



Correlates of Homophobia, Transphobia, and Internalized Homophobia in Gay or Lesbian and Heterosexual Samples

Katrina Warriner BS , Craig T. Nagoshi PhD & Julie L. Nagoshi PhD

To cite this article: Katrina Warriner BS , Craig T. Nagoshi PhD & Julie L. Nagoshi PhD (2013) Correlates of Homophobia, Transphobia, and Internalized Homophobia in Gay or Lesbian and Heterosexual Samples, Journal of Homosexuality, 60:9, 1297-1314, DOI: [10.1080/00918369.2013.806177](https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2013.806177)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2013.806177>



Published online: 16 Aug 2013.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 4381



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 37 View citing articles [↗](#)

Correlates of Homophobia, Transphobia, and Internalized Homophobia in Gay or Lesbian and Heterosexual Samples

KATRINA WARRINER, BS

*Department of Counseling/Counseling Psychology, Arizona State University, Tempe,
Arizona, USA*

CRAIG T. NAGOSHI, PhD

*Department of Psychology and School of Social Work, University of Texas at Arlington,
Arlington, Texas, USA*

JULIE L. NAGOSHI, PhD

School of Social Work, University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, Texas, USA

This research assessed the correlates of homophobia and transphobia in heterosexual and homosexual individuals, based on a theory of different sources of perceived symbolic threat to social status. Compared to 310 heterosexual college students, a sample of 30 gay male and 30 lesbian college students scored lower on homophobia, transphobia, and religious fundamentalism. Mean gender differences were smaller for gay men and lesbians for homophobia, aggressiveness, benevolent sexism, masculinity, and femininity. Fundamentalism, right-wing authoritarianism, and hostile and benevolent sexism were correlated only with homophobia in lesbians, whereas fundamentalism and authoritarianism were correlated only with transphobia in gay men. Correlates of internalized homophobia were different than those found for homophobia and transphobia, which was discussed in terms of gender differences in threats to status based on sexual orientation versus gender identity.

KEYWORDS *gender, homophobia, internalized homophobia, sexual orientation, social attitudes, transphobia*

Address correspondence to Craig T. Nagoshi, Department of Psychology and School of Social Work, University of Texas at Arlington, Box 19528, Arlington, TX 76019, USA. E-mail: cnagoshi@uta.edu

Although numerous studies have been conducted looking at the correlates of prejudice toward lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) individuals in the heterosexual community, little is known about the correlates of homophobia and transphobia (prejudice against transgender individuals; Hill & Willoughby, 2005) within the LGBTQ community itself. Nagoshi et al. (2008) presented a three-part theory of gender-based prejudices, discussed later, that considers how such prejudices arise not only from a generalized fear of outgroup differences, as a result of a “conservative” social upbringing, but also from gender differences in heterosexual individuals’ perceptions of specific threats to social status posed by individuals who deviate from heteronormative gender identity versus sexual orientation. Such perceived threats may still be operative even in gay men and lesbians to cause increases in homophobia and transphobia (Russell & Bohan, 2006). It is also important to note that some members of the gay or lesbian community perceive transgenders to be different from and threatening to the lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) community (Green, 2004).

This article presents the findings of a study assessing the correlates of homophobia and transphobia within a sample of self-identified LGB college students. These means and correlates for LGBs are compared to the findings from a previous study (Nagoshi et al., 2008) of a sample of self-identified heterosexual college students. An additional aim of the study was to assess correlates of internalized homophobia (IH) and compare these correlates to those for homophobia and transphobia in the LGB students.

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Homophobia is described as the fear, hatred or intolerance of sharing space with individuals who are homosexual (Weinberg, 1972; i.e., those individuals outside the heteronormative schema for sexual orientation. Transphobia is defined as the degree to which an individual is uncomfortable with or is prejudiced toward a transgender individual (Hill & Willoughby, 2005). This can be expressed not just toward transgender individuals but also toward any individual who may bend or transgress the heterosexual gender roles, including cross-dressers, drag performers, or women who perform more masculinely or men who perform more femininely (Weinberg, 1972). Transphobia is distinctly different from homophobia in that it is a fear of those who do not conform to one’s expected gender role (the expected performative aspects of gender) and gender identity (one’s internal sense of belonging to a gender group, whether male, female, or something more fluid), rather than one’s sexual orientation (Nagoshi et al., 2008).

INTEGRATED THREAT THEORY OF PREJUDICE

The integrated threat theory of prejudice (Stephan & Stephan, 2000) describes how perceived threats and stressors within a group will cause feelings of prejudice. The realistic and symbolic threats of the ingroup are due to negative stereotypes and anxiety about the outgroup. Realistic threats are described as threats posed by an outgroup to the social or political power and economic resources of the ingroup (LeVine & Campbell, 1972). Symbolic threat relates to cultural perspectives or ways of life as perceived in traditions, attitudes, customs, or beliefs. These threats are caused by either the negative stereotypes of the outgroup as seen by the ingroup or by the anxiety experienced by the ingroup during exposure to and interaction with the outgroup (Stephan & Stephen, 2000). The integrated threat theory suggests that an individual who is socialized into “traditional” social values would perceive a symbolic threat from any outside, non-socially conforming group. This symbolic threat of any non-socially conforming group may explain why certain value systems and attitudes have been correlated with prejudice.

