Development of the Heteronormative Attitudes and Beliefs Scale

Bias based on sexual orientation and identity has been associated with a wide range of negative outcomes. For example, sexual minorities (i.e., individuals whose sexual behavior, psychological orientation, or identity is at least somewhat same-sex oriented) report significant levels of psychological distress in response to sexual identity-based hate crimes as well as heterosexist and homophobic comments (Szymanski, 2005). Experimental evidence suggests that even ambient heterosexist comments and actions – not targeted directly at the observer but nonetheless occurring in his or her surrounding environment – causes stress to sexual minority individuals (Burn, Kadlec, & Rexer, 2005; Konik, 2005; Silverschanz, 2007). And it has been proposed that all people, regardless of identity or orientation, are affected negatively by ambient prejudice such as sexism, heterosexism, and homophobia (Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langout, 2001; Franck, 2002; Silverschanz, 2007).

There are numerous ways to measure attitudes towards sexual minorities, including scales of internalized homophobia (sexual minorities' shame and self-hatred based on negative societal messages about being non-heterosexual; e.g., Martin & Dean, 1988, as cited in Peterson & Gerrity, 2005) and measures of people's beliefs and attitudes towards sexual minorities more generally (e.g., Herek, 1994; Morrison & Morrison, 2002; Morrison, Parriag, & Morrison, 1999; Raja & Stokes, 1998; Steffens, 2005). However, explicit prejudicial attitudes may not be the only contributors to discriminatory behaviors and bias. More subtle underlying attitudes and beliefs about the nature of sexuality and what constitutes a normal and healthy adult relationship may also affect such outcomes. One approach to studying these underlying issues is to examine the effects of normative societal expectations about sexual behavior and identities. This area of

study may be defined as heteronormativity, a construct that is often cited in gender studies as an important contributor to heterosexism, homophobia, and sexism (e.g., Blasius, 2000; Grace, 1999; Lancaster, 2003; Phelan, 2001, all cited in Kitzinger, 2005; also see Tee & Hegarty, 2006).

Heteronormativity: Definitions & Consequences

Heteronormativity has been defined as enforced compliance with culturally determined heterosexual roles (Nielsen, Walden, & Kunkel, 2000), and assumptions about heterosexuality as 'natural' or 'normal' (Kitzinger, 2005). Gender is closely related and often intertwined with such definitions, for normative heterosexuality cannot exist without rigid, binary expectations of behavior based on gender (e.g., Jackson, 2006). For example, heteronormativity has a circular relationship with hegemonic masculinity, both creating and resulting from the strict boundaries delimiting acceptable male behavior (e.g., Jones, 2006; Martino, 2000).

Jackson (2006, p. 114) explains that heteronormativity is "mobilized and reproduced" in ordinary, everyday social discourse and behavior, and Yep (2003, p. 13) proposes that it is caused by an "anxious" urge to protect illusory beliefs that heterosexuality is natural, normal, and inevitable. Rubin (1975), Rich (1980), and Jackson (1999), previously explored the "obligatory…compulsory…(and) compulsive" pressures toward heterosexuality (all cited in Yep, p. 18). Yep builds on this work to elucidate the violence that heteronormativity inflicts on women (by requiring that they serve men in marriage and motherhood), men (by defining rigid expectations of hegemonic masculinity), sexual minorities (by defining them as 'other' and thus not fully human), and individuals who experience multiple forms of prejudice and marginalization due to the intersections of racial, ethnic, gender, sexual, and other identities. Consistent with Yep's portrayal of heteronormative violence, Lind (2004) points out that sexual

minorities living in poverty are especially disenfranchised; they have limited access to resources, and the social services that would otherwise be available to heterosexually-headed households are denied to them due to definitions of marriage and family in welfare law.

Another negative consequence of social norms for sexual minorities is repeatedly confronting assumptions about heterosexuality, which results in having to make daily decisions about coming out or 'passing,' both of which involve particular stressors (Land & Kitzinger, 2005). Similarly, at social functions such as weddings, where the social capital of heterosexuality is celebrated and revered, sexual minorities are either invisible or 'othered' (Oswald, 2000). In two recent studies (Harwood, 1998; Hylton, 2005), lesbian social work students reported that their colleagues and instructors assumed they were heterosexual unless they explicitly stated otherwise, that sexual minority concerns were not given as much importance as other aspects of social justice, and that privileging of and assumptions about heterosexuality led to feelings of isolation and invisibility among these lesbian students. In another qualitative study, Nielsen, Walden, & Kunkel (2000) explained that male undergraduate students who purposefully violated traditional gender norms encountered homophobic jokes and protestations by interlocutors of their own heterosexuality, while female students transgressing normative gender roles received unsolicited advice about adhering to femininity if they hoped to attract a mate. As construed by Yep (2003), and demonstrated by numerous qualitative investigations, the 'violence' of heteronormativity is perpetuated on several levels: institutional, interpersonal, and even intrapsychic (i.e., the self-hatred of internalized homophobia in sexual minorities).

