

1-1-2010

# Predictors of Attitudes toward Lesbians and Transgender Women in Relationships on a College Campus

Alishia Anne Wrubleski  
*Bucknell University*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/honors\\_theses](http://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/honors_theses)

---

## Recommended Citation

Wrubleski, Alishia Anne, "Predictors of Attitudes toward Lesbians and Transgender Women in Relationships on a College Campus" (2010). *Honor's Theses*. Paper 54.

This Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses at Bucknell Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honor's Theses by an authorized administrator of Bucknell Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [dcadmin@bucknell.edu](mailto:dcadmin@bucknell.edu).

PREDICTORS OF ATTITUDES TOWARD LESBIANS AND  
TRANSGENDER WOMEN IN RELATIONSHIPS ON A COLLEGE CAMPUS

by

Alishia A. M. Wrubleski

A Thesis Submitted to the Honors Council  
For Honors in Psychology at Bucknell University

May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010

Approved:

---

Dr. William F. Flack, Jr.  
Thesis Advisor

---

Dr. T. Joel Wade  
Department of Psychology Chairperson

### Acknowledgements

I would like to extend a great deal of gratitude to Professor Flack, who has been an extraordinary guide, advisor and mentor throughout our work on this Honors Thesis Project. He has been an inspirational figure in my academic career, not only because of his dedication to this year-long endeavor, but also as a result of the depth with which I experienced the material in his advanced Psychology course, as well as the time he volunteered to help me through the process of applying to graduate programs. I would also like to thank Professor Dean for his early interest in this study as well as the attention to detail and loveable humor that he put into the formation of my final copy. I am also grateful for the integral contributions of Professor Jablonski, as my third committee member, and Mike Weaver, for his work in the survey building, publishing and data collection components of this study. Lastly, I would like to thank Susan Collins and Dr. Mindi Raggi for their intellectual contributions as well as the all of the people behind the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation and the Bucknell Community College Scholars Program, without whom, my presence at this remarkable institution would not be possible.

Table of Contents

1. Abstract.....	Page 4
2. Introduction.....	Page 5
3. Literature Review.....	Page 6
4. Method.....	Page 12
5. Results.....	Page 19
6. Discussion.....	Page 22
7. References.....	Page 28
8. Table 1.....	Page 32
9. Table 2.....	Page 33
10. Table 3.....	Page 34
11. Appendix A.....	Page 35
12. Appendix B.....	Page 36
13. Appendix C.....	Page 38

### Abstract

The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of the attitudes which perpetuate intolerance toward LGBT individuals, and to recognize, in particular, the unique attitudes transpeople face as a minority in the nation and even in the LGBT community. This research contributes to the bodies of research concerning the interrelatedness of intrinsic religiosity, political conservatism, sexism, the rape myth, lack of effective legal protection, and the intolerance of gender non-conformists. I have identified distinctions between attitudes on the part of both women and men, as well as toward different gender non-conformists. I have also taken research as a whole further by assessing the predictors of attitudes toward specific members of the LGBT community in public relationships. The implications of these findings are potentially as far reaching as to have an impact on policies effecting healthcare, education, anti-discrimination and employer rights legislation, on both local and national levels.

## Introduction

The 2001 film, *Southern Comfort* documents the story of a man, named Robert Eads, who died of ovarian cancer. Eads explained how many of the two dozen plus doctors with which he consulted were willing to go forward with his cancer treatment despite the fact that he did not have health insurance. However, once he explained which type of cancer he had, Eads was immediately identified as a transperson and denied treatment for a variety of reasons. Some doctors told him that his cancer treatment would make the other patients uncomfortable, others told him that they, themselves, would be uncomfortable about treating him, and a few simply stated that Eads would not be treated because the staff did not agree with what he was. Eads did not receive treatment until 1997 and died in 1999 at the age of 53.

*Southern Comfort* attempted to shed light on just a few of the many unique dilemmas that people face as members of the trans-community. Out of intellectual curiosity, I began to further research these issues in my subsequent college courses and collaborated my findings with ideas from a variety of individuals and group-activists in the LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bi, Transgender<sup>1</sup>) community. As a result of this exploration, I became interested in the political significance of the unique dilemmas that transpeople face as part of the LGBT community and the modern paradox of the philosophical standpoint with which similar issues are currently being dealt.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purpose of this study we used the definitions of “transgender” provided by the National Center for Transgender Equality: “Transgender: An umbrella term for people whose gender identity, expression or behavior is different from those typically associated with their assigned sex at birth, including but not limited to transsexuals, cross-dressers, androgynous people, genderqueers, and gender non-conforming people”

## Literature Review

### *Past Research on Intolerance Attitudes and Attitudes toward LGBT individuals*

The tolerance of difference and diversity among minority groups in the United States, in general, has become popularized to the extent that public displays of intolerance are one of the few forms of expression that pro-tolerance advocates deem absolutely intolerable. The paradox of this current movement is described by philosopher of science, Karl Popper; “Unlimited tolerance must lead to the disappearance of tolerance. If we extend unlimited tolerance even to those who are intolerant, if we are not prepared to defend a tolerant society against the onslaught of the intolerant, then the tolerant will be destroyed, and tolerance with them”. Truly, a philosophical standpoint from which intolerant attitudes are deemed intolerable essentially contradicts itself. Nevertheless, the way Americans conceive of tolerance has been altered by this modern philosophy, termed “moral relativism” (Daniels, 2002). Furthermore, despite the controversial implications of moral relativism in relation to minority populations such as the LGBT community, (Morrison & Morrison, 2002; Horn, Szalacha & Drill, 2008; Lind, 2004; Ohlander et al., 2005; Eckes & McCarthy, 2008; Daniels, 2002), the movement has inspired a plethora of constructive research.

Current studies show a trend of expressed tolerance toward LGBT people (Morrison & Morrison, 2002; Hill, 2005; Antoszewski et al., 2007) among youth in the United States, as well as young adults; a group that expresses more tolerance with the number of years dedicated to post-secondary education (Pearl & Galupo, 2007; Ohlander et al., 2005). However, as gender non-conformists have become more publicly open about their sexuality, attitudes have become increasingly complex (Pearl & Galupo, 2007) and research geared toward attitudes concerning ‘out’

individuals, as opposed to those who pass as gender normative, is lacking (Hill, 2005). Various researchers suggest that new research must focus not only on evaluating modern social attitudes toward LGBT individuals (Morrison & Morrison, 2005) in the context of sexually open individuals (Pearl & Galupo, 2007) but also on evaluating the wide range of influences from which attitudes concerning gender non-conformists are formed (Aosved & Long, 2006).

Subsequent to a series of studies on a variety of social attitudes, researchers have proposed that intolerant views are essentially interrelated (Aosved & Long 2006; Parrott & Gallagher 2008). Although sexism, racism, homophobia, classism, ageism, religious intolerance, and acceptance of the rape myth<sup>2</sup> may seem like loosely related attitudes, Aosved and Long found that they are all co-occurring systems of belief. According to the authors, results such as these suggest that intolerant attitudes are not distinct elements of any given individual's repertoire attitudes but rather part of an overarching outlook that is intolerant. The indications of this research are summarized in the Integrated Model of Behaviors, also summarized in the article by Aosved and Long, which implies that in order to understand an individual's behavior one must consider that individual in the context of both their personal and social life experiences. The former, known as the microsystem, pertains to the influence of an individual's specific life experiences and the latter, known as the exosystem, pertains to the influence of the greater social system in which an individual resides. The microsystem refers primarily to intolerant attitudes on an individual level while the exosystem pertains to the society as a whole and the laws by which it is governed.