CORRELATES OF HOMOPHOBIA, TRANSPHOBIA, AND IH

Previous studies (Nagoshi et al., 2008) have found that higher levels of homophobia are correlated with greater right-wing authoritarianism (B. Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992) and religious fundamentalism (Hopwood & Connors, 2002). People socialized into beliefs based on right-wing authoritarianism and religious fundamentalism see homosexuality as a non-conforming identity and, therefore, view homosexuality as a possible threat to the heteronormative dominant way of life. Beliefs in traditional gender roles have been found to be predictive of homophobia in men (Polimeni, Hardie, & Buzwell, 2000) and in women (Nagoshi et al., 2008).

Another mechanism of homophobia can be understood in terms of proneness to aggression, reflective of “hypermasculinity.” More specifically, proneness to aggression has been found to be a predictor of homophobia in men (Bernat, Calhoun, Adams, & Zeichner, 2001). For men, aggression proneness was positively correlated with both homophobia and transphobia, whereas this was not found in women (Nagoshi et al., 2008). Consistent with Bernat et al. (2001), these findings suggest that there may be more anxiety in men regarding gender manifestations outside the heterosexual sexual preference. In fact, numerous studies (Parrott, Adams, & Zeichner, 2002; Patel, Long, McCammon, & Wuensch, 1995; Sinn, 1997) have found that the discomfort heterosexual men experience toward gay men may actually be a discomfort with the feminine characteristics expressed by the gay men and, therefore, may be a possible threat to their masculine identity. In applying the

integrated threat theory, it could be understood that hypermasculinity and sexism are correlates of homophobia in all men due to the threat of losing social power. Considering that, in our culture, men have social dominance over women, it is possible that any man deviating from heteronormative gender roles, gender identities, or sexual orientations would be perceived as a threat to this male dominance. Therefore, any form of feminizing masculinity may break down the social norms that keep men in power (Norton, 1997).

Sexism, as measured by the Economic Beliefs Scale, has been found to be positively correlated with homophobia for both men and women (Stevenson & Medler, 1995), whereas viewing oneself as fitting into traditional gender roles was found to be correlated with homophobia in men (Polimeni et al., 2000; Theodore & Basow, 2000). In contrast, beliefs in more egalitarian gender roles have been found to be predictive of lesser homophobia in women (Theodore & Basow, 2000). For women, the threats leading to transphobia and homophobia seem to be different. Women's fears do not seem to be as related to a threat of loss of gender identity as in men because women's gender status already relegates them to having less social power than men (Nagoshi et al., 2008).

Benevolent sexism toward women, from the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996), has also been positively correlated with homophobia in women more so than in men (Nagoshi et al., 2008). Benevolent sexism can be understood in terms of heteronormative men and women accepting the appropriateness of traditional gender beliefs and gender roles that place women's status in society below that of men. Considering again the integrated threat theory, women may see lesbians as outside the sexual identity norm and, thus, not in competition for an intimate relationship with men, producing less homophobia, but for some women, lesbianism is seen as a threat, due to sexual fantasies in men about the attractiveness of lesbians (Hamilton, 2007).

There are important distinctions between the LGB and transgender communities in that they are based on different parts of gender-based identity. Transgenderism reflects an identity that is outside the male–female gender binary, whereas LGB individuals are outside the expected heterosexual identity. Despite findings that transphobia and its resulting discrimination and harassment has a large, negative impact on the lives of transgender individuals on college campuses (Beemyn, Curtis, Davis, & Tubbs, 2005; Winter, Webster, & Cheung, 2008), correlates of transphobia are understudied and even less studied in LGB individuals.

With regard to IH, as Russell and Bohan (2006) discussed, the idea of IH began from psychoanalytic traditions proposing that societal homophobic attitudes are often internalized by lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) people. IH as a phenomenon is highly debated (Williamson, 2000) because there is a concern that IH has become a means of pathologizing

the lesbian, gay, bisexual, or queer (LGBQ) community (Russell & Bohan, 2006). Due to the complexities of IH, it has also been debated as to how best to measure it. Measures used in regards to IH vary greatly and have often yielded equivocal relations with measures of psychological maladjustment (Williamson, 2000). A recent meta-analysis by Newcomb and Mustanski (2010), however, suggests that there may be a more consistent, positive relation between IH and psychological maladjustment or distress across a range of different measures of IH. As noted by Wright and Perry (2006), older scales may actually measure issues of gender identity, sexism, and religious fundamentalism, rather than actual discomfort of being self-identified as LGB. Wright and Perry created the Sexual Identity Distress Scale to measure IH in terms of feelings and attitudes about being LGB identified, rather than in terms of outcomes and behaviors.