Although heteronormativity has not been explicitly examined in quantitative social science research, studies have examined closely related constructs. For instance,

authoritarianism is directly associated with support of traditional, hierarchical power structures that demand rigid adherence to traditional gender roles (Duncan, Peterson, & Winter, 1997; Whitley & Ægisdottir, 2000). Authoritarianism has also been specifically linked to negative attitudes towards sexual minorities (Haddock, Zanna, and Esses, 1993, as cited in Ducnan, Peterson, & Winter, 1997; Tee & Hegarty, 2006). In turn, negative attitudes towards sexual minorities have also correlated with lower levels of openness to experience (Cullen, Wright, & Alessandri, 2002), and inflexible beliefs about fundamental, categorical differences between people based on sexual identity or orientation (Hegarty & Pratto, 2001).

In sum, heteronormative attitudes and beliefs define the boundaries of normative sexual behavior (e.g., people should partner with others of the opposite sex), and relate to proscriptions against behaviors and feelings that violate these norms. In addition, heteronormativity is theorized to rely on underlying assumptions about binary, essentialist beliefs about sex and gender. However, current literature includes neither a measure of the construct of heteronormativity, nor a quantitative investigation of the relationships among heteronormative attitudes, attitudes towards sexual minorities, and other relevant personality constructs. The aim of this study was to develop a measure of heteronormativity, the Heteronormative Attitudes and Beliefs Scale (HABS), and to examine relationships among heteronormativity, authoritarianism, and attitudes towards lesbians and gays. For the purposes of this study, heteronormativity will be defined as beliefs about (1) sex and gender as binary and biologically determined and (2) the assumed normality of sexual relationships between males/men and females/women.

I hypothesized that the HABS would be comprised of two factors, which would map onto the two components of heteronormativity described above (binary/biologically determined sex and gender, and normative behavioral expectations). I further hypothesized that scores on this

new measure would correlate significantly with authoritarian attitudes and prejudicial attitudes towards lesbians and gays.

Methods

Participants

Eighty-four undergraduate students participated in this study, including 49 students from an introductory-level abnormal psychology course and 35 from an upper-level psychology course on gender and sexual identity (mean age = 20, range = 18-22 years). Approximately ¼ of the participants (24%) were male, ¾ were female, and none of the participants identified as transgender. In addition, 11% (n = 10) of the participants were sexual minorities and 21% (n = 18) identified as racial or ethnic minorities. Minority group categorizations were based on open-ended questions about race/ethnicity ("How would you describe your racial or ethnic identity?") and sexual orientation ("How would you describe your sexual orientation?"). Racial and ethnic minority participants included students identifying as Asian, Indian, Middle Eastern, or Chinese (n = 9); Latino/a, Hispanic, or Puerto Rican (n = 5); African-American or Black (n = 3); and Native American (n = 1). Sexual minority identity responses included "mostly straight" (n = 2); questioning, open, undefined, or bisexual (n = 6); and gay (n = 2). In addition, 9 students identified as a "straight ally" or "open heterosexual" and were categorized as heterosexual.

Significant differences by demographic and administration groups were noted. For example, chi square analyses demonstrated a significantly larger percentage of racial and ethnic minority students in the introductory-level course as compared to upper-level course ($\chi^2(1, N = 83) = 5.61, p < .05.$). In addition, there was a trend towards a greater percentage of European-American females as compared to racial/ethnic minority females ($\chi^2(1, N = 83) = 2.75, p < .10$).

As might be expected, the mean age of students in the upper level course (M = 20.97, SD = .89) was significantly higher than the mean age of students in the introductory-level course (M = 19.96, SD = 1.12). No additional significant differences were observed among the demographic and administration groups.