The Social Cognitive Domain Theory (Heinze & Horn, 2009) also contains multiple domains of knowledge, including moral, conventional and personal domains, from which social reasoning is formed. Theories such as the Integrated Model of Behavior and Social Cognitive Domain Theory

---

<sup>2</sup> The Rape Myth refers to be belief that both female and male victims of rape are to blame for having been raped in situations where believer expects that the individual should have been able to avoid or escape it (Aosved & Long, 2006).

point to the breadth and complexity of attitude formation in both social and individual contexts and provide insight as to why, when questioned, some study participants are unable to ascertain where their own attitudes come from (Stotzer, 2009). Abundant empirical research has assessed attitudes toward LGBT people in the context of the social pressure for the general expression of tolerance, as well as attitudes toward LGBT people in the context of sexism, conservative orientation, and the law.

*Attitudes toward LGBT individuals and current social demands*

Contrary to norms in past decades, the outward expression of tolerance has become the current norm among youth and young adults in the United States. In fact, recent studies suggest that openly derogatory attitudes toward sexual orientation minorities are often automatically rejected among the general population of college-aged students (Morrison & Morrison, 2002). Traditional forms of prejudice have become ‘old-fashioned’ and these authors affirm that, in many cases, the attitudes of youth and young adults toward LGBT people have shifted from having foundations in religion to morally abstract, less direct, and socially-oriented concerns. This social adaptation has thus made it essential for researchers to develop new ways of measuring intolerant attitudes. Such changes have led to the development of scales such as the “*Short Internalized Homonegativity Scale*” (Currie et al., 2004) and the “*Genderism and Transphobia Scale*” (Hill et al., 2005). Both of these scales were used in the present study so that modern attitudes toward LGBT people could be assessed among college students.

*Intolerance toward LGBT individuals and sexism*

Adherence to traditional gender role beliefs is positively associated with sexual prejudice (Parrott & Gallagher, 2008) and, in certain cases, sexual prejudice has predicted amplified levels of anger in response to gender non-conformists (Parrott & Gallagher, 2008). The study by Aosved and

Long supports these findings, suggesting that sexist and homophobic attitudes are essentially interrelated. This considered, the *Ambivalent Sexism Inventory* was employed so that sexism could be assessed as a possible predictor of intolerant attitudes toward LGBT people.

*Intolerance toward LGBT individuals and conservatism*

Even people who are not personally motivated to be intolerant are likely to adopt negatively biased views toward LGBT people simply by living within a gender conservative culture (Adamczyk & Pitt, 2009). As a result, these authors affirm that populations which express intolerance toward gender non-conformists on the basis of a conservative orientation to sexual behavior are likely to include people who do not identify themselves as conservative, yet are still intolerant of non-traditional gender expression. This considered, the *Liberal vs. Conservatism* scale was employed so that conservative orientation to sexual behavior could be assessed as a possible predictor of intolerant attitudes toward LGBT people.

*Intolerance toward LGBT individuals and the law*

Laws concerning LGBT people vary by state in the extent to which they protect sexual orientation minorities from verbal and physical harassment, as well as discrimination, and are often inconsistent within individual states (Eckes & McCarthy, 2008; Grattet & Jenness, 2001). In addition, several states do not even recognize harassment on the basis of sexual orientation as a prosecutable type of harassment (Eckes & McCarthy, 2008; Grattet & Jenness, 2001). Furthermore, laws also vary in terms of the individual members of the LGBT community they specifically protect, such that homosexual individuals are specifically protected more often than bi or transgender individuals (Eckes & McCarthy, 2008). This state-level legal framework puts many LGBT people, especially those who are openly gender non-conformists, in a delicate position for finding and maintaining a job, an education, healthcare and legal protection, among other concerns.

At the present, there are no federal civil rights laws that protect LGBT people who have been harassed on the job, or dismissed from their job on account of their sexual orientation (Eckes & McCarthy, 2008), which was the motivation behind the current movement to pass ENDA, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (Ireland, 2007). Although LGBT rights activists have been pushing for the passage of numerous protection laws concerning healthcare, government contractors, documents and records, privacy, education, and youth homelessness (Keisling, 2009), the ENDA legislation has raised particular a dilemma among sexual orientation minorities (Ireland, 2007): These activists are being offered the opportunity to have ENDA passed under the condition that trans individuals are not included under the protection laws of this bill, however, the nature of the decision the LGBT civil rights activists are faced with is as complex as the nature of the diverse group of people it involves. Although LGBT people are commonly referred to as a ‘community’, they are more accurately characterized as a group that is separated by silos of distinct types of people, and the distinct conditions that each type of person is met with.

The protection laws for LGBT people which exist in the United States as well as the areas in which protection laws are lacking, are examples of how individual groups of people within the LGBT community, especially homosexual and transgender groups, are treated quite differently.

### *The Present Study*

No current research has examined the difference in attitudes toward lesbians and transgender women in relationships on a college campus, and the purpose of the present study was to assess predictors of attitudes toward specific members of the LGBT community. Since homosexuals are generally met with a lesser degree of homophobia than transpersons are met with transphobia (Nagoshi, et al., 2008), and female homosexuals are met with a moderately lesser degree of homophobia than male homosexuals (Herek, 1988), the authors of this study chose to assess attitudes

toward lesbians and transgender women in relationships, specifically. In order to finalize this decision we also consulted a number of scholars, students and members of the LGBT community, the vast majority of whom confirmed the above findings. Finally, we elected to use transgender women in this study as opposed to transgender men for the purpose of maintaining gender consistency among person types.

A survey was designed to measure attitudes toward homosexual and transgender people, as well as traits that could potentially predict the expressed attitudes toward each type of person. Scenarios, in which participants were hypothetically confronted with either lesbians or a transgender woman in relationships, were designed to assess attitudes in the form of common empirically used descriptors of tolerance, comfort and approval, toward these different types of people. In light of the increasingly complex nature of attitudes toward LGBT people in public relationships (Pearl & Galupo, 2007), the individuals were either described as “sitting across from each other” or “holding hands” in each scenario to include both neutral and intimate public displays.

### *Hypotheses*

1. Scores from both the *Short Internalized Homonegativity Scale* and scenarios of lesbians in a public relationship, as well as scores from both the *Genderism and Transphobia Scale* and scenarios of transwomen in a relationship will indicate attitudes toward gender non-conformists that are more comfortable than not comfortable and more approving than disapproving.
2. Scores from both the *Short Internalized Homonegativity Scale* and scenarios of lesbians in a relationship, as well as scores from both the *Genderism and Transphobia Scale* and scenarios

of transwomen in relationships will indicate that women, relative to men, are significantly more comfortable and approving of gender non-conformists.

3. The combined scores for comfort/approval from the scenarios of lesbians in a relationship will differ significantly from the combined scores for comfort/approval from the scenarios of transwomen in a relationship.