IH in gay or lesbian samples has been found to be negatively correlated (Peterson & Gerrity, 2006) with social support and positively correlated with psychological distress (Szymanski & Carr, 2008; Szymanski, 2005). Studies of IH have found higher rates of IH in gay and bisexual men, rather than in lesbians (D'Augelli, Grossman, Hershberger, & O'Connell, 2001). O'Neil et al. (1986) described the fear of femininity in men as a type of gender role conflict. Related to the findings of heterosexual men feeling uncomfortable about feminine characteristics in men (Parrott et al., 2002), gay men have also been found to experience gender role conflict and its negative effects (Simonsen, Blazina, & Watkins, 2000). Gender role conflict, as well as ideas of traditional gender roles, have been positively correlated with IH in gay and bisexual men (Ervin, 2004; Sanchez, 2005; Szymanski & Carr, 2008).

AIMS AND HYPOTHESES

This study is designed to further the understanding about the bases of transphobia and homophobia in a gay and lesbian college community. Perceived threats to social status based on adherence to conventional political and religious beliefs or based on protecting conventional gender-linked social status may still be operative in LGB individuals because their gender identity is hypothetically not compromised by their sexual orientation. Correlates of homophobia and transphobia found for heterosexuals may, therefore, also be found in LGB individuals. This study incorporated the data collected in Nagoshi et al.'s (2008) study, to see if there were any overall mean and correlation differences in homophobia, transphobia, and their correlates between LGB and heterosexual college students, as well as to see if there were similar gender differences. The study also considered IH as a possible related phenomenon and assessed its relation to the correlates of homophobia and transphobia in LGB individuals:

- H1: The first hypothesis tested was that gay men and lesbians would not score as high as heterosexuals overall on measures indicative of gender conformity (i.e., right-wing authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, sexism, homophobia, and transphobia) due to their identification with a group outside conventional social norms.
- H2: The second hypothesis was that mean differences between the genders would be less for gendered behaviors (i.e., masculinity, femininity, aggression, and hostile sexism) in the gay and lesbian sample than in heterosexuals (Nagoshi et al., 2008), although gay men were still expected to score higher than lesbians on homophobia, transphobia, masculinity, aggression, and hostile sexism.
- H3: The third hypothesis was that greater levels of social conservatism (right-wing authoritarianism and religious fundamentalism) would predict greater levels of homophobia and transphobia in gay men and lesbians.
- H4: Because of the continued experience of differential social power based on gender, it was also expected that for gay men and lesbians, benevolent sexism (traditional gender roles) would be correlated with greater levels of transphobia, but not necessarily homophobia, in both gays and lesbians, but more so for lesbians.
- H5: The final hypothesis was that the same correlates of homophobia and transphobia would also predict IH in gay men and lesbians.

METHOD

Participants

Self-identified LGB undergraduate student participants were collected through contacts with student organizations that serve the LGBTQ, female, and multicultural communities on campus. Sixty (30 women and 30 men) students filled out the questionnaire. The mean age for men was 20.0 ($SD = 2.3$) and 20.3 for women ($SD = 2.2$). The ethnic composition was 60% White, 13% Hispanic, 12% Black, 3% Asian, 2% American Indian, and 10% "other." Nineteen percent reported themselves as Protestant or other Christian, 17% Catholic, 3% Jewish, 2% Mormon, 15% "other," and 43% atheist or agnostic.

The data from the Nagoshi et al. (2008) study was drawn from 153 female and 157 male college students enrolled in introductory psychology courses from the same university as this sample. All but six reported themselves as being "straight." The ethnic group breakdown was 75% White, 12% Hispanic, 5% Asian, 2% African American, 2% Native American, and 4% "other." Thirty-five percent of the sample reported themselves as being Catholic, 32% Protestant or "other Christian," 5% Jewish, 3% Mormon, 12% "other," and 14% atheist or agnostic.

Measures

Unless noted, the alpha coefficients listed here are from the LGB sample first and the heterosexual sample second. For all scales, scores were the means across the scale items, so the scale range is the same as the item range. Measures were presented in a set order.

Transphobia Scale. The Transphobia Scale (Nagoshi et al., 2008; 9 items; $\alpha = .91, .82$) measures prejudice against transgender individuals. Some questions included were, "I don't like it when someone is flirting with me, and I can't tell if they are a man or a woman," and "I am uncomfortable around people who don't conform to traditional gender roles, e.g., aggressive women or emotional men." Items were responded to on a scale from 1 (*completely disagree*) to 7 (*completely agree*).

Homophobia Scale. The Homophobia Scale (Wright, Adams, & Bernat, 1999; 25 items; $\alpha = .80, .95$) assesses the degree to which a person is prejudiced against homosexual individuals, with items responded to on a scale from 1 (*completely disagree*) to 5 (*completely agree*). Example questions include, "I would hit a homosexual for coming on to me," and "Marriage between homosexual individuals is acceptable."

Personal Attributes Questionnaire. The Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence et al., 1975) assesses femininity ($\alpha = .63, .77$) and masculinity ($\alpha = .74, .75$) traditionally defined in regards to instrumentality versus emotional expressiveness. The measure has participants rate how much of a trait they think they are using 5-point scales ranging from, for example, 1 (*not at all aggressive*) to 5 (*very aggressive*) and 1 (*very home oriented*) to 5 (*very worldly*).