Instruments

The Heteronormative Attitudes and Beliefs Scale (HABS) was developed from a set of 38 items which were selected, adapted, or designed to load on two hypothesized factors: (1) essentialized and binary beliefs about gender and sex and (2) normative behavioral expectations for men and women in romantic or sexual relationships (see Table 1 for items). Several items pertaining to binary and essentialized beliefs about gender and sex were adapted from Tee & Hegarty (2006). Approximately ½ of the items were positively worded (i.e., higher levels of agreement = higher levels of heteronormativity) and the remaining items were negatively worded (i.e., higher levels of agreement = lower levels of heteronormativity). All items used a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Following the wording in Altemeyer's (1998) measure of RWA, the midpoint response for each item was "exactly neutral."

Two additional measures were administered in order to establish the validity of the HABS. First, RWA was measured using a 20-item version of Altemeyer's (1998) well-established questionnaire. In Christopher and Mull's (2006) study, Chronbach's alpha for this measure was .95, and D.G. Winter (personal communication, February 23rd, 2007) reported observing alphas well over .90 across multiple studies. Altemeyer's previous versions of this measure have also demonstrated excellent reliability and validity (see Altemeyer, 1988 and

1996). Following Duncan, Peterson, and Winter (1997), participants rated each item using a 7-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. A standardized mean composite score was computed to assess overall RWA tendencies. Second, a 10-item version of Herek's (1994) Attitudes Towards Lesbians and Gays (ATLG) was used to measure heterosexist prejudice directed towards lesbians and gay men. The ATLG limits its evaluation of sexual minorities to two discrete groups (lesbians and gay men), thus neglecting to directly measure attitudes about other sexual minorities, such as bisexuals. However, this measure is well-established in the literature as accurately predicting heterosexist attitudes and behaviors (e.g., Stover & Morera, 2007). Standardized mean composite scores were calculated to assess both attitudes towards lesbians (ATL) and attitudes towards gay men (ATG).

Administrative and Statistical Procedures

Undergraduate students in the two psychology courses were asked during class time to volunteer for this study. Willing participants stayed to complete the survey. Negatively-worded items on each measure were reverse-scored before calculating scale reliabilities, and these scores were standardized before computing the mean scores that were used in correlational analyses, group comparisons, and regressions.

Results

Reliability and Validity of the Heteronormative Attitudes and Beliefs Scale

A Varimax rotated factor analysis of the 38 items in Table 1 revealed 2 factors with Eigenvalues of 9.42 and 5.86, accounting respectively for 24.79% and 15.42% of the variance (the scree plot suggested a 2-factor solution). All items with factor loadings of at least .5

(absolute value) were considered for inclusion in the final scale; the items with the highest loadings on one factor and relatively lowest loadings on the other factor were retained in the analyses that follow. This resulted in a 16-item measure of heteronormativity, comprised of two scales with 8 items each, with balanced negative/positive wording. The scales, labeled Binary Gender and Normative Behavior, reflected the two predicted components of heteronormativity. Chronbach's alpha for the Binary Gender Scale was $\alpha = .92$, and reliability for the Normative Behavior Scales was $\alpha = .78$. Sample items loading on the two scales included the following:

Binary Gender Scale:
Gender is determined by biological factors before birth.
People who say there are only 2 legitimate genders are mistaken.

Normative Behavior Scale:
In intimate relationships, people should act only according to what is traditionally expected of their gender.
People should partner with whomever they choose, regardless of sex or gender.

As predicted, the HABS correlated significantly with RWA, attitudes towards lesbians, and attitudes towards gay men (see Table 2). This was true for both the Binary Gender sub-scale as well as the Normative Behavior sub-scale.

Group Comparisons and Regressions

T-tests revealed some significant differences based on group membership. For example, there were significant differences in scores by course enrollment (recall that the participants came from an introductory-level abnormal psychology course and an upper-level psychology course on gender and sexual identities). Students from the upper-level course indicated significantly more positive views about gay men ($t(82) = 2.20$, $p < .05$) and a trend towards significantly more positive views about lesbians ($t(82) = 1.92$, $p < .05$), and they scored lower

(i.e., less heteronormative) on the Binary Gender subscale ($t(82) = -2.34$, $p < .05$) than did students from the abnormal psychology course. However, there were no significant differences on the Normative Behavior subscale by course enrollment.

