

Homosexuality, homophobia and support for Lesbians and Gay human rights

Relationship between affective and cognitive reaction toward homosexuals: an exploratory study in a Southern Italian sample

Rosalia Condorelli

Published online: 5 February 2014
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2014

Abstract Studies on homophobia found the origin of discriminatory attitudes regarding homosexuals in conceptual equations presenting homosexuality either as a genetic error, or as psychological “disturbance” or at other times as a ‘mistake’ in the socialization process. Although in respect to the more or less recent past, today we witness a greater amount of openness toward homosexuals which has above all affirmed juridical equality, yet discriminatory attitudes seem to persist in mentalities and social practices. This study investigates homophobia in Sicilian society, where the culture has traditionally focused on the ‘male cult’, with strong sexist and homophobic attitudes. In particular, it explores the relationship between an emotional or affective negative reaction toward homosexuals and a more cognitive or rational reaction toward homosexuality particularly linked to the degree of support for Gay and Lesbian human rights issues. It is our hypothesis that it is possible to feel uncomfortable in associating with homosexuals without necessarily refusing them social and political equality. The findings seem to confirm the idea that knowing one reaction the other reaction can’t be necessarily inferred. They in fact show that there is no a relationship between an affective reaction (measured by revised version of the Hudson/Ricketts Index of Homophobia or IAH scale) and a cognitive one toward homosexuality.

Keywords Homosexuality · Homophobia · Affective negative reaction toward homosexuals · Cognitive or rational reaction toward homosexuality · HIP scale · Support for Gay and Lesbian human rights

1 Introduction

Studies on homophobia found the origin of discriminatory attitudes regarding homosexuals in conceptual equations as for example homosexuality = disorder (physiological or

R. Condorelli (✉)
Department of Political and Social Sciences, Catania University,
8 Vittorio Emanuele II, 95131 Catania, Italy
e-mail: rosalia.condorelli@tiscali.it; rcondor@unict.it

psychological), homosexuality = deviance, homosexuality = perversion. These convictions are mainly linked to the way homosexuality has been previously interpreted by theories deriving from diverse fields (biological, psychological and social), presenting it either as a genetic error, or as psychological “disturbance” or at other times as a ‘mistake’ in the socialization process.

It is generally known that both innatistic and certain psychoanalytic theories see homosexuality as a pathology. In the first case, it is seen as a mistake of nature, the causes being genetic, biological, relating to imbalance in chromosome mapping, in nervous system conformation or in a section of the brain (hypothalamus) or again in hormone equilibrium during pregnancy. In the second case, homosexuality is a personal and individual psychological question, a disorder in the normal psychic development during childhood caused by strongly identifying with the maternal figure at a very early age. The masculinity deficit which homosexuals seem to carry is the result of a bad relationship with mothers who are too dominant, with a lack of identification with a father figure due to substantially non-significant relationships with the father. This literature has obtained widespread support, although, contrary to Jung and Adler, Freud himself refused to classify homosexuality as a ‘disease’, citing Plato, Michelangelo, and Leonardo da Vinci.

Voluntaristic explanations do not acknowledge the existence of ‘homosexual individuals’ but only of ‘homosexual acts’. Thus, homosexuality is an acquired response behavior, assumed voluntarily and therefore a deviance from the heterosexual norm, a sort of moral perversion. From their point of view, post-modern theories and the *queer theory* have underlined how speaking of homosexuality as a disorder or moral deviance may be nonsensical and may add up to create a ‘false problem’ in light of evidences that question the claimed ‘naturalness’ of the heterosexual paradigm and show, by contrast, the fluid and ever-changing character of sexuality and the natural bisexuality of human beings (Stoller 1978; Money and Tucker 1975). In reality, according to constructionists the heterosexuality and homosexuality categories exist only as a product of a *social construction* of gender and sexuality differences. In other words, culture has instituted in this regard a binary logic to guarantee social reproduction. Heterosexuality, as ‘normal’ sexual orientation, is therefore an ‘instituted’ process, a social construction, and at the same time so is homosexuality, as a *moral deviance* from the dominant norm, a deviance which threatens society’s survival, its cultural and moral cohesion thereby making it legitimate to stop, repress and even punish, as often done in various traditional societies. In short, the category of ‘homosexual’ as morally deviant individual and the consequential homophobia would not exist if it were not for *heterosexism*, the social representation attributing to heterosexuality the condition and character of normality and normativity. So, all the other sexualities are configured as ‘pathological, perverse, immoral, criminal, and destroyers of society’ (Borrillo 2009, p. 26). This would explain, in a social defense logic, why on the one hand strengthening gender differences, encouraging heterosexuality and thereby containing homosexuality, is the basis for proper socialization, and why homosexuality can be a ‘mistake’ in the process of sexual orientation; on the other hand, why the inferiorization and stigmatization of homosexuality can be justified as logical consequence of the moral duty to defend the survival of society. This framework provides a functional explanation for homophobia, intervening as a socio-cultural device maintaining sexual social order or *sexual differentialism* (gender and sexual orientation) instituted by society itself to safeguard its reproduction.