Right-wing authoritarianism. Right-wing authoritarianism (R. Altemeyer, 1981; $\alpha = .84, .80$) reflects a belief in submission to authority, the legitimacy of aggressive actions by authority, and conventional social norms. One example statement from the questionnaire is, "Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn." The items were responded to on a scale from -3 (*strongly disagree*) to 3 (*strongly agree*).

Religious fundamentalism. Religious fundamentalism (B. Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; $\alpha = .89, .95$) reflects adherence to a centralized religious belief system that is fundamental for existence, represents a special relationship with God, and must be strictly adhered to in opposition to the forces of evil. One example statement from the questionnaire is, "God has given mankind a complete, unfailing guide to happiness and salvation, which must be totally followed." Items were responded to on a scale of -4 (*very strongly disagree*) to 4 (*very strongly agree*).

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996) measures hostile sexism ($\alpha = .87, .83$), prejudice against women and women's rights, and benevolent sexism ($\alpha = 0.82, 0.79$),

reflecting a positive view of women only as they fit into traditional gender roles. Items are responded to on a scale of 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Example items include, "No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman," and "Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for 'equality'."

Aggression Questionnaire. The Aggression Questionnaire (Buss & Perry, 1992) measures several dimensions of proneness to aggressive behavior and hostile cognitions, including physical aggression ($\alpha = .85, .85$), verbal aggression ($\alpha = .74, .73$), anger ($\alpha = .81, .82$), and hostility ($\alpha = .83, .83$), with items responded to on a scale of 1 (*not at all like me*) to 5 (*very much like me*). Only the physical aggression subscale, indicative of hypermasculinity, is used in these analyses. An example item on this subscale is, "I get into fights a little more than the average person."

Sexual Identity Distress Scale. The Sexual Identity Distress Scale (Wright & Perry, 2006; $\alpha = .74$ from the LGB sample) is a seven-item scale of internal homophobia created to measure the amount of distress an individual feels toward their self-identification as a LGBQ individual. It looks at the negative affects an individual feels if they identify within the LGB community. Items were responded to on a scale ranging from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 5 (*strongly disagree*). Example items include, "I feel uneasy around people who are very open in public about being gay," and "I worry a lot about what others think about my being gay."

Procedure

LGB participants were given a seven page, shortened version of the questionnaire used by Nagoshi et al. (2008), along with a cover sheet regarding their rights as participants in the study. The questionnaire consisted of questions obtaining basic demographic information, sex, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and religion. Willing participants were given the opportunity to fill out the questionnaire after a general meeting of their organization or to complete it later and return it in an anonymous envelope to designated dropoff locations on campus located in a secured office.

RESULTS

Mean Differences by Gender and Sexual Orientation

Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations separately by gender and sexual orientation (comparing this sample against the heterosexual sample from Nagoshi et al., 2008) for the homophobia, transphobia, PAQ masculinity and femininity, right-wing authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism,

TABLE 1 Means and Standard Deviations by Gender and Sexual Orientation

Scale	Gays and Lesbians				Heterosexuals			
	Women		Men		Women		Men	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Homophobia (1–5) ^a	1.24	0.18	1.53	0.40	1.68	0.69	2.66	0.83 ^{b,c,d}
Transphobia (1–7)	2.06	1.33	2.38	1.31	4.25	1.20	5.05	1.06 ^{b,c}
Personal Attributes Questionnaire								
Masculinity (1–5)	2.62	0.46	2.49	0.69	2.47	0.54	2.65	0.62
Femininity (1–5)	2.96	0.52	2.97	0.56	2.96	0.54	2.67	0.55
Religious fundamentalism (–4 to 4)	–2.71	1.39	–2.50	0.96	–0.62	1.39	–0.36	1.38 ^c
Right-wing authoritarian. (–3 to 3)	–1.01	0.74	–0.74	0.73	0.26	0.69	0.40	0.73 ^{b,c}
Buss–Perry Aggression Questionnaire								
Physical aggression (1–5)	2.50	0.89	2.63	0.93	2.27	0.77	3.07	0.85 ^{b,d}
Ambivalent sexism								
Hostile (0–5)	1.16	0.82	1.73	1.03	2.22	0.79	2.90	0.69 ^{b,c}
Benevolent (0–5)	1.45	0.92	1.34	0.82	2.64	0.82	2.81	0.70 ^{c,d}

^aScale endpoints are in parentheses; higher scores indicate having more of the attribute. ^bSignificant ($p < .05$) main effect of gender. ^cSignificant ($p < .05$) main effect of sexual orientation. ^dSignificant ($p < .05$) interaction of Gender \times Sexual Orientation.