## Method

### *Participants*

Participants were 192 Bucknell University students of at least 18 years of age and currently living on campus with a mean age of 19.8 and a standard deviation of 1.3. Of these, 85 (44.3%) were male and 107(55.7) were female, while 63 (32.8%) were freshman, 50 (26.0%) were sophomores, 30 (15.6%) were juniors, and 49 (25.5%) were seniors. Additionally, 69 (35.9%) students were social sorority or fraternity members, and 48 (25.0%) were part of a varsity athletic team. The distribution of religious orientation was such that 121 (60%) were Christian, 53 (27.6%) were Jewish and 16 (8.3%) were Muslim. Also, 179 (93.2%) of the students identified themselves as straight while 8 (4.2%) identified themselves as bisexual, 2 (1%) as gay, 2 (1%) as lesbian, and 1 (0.5%) as other. Finally 9.0% of students claimed to have a combined parental income of less than \$50,000, 31.7% between \$50,000-100,000, 20.1% between \$100,000-150,000, 11.1 between \$150,000-200,000, 9.5% between \$200,000-250,000, and 18.5% above \$250,000. These demographics approximate the campus demographics as a whole and are roughly in line with the results from recent studies conducted on campus.

### *Procedure*

The campus registrar randomly selected 900 students who were at least 18 years of age and currently living on campus, then invited those students to participate in our online survey by email (see Appendix A). Each participant was presented with a page of informed consent information titled “Difference and Diversity” (see Appendix B), which described the study as a series of questions about attitudes toward different types of sexual behaviors and notified students that, upon completion of the survey (see Appendix C), they would have the opportunity to submit their email address independently of their responses in order to enter a weekly drawing of 1 of 2 weekly \$50 prizes. This drawing took place over 5 weeks and randomly selected 2 students each week.

### *Measures*

The survey for this study asked participants to respond to a number of different trait scales. These scales consisted of:

*Empathy.* The interpersonal reactivity index (IRI; Davis, 1980) was designed to measure empathy. It is a 28-item scale consisting of statements that inquire about the participants’ thoughts and feelings in relation to their own and other people’s perspectives. The instructions ask that each participant circle the number which indicates how well this statement describes their self (e.g. 0 = not well, 4 = very well). The internal reliabilities of the measure’s subscales range from .70 to .78, and the test-retest reliabilities range from .62 to .81 after an interval of about 2 months (Davis, 1980). Internal consistency in the present sample was .55, and a total of 181 participants completed this scale.

*Orientations toward Sexual Expression.* The short-form liberal vs. conservatism scale (SAS; Hudson et al., 1983) was used to examine the possible influence of attitudes about sexual behavior on the participants’ attitudes toward gender non-conformists. In this study, participants are given a

list of 25 statements concerning sexual expression in the context of areas such as education, media, public and private life, and are asked to place a number next to each statement which indicates whether they 1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – neither agree nor disagree, 4 – agree, or 5 – strongly agree. The scale demonstrated a discriminant validity of  $r = .73$  (Hudson et al., 1983), and internal consistency in the present sample was .93. A total of 178 participants completed this scale.

*Sexism.* The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996) was used in this study to examine the possible influence of hostile vs. benevolent sexist attitudes to the participants' attitudes toward gender non-conformists. It was designed to discriminate sexist attitudes that are demeaning of that sex from attitudes toward that sex that are compassionate. The survey consists of 22 items, 11 of which are considered benevolent (e.g. Women should be cherished and protected by men, Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.), and 11 of which are considered hostile (e.g. Women are too easily offended, Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality"). Reliability analyses of the overall ASI scores, as well as the two subscale components, yield acceptable  $\alpha$  coefficients ranging from .75 to .92. The ASI subscale measures have a reliable Recognition of Discrimination factor of  $\alpha = .77$ . The standard regression coefficients for the combined regression are -.52 for Hostile Sexism and .25 for Benevolent Sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Internal consistency in the present sample was .88. A total of 166 participants completed this scale.

*Narcissism.* The NPI-16 short measure of narcissism scale (NPI-16; Ames, et al., 2006) was used to evaluate the possible influence of self-enhancement in the responses of the participants on their attitudes toward gender non-conformists. The questionnaire consists of 16 pairs of statements which contain one that is consistent with narcissism and one that is not consistent with narcissism.

The participant is asked to indicate which of the two statements best describes their self. The convergent validity for this scale is .90, and the test-re-test reliability is .05 (Ames, et al., 2006). Internal consistency in the present sample was -.08, and a total of 191 participants completed this scale.

*Androgyny.* The Measure of Psychological Androgyny Scale (SBSRI; Bem, 1974) was used to assess the possible influence of gender likeness or differentiation in participants' attitudes on their attitudes toward gender non-conformists. It is an adjective-checklist style questionnaire that asks participants to label individual adjectives as either Female or Male. Of the 40 items, 20 are stereotypically feminine (e.g. Flatterable, Soft-spoken) and 20 are stereotypically masculine (e.g. Dominant, Willing to take risks). Higher scores on the feminine or masculine scales indicate support for the gender stereotypes which describe their self. The test re-test scores from this measure range from .89 to .93 (Bem, 1974), and internal consistency in the present sample was .83. A total of 181 participants completed this scale.

*Conformity.* The Conformity Scale (TCS; Mehrabian & Stefl, 1995) was used to assess the possible influence of the participants' willingness to comply with social pressures on their attitudes toward gender non-conformists. The scale consists of 11 items in which the participants' willingness to sympathize with, give into, and follow others is determined. The scale uses a 9-point Likert-type agreement-disagreement scale to assess the degree to which they agree or disagree with social conformity. This scale demonstrates a satisfactory reliability coefficient of .77 and a test-retest intercorrelation of .73 (Mehrabian & Stefl, 1995). Internal consistency in the present sample was .49 and a total of 180 participants completed this scale.

*Social Desirability:* The Social Desirability Scale (SDS-10; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) was administered to control for socially desirable responses. It consists of a list of 10 statements in which

the participant is instructed to reflect upon their own actions and respond to each statement as either “true” or “false” in relation to their self. This scale has shown acceptable internal consistency and has a high convergent validity with the longer, 33-item version of this measure (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). Internal consistency in the present sample was .55 and a total of 190 subjects completed this scale.

In light of the research on modern attitudes toward gender non-conformists, the following scales were selected:

*Homonegativity.* The Short Internalized Homonegativity Scale (SIHS; Currie et al., 2004) was designed to assess the domain of sexual comfort with gay persons in the context of the current norm for the general expression of tolerance. It is a 13-item scale including statements such as “even if I could change my sexual orientation I wouldn’t”, and “I am comfortable about people finding out that I am gay”, which participants are asked to score on a 7-point Likert-type scale. The  $\alpha$  reported for the original version of this scale was .78 (Currie et al., 2004). The Internal consistency in the present sample was .85, and a total of 152 participants completed this scale.

*Genderism and Transphobia.* The Genderism and Transphobia scale (GTS; Hill et al., 2005) was used to determine levels of intolerance toward transwomen. It was developed to measure antipathy toward the transgender community as a whole in light of the current norm for the general expression of tolerance. The questionnaire contains 32 items relating to violence, harassment and discrimination toward trans individuals such as “feminine men make me feel uncomfortable” and “I would avoid talking to a woman if I knew she had surgically created a penis and testicles”, which participants are asked to rate on a scale from 1 to 7 (1 = *strongly agree*, 7 = *strongly disagree*). The convergent as well as discriminant validities of this scale were both quite good (Hill et al., 2005),

and the internal consistency in the present sample was .96. A total of 156 participants completed this scale.