Considered a physio-psychological disorder or deviance, homosexuality aroused strong negative responses through the history of Western Europe and of other parts of the world as well. From 1250 to 1300, homosexuality was punishable by the death sentence in Europe, to be then abolished definitively as late as 1861. Prussian law, the German Empire, and in more

recent times Hitler's Germany and Fascist Italy continued to persecute homosexuals by strict measures of detention (from prisons to concentration camps). Connecting homosexuality to Fascism, up to 1967 it was punishable in Russia by a two year prison sentence. Finally, 1969 marked the beginning of the first organized Gay movement in the United States, which published a Gay manifesto in 1980, becoming the largest homosexual movement in history. At the same time, Arci-gay clubs sprang up even in Italy (FUORI, an acronym standing for Unified Revolutionary Italian Homosexual Front which recalls the English term *Coming Out*, i.e. public declaration of one's homosexuality). Bologna opened up a polyvalent gay culture center and in 1982 the monthly *Babilonia* was first published. In 1991, despite the fact that the association between homosexuality and AIDS had hardened positions, the Executive Council of the *American Psychoanalytic Association* approved a document against any form of public or private discrimination against homosexuals. In respect to the more or less recent past, today, we witness a greater amount of openness, which has above all affirmed juridical equality, as far as Gay rights are concerned. Yet, discriminatory attitudes seem to persist in mentalities and social practices. In the early 90s various surveys in England, Italy and the USA revealed a widespread social disapproval towards homosexuals, 'guilty' of moral decadence of which AIDS was the worse symptom. Later surveys showed more tolerance but surely not the disappearance of homophobic attitudes, harassments, marginalisation, persecutions and labor market discriminations ([Amnesty International Report 2004](#); [Elmslie and Tebaldi 2007](#)). In 2009 the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) reported that homophobia still harms career and mental and physical health of about 4 million people in Europe. LGBT persons are "often subject to homophobia and discrimination at work in a number of ways: direct discrimination, harassment, bullying, ridicule and being socially 'frozen-out'" (2009, p.11).

In more controlled scientific terms, what do we mean by homophobia? The precise definition of the term has been at the core of a long debate, starting from the 70s ([Smith 1971](#)) when we can record the first scientific research aimed at measuring the degree of homophobia in heterosexual population in order to investigate traits of homophobic personality as well as the relationships between homophobia and biological, social and economic variables (age, sex, ethnicity, class status, marital status, educational level, religious affiliation, etc.). As [Borrillo \(2009\)](#) emphasizes, nowadays, the term 'homophobia' indicates the *psychological consequence* of heterosexism, of that intellectual and political device of discrimination based on gender and sexual orientation which gives heterosexuality the monopoly on normality as an insurance covering human reproduction. By so doing, heterosexism foment homophobia, i.e. contempt toward all those, men or women, who do not fit into the referent model. From this perspective, homophobia is essentially an emotional or affective negative reaction toward homosexuals which manifests itself in "responses of fear, anger, disgust, discomfort, and aversion that individuals experience in dealing with gay people" ([Hudson and Ricketts 1980](#), p. 358). Popularized by Weinberg in 1972, the term homophobia was defined by the author himself as "the dread of being in close quarters with homosexuals". In this sense, homophobia belongs to the wider general concept of *homonegativism* regarded as the entire domain of anti-gay responses. Such a domain is multidimensional and includes *affective responses* to gay people and *cognitive*, less irrational, intellectual attitudes toward homosexuality as a phenomenon related to the evaluation of its legality, morality, or social desirability. This distinction was introduced by Hudson and Ricketts to provide a univocal measurement of the concept. After Weinburg, the word "homophobia" was used by professionals and non-professionals to indicate "any negative attitude, belief or action against homosexuals, with the result that it had lost much of its original precision" ([Hudson and Ricketts 1980](#), p. 357). According to the authors, cognitive responses are unsuitable for measuring what

is an emotional or affective response. Therefore, the distinction between homophobia and *homonegativism* was needed to safeguard that conceptual clarity *significantly* jeopardized every time that items measuring cognitive responses were combined with those measuring more affective responses (for example, in research by: [Levitt and Klassen 1974](#); [Lumby 1976](#); [Millham et al 1976](#)).