Buss–Perry physical aggression, and hostile and benevolent sexism measures. Gender and LGB versus heterosexual group differences were analyzed through 2 (Gender: male vs. female) \times 2 (Sexual Orientation: heterosexual vs. homosexual) factorial analyses of variance. The multivariate F s across the nine dependent variables were as follows: gender, $F(9, 269) = 5.70$, $p < .001$; sexual orientation, $F(9, 269) = 29.49$, $p < .001$; and Gender \times Sexual Orientation interaction, $F(9, 269) = 2.16$, $p < .05$. Consistent with the results for heterosexuals from Nagoshi et al. (2008), men (in general) scored higher than women on homophobia, $F(1, 363) = 38.30$, $p < .001$; transphobia, $F(1, 361) = 11.18$, $p < .001$; physical aggression, $F(1, 360) = 14.94$, $p < .001$; and hostile and benevolent sexism, $F(1, 333) = 30.64$, $p < .001$. However, the significant Gender \times Sexual Orientation interactions for homophobia and physical aggression are the result of this gender difference being attenuated in the LGB group, as compared to the heterosexual one (H2): $F(1, 363) = 11.17$, $p < .001$ and $F(1, 360) = 7.70$, $p < .01$, respectively. For masculinity and femininity, the Gender \times Sexual Orientation interactions were both marginally significant—for masculinity, $F(1, 343) = 3.34$, $p = .07$; for femininity, $F(1, 345) = 3.02$, $p = .08$ —with lesbians scoring higher than gay men on masculinity and with lesbians and gay men being equal on femininity, as compared to the typical higher masculinity for men and higher femininity for women in the heterosexual group. There were also several significant differences for sexual orientation, with the gay and lesbian group scoring notably lower than heterosexual men and women on homophobia, $F(1, 363) = 59.14$, $p < .001$;

transphobia, $F(1, 361) = 209.38, p < .001$; religious fundamentalism, $F(1, 359) = 114.65, p < .001$; right-wing authoritarianism, $F(1, 363) = 147.58, p < .001$; and hostile sexism, $F(1, 333) = 95.72, p < .001$ and benevolent sexism, $F(1, 338) = 141.85, p < .001$ (H1). The sexual orientation differences for transphobia and homophobia are not surprising, but it is interesting that gays and lesbians are also much lower (the magnitude of the F s are indicative of the very large effect sizes here) on the factors that predict homophobia and transphobia (e.g., being considerably lower on religious fundamentalism).

Correlations by Gender and Sexual Orientation

Table 2 presents the correlations in the LGB and heterosexual samples of the homophobia, transphobia, and IH scales with masculinity and femininity, right-wing authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, physical aggression, and benevolent and hostile sexism. These correlations are presented separately by gender. Whereas transphobia was positively correlated with homophobia for the LGB sample, these correlations were less than those for the heterosexual sample (this difference is not significant based on Fisher's z tests). The correlates of homophobia and transphobia in lesbians were similar to those found for heterosexual women, in that religious fundamentalism, right-wing authoritarianism, and hostile and benevolent sexism all were positively correlated with homophobia and transphobia, with most of these correlations reaching statistical significance, despite the smaller sample size for the lesbians (H3). One notable difference was that the correlation of sexism with homophobia was much higher than the corresponding correlations with transphobia, whereas the reverse pattern was found for heterosexual women. For gay men—in contrast to the findings for heterosexual men—transphobia, but not homophobia, was positively correlated with religious fundamentalism and right-wing authoritarianism. Whereas heterosexual men's hypermasculinity, as measured by physical aggression proneness, was positively correlated with homophobia, for gay men, this correlation was zero. Whereas masculinity and femininity were not correlated with homophobia or transphobia in heterosexual individuals, for both gay men and lesbians, femininity was negatively correlated with transphobia.

There were few correlations of other variables with IH, suggesting that this construct is etiologically distinct from homophobia, as measured by the Wright et al. (1999) scale. It was also apparent that correlates of IH were different for lesbians versus gay men, with transphobia being positively correlated and masculinity negatively correlated with IH in gay men, whereas benevolent sexism was positively correlated with IH in lesbians.

TABLE 2 Correlations of Homophobia, Transphobia, and Internalized Homophobia With Correlates by Gender and Sexual Orientation

Scale	Lesbian Woman		Gay Men		Straight Women		Straight Men	
	Homophobia	Transphobia	Internalized Homophobia	Homophobia	Transphobia	Internalized Homophobia	Homophobia	Transphobia
Transphobia	.33			.47*			.56***	
Internalized homophobia	.48**	.16		.33				
Personal Attributes Questionnaire								
Masculinity (1–5)	–.11	–.18	–.29	–.10	–.24	–.54**	.03	–.11
Femininity (1–5)	.07	–.52**	.36	–.19	–.39*	–.15	.06	–.04
Religious fundamentalism	.47*	.31	.23	.09	.66***	.34	.54***	.54***
Right-wing authoritarianism	.34	.40*	.09	.07	.46*	.23	.34***	.49***
Buss–Perry Aggression Questionnaire	–.14	.09	–.20	.11	–.02	–.04	–.01	.04
Physical aggression								
Ambivalent sexism								
Hostile	.68***	.25	.30	.31	.31	.00	.24**	.22**
Benevolent	.57***	.36	.50**	–.02	.23	.20	.21*	.42***

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses

Hierarchical multiple regression analyses (see Table 3) were conducted as a further test of the theory of the etiologies of homophobia and transphobia tested in a heterosexual sample by Nagoshi et al. (2008). This theory proposes that for both men and women social conventionalism produces prejudices against any socially non-conforming groups, including homosexual and transgender individuals. A second source of prejudice only in men is a hypermasculinity that reflects a fear of loss of male social power for any deviations, whether of gender roles, gender identity, or sexual orientation, in traditionally male gender attributes. A third proposed source of prejudice only against transgender individuals, particularly for women, is the fear of loss of social power specifically associated with deviations from traditional gender roles.