Interestingly, there was a trend toward significantly less heteronormativity by sexual minority status on the Binary Gender subscale ($t(81) = 1.71$, $p < .10$), with no significant differences by sexual minority status on the Normative Behavior subscale. However, due to the small percentage of sexual minority students, there was likely insufficient power to detect significant differences. This was also likely true in the case of gender; t-tests revealed no significant differences by participant gender, but there was likely insufficient power to detect differences due to the small percentage of male participants.

Racial and ethnic minority participants demonstrated significantly higher heteronormative attitudes with respect to the Binary Gender scale ($t(81) = -2.17$, $p < .05$), significantly greater prejudicial attitudes toward both lesbians ($t(81) = 2.03$, $p < .05$) and gay men ($t(81) = 2.38$, $p < .05$), and significantly higher authoritarian attitudes ($t(81) = -2.28$, $p < .05$). However, when regressing racial/ethnic minority status against these attitudinal scales while controlling for course enrollment (upper-level vs. introductory-level psychology) and age, racial/ethnic minority status no longer significantly predicted authoritarianism, heteronormativity, or attitudes towards lesbians or gay men ($p \geq .05$).

Relationships among Study Variables

Intercorrelations among study variables are presented in Table 2. As predicted, there were strong and significant correlations among all attitudinal variables in this study. Regression

analyses revealed that even when controlling for age and course enrollment, RWA significantly predicted scores on the Binary Gender ($\beta = .52$, $t(82) = 5.62$, $p < .001$.) and Normative Behavior scales ($\beta = .66$, $t(82) = 7.76$, $p < .001$). RWA also explained a significant proportion of variance in Binary Gender scores ($R^2 = .27$, $F(1, 82) = 30.73$, $p < .001$) and Normative Behavior scores ($R^2 = .40$, $F(1, 82) = 55.67$, $p < .001$).

Regressions were also conducted on relationships between heteronormative attitudes and attitudes towards lesbians and gay men. The Binary Gender and Normative Behavior scales (combined in one model) accounted for a significant amount of variance in attitudes towards lesbians ($R^2 = .39$, $F(2, 81) = 25.49$, $p < .001$) and gay men ($R^2 = .41$, $F(2, 81) = 28.12$, $p < .001$). Binary Gender scores significantly predicted attitudes towards lesbians ($\beta = -.37$, $t(81) = -3.83$, $p < .001$) and gay men ($\beta = -3.58$, $t(81) = -3.58$, $p < .01$). Similarly, Normative Behavior scores predicted attitudes towards lesbians ($\beta = -.37$, $t(81) = -3.90$, $p < .001$) and gay men ($\beta = -.42$, $t(81) = -4.51$, $p < .001$). However, when controlling for RWA, neither subscale significantly predicted attitudes towards gay men, and only the Binary Gender scale significantly predicted attitudes towards lesbians ($\beta = -.19$, $t(80) = -2.13$, $p < .05$).

Discussion

These findings reveal preliminary support for the validity and reliability of the HABS. Because heteronormative attitudes are theorized as contributing directly to prejudicial attitudes towards lesbians and gays, it was hypothesized that these two measures would correlate significantly. And because RWA and attitudes towards lesbians and gays have been highly correlated in previous studies, it was hypothesized that RWA and heteronormativity would also be highly correlated. Results supporting these hypotheses suggest that the HABS measure and

its two subscales have adequate concurrent validity with these closely related constructs. Discriminant validity was not directly tested in this study, and I need to consult with someone more knowledgeable about statistics in order to discern whether the regression analyses reported above suggest that the HABS measure is at least somewhat orthogonal to the constructs of RWA and attitudes toward sexual minorities.

Caution is warranted in the interpretation of group differences in heteronormativity among participants of this study. On the one hand, sample sizes are likely too small to detect significant group differences by gender and sexual minority status. On the other hand, significant group differences observed by racial and ethnic minority status are based on small numbers of people who do not likely represent the diversity of opinions and perspectives within racial and ethnic minority groups, and prediction of outcomes by racial and ethnic minority status becomes nonsignificant when controlling for age and course enrollment. In addition, no intra-group analyses for racial and ethnic minority groups (i.e., African Americans, Latino/as), sexual minority status, or gender were possible due to the small within-cell sample sizes. For these reasons, neither the significant differences by racial/ethnic minority status and sexual minority status, nor the lack of significant differences found when comparing scores by gender, are discussed here.