Based on this distinction, in 1980 Hudson and Ricketts offered a short-form scale to measure homophobia (*Index of Homophobia* or *IHP*) in order “to investigate the homophobia in the heterosexual population and to understand the ways in which homophobia relates to other areas of human social and psychological functioning” (1980, p. 360). The IHP is a purely affective scale and, according to our authors, measures homophobia with a good degree of reliability and validity. They have recommended its use, despite some of its limitations. In effect, today, the IHP constitutes an important point of reference for measuring negative attitudes toward homosexuals. It is still one of the most used scales for its good psychometric properties.

This being considered, the following study applies the IHP to an Italian sample of 300 Catania citizens, divided into age groups (18–25, 26–45 and 46–65 years). Homophobia has not yet been systematically studied using Italian samples ([Lingiardi et al. 2005](#)). This study investigates homophobia in Sicilian society, where the culture has traditionally focused on the ‘male cult’, with strong sexist and homophobic attitudes. Traditionally, Sicilian culture represents homosexuals as deviant and disgusting. It follows that this paper focuses on two core issues. The first explores the relationship between homophobia and factors such as age, gender, education, income, marital status, and religious beliefs. Research on homophobia indicates that people’s socio-demographic characteristics result in different attitudes toward homosexuals. Usually, women and more educated people tend to express more positive attitudes (e.g. [Herek 1988](#); [D’Augelli and Hershberger 1995](#); [Herek and Capitanio 1995](#); [Kite and Whitley 1996, 1998](#); [Schellenberg et al. 1999](#); [Gelbal and Duyan 2006](#); [Sakalli 2002a, b](#); [Siebert et al. 2009](#)). The second is the relationship between an emotional or affective negative reaction toward homosexuals and a more cognitive or rational reaction toward homosexuality particularly linked to the degree of support for Gay and Lesbian human rights issues.

The following question has guided this study. Is there a necessarily consequential relationship between an emotional reaction and a cognitive one toward homosexuality, so that by knowing one reaction the other reaction can be inferred? It is our hypothesis that there is no consequential relationship, instead it is possible to feel uncomfortable in associating with homosexuals without necessarily refusing them social and political equality. On the other hand, experience teaches us that in modern society the opposite situation is quite frequent: even though we tolerate or go as far as sympathize with homosexuals, we nevertheless consider any kind of policy granting them equal rights unacceptable. As [Borillo](#) notes [Borillo et al. 1999](#); [Borillo 2009](#), the heated debates on the PACS (Civil Pacts of Solidarity) are very significant as a point in case. Granted the non-representativeness of the sample, it is an exploratory and heuristic study. A wider sample is required for more definitive conclusions.

2 Method

2.1 Participants

The sample consisted of 300 Catania citizens. There is good variation within the sample with respect to a number of social and economic characteristics of the respondents. It should be useful to explore the way in which these characteristics relate to homophobia although the findings

Table 1 Sample socio-demographic characteristics

	N (%)
Gender	
Male	132 (44)
Female	168 (56)
Age	
18–25	100 (33.3)
25–25	100 (33.3)
45–65	100 (33.3)
Marital status	
In a relationship	99 (33)
Not in a relationship	182 (60.7)
Separated/divorced	19 (6.3)
Education	
Did not graduate HS	27 (9)
High educational level	273 (91)
SES	
Low	16 (5.3)
Middle	93 (31)
High	47 (15.6)
Students	111 (37)
Unemployed	12 (4)
Retired	12 (4)
Housewife	9 (3)
Religion	
Practicing C.C.	99 (33)
Non practicing	182 (60.7)
No religious	19 (6.3)
Beliefs	

cannot be generalized to population. Specifically speaking, there is good balance in sex and age variable. Participants were 132 men (44 %) and 168 women (56 %), aged from 18 to 65 years [$n = 100$ (33,3 % of the total sample) from 18 to 25 years, $n = 100$ (33,3 %) from 25 to 45 years, $n = 100$ (33,3 %) from 45 to 65 years). Sixty-one percent of the participants were single, 33 % married, 6.3 % separated and divorced. Regarding the strength of their religious beliefs, 33 % reported that they were practicing Catholic Christians, 60.7 % non-practicing Catholic Christians, and 6.3 % reported that they had no religious affiliation. Educational levels of the participants were as follows: 91 % (273) had a high education level and 9 % ($n = 27$) had a low education level (elementary school). Thirty-seven of the participants ($n = 111$) were University students. Table 1 summarizes participants' socio-demographic characteristics.