Finally, in order to better obscure the goal of this research, the short version of the Big Five Personality Scale was administered in the study although it was not used in the final analyses:

*The Very Brief Measure of the Big-Five Personality Domains:* The ten-item personality inventory for the Big Five personality scale (BFPS-TIPI; Gosling et al., 2003) was designed to quickly assess personality and be used among other multi-item instruments. It lists 10 pairs of synonymous personality traits and asks the participant to rate how much each pair relates or does not relate to their self (e.g. 1 – disagree strongly to 7 – agree strongly). The convergent validity of this scale was such that the mean  $r = .77$ , with a discriminant validity of the mean  $r = .20$  (Gosling et al., 2003). Internal consistency in the present sample was .49 and a total of 184 participants completed this scale.

Following these scales, participants were provided definitions for either “lesbian” or “transgender woman” and asked to read and respond to four short scenarios. The scenarios read:

“Imagine you are sitting in the Bison at an hour when not many other students are eating. You are on the ground level behind the registers, but at one of the tables near you, just up the steps, there is a couple eating. They are (lesbians/a visibly transgender female with a male), and are eating while sitting (across from each other/next to each other and holding hands).”

These scenarios varied such that participants were hypothetically encountering lesbians sitting across from each other in the first version, lesbians holding hands in the second, a visibly transgender female with a male sitting across from each other in the third, and a visibly transgender female with a male holding hands in the fourth. In order that the data were not skewed due to responses from participants based on the order of exposure, these scenarios were administered in

four different orders, such that the order of the first was scenario 1, 2, 3, then 4, the order of the second was scenario 2, 3, 4, then 1, the order of the third was scenario 3, 4, 1, then 2, and the order of the last was scenario 4, 1, 2, then 3. After each scenario was presented, the students were asked to indicate on an 11-point Likert-type scale the degree to which they were comfortable/not and approving/not of each situation. In order to control for the effect of participant fatigue, given that the scenarios were being presented last in this survey, the comfort and approval rating scales were reverse scored such that higher numbers on the comfort scale indicated greater levels of comfort while lower numbers on the approval scale indicated greater levels of approval. For the scales in response to the scenarios with lesbians not touching, a total of 185 participants responded to the comfort/not scale, and a total of 186 participants responded to the approval/not scale. For the scales in response to the scenarios with lesbians touching, a total of 182 participants responded to the comfort/not scale, and a total of 183 participants responded to the approval/not scale. For the scales in response to the scenarios with a transgender woman and a male not touching, a total of 183 participants responded to the comfort/not scale, and a total of 183 participants responded to the approval/not scale. For the scales in response to the scenarios with a transgender woman and a male touching, a total of 184 participants responded to the comfort/not scale, and a total of 184 participants responded to the approval/not scale.

### *Analyses Employed*

The Mean and SD of scores of comfort and approval by female and male participants toward lesbians and transgender women in relationships on a college campus were employed in the analysis of the first hypothesis, and a series of t-tests were employed in the analyses of the second hypothesis. An ANOVA test was employed so that the possible difference in attitudes by men and women toward lesbians in relationships as opposed to transgender women in relationships could be assessed

for the third hypothesis, and a Regression analysis was employed so that trait scales could be assessed as possible predictors of attitudes toward the different person types.

## Results

### *Hypotheses Tests*

Because the scales which followed each scenario were originally reverse scored, responses to both the scales for comfort and approval were adjusted for the purpose of analysis such that higher scores indicated higher levels of comfort and approval. The mean scores on the four scenarios indicated that both men and women scored more closely to the comfortable and approving side of the scale than to the uncomfortable and disapproving side, in their responses to both lesbian and transpersons in relationships on a college campus (see Table 1). These results supported our first hypothesis. Multiple *t*-tests also indicated that, in general, there was a significant difference between the mean scores of men and women such that women were more comfortable and approving relative to men (see Table 1). These results supported our second hypothesis. An *F*-test indicated that the overall scores from the two sets of scales were significantly different, such that responses to scales with lesbians indicated higher levels of comfort and approval than responses to scales with transpersons. These results supported our third hypothesis. Additionally, a multiple regression analysis was used with criteria for entry of predictors set at .05 and removal set at .10 for two additional analyses (see Table 2). The first analysis indicated that responses to the scenarios of lesbians in a relationship were largely predicted by the *Liberal vs. Conservatism* and *Genderism and Transphobia* scales, while the *BEM Masculinity* and *Conformity* scales were marginal influences. Similarly, the second analysis indicated that responses to the scenarios of transwomen in a

relationship were largely predicted by the *Liberal vs. Conservatism* and *Genderism and Transphobia* scales, however, the *BEM Masculinity* scale was the only additional marginal influence.

The female portion of the sample expressed higher levels of comfort and approval than discomfort and disapproval in all four scenarios. The male portion of the sample also expressed higher levels of comfort and approval than discomfort and disapproval in all four scenarios. Similarly, all participants expressed higher levels of tolerance than intolerance toward homosexuals and transpeople in their responses to the *Homonegativity* and *Genderism and Transphobia* scales. These findings supported our first hypothesis.

There was a moderately significant effect for gender in which women were more comfortable than men with the scenario of lesbians not touching,  $t(183) = 1.92, p < .05$ , with the scenario of lesbians holding hands,  $t(180) = 1.94, p = .05$ , with the scenario of the transgender female and male not touching  $t(181) = 3.13, p < .05$ , and with the scenario of the transgender female and male holding hands  $t(182) = 2.29, p < .05$ . Likewise, there was also a significant effect for gender in which women were more approving than men with the scenario of lesbians not touching,  $t(184) = 2.30, p < .05$ , with the scenario of lesbians holding hands,  $t(181) = 2.94, p < .05$ , with the scenario of the transgender female and male not touching,  $t(181) = 3.13, p < .05$ , and with the scenario of the transgender female and male holding hands  $t(182) = 2.37, p < .05$ . There also was a moderately significant effect for gender in which women expressed higher levels of tolerance than men in their responses to the *Homonegativity* scale,  $t(150) = 5.31, p < .01$ , and the *Genderism and Transphobia* scale,  $t(154) = 4.91, p < .01$ .

An analysis of variance indicated that the effect of person type was significant,  $F(1, 183) = 19.58, p < .001$ , such that responses to the scenarios with lesbians in relationships,

M=8.87(SD=9.39), were more comfortable and accepting than responses to the scenarios with transwomen in relationships M=11.31(SD=10.13).

Finally, all of the scores for comfort and approval by both men and women in response lesbians in a relationship, and all of the scores for comfort and approval by both men and women in response to the transgender female and male in a relationship were combined separately. Then, a regression analysis was performed for these two groups in relation to each of the earlier trait scales. Results from the first regression analysis indicated that at least 46% of the responses to scenarios of lesbians in a relationship were predicted by certain trait scales (See Table 2). Of the trait scales, the *Liberal vs. Conservatism* and *Genderism and Transphobia* scales were significant predictors, while the *BEM Masculinity* and *Conformity* scales were marginally significant predictors. Results from the second regression analysis indicated that at least 50% of the responses to scenarios of transgender women in a relationship with a male were predicted by certain trait scales (See Table 2). Of the trait scales, the *Liberal vs. Conservatism* and *Genderism and Transphobia* scales were significant predictors, while the *BEM Masculinity* scale was only a marginally significant predictor.