Limitations and Future Research

This study lays a foundation for future investigations of heteronormative attitudes and behaviors using the HABS. Several limitations that could be addressed in subsequent studies are

described here. For example, neither religion nor political orientation were measured in this study, and a greater diversity of demographics such as race, ethnicity, age, and education level would help in determining whether the properties observed in this study are generalizable to particular populations. In addition, in order to make sense of any group differences by sexual, racial, or ethnic minority status, these populations should be oversampled to allow for intra-group as well as inter-group analyses.

Future Research: Measure Development

Discriminant validity was not explored in this study and could be examined in the future by investigating intercorrelations among HABS scores, RWA, and constructs expected to relate to RWA but not necessarily to heteronormative attitudes. For example, attitudes about the natural environment correlate significantly with RWA (e.g., Schultz & Stone, 1994) but would be expected to be somewhat orthogonal to attitudes about sexuality. Future studies could also assess test-retest reliability to determine the stability of individuals' heteronormative attitudes and beliefs as well as the affects of potential interventions aimed at reducing heteronormative assumptions.

During the Winter 2008 semester, I plan to replicate the study described in this paper in order to gain a better understanding of the properties of this new measure. Study participants will be recruited from undergraduate courses, hopefully from courses in different departments such as Women's Studies, Sociology, and Psychology.

Future Research: Applications

In addition to pursuing a better understanding of heteronormativity and the statistical properties of the HABS, future research could use this measure to examine potential causes and consequences of heteronormative attitudes and beliefs. For example, understanding how heteronormativity and sexual orientation relate to one another may help us to make sense of mental health outcomes for lesbians, gay men, bisexual and transgender women and men, and even heterosexuals who subtly or blatantly transgress the rigid expectations that characterize a heteronormative society.

In my dissertation study, I am using the HABS in my investigation of two main research questions. First, how do sexual orientation and gender relate to personality constructs such as right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), tolerance of ambiguity, openness to experience, and heteronormative attitudes and beliefs? And second, how do tolerance of ambiguity, openness to experience, RWA, and heteronormative attitudes and beliefs relate to psychological well-being? With respect to the second question, my dissertation study is also investigating whether sexual orientation (as defined by psychological orientation, behavioral orientation, and self-defined identity) predicts different relationships among the variables. I will also assess fluidity, or the degree to which psychological, behavioral, and identity aspects of sexuality vary, and outness, or the extent to which individuals disclose these three aspects of sexuality to others. Because research participants' understandings of the concepts under investigation may vary, I will ask participants to provide the labels and terms they use to define and describe their experiences and identities in addition to asking closed-ended questions about demographics and sexual orientation. After I complete the data collection phase of this project, the following relevant hypotheses will be tested:

H1. **Sexual minorities** will report lower **heteronormativity** and **RWA** than **heterosexuals**.

H2. **Sexual minorities** will report higher **tolerance of ambiguity** and **openness to experience** than **heterosexuals**.
H3. **Women** will exhibit greater **sexual fluidity** than men; this will hold across categories of **sexual identity**.
H4. **Heteronormativity** will correlate negatively with **sexual fluidity**, **tolerance of ambiguity**, and **openness to experience**.
H5. Significantly larger correlation coefficients will be observed among **sexual minorities** as compared to **heterosexuals** with respect to the relationships between **psychological well-being** and **heteronormativity**, **tolerance of ambiguity,** and **openness to experience**.
H6. **Heterosexuals** who have high **exposure to sexual minorities** will report lower **heteronormativity** and **RWA** and higher **tolerance of ambiguity** and **openness to experience** than **heterosexuals** who have low **exposure to sexual minorities**.
H7. For **heterosexuals**, **gender** and **exposure to sexual minorities** will contribute uniquely to variance in **heteronormativity.**
H8. For **sexual minorities**, **outness, tolerance of ambiguity**, **openness to experience**, **RWA,** and **heteronormativity** will contribute uniquely to variance in **positive well-being**.

As described above, the problems and consequences of heteronormative attitudes are many; normative expectations of gender and sexual experiences likely affect all those who transgress such norms. And arguably few, if any, individuals always satisfy all of the normative expectations of gender and sexuality. Developing this measure is a preliminary step towards a better understanding of the significance of heteronormativity in our daily lives. And with increased understanding, we may yet, as Yep (2003) proposes, be able to challenge the boundaries of (hetero)sexuality – to undermine some of the ways in which heterosexuality is created and maintained, to destabilize some of the ways in which gender hierarchies uphold heterosexuality, and to understand sexuality as only one layer in our complex and intersecting identities.

