦ Camp Counselor (July 2009 – Present)
♦ Vice-President of the Student Red Cross Association (Sept. 2008 – June 2009)
♦ Peer Tutor (March 2007 – December 2007)

Was hired as a part-time peer tutor to assist students with their writing assignments in all academic subject areas; left peer tutoring position (on excellent terms) at the end of the 2007 academic year. Joined the Student Red Cross Association on campus at the return of the following academic year and was enthusiastically promoted to the position of Vice President of the association until graduation from the university. Presently is a camp counselor.

Key Contributions:
♦ Help students organize and edit their writing assignments.
♦ Conduct one-on-one tutoring in English composition.
♦ Promote awareness of Gay and Lesbian issues at large by supporting the development of all students.
♦ Provide support to the students and staff of the Gay and Lesbian Student Association and promote the mission of the association.
♦ Responsible for being an active part of all camp activities: canoeing excursion, a state-of-the-art challenge course, basketball, tennis, beach volleyball, campfires, hiking trails, social activities, and overall camp experience.
♦ Provide leadership and support to fellow counselors.
Certified Elementary School Teacher

Certified elementary teacher with a passion for education and is eager to start a full-time teaching career. Strong interpersonal skills to build strong bond with students, parents, and faculty in hope to inspire quality education; deeply committed to learning, teaching, and the success of the students.

EDUCATION AND CREDENTIALS

♦ Bachelor of Arts in Education, 2009
  University of California, San Francisco
♦ Graduated with a GPA of 2.8
♦ Multiple Subjects Teaching Credential, 2010

CORE COMPETENCIES

♦ Creative Lesson Planning
♦ Mentoring & Motivating
♦ Textbook Review & Selection
♦ Parental Communication & Involvement
♦ Hands-on Instruction
♦ Curriculum Development
♦ Instructional Best Practices
♦ Classroom Management & Discipline
♦ Cultural Sensitivity
♦ Student Assessment

HONOR ACTIVITIES & EXPERIENCE

♦ Camp Counselor (July 2009 – Present)
♦ Vice-President of the Student Red Cross Association (Sept. 2008 – June 2009)
♦ Peer Tutor (March 2007 – December 2007)

Was hired as a part-time peer tutor to assist students with their writing assignments in all academic subject areas; left peer tutoring position (on excellent terms) at the end of the 2007 academic year. Joined the Student Red Cross Association on campus at the return of the following academic year and was enthusiastically promoted to the position of Vice President of the association until graduation from the university. Presently is a camp counselor.

Key Contributions:

♦ Help students organize and edit their writing assignments.
♦ Conduct one-on-one tutoring in English composition.
♦ Promote awareness of Gay and Lesbian issues at large by supporting the development of all students.
♦ Provide support to the students and staff of the Gay and Lesbian Student Association and promote the mission of the association.
♦ Responsible for being an active part of all camp activities: canoeing excursion, a state-of-the-art challenge course, basketball, tennis, beach volleyball, campfires, hiking trails, social activities, and overall camp experience.
♦ Provide leadership and support to fellow counselors.
APPENDIX L
Judgment Task Survey

Please read the following statements carefully and fill in the blank space with a number from the scale to indicate your response. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions, so please answer openly and honestly. All answers shall be anonymous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. _____I feel this person would make a good candidate for the job in question.
2. _____I do not think this person is sufficiently qualified for the job.
3. _____I would give this person serious consideration for the job in question.
4. _____I would feel uncomfortable if this person was hired for this job.
5. _____I would guess that this person is in the top 20% of people interviewed.
6. _____I do not feel this person has the necessary qualifications to be successful at the job in question.
7. _____I feel favorably toward this person.
8. _____I would guess that most other applicants would be better suited for this job.
9. _____This person has excellent qualifications for the job.
10. _____I would not hire this person for the job.
11. _____This person should have no problems competing for the job or a similar job.
12. _____I would hire this person for the job.
APPENDIX M

Personal Attributes Questionnaire

Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think the applicant is. Each item consists of a PAIR of characteristics, with the numbers 1 to 7 in between.

Each pair describes contradictory characteristics - that is, the applicant cannot be both at the same time, such as very artistic and not at all artistic.

The letters form a scale between the two extremes. You are to choose a number which describes where you think the APPLICANT fall on the scale. For example, if you think that the applicant is not independent, you would choose 1. If you think that the applicant is very independent, you might choose 7. If only medium, you might choose 3 or 4, and so forth.

1. Not at all independent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very independent
2. Not at all emotional 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very emotional
3. Very passive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very active
4. Very rough 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very gentle
5. Not at all helpful to others 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very helpful to others
6. Not at all competitive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very competitive
7. Not at all kind 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very kind
8. Not at all aware of feelings of others 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very aware of feelings of others
9. Can make decisions easily 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Has difficulty making decisions
10. Gives up very easily 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Never gives up easily
11. Not at all self-confident 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very self-confident
12. Feels very inferior 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Feels very superior
13. Not at all understanding of others 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very understanding of others
14. Very cold in relations with others 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very warm in relations with others
15. Goes to pieces under pressure 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Stands up well under pressure
16. Able to devote self completely to others 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all able to devote self completely to others
APPENDIX N

Modern Homonegative Scale

Please read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by choosing a number from the scale below and write the number in the blank space.

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Don’t know
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree

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

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

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

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

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


7. Gay men and lesbians should stop shoving their lifestyle down other people’s throats.

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

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

10. Gay men and lesbians should stop complaining about the way they are treated and simply get on with their lives.

11. In today’s tough economic times, Americans’ tax dollars shouldn’t be used to support gay men and lesbians’ organizations.