Correlational analyses for social desirable responses were run with the responses to each trait scale and scenario scale (see Table 3). The results indicated that, of the 17 scales, 2 were statistically correlated with the *Social Desirability Scale*. These scales were both scales for the comfort/not with the scenario of a transgender woman in a non-touching and with the scenario of a transgender woman in a touching relationship.

## Discussion

### *Results of Hypothesis Testing*

As people have evolved to expect the outward expression of tolerance toward LGBT individuals (Morrison & Morrison, 2002; Hill, 2005; Antoszewski et al., 2007), attitude expression toward these individuals has adapted accordingly, and attitude measures sensitive to these changes have been developed (Morrison & Morrison, 2002; Currie, et al., 2004;). Additional consideration has also been given to behavioral changes of the LGBT community such as, but not limited to, the increased openness of sexuality (Pearl & Galupo, 2007) and political pressure of their civil rights movement (Ireland, 2007). The study at hand was designed in light of this information to select the most appropriate trait scales and in order to create the most appropriate scenarios.

We first conjectured that scores from both the *Homonegativity Scale* and scenarios of lesbians in a relationship, as well as scores from both the *Genderism and Transphobia Scale* and scenarios of transwomen in relationships would indicate attitudes toward gender non-conformists that were more comfortable than not comfortable and more approving than disapproving. The results from our comparative analyses indicated that both men and women expressed that they were relatively comfortable and approving in their responses toward both lesbian and transwomen in relationships on a college campus. These findings supported our first hypothesis, attribute to the validity of the scenarios we created, and support literature that recognizes the modern theological standpoint of moral relativism (Morrison & Morrison, 2002; Hill, 2005; Antoszewski et al., 2007).

Secondly, we conjectured that scores from both the *Homonegativity Scale* and scenarios of lesbians in a relationship, as well as scores from both the *Genderism and Transphobia Scale* and scenarios of transwomen in a relationship, would indicate that women, relative to men, were significantly more comfortable and approving of gender non-conformists. This hypothesis was

supported and demonstrated statistical significance throughout all of the analyses. These results were anticipated on the basis of a variety of previous studies (Antoszewski, et al., 2007; Winter, et al., 2008; Pearl & Galupo, 2007), both on Bucknell's campus and off, which indicated that females were more willing to demonstrate empathy toward LGBT people than males.

Thirdly, we conjectured that the combined scores for comfort and approval from the scenarios of lesbians in a relationship would differ significantly from the combined scores for comfort and approval from the scenarios of transwomen in a relationship. This hypothesis was supported. Such a finding is potentially meaningful in the context of the social implications of attitudes toward LGBT people and was anticipated by the authors due to evidence of transpeople's current struggle even among other gender non-conformists (Ireland, 2007). Our results indicate that, among this population of youth and young adults in the United States, lesbians in a relationship would likely be met with more comfort and approval than a transwoman in a relationship.

Our final analyses indicated that responses to both the scenarios with both lesbians and transwomen in relationships were largely predicted by the trait scales designed to measure open-minded vs. strictly traditional notions about sexual behavior (*Liberal vs. Conservatism Scale*) and attitudes toward non gender conformity (*Genderism and Transphobia Scale*). Considering that traditional sexual attitudes intend to limit the variation and free expression of sexual behavior, it is logical that this scale would be such a significant predictor. It is likewise logical that the scale designed to measure attitudes toward non gender conformity would also be a significant predictor of attitudes toward gender non-conformists, however, considering that the *Genderism and Transphobia* was only recently developed, these findings support it in terms of convergent validity.

The significant correlations for social desirability indicated that the data from the scales for comfort toward lesbians and transgender women in relationships were skewed, such that participants

indicated higher levels of comfort with these scenarios than was likely sincere. However, even with data that were skewed in the direction of comfort, the combined scores for comfort and approval toward the scenarios with transgender women in relationships were still significantly lower than the combined scores for comfort and approval toward the scenarios with lesbians in a relationship.

### *Significance*

Therefore, although the trend among youth and young adults in the U.S. is to demonstrate tolerance, areas of distinction within that face of tolerance clearly exist. This study has demonstrated that women are more comfortable and approving of the relationships certain gender non conformists have, and that, despite sex/gender, lesbian relationships receive more attitudes of comfortableness and approval than transgender relationships. Such findings are potentially relevant in terms of LGBT individuals obtaining a job, an education, healthcare and legal protection, among other concerns. These results suggest that any member of the LGBT community could possibly have a less problematic time resolving these issues if the people making the executive decisions were female rather than male. They also suggest that, no matter what the executive decision makers' sex/gender, lesbian persons in relationships could possibly be received more openly than transpersons in relationships. And, most importantly, beyond the categories of sex/gender and person type, an individual's personal attitudes toward sexual behavior as well as their attitudes toward gender non-conformity are predictors of their attitudes toward the relationships of lesbians and transwomen alike.

### *Limitations*

One limitation of this study may be that the participants are largely ungeneralizable beyond traditional university students in terms of age and level of education. Although certain scales used in this study, such as the *Homonegativity* and *Transphobia* scales, were intended to measure modern

attitudes toward LGBT people and thus should be limited to the generation with which these measures apply, the students from this sample alone are not enough to evaluate the predictors of attitudes for all Americans youths. Another limitation of this study may be that it is uncertain to what degree the participants had been exposed to gender non-conformists in the past and, particularly in the case of students who may have never been exposed, it is uncertain whether these participants would accurately be able to imagine a lesbian or transperson in a relationship, based on the information from the definitions provided.

#### *Implications for Further Research*

That considered, the influence of intrinsic religiosity on attitudes toward sexual orientation minorities could be a valuable focus of future research, especially considering that liberal vs. conservative political attitudes was such a significant factor in this study. This is not to say that intrinsic religiosity and political conservatism are equivalent attitudes, however, many of the items from the *liberal vs. conservatism scale*, such as “sex education should be restricted to the home” and “I think sex should be reserved for marriage”, overlap with fundamentally religious frames of reference.

Since the both the *Genderism and Transphobia* and *Liberal vs. Conservatism* scales were significant predictors of attitudes toward lesbians and transwomen in relationships in this study, they could also be implemented in studies with different variations of sexuality and/or gender. Finally, these scales could also be evaluated as predictors of attitudes toward LGBT people with a population of subjects different from the one in this study.

Previous research has illustrated the impact that education (Pearl & Galupo, 2007; Ohlander et al., 2005) has on attitudes toward LGBT people. The population of subjects in this study was made up of students from an elite post-secondary institution, and their responses fell right in line

with what would have been expected in light of earlier findings. This supports the external validity of our study to some degree, however, the results are only generalizable to other populations of students at elite institutions with comparable demographics. Therefore, consideration of other possible influences on attitudes toward LGBT people could be used in relation to a more diverse body youth and young adults. For example, another significant indicator of attitudes is the type and duration of exposure that individuals have had with gender non-conformists (Stotzer, 2009; Heinze & Horn, 2009). Studies constructed in light of the findings from these studies could provide a deeper understanding of attitudes even within a population of students similar to this study.

Finally, additional research could investigate the influence of the law on attitudes toward LGBT individuals. According to a study on the influence of school anti-harassment policies on attitudes toward gender non-conformists (Ohlander, et al., 2005), schools which lack anti-harassment policies for gender conformists could be promoting the existence of hostile attitudes toward LGBT people, while schools that have clear anti-harassment policies could be increasing the levels of tolerance toward them. Should similar results be found in terms of attitudes toward LGBT and state and/or federal laws, they would have major implications for the advancement of the LGBT civil rights movement.