Table 1: Factor Loadings on the Heteronormative Attitudes and Beliefs Scale

Item	Component	
	1	2
1. What we think of as biological sex is actually made up by society.	-.411	.077
2. Gender is determined by biological factors, such as genes and hormones, before birth.	**.650**	.074
3. People should partner only with individuals of the opposite sex.	.419	.494

4. There are only two sexes: male and female.	**.779**	.078
5. It is just because of what society expects that babies are assigned to a gender based on what their bodies look like.	-.483	-.071
6. All people are either male or female.	**.790**	.129
7. If you are male or female, then you are that gender for all time.	.675	.200
8. Gender means who a person is, based on sex.	.734	.218
9. When people undergo sex change operations, they are altering their biological sex.	-.039	-.421
10. Sexual orientation and identity are complex and difficult to determine unless you get to know a person.	-.529	-.344
11. In intimate relationships, women and men take on roles according to gender for a reason; it's really the best way to have a successful relationship.	.247	**.704**
12. Some people just don't fit into either male or female sex categories	-.760	-.123
13. In intimate relationships, people should act only according to what is traditionally expected of their gender	.027	**.575**
14. As long as children are not exposed to homosexual ideas, they will grow up to be straight.	.264	.588
15. Gender is the same thing as sex.	**.823**	.089
16. All of my friends and family members are straight.	.303	.279
17. It's perfectly okay for people to have intimate relationships with people of the same sex.	-.305	**-.677**
18. Even people born with both a penis and a vagina are essentially male OR female.	.558	.301
19. You can figure out gender by looking at a person.	.400	.452
20. The best way to raise a child is to have a mother and a father raise the child together.	.168	**.616**
21. In healthy intimate relationships, women may sometimes take on stereotypical 'male' roles, and men may sometimes take on stereotypical 'female' roles.	.039	**-.591**
22. Being sexually attracted to someone of the same sex indicates an imbalance or abnormality of some sort.	.397	.530
23. Gender is something that is "made up" by society, not created by nature.	-.677	-.121
24. Sex is complex; in fact, there might even be more than 2 sexes.	**-.751**	-.092
25. Gender is a complicated issue, and it doesn't always match up with biological sex.	**-.801**	-.093
26. When I meet new people, I use neutral language to refer to partners, because the person may or may not be heterosexual.	-.184	-.102
27. It is possible that people who identify themselves as heterosexual will at some point fall in love with someone of the same sex.	-.243	-.509
28. Women and men need not fall into stereotypical gender roles when in an intimate relationship.	.001	**-.541**
29. People who seem normal are probably straight.	.133	.569
30. People should partner with whomever they choose, regardless of sex or gender.	-.222	**-.561**
31. There are particular ways that men should act and particular ways that women should act in relationships.	.080	**.733**
32. When I meet new people, I assume that they are straight.	-.197	.215
33. People who say that there are only two legitimate genders are mistaken.	**-.801**	-.059
34. In intimate relationships, it is not necessary for women and men to adopt particular roles according to gender.	-.065	-.482
35. Gender is something we learn from society.	**-.705**	-.096
36. Living a 'good life' has little to do with sexual orientation.	.089	-.144
37. It is hard to be sure of a person's sexual orientation without specifically asking.	-.429	-.126
38. Even a person with ambiguous genitalia is still either male or female.	.694	.244

Note: Final sixteen HABS items are in bold.

Table 2: *Intercorrelations among Continuous Variables*

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Binary Gender Subscale	-					
2. Normative Behavior Subscale	.42**	-				
3. RWA	.52**	.64**	-			
4. Attitudes towards Lesbians	-.52**	-.53**	-.72**	-		
5. Attitudes towards Gay Men	-.51**	-.56**	-.72**	.97**	-	
6. Age	-.22**	-.14	.03	.06	.05	-

**p<.01

References

Altemeyer, B. (1998). A 20-item version of the RWA scale. Unpublished paper. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The authoritarian specter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Blasius, M. (2000). Introduction. In M. Blasius (Ed.), *Sexual identities: Queer politics* (pp. i-vii). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Burn, S. M., Kadlec, K., & Rexer, R. (2005). Effects of subtle heterosexism on gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality, 49*(2), 23-38.