12. Gay men and lesbians have become far too confrontational in their demand for equal rights.
APPENDIX O

Fear of Negative Evaluation Brief Version

Please read each of the following statements carefully and indicate how characteristic it is of you according to the following scale:

1 = Not at all characteristic of me
2 = Slightly characteristic of me
3 = Moderately characteristic of me
4 = Very characteristic of me
5 = Extremely characteristic of me

1. I worry about what other people will think of me even when I know it doesn't make any difference.
2. I am unconcerned even if I know people are forming an unfavorable impression of me.
3. I am frequently afraid of other people noticing my shortcomings.
4. I rarely worry about what kind of impression I am making on someone.
5. I am afraid others will not approve of me.
6. I am afraid that people will find fault with me.
7. Other people's opinions of me do not bother me.
8. When I am talking to someone, I worry about what they may be thinking about me.
9. I am usually worried about what kind of impression I make.
10. If I know someone is judging me, it has little effect on me.
11. Sometimes I think I am too concerned with what other people think of me.
12. I often worry that I will say or do the wrong things.
APPENDIX P

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

Below is a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the following scale. Please write the number in the blank space.

0 = Disagree strongly
1 = Disagree somewhat
2 = Disagree slightly
3 = Agree slightly
4 = Agree somewhat
5 = Agree strongly

_____ 1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.
_____ 2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for “equality.”
_____ 3. In a disaster, women should not necessarily be rescued before men.
_____ 4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.
_____ 5. Women are too easily offended.
_____ 6. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.
_____ 7. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.
_____ 8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.
_____ 9. Women should be cherished and protected by men.
_____ 10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.
_____ 11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.
_____ 12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.
_____ 13. Men are complete without women.
_____ 14. Women exaggerate the problems they have at work.
_____ 15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.
_____ 16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.
_____ 17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.
_____ 18. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.
_____ 19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.
_____ 20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.
_____ 21. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.
_____ 22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.
APPENDIX Q

Marlow-Crowne Social Desirability Short Form

Please read and respond to each statement below and answer as either True (T) or False (F) about your own behavior, feelings, or attitude.

T = true/ F = false

1. _______ It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
2. _______ I sometimes feel resentful when I don’t get my way.
3. _______ On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
4. _______ There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
5. _______ No matter who I’m talking to, I’m always a good listener.
6. _______ There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
7. _______ I’m always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
8. _______ I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
9. _______ I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
10. ______ I have never been irked when people expressed ideas every different from my own.
11. ______ There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortunes of others.
12. ______ I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
13. ______ I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone’s feelings.
APPENDIX R

Internal and External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Scale

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the following scale. Please write the number in the blank space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. ______Because of today’s politically correct standards I try to appear non-prejudiced towards gay and lesbian people.
2. ______I attempt to act in non-prejudiced ways toward gay and lesbian people because it is personally important to me.
3. ______According to my personal values, using stereotypes about gay and lesbian people is OK.
4. ______I try to hide any negative thoughts about gay and lesbian people in order to avoid negative reactions from others.
5. ______If I acted prejudiced toward gay and lesbian people, I would be concerned that others would be angry with me.
6. ______I am personally motivated by my beliefs to be non-prejudiced toward gay and lesbian people.
7. ______Because of my personal values, I believe that using stereotypes about gay and lesbian people is wrong.
8. ______I attempt to appear non-prejudiced toward gay and lesbian people in order to avoid disapproval from other people.
9. ______I try to act non-prejudiced toward gay and lesbian people because of pressure from others.
10. ______Being non-prejudiced toward gay and lesbian people is important to my self-concept.
APPENDIX S

Demographic Information

Demographic Questions (Please give only ONE answer to one question)

1. What is your sex?  1. □ Male  2. □ Female

2. What is your age? ________ 3. What is your major? __________________________

4. How many years have you been attending college? ________________

5. What is your racial/ethnic identity?
   □ 1 = American Indian/Alaska Native  □ 5 = Hispanic/Latino
   □ 2 = Black/African American  □ 6 = Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
   □ 3 = White/Caucasian  □ 7 = Middle Eastern
   □ 4 = Asian/Asian American  □ 8 = Other:_____________________

6. What is your religious preference?
   □ 1 = Christian/Protestant  □ 5 = Catholic
   □ 2 = Jewish  □ 6 = Muslim/Islam
   □ 3 = Buddhist  □ 7 = Mormon
   □ 4 = Atheist/Agnostic  □ 8 = Other:_____________________

7. How often do you attend religious services?
   □ 1 = More than once a week  □ 4 = Occasionally
   □ 2 = Once a week  □ 5 = Never
   □ 3 = Once a month

8. How religious do you consider yourself to be?
   □ 1 = Not at all religious  □ 3 = Slightly religious
   □ 2 = Somewhat religious  □ 4 = Very religious
9. How would you describe your sexual orientation?
   □ 1 = Completely Heterosexual  □ 4 = Primarily Homosexual
   □ 2 = Primarily Heterosexual    □ 5 = Completely Homosexual
   □ 3 = Bisexual                  □ 6 = Questioning/Don’t Know

10. What do you feel is the main etiology (cause) for homosexuality?
    □ 1 = Chosen lifestyle          □ 4 = Negative heterosexual experience
    □ 2 = Sexually abused as a child □ 5 = Parental upbringing
    □ 3 = Heredity/Biological/Hormone imbalance

11. How would you describe your political orientation?
    □ 1 = Very Liberal              □ 4 = Conservative
    □ 2 = Liberal                   □ 5 = Very Conservative
    □ 3 = Moderate
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