The hierarchical regression model (see Table 3) was built by first entering authoritarianism and fundamentalism as a block representing the causally prior effects of general social conventionalism. The second step of the model was to enter Buss–Perry physical aggression, indicative of hypermasculinity, to test its incremental effect over and above the effects of authoritarianism and fundamentalism. The third step to the model was to finally enter benevolent sexism, indicative of adherence to traditional gender roles, into the model to test the incremental effects of these variables over and above the other correlates. These analyses were run separately for men and women and for homophobia, transphobia, and IH. Tolerances for all entered variables were well above .10, indicating that multicollinearity among the predictors was not so high as to cause the correlation matrices to become singular. As shown in Table 3, the results were only partially consistent with the proposed theory tested on heterosexual individuals. For lesbians, religious fundamentalism and right-wing authoritarianism were predictive of homophobia, with benevolent sexism predicting homophobia over and above the effects of general social conservatism.

Table 3 also presents the results of the same hierarchical regression analyses conducted on the heterosexual sample. To make the findings more comparable, rape myth acceptance, which was included in the Nagoshi et al. (2008) analyses, was dropped here. In contrast to the findings for heterosexual individuals, over and above the effect of social conservatism, sexism did not predict transphobia in lesbians. For gay men, religious fundamentalism and right-wing authoritarianism predicted only transphobia, with no incremental effects of hypermasculinity or benevolent sexism on homophobia or transphobia. The amount of total variance (multiple R^2) of homophobia or transphobia accounted for by the predictors ranged from .24 to .50 across the LGB and heterosexual samples, with the notable exception of homophobia for gay men, where the multiple R^2 was near zero. None of the predictors was significant in the multiple regression analyses for IH for lesbians or gay men, undoubtedly due to the lack of statistical power in the small sample.

TABLE 3 Hierarchical Multiple Regressions of Homophobia, Transphobia, and Internalized Homophobia on Authoritarianism, Religious Fundamentalism, Aggression, and Sexism by Gender and Sexual Orientation

Variable	Lesbians and Gay men						Straights									
	Homophobia			Transphobia			Internalized Homophobia			Homophobia			Transphobia			
	Multiple R^2			Multiple R^2			Multiple R^2			Multiple R^2			Multiple R^2			
	β^a	R	change	β^a	R	change	β^a	R	change	β^a	R	change	β^a	R	change	
Women																
Religious fundamentalism	.05			-.06			.07			.51			.34			
Authoritarianism	.00	.55	.30*	.35	.47	.22	-.13	.45	.20	.03	.53	.28***	.19	.57	.32***	
Physical aggression	-.29	.59	.05	-.05	.47	.00	-.28	.50	.05	-.03	.53	.00	.02	.57	.00	
Benevolent sexism	.64	.67	.12*	.24	.49	.02	.59	.60	.11	.01	.53	.00	.21	.60	.03**	
Men																
Religious fundamentalism	.04			.68			.36			.24			.03			
Authoritarianism	.06	.03	.00	.11	.68	.46**	.03	.37	.14	.35	.56	.31***	.37	.44	.19***	
Physical aggression	.15	.13	.02	-.16	.70	.03	-.15	.40	.02	.28	.62	.08***	.16	.47	.03*	
Benevolent sexism	-.13	.17	.01	-.10	.71	.01	.02	.40	.00	-.03	.62	.00	.14	.49	.02	

^aBeta for final equation.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.
beta for linear equation.

DISCUSSION

The hypothesis that gays and lesbians differ from heterosexuals on social values (H1) was supported for all the measures, including homophobia, transphobia, right-wing authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, and sexism. The gay and lesbian sample, having a self-identity outside the social norm, are overall less socially conservative than the heterosexual sample. When comparing gender differences of the heterosexual sample to the gender differences of the gay and lesbian sample, the gay and lesbian gender differences were smaller than those seen in the heterosexual sample for measures related to gender-based identity, such as homophobia, masculinity and femininity, aggression proneness, and benevolent sexism (H2). An important gender difference for the gay and lesbian sample is also the near-significant gender by sexual orientation interactions, where lesbians scored higher than gay men on masculinity, whereas gay men and lesbians were equal on femininity.

Gay men scored higher than lesbians on transphobia, homophobia and aggression, as predicted. This is consistent with the theoretical model (Nagoshi et al., 2008) that men experience more feelings of prejudice due to the greater threat to their dominant social role. Gay men, consistent with heterosexual men, score higher on both benevolent and hostile sexism than lesbians. One explanation is that being outside the social norm on sexual orientation does not change how the mechanism of sexism occurs in men. Lesbians are still a threat to gay men's dominant social role, despite the gay man's sexual orientation, perhaps taking him out of the heterosexual male dominant status.