Cortina, L.M., Magley, V.J., Williams, J.H, & Langout, R.D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6*(1), 64-80.

Cullen, J. M., Wright, L. W. J., & Alessandri, M. (2002). The personality variable Openness to Experience as it relates to homophobia. *Journal of Homosexuality, 42*(4), 119-134.

Duncan, L. E., Peterson, B. E., & Winter, D. G. (1997). Authoritarianism and gender roles: Toward a psychological analysis of hegemonic relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*(1), 41-49.

Franck, K. C. (2002). Rethinking homophobia: Interrogating heteronormativity in an urban school. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 30*(2), 274-286.

Grace, F. (1999). Risky business: Heterosexual credit & lending practices. *Sexualities, 2,* 433-449.

Harwood, L. (1998). In the pink? Lesbian students' experiences of social work education. *Social Work Education, 17*(2), 157-172.

Hegarty, P. & Pratto, F. (2001). Sexual orientation beliefs: Their relationship to anti-gay attitudes and biological determinist arguments. *Journal of Homosexuality, 41,* 121-135.

Herek, G. M. (1994). Assessing heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: A review of empirical research with the ATLG scale. In B. Greene, & G. M. Herek (Eds.), *Lesbian and gay psychology: Theory, research, and clinical applications.* (pp. 206-228). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hylton, M.E. (2005). Heteronormativity and the experiences of lesbian and bisexual women as social work students. *Journal of Social Work Education, 41,* 67-83.

Jackson, S. (2006). Gender, sexuality and heterosexuality: The complexity (and limits) of heteronormativity. *Feminist Theory, 7*(1), 105-121.

Kitzinger, C. (2005). Heteronormativity in action: Reproducing the heterosexual nuclear family in after-hours medical calls. *Social Problems, 52*(4), 477-498.

Konik, J. (2005). *Harassment as a system for policing traditional gender norms in the workplace: The structure and process of sexual harassment and heterosexist harassment.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

Lancaster, R.N. (2003). *The trouble with nature: Sex & science in popular culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Land, V., & Kitzinger, C. (2005). Speaking as a lesbian: Correcting the heterosexist presumption. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 38*(4), 371-416.

Lind, A. (2004). Legislating the family: Heterosexist bias in social welfare policy frameworks. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare, 31*(4), 21-35.

Nielsen, J. M., Walden, G., & Kunkel, C. A. (2000). Gendered heteronormativity: Empirical illustrations in everyday life. *Sociological Quarterly, 41*(2), 283-296.

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

Morrison, T.G., Parriag, A.V., & Morrison, M.A. (1999). The psychometric properties of the Homonegativity Scale. *Journal of Homosexuality,* 37(4), 111-126.

Oswald, R. F. (2000). A member of the wedding? heterosexism and family ritual. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 17*(3), 349-368.

Peterson, T.L., & Gerrity, D.A. (2005). Internalized homophobia, lesbian identity development, and self-esteem in undergraduate women. *Journal of Homosexuality, 50,* 49-75.

Phelan, S. (2001). *Sexual strangers: Gays, lesbians, & dilemmas of citizenship*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Raja, S., & Stokes, J.P. (1998). Assessing attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: The Modern Homophobia Scale. *Journal of Gay, Lesbian, & Bisexual Identity,* 3(2), 113-134.

Schultz, P.W., & Stone, W.F. (1994). Authoritarianism and attitudes toward the environment. *Environment & Behavior, 26,* 25-37.

Silverschanz, P.C. (2007). *Sticks and stones (and queer jokes): Psychosocial and academic consequences of heterosexist harassment.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

Steffens, M.C. (2005). Implicit and explicit attitudes towards lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality,* 49(2), 39-66.

Stoever, C. J., & Morera, O.F. (2007). A confirmatory factor analysis of the Attitudes toward Lesbians and Gays (ATLG) measure. *Journal of Homosexuality, 52*(3/4), 189-209.

Szymanski, D. M. (2005). Heterosexism and sexism as correlates of psychological distress in lesbians. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 83*(3), 355-360.

Tee, N., & Hegarty, P. (2006). Predicting opposition to the civil rights of trans persons in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 16*(1), 70-80.

Whitley, B.E., Jr. (1999). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, & prejudice. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 77*, 126-134.

Yep, G. A. (2003). The violence of heteronormativity in communication studies: Notes on injury, healing, and queer world-making. *Journal of Homosexuality, 45*(2), 11-59.