The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of the attitudes which perpetuate intolerance toward LGBT people, and to recognize, in particular, the unique attitudes transpeople face as a minority to the nation and even to the LGBT community. This research contributes to the bodies of research concerning the interrelatedness of intrinsic religiosity, political conservatism, sexism, the lack of legal protection, and the intolerance of sexual-orientation minorities. It has identified critical distinctions between attitudes on the part of different sexes/genders as well as toward different non gender conformist. It has also taken research as a

whole further by assessing the predictors of attitudes toward certain members of the LGBT community in public relationships. Since each of these factors is truly significant among college-aged people in general, the implications could very well reach to the greater population of the United States. The findings of this study could be used to direct work concerning sexual orientation minorities on college campuses as well as work for the LGBT civil rights movement. Although operating on different levels, these organizations could both use information from this study to raise awareness of certain inequalities, create a tactic for making new policies and determine the most effective way to pool resources and constructively influence the executive heads of the institution with which they are working. The implications of these findings are as far reaching as to have an impact on policies effecting healthcare, education, anti-discrimination, and employee rights legislation nationwide.

## References

- Adamczyk, A., & Pitt C. (2009). Shaping attitudes about homosexuality: The role of religion and cultural context. *Social Science Research*, 38, 338-351.
- Ames, D. R., Rose, P., & Anderson, C.P. (2006). The NPI-16 as a short measure of narcissism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 440-450.
- Antoszewski, B., et al. (2007). Knowledge of and Attitude Toward Transsexualism Among College Students. *Sex Disabil*, 25, 29-35.
- Aosved, A.C., & Long P.J. (2006). Co-occurrence of Rape Myth Acceptance, Sexism, Racism, Homophobia, Ageism, Classism, and Religious Intolerance. *Sex Roles*, 55, 481-492.
- Bem, Sandra. (1974). The Measure of Psychological Androgyny. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 42(2), 155.
- Crowne, D., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A New Scale of Social Desirability Independent of Psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24(4), 349-354.
- Currie, M. R., Findlay, B. M. & Cunningham E. G. (2005). Homophobic appropriation: The psychological correlates of the short internalized homonegativity scale: A new measure of internalized homophobia. *Australian Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 6(1), 11-21.
- Davis, M. H.. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAJ Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 10, 85-96.
- Daniels, S. (2002). Intolerant tolerance: The weapon of moral relativism. *North Carolina Family Policy Council*, 1-4.

Eckes, S.E., & McCarthy M.M. (2008). GLBT teachers: The evolving legal protections. *American Educational Research Association*, 45(530), Retrieved from

<http://aer.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/45/3/530> doi: 10.3102/0002831208314764

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 491-512.

Gosling, S., et al. (2003). A very brief measure of the Big-five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37, 504-528.

Grattet, R., & Jenness, V. (2001). Examining the boundaries of hate crime law: disabilities and the "dilemma of difference". *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 45, 653.

Heinze, J.E., & Horn S.S. (2009). Intergroup Contact and Attitudes about Homosexuality in Adolescence. *J Youth Adolescence*, 38, 937-951.

Herek, G. M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: correlates and gender differences. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 25(4), 451-477.

Hill, D. B., et al. (2005). The development and validation of the genderism and transphobia scale. *Sex Roles*, 53(7/8), 531-544.

Horn, S.S., Szalacha, L.A., & Drill, K. (2008). Schooling, sexuality, and rights: An investigation of heterosexual students' social cognition regarding sexual orientation and the rights of gay and lesbian peers in school. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64(4), 791-813.

Hudson, W. W., Murphy, G. J. & Nurius, P. S.. (1983) A short-form scale to measure liberal vs. conservative orientations toward human sexual expression. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 19(3), 258-272.

Ireland, D. (2007, October 04). *No ENDA Without Trans Protections*. Retrieved from [http://www.gaycitynews.com/gay\\_city\\_news/front/](http://www.gaycitynews.com/gay_city_news/front/)

Keisling, M. (2009). *Transgender equality and the federal government*. Retrieved from [http://www.transequality.org/federal\\_gov.html](http://www.transequality.org/federal_gov.html)

Lind, A. (2004). Legislating the family: Heterosexist bias in social welfare policy frameworks. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, XXXI(4), 21-33.

Mehrabian, A., & Stefl, C.A. (1995). Basic temperament components of loneliness, shyness, and conformity. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 23, 253-264.

Morrison, M. A., & Morrison, T.G. (2002). Development and validation of scale measuring modern prejudice toward gay men and lesbian women. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43(2), 15-37.

Nagoshi, J., et al., (2008). Gender differences in correlates of homophobia and transphobia. *Sex Roles*, 59, 521-531.

Ohlander, J., et al. (2005). Explaining educational influences on attitudes toward homosexual relations. *Social Science Research*, 34, 781-799.

Parrott, D. J. & Gallagher, K. E. (2008). What accounts for heterosexual women's negative emotional response to lesbians?: Examination of traditional gender role attitudes and sexual prejudice. *Springer Science + Business Media*, 59, 229-239.

Pearl, M. L., & Galupo P. M. (2007). Development and Validation of the Attitudes Toward Same-Sex Marriage Scale. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 53(3), 117-130.

Stotzer, R.L. (2009). Straight Allies: Supportive Attitudes Toward Lesbians, Gay Men, and Bisexuals in a College Sample. *Sex Roles*, 60, 67-80.

Winter, S., et al. (2008). Measuring Hong Kong Undergraduate Students' Attitudes Towards Transpeople. *Sex Roles*, 59, 670-683.

Table 1

*t*-test Analyses for Scenarios

PersonType	Female M(SD)	Male M(SD)	<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>
Lesbian				
Not touching				
Comfortable/not (10-0)	8.50(2.25)	7.80(2.62)	.03*	.29
Approve/disapprove (10-0)	8.11(3.25)	7.01(3.22)	.01*	-.34
Touching				
Comfortable/not (10-0)	8.29(2.19)	7.57(2.69)	.03*	.29
Approve/disapprove (10-0)	8.24(2.96)	6.89(3.26)	.00*	-.43
Transwoman				
Not touching				
Comfortable/not (10-0)	8.15(2.15)	6.90(3.01)	.00*	.47
Approve/disapprove (10-0)	8.07(3.06)	6.62(3.14)	.00*	-.47
Touching				
Comfortable/not (10-0)	7.68(2.19)	6.75(3.09)	.01*	.35
Approve/disapprove (10-0)	7.39(3.13)	6.27(3.23)	.01*	-.35

Note. \**t* < .05

Table 2

*Regression Analyses for Scenario Ratings and Trait Scales*

Person Type	$R^2$	Adjusted $R^2$	Scale	Significance
Lesbian	.51	.46		
			Empathy	.25
			Androgyny (masculine)	.07
			Androgyny (feminine)	.44
			Narcissism	.41
			Conformity	.06
			Sexism	.63
			Orientations toward Sexual Expression	.00*
			Homonegativity	.27
			Transphobia	.02*
Transwoman	.55	.50		
			Empathy	.43
			Androgyny (masculine)	.07
			Androgyny (feminine)	.32
			Narcissism	.35
			Conformity	.11
			Sexism	.25
			Orientations toward Sexual Expression	.00*
			Homonegativity	.73
			Transphobia	.00*

Note. \* $p < .05$

Table 3

*Correlations for Social Desirability and Responses to Scales*

Scale	Significance of Social Desirability
Empathy	.50
Androgyny (masculine)	.59
Androgyny (feminine)	.39
Narcissism	.36
Conformity	.69
Sexism	.94
Orientations toward Sexual Expression	.81
Homonegativity	.06
Transphobia	.11
Lesbians not touching comfortable/not	.89
Lesbians not touching approve/disapprove	.44
Lesbians touching comfort/not	.98
Lesbians touching approve/disapprove	.27
Transwoman not touching comfortable/not	.02*
Transwoman not touching approve/disapprove	.09
Transwoman touching comfort/not	.00**
Transwoman touching approve/disapprove	.06

*Note.* \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$

Appendix A: Email to Students

Dear Bucknell Student,

Please fill out this short survey asking about your feelings concerning different types of behaviors. It will only take up to 30 minutes, you will contribute to important research being done this semester, and you could get \$50 cash! 10 students will receive \$50 so take the survey as soon as possible.