The correlational findings for the gay and lesbian sample, when separated by gender, partially followed the patterns expected from H3, but not H4. Transphobia and homophobia were still correlated with each other but somewhat less than in the heterosexual sample. The correlates overall for lesbians followed the patterns seen in heterosexual women, except for the notable difference that correlations of sexism with homophobia were much higher than the correlations with transphobia. This is notable, considering the pattern was reversed in the heterosexual sample of Nagoshi et al. (2008). For lesbians, the finding that sexism is more correlated with homophobia than with transphobia may be understood by looking at the mechanism of threat for lesbians. If lesbians are socialized to believe in traditional gender roles for women, they may perceive that the threat of losing power due to the lack of forming relationships with men is greater than any power loss from a shift in gender performance. Heterosexual women may perceive that they can only gain power in a patriarchal society by having sex with or acting like a man (Hamilton, 2007). Therefore, for lesbians, their sexuality represents a loss of social power.

For gay men, the correlates of homophobia and transphobia were different than were found in the heterosexual male sample. Homophobia was not correlated with religious fundamentalism and right-wing authoritarianism in gay men, but these variables were highly correlated with transphobia. One explanation is that it is primarily the threat of giving up one's male gender identity and its associated privileges that is most salient for a socially conservative belief system, rather than sexual orientation. This supports the model that, for gay men, similar to heterosexual men, it is the traditional role of being a man that is most important to the mechanism of prejudice. When considering the literature, this points to the possibility that it is the threat of being considered feminine that leads to homophobia in heterosexual men, rather than the threat of actual gay orientation (Norton, 1997). Consistent with this, Bosson, Prewitt-Freilino, and Taylor (2005) proposed that heterosexual men's aversion to femininity stems from their fear of being seen as gay.

Also contrary to the findings in Nagoshi et al. (2008), hypermasculinity, as measured by physical aggression proneness, was not correlated with homophobia in gay men, as seen in heterosexuals. One explanation is that, for gay men, homophobia is not related to hypermasculinity due to masculinity being separate from sexual orientation. Further research is needed to confirm this hypothesis. Another difference from the findings from the heterosexual sample in Nagoshi et al. was that, for gay men and lesbians, femininity was negatively correlated with transphobia for both gay men and lesbians. Someone who is feminine may have less of a problem with someone being outside the gender norms because femininity is not the dominant gender performance. An individual who expresses femininity may, thus, feel less threatened by someone else performing outside the traditional gender norms.

IH, as measured by the Sexual Identity Distress Scale, was found to be etiologically distinct from the homophobia measured by the Wright et al. (1999) scale (disconfirmation of H5). Considering the inconclusive literature on IH, this finding may help us realize that to study IH, we must better understand how the mechanisms of IH differ from the mechanisms of homophobia in the heterosexual community. Also worthy of note are the gender differences between gay men and lesbians in correlates of IH. For gay men, the more transphobic an individual was the more IH they exhibited, whereas the more masculinity they exhibited the less IH they exhibited. One explanation is that IH may be more connected to issues of gender roles and gender norms than with sexual orientation in men, similar to the pattern in heterosexual men, where homophobia may actually be more about issues of masculinity and femininity than sexual orientation. For lesbians, benevolent sexism was positively correlated with IH, which supports the idea that a lesbian who has been socialized to accept traditional gender roles will be more threatened

by being outside the heterosexual sexual orientation than by deviating from traditional norms of gender roles and identity (Nagoshi et al., 2008).

More research is needed to greater understand the complex relations and mechanisms related to homophobia, transphobia, and IH in the gay and lesbian community. It is also important that future research consider the ways IH is measured (Williamson, 2000) and how those scales may be measuring mechanisms associated with social conservatism overall, rather than actual distress or threat to an individual's own sexuality. The majority of the studies on IH have been done on samples of gay men. Literature considering IH and its correlations in lesbian and bisexual women is minimal and clinical in nature, and the correlates of IH have not been focused on.

With regard to limitations of the study, the sample size was small and collected from undergraduate student organizations that require an individual to be comfortable identifying with the LGB community. It should be noted that, given the much smaller sample size for the gay men and lesbians, as compared to the heterosexuals, significant correlations for the heterosexual group may result from larger magnitude effects. The college student sample used in this study limits generalization to non-college student populations, and the cross-sectional nature of the study limits causal inferences. Measurement issues include possible social desirability effects, when measuring explicit attitudes, as well as possible attenuation of effects for measures with low reliabilities.

Future research should obtain larger, more diverse samples of gay men and lesbians who are not all associated with student LGBT campus organizations. Individuals in such organizations are clearly "out," and it is possible that non-heterosexual individuals who have not disclosed their sexual identities may be more like heterosexual individuals in their gender-related attitudes and behaviors. Future research should also directly compare the Nagoshi et al. (2008) Transphobia Scale with Hill and Willoughby's (2005) Genderism and Transphobia Scale and validate both scales against more behavioral measures of prejudice, such as the Implicit Association Test (Greenwald, Poehlman, Uhlmann, & Banaji, 2009).

REFERENCES

- Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. E. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest, and prejudice. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 2, 113–133.
- Altemeyer, R. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Manitoba, Canada: University of Manitoba Press.
- Beemyn, B., Curtis, B., Davis, M., & Tubbs, N. J. (2005). Transgender issues on college campuses. *New Directions for Student Services*, 111, 49–60.