2.2 Instruments

A questionnaire was administered which included two question subgroups. The first subgroup included questions relating to participants' socio-demographic characteristics (i.e. sex, age,

education, marital status, professional role, religious beliefs), their interpersonal contact with gay men and lesbians, and their personal knowledge or friendship with homosexual persons. The second subgroup included items addressing Lesbian and Gay human rights issues (i.e. employment, political rights, marriage, spousal benefits such as parental leave, pension rights, etc., and adoption issues) (items from SLGHR scale, Ellis et al. 2002; Malaney et al. 1997; Eliason 1996; D'Augelli 1989).

The revised Hudson/Ricketts index of Homophobia version was used to measure attitudes toward homosexuals.

There are a variety of scales designed to measure sexual prejudice, opportunely summarized in Schwanberg's article, *Attitudes towards Gay Men and Lesbian Women: Instrumentation Issues* (1993). Some scales measure more cognitive and cultural attitudes against homosexuals like the well-known and widely used Herek's ATLG scale (*Attitude toward Lesbians and Gay Men Scale*, including such items as: "Lesbians are sick", "Male homosexuality is a perversion", "Female homosexuality is a sin", "Sex between two women [men] is wrong", "State laws regulating private, consenting lesbian behavior, should be loosened", Herek 1984, 1994). Other scales, instead, measure emotional and irrational responses, or the way heterosexuals feel about associating with homosexuals. The *Index of Homophobia (IHP)*, created by Hudson and Ricketts in 1980, was the first attempt to construct a scale solely on items that measured emotional reactions to Gays (an affective response of fear, discomfort, disgust, anxiety, anger, aversion with respect to either proximal or distal contacts or involvement with homosexual individuals, which are a prelude to prejudice and negative discriminatory attitudes towards homosexuals). The Index excludes "judgments concerning the morality of homosexuality, decisions about personal and social relationships involving persons (what one should or should not do), or any other responses concerning beliefs, preferences, legality, or social desirability" (Hudson and Ricketts 1980, p. 366).

As already stated above, the Index, according to its authors, allows one to avoid problems of univocal measurement of the concept "homophobia" (conforming to Weinberg's original definition) which might be induced by scales characterized by combining both items measuring cognitive and affective responses. The IHP scale measures homophobia with a good degree of validity and reliability, thus explaining its widespread use.

The *Index of Homophobia* is a 25-item scale. Responses are given on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 to 5 (1 = *strongly agree*, 2 = *agree*, 3 = *neither agree nor disagree*, 4 = *disagree*, 5 = *strongly disagree*). The total score of each respondent ranges from 0 to 100, and is distributed along a continuum which goes from maximum acceptance to a total refusal of homosexuals. Lower scores reflect more accepting and positive attitudes toward homosexuals while higher scores reflect more homophobic attitudes. Specifically, a score of 0–25 indicates a clear non homophobic attitude (*high grade non-homophobia*), 25–50 expresses a basically non-homophobic attitude with some exceptions compared to the preceding level (*low grade non-homophobia*). A score between 50 and 75 refers to people regarded as *low grade homophobics*. These subjects show a higher level of homophobia with more exceptions while still not reaching total refusal of homosexuals. This latter state is expressed by a range score above 75 which indicates *high grade homophobia*. Positive and negative statements about gay people and their social interactions were used to control for any response set biases. Once the negative worded items were reverse-scored (so that a score of 1 = 5, 2 = 4, 4 = 2, 5 = 1, and a score of 3, indicating a neutral answer, remained unchanged), the total score is computed as

$$S = \left(\sum X - N \right) (100) / \{ (N)(4) \}$$

X is a single item score and N is the number of items actually completed. Any items left blank are automatically scored as 0. The formula was introduced by the authors to always reach a total score of 0 to 100 “regardless of the number of items left blank or improperly completed” (Hudson and Ricketts 1980, p. 360). If a respondent completes all 25 items, the total score can be computed as

$$S = \sum X - 25$$

Hudson and Ricketts themselves tested the psychometric properties of the scale on a non-random sample of 300 students in the department of Social Work, Sociology, and Psychology at the University of Hawaii at Manoa and demonstrated its reliability, unidimensionality and validity¹. Although the findings could not be generalized, they have offered some suggestions concerning the relationship between homophobia and some social and economic correlates. The sample showed, on the whole, a high level of homophobia regardless of difference in gender and economic status, with the exception of age, level of education (inverse correlation), and ethnicity (Japanese, Chinese and Filipinos being the most homophobic of all other ethnic groups). Probably, commented the authors, “the younger people in the sample had been unable to overcome through maturation or education the insidious fear of homosexuality that [their] culture begins to instill in [their] children as soon as they are old enough to have playmates” (1980, p.368).