Upon completion of the survey, you will have the chance to enter your email address into a drawing to win one of the 10 cash prizes. All of your answers are COMPLETELY ANONYMOUS and there is no way to track your answers to your email address. The survey can be completed on any computer.

To be directed to the survey, copy and paste this into your browser:

[www.students.bucknell.edu/projects/survey](http://www.students.bucknell.edu/projects/survey)

Your participation is truly appreciated.

Thank you very much.

Questions? Contact [wflack@bucknell.edu](mailto:wflack@bucknell.edu)

Appendix B: Difference and Diversity consent form

## Difference and Diversity

### Informed Consent

Consent Form

Human Participants Research

Bucknell University

Project Title: Difference and Diversity

General Plan of the Research: I understand that if I consent to participate in this study, I will be asked to complete a survey, which will ask me a series of questions about my attitudes toward different types of sexual behaviors. My answers to all of the survey questions will be **completely anonymous**. I will not be asked to reveal any information that could be used to identify me as a participant in this study.

Estimated Duration of the Research: I understand that the survey should take me no longer than half an hour to complete.

Estimated Total Number of Participants: I understand that the experimenters expect to collect survey data from 180 participants.

Questions? If I have questions or concerns, I understand that I may contact the Principal Investigator, Professor Bill Flack, wflack@bucknell.edu, 577-1131, Department of Psychology.

Voluntary Participation: I understand that my participation in this research project is completely voluntary. If I agree to participate, I may change my mind at any time and for any reason. I may refuse to answer any questions and/or withdraw from the study at any time without penalty, and if I choose, my results will not be saved.

Benefits of Participation: I understand that I will have the option to enter into a drawing for a chance to win one of ten \$50 prizes for participating in this research at the end of the survey. It is also possible that I will benefit from the opportunity to reflect on these questions, and I may find the exercise useful. In addition, I may also benefit from learning about psychological research from participating in this study.

Anonymity: I understand that my answers to all of the survey questions will be completely anonymous, meaning there is no way that my answers will be able to be connected to my identity. I will not be asked to reveal any information that could be used to identify me as a participant in this study. All of the information that I provide will be stored in a secure datafile access to which is limited to the Principal Investigator, members of his student research team, and three professional staff members of ISR. The survey datafile will be stored separately from the file containing my email address, which will be randomized. This eliminates any possibility that I could be identified with my answers.

Discomforts: I understand that it is possible that considering some of the questions on the survey could cause me minor discomfort. I also understand that I can complete this survey on any computer that uses Microsoft Windows software and that is either directly or wirelessly connected to the university server (however, hardwired connections are encouraged to ensure that the survey software runs properly).

Risks: I understand that, aside from the risk of discomfort as indicated above, there are no other known risks to me from participating in this research. I also understand that, in the event that I become uncomfortable or upset by any of the questions, and feel the need to speak with someone about my reactions, I may contact Psychological Services (577-1604).

By clicking this box I agree to participate in this research, and I acknowledge that I am 18 years of age or older.

## Appendix C: Difference and Diversity survey

### Demographics

#### 1) Gender

- Male
- Female

#### 2) Please enter your age

---

#### 3) Class Year

- Freshmen
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior

#### 4) Greek Status

- Greek
- Independent

#### 5) Athletic Status

- Varsity team member
- Not a varsity team member

**6) Religious Status**

- Jewish
- Muslim
- Christian
- Other

**7) Sexual orientation**

- Gay
- Bisexual
- Lesbian
- Heterosexual
- Other

**8) Please indicate your Combined Family Income**

- Below \$50,000
- \$50,000 - \$100,000
- \$100,000 - \$150,000
- \$150,000 - \$200,000
- \$200,000 - \$250,000
- Above \$250,000

9) Read each item, decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally, and then circle either the “T” or the “F” to indicate your response.

	True	False
I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have never intensely disliked anyone.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrong doings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I can remember “playing sick” to get out of something.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**IRI**

10) The following statements inquire about your thoughts and feelings in a variety of situations. For each item, indicate how well it describes you by choosing the appropriate letter on the scale at the top of the page: A, B, C, D, or E. When you have decided on your answer, fill in the letter next to the item number. **READ EACH ITEM CAREFULLY BEFORE RESPONDING.** Answer as

**honestly as you can. Thank you.**

	A - does not describe me	B	D	D - describes me
I daydream and fantasize, with some regularity, about things that might happen to me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the "other guy's" point of view.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sometimes I don't feel very sorry for other people when they are having problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I really get involved with the feelings of the characters in a novel.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In emergency situations, I feel apprehensive and ill-at-ease.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am usually objective when I watch a movie or play, and I don't often get completely caught up in it.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I sometimes feel helpless when I am in the middle of a very emotional situation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Becoming extremely involved in a good book or movie is somewhat rare for me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
When I see someone get hurt, I tend to remain calm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If I'm sure I'm right about something, I don't waste much time listening to other people's arguments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
After seeing a play or movie, I have felt as though I were one of the characters.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Being in a tense emotional situation scares me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am usually pretty effective in dealing with emergencies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am often quite touched by things that I see happen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
When I watch a good movie, I can very easily put myself in the place of a leading character.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I tend to lose control during emergencies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in his shoes" for a while.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
When I am reading an interesting story or novel, I imagine how I would feel if the events in the story were happening to me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
When I see someone who badly needs help in an emergency, I go to pieces.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**SBSRI**

11)

**Mark each either Female or Male**

	Female	Male
Masculine	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ambitious	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has leadership abilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Acts as leader	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Independent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Self-sufficient	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Defends own attitudes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Athletic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Self-reliant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Willing to take a stand	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strong personality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Competitive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Willing to take risks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Loyal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assertive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individualistic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Makes decisions easily	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Aggressive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dominant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Analytical	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sensitive to the needs of others	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Loves children	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Understanding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sympathetic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Forceful	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Compassionate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cheerful of others	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Warm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Affectionate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gentle	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Eager to soothe hurt feelings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tender	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yielding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Flatterable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does not use harsh language	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Soft-spoken	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Childlike	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Feminine	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gullible	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**NPI 16**

**Read each pair of statements below and select the one that comes closest to describing your**

**feelings and attitudes about yourself. You may feel that neither statement describes you well, but pick the one that comes closest. Please complete all pairs.**

**12) a)**

- I really like to be the center of attention
- It makes me uncomfortable to be the center of attention