- Bernat, J. A., Calhoun, K. S., Adams, H. E., & Zeichner, A. (2001). Homophobia and physical aggression toward homosexual and heterosexual individuals. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 110*, 179–187.
- Bosson, J. K., Prewitt-Freilino, J. L., & Taylor, J. N. (2005). Role rigidity: A problem of identity misclassification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*, 552–565.
- Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*, 452–459.
- D'Augelli, A. R., Grossman, A. H., Hershberger, S. L., & O'Connell, T. S. (2001). Aspects of mental health among older lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults. *Aging & Mental Health, 5*, 149–158.
- Ervin, A. M. (2004). Male gender role conflict and internalized homonegativity: The impact on gay men's psychological well-being. Section A. Humanities & Social Sciences. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65*(7), 3704.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 491–512.
- Green, J. (2004). *Becoming a visible man*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Greenwald, A. G., Poehlman, T. A., Uhlmann, E., & Banaji, M. R. (2009). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-analysis of predictive validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97*, 17–41.
- Hamilton, L. (2007). Trading on heterosexuality: College women's gender strategies and homophobia. *Gender & Society, 21*, 145–172.
- Hill, D. B., & Willoughby, B. L. B. (2005). The development and validation of the genderism and transphobia scale. *Sex Roles, 53*, 531–544.
- Hopwood, M., & Connors, J. (2002). Heterosexual attitudes to homosexuality: Homophobia at a rural Australian university. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services: Issues in Practice, Policy, & Research, 14*, 79–94.
- LeVine, R. A., & Campbell, D. T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Nagoshi, J. L., Adams, K. A., Terrell, H. K., Hill, E. D., Brzuzy, S., & Nagoshi, C. T. (2008). Gender differences in correlates of homophobia and transphobia. *Sex Roles, 59*, 521–531.
- Newcomb, M. E., & Mustanski, B. (2010). Internalized homophobia and internalizing mental health problems: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 30*, 1019–1029.
- Norton, J. (1997). "Brain says you're a girl, but I think you're a sissy boy": Cultural origins of transphobia. *Journal of Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Identity, 2*, 139–164.
- O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender Role Conflict Scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 14*, 335–350.
- Parrott, D. J., Adams, H. E., & Zeichner, A. (2002). Homophobia: Personality and attitudinal correlates. *Personality and Individual Differences, 32*, 1269–1278.
- Patel, S., Long, T. E., McCammon, S. L., & Wuensch, K. L. (1995). Personality and emotional correlates of self-reported antigay behaviors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10*, 354–366.
- Peterson, T. L., & Gerrity, D. A. (2006). Internalized homophobia, lesbian identity development, and self-esteem in undergraduate women. *Journal of Homosexuality, 50*, 49–75.

- Polimeni, A.-M., Hardie, E., & Buzwell, S. (2000). Homophobia among Australian heterosexuals: The role of sex, gender role ideology, and gender role traits. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 5, 1–10.
- Russell, G. M., & Bohan, J. S. (2006). The case of internalized homophobia: Theory and/as practice. *Theory & Psychology*, 16, 343–366.
- Simonsen, G., Blazina, C., & Watkins, C. E., Jr. (2000). Gender role conflict and psychological well-being among gay men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47, 85–89.
- Sinn, J. S. (1997). The predictive and discriminate validity of masculine ideology. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31, 117–135.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Stapp, J. (1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex-role attributes and their relations to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 29–39.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1996). Predicting prejudice. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20, 409–426.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 23–45). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stevenson, M. R., & Medler, B. R. (1995). Is homophobia a weapon of sexism? *Journal of Men's Studies*, 4, 1–8.
- Szymanski, D. M. (2005). Heterosexism and sexism as correlates of psychological distress in lesbians. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 83, 355–360.
- Szymanski, D. M., & Carr, E. R. (2008). The roles of gender role conflict and internalized heterosexism in gay and bisexual men's psychological distress: Testing two mediation models. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 9, 40–54.
- Theodore, P. S., & Basow, S. A. (2000). Heterosexual masculinity and homophobia: A reaction to the self? *Journal of Homosexuality*, 40, 31–48.
- Weinberg, G. (1972). *Society and the healthy homosexual*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Wilchins, R. A. (2002). Queerer bodies. In J. Nestle, C. Howell, & R. A. Wilchins (Eds.), *Gender queer: Voices from beyond the sexual binary* (pp. 33–46). Los Angeles, CA: Alyson.
- Williamson, I. (2000). Internalized homophobia and health issues affecting lesbians and gay men. *Health Education Research*, 15, 97–107.
- Winter, S., Webster, B., & Eleanor Cheung, P. K. (2008). Measuring Hong Kong undergraduate students' attitudes towards transpeople. *Sex Roles*, 59, 670–683.
- Wright, E. R., & Perry, B. L. (2006). Sexual identity distress, social support, and the health of gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 51, 81–110.
- Wright, L. W., Adams, H. E., & Bernat, J. A. (1999). The Homophobia Scale: Development and validation. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 21, 337–347.