Hudson and Ricketts finally came up with an improved version of the IHP with an alpha coefficient of 0.95, and renamed it the *IAH (Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals)* “in order to reduce the potential for “socially desirable” responding” (1980, p. 370). Table 2 shows the latest modified version of the Homophobia Index².

In evaluating the goodness of their work, the authors indicated its main limitation, which is: using a non-random sample consisting of predominantly young, well-educated adults from a University setting. So, they recommended the need to acquire additional information concerning scale’s performance with samples from very different age groups of adults and backgrounds. However, several years of research confirm, today, that the scale has good psychometric properties. The IAH has been used in various research projects after Hudson and Ricketts’ studies, even though they were done on student samples (e.g. Pagtolun-An and Clair 1986; Serdahely and Ziemba 1984; Roderick et al. 1998; Miresghhi and Matsumoto 2008). It was even readapted by White and Franzini (1999) to measure *heteronegativism* (homosexual attitudes toward heterosexuals). In particular, a study conducted on an Australian sample showed an optimal reliability and validity level of the scale (Pain and Disney 1995). Applied to 207 students from Middle East Technical University, the IAH and the Glick and Fiske’s

¹ According to tests conducted by Hudson and Ricketts an alpha coefficient of 0.91 and a low standard error of measurement suffice to show the scale’s reliability and unidimensionality. A positive correlation of 0.53 significant at $p < .0001$ of IHP and SAS scores [*Sexual Attitude Scale*, a reliable and valid measure of an individual’s conservative vs liberal beliefs on the expression of human sexuality (Hudson and Murphy 1978)] assure instead construct validity.

² Items 12, 18, 19, 20 and 21 of the IHP modified version replace the following original items:

12. I would deny to members of my peer group that I had friends who were homosexual
18. I would like to have my parents know that I had gay friends.
19. I would feel uncomfortable kissing a close friend of my sex in public
20. I would like to have friends of my sex who were homosexual
21. If a member of my sex made an advance toward me I would wonder if I were homosexual

According to Hudson and Ricketts, these items conform less to the proposed definition of homophobia: item 12 represents a *decision* concerning social relations; items 18 and 20 represent *preference* statements and item 21 represents a *judgement* concerning one’s sexual status. Item 19 was substituted to strengthen the overall scale.

Table 2 Revised version of the Hudson/Ricketts Index of Homophobia or IAH

Items	1. Strongly agree	2. Agree	3. Neither agree nor disagree	4. Disagree	5. Strongly disagree
1. I would feel comfortable working closely with a male homosexual					
2. I would enjoy attending social functions at which homosexuals were present					
3. I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my neighbour was homosexual					
4. If a member of my sex made a sexual advance toward me I would feel angry					
5. I would feel comfortable knowing that I was attractive to members of my sex					
6. I would feel uncomfortable being seen in a gay bar					
7. I would feel comfortable if a member of my sex made an advance toward me					
8. I would be comfortable if I found myself attracted to a member of my sex					
9. I would feel disappointed if I learned that my child was homosexual					
10. I would feel nervous being in a group of homosexuals					
11. I would feel comfortable knowing that my clergyman was homosexual					
12. I would be upset if I learned that my brother or sister was homosexual					
13. I would feel that I had failed as a parent if I learned that my child was gay					
14. If I saw two men holding hands in public I would feel disgusted					
15. If a member of my sex made an advance toward me I would be offended					
16. I would feel comfortable if I learned that my daughter's teacher was a lesbian					
17. I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my spouse or partner was attracted to members of his or her sex					
18. I would feel at ease talking with a homosexual person at a party					
19. I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my boss was homosexual					
20. It would not bother me to walk through a predominantly gay section of town					
21. It would disturb me to find out that my doctor was homosexual					
22. I would feel comfortable if I learned that my best friend of my sex was homosexual					
23. If a member of my sex made an advance toward me