**13) b)**

- I am no better or no worse than most people
- I think I am a special person

**14) c)**

- Everybody likes to hear my stories
- Sometimes I tell good stories

**15) d)**

- I usually get the respect that I deserve
- I insist upon getting the respect that is due me

**16) e)**

- I don't mind following orders
- I like having authority over people

17) f)

- I am going to be a great person
- I hope I am going to be successful

18) g)

- People sometimes believe what I tell them
- I can make anybody believe anything I want them to

19) h)

- I expect a great deal from other people
- I like to do things for other people

20) i)

- I like to be the center of attention
- I prefer to blend in with the crowd

21) j)

- I am much like everybody else
- I am an extraordinary person

22) k)

- I always know what I am doing
- Sometimes I am not sure of what I am doing

**23) l)**

- I don't like it when I find myself manipulating people
- I find it easy to manipulate people

**24) m)**

- Being an authority doesn't mean that much to me
- People always seem to recognize my authority

**25) n)**

- I know that I am good because everybody keeps telling me so
- When people compliment me I sometimes get embarrassed

**26) o)**

- I try not to be a show off
- I am apt to show off if I get the chance

**27) p)**

- I am more capable than other people
- There is a lot that I can learn from other people





conforming in my ways.									
If someone is very persuasive, I tend to change my opinion and go along with them.	<input type="checkbox"/>								
I don't give in to others easily.	<input type="checkbox"/>								
I tend to rely on others when I have to make an important decision quickly.	<input type="checkbox"/>								
I prefer to make my own way in life rather than find a group I can follow.	<input type="checkbox"/>								

**BFPS-TIPI**

29)







kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.						
Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.	<input type="checkbox"/>					

**IR-SAS**

31) **This questionnaire is designed to measure the way you feel about sexual behavior. It is not a test, so there are no right or wrong answers. Answer each item as carefully and accurately as you can by selecting the response that best pertains to you.**

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Niether agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I think there is too much sexual freedom given to adults these days	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I think that the increased sexual freedom seen in the past several years has done much to undermine the American	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

family					
I think that young people have been given too much information about sex	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Sex education should be restricted to the home	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Older people do not need to have sex	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Sex education should be given only when people are ready for marriage	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Premarital sex may be a sign of decaying social order	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Extramarital sex is never excusable	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I think there is too much sexual freedom given to teenagers these days	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I think there is not enough sexual restraint among young people	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I think people indulge in sex too much	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I think the only proper way to have sex is through intercourse	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I think sex should be reserved for marriage	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Sex should be only for the young	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Too much social approval has been given to homosexuals	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Sex should be devoted to the business of procreation	<input type="checkbox"/>				
People should not masturbate	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Heavy sexual petting should be discouraged	<input type="checkbox"/>				
People should not discuss their sexual affairs or business with others	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Severely handicapped (physically and mentally) people should not have sex	<input type="checkbox"/>				
There should be no laws prohibiting sexual acts between	<input type="checkbox"/>				









herself as a man in public							
It is all right to make fun of people who cross-dress	<input type="checkbox"/>						
If I encountered a male who wore high-heeled shoes, stockings, and makeup, I would consider beating him up	<input type="checkbox"/>						

34) For the purpose of this research we will be using the definition of "lesbian" provided by the Oxford English Dictionary.

**"Lesbian: *n.* A female homosexual."**

**Imagine you are sitting in the Bison at an hour when not many other students are eating. You are on the ground level behind the registers, but at one of the tables near you, just up the steps, there is a couple eating. They are lesbians, and are eating while sitting across from each other.**

**Please indicate on the following scale how comfortable or uncomfortable you would be in this situation**

- 0 - Extremely uncomfortable
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6

- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10 - Completely comfortable

**35) Please indicate on the following scale the extent to which you approve/disapprove of this situation**

- 0 - Strongly approve
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10 - Strongly disapprove

**36) For the purpose of this research we will be using the definition of "lesbian" provided by the Oxford English Dictionary.**

**"Lesbian: *n.* A female homosexual."**

**Imagine you are sitting in the Bison at an hour when not many other students are eating. You are on the ground level behind the registers, but at one of the tables near you, just up the steps, there is**

**a couple eating. They are lesbians, and are eating while sitting next to each other and holding hands.**

**Please indicate on the following scale how comfortable or uncomfortable you would be in this situation**

- 0 - Extremely uncomfortable
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10 - Completely comfortable

**37) Please indicate on the following scale the extent to which you approve/disapprove of this situation**

- 0 - Strongly approve
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10 - Strongly disapprove

38) *For the purpose of this research we will be using the definitions of transsexual, transgender woman and MTF provided by the National Center for Transgender Equality:*

*“Transgender: An umbrella term for people whose gender identity, expression or behavior is different from those typically associated with their assigned sex at birth, including but not limited to transsexuals, cross-dressers, androgynous people, genderqueers, and gender non-conforming people.”*

*“Transgender Woman: A term for a transgender individual who currently identifies as a woman (see also MTF)”*

*“MTF: A person who transitions from ‘male-to-female’, meaning a person who was assigned male at birth, but identifies and lives as a female.”*

**Imagine you are sitting in the Bison at an hour when not many other students are eating. You are on the ground level behind the registers, but at one of the tables near you, just up the steps, there is a couple eating. They are a visibly transgender female with a male, and are eating while sitting across from each other.**

**Please indicate on the following scale how comfortable or uncomfortable you would be in this situation**

- 0 - Extremely uncomfortable
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10 - Completely comfortable

**39) Please indicate on the following scale the extent to which you approve/disapprove of this situation**

- 0 - Strongly approve
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10 - Strongly disapprove

40) *For the purpose of this research we will be using the definitions of transsexual, transgender woman and MTF provided by the National Center for Transgender Equality:*

*“Transgender: An umbrella term for people whose gender identity, expression or behavior is different from those typically associated with their assigned sex at birth, including but not limited to transsexuals, cross-dressers, androgynous people, genderqueers, and gender non-conforming people.”*

*“Transgender Woman: A term for a transgender individual who currently identifies as a woman (see also MTF)”*

*“MTF: A person who transitions from ‘male-to-female’, meaning a person who was assigned male at birth, but identifies and lives as a female.”*

**Imagine you are sitting in the Bison at an hour when not many other students are eating. You are on the ground level behind the registers, but at one of the tables near you, just up the steps, there is a couple eating. They are a visibly transgender female with a male, and are sitting next to each other and holding hands.**

**Please indicate on the following scale how comfortable or uncomfortable you would be in this situation**

0 - Extremely uncomfortable

1

2

3

4

5

6

- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10 - Completely comfortable

**41) Please indicate on the following scale the extent to which you approve/disapprove of this situation**

- 0 - Strongly approve
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10 - Strongly disapprove

**Debriefing:**

**The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of the attitudes which perpetuate intolerance toward LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transpeople) and to recognize, in particular, the unique attitudes transpeople face as a minority to the nation and even to the LGBT community. In the current study we intend to differentiate between attitudes toward the most**

**widely accepted of the LGBT, lesbian persons, and the most widely denied of the LGBT, transgender women persons.**

**For additional information on these issues please visit the website for the National Center for Transgender Equality at [www.nctequality.org](http://www.nctequality.org), and the website for the Gay and Lesbian Association at [www.glaad.org](http://www.glaad.org).**

**After submitting the survey, you will be transferred to a page where you can enter your name in the drawing for a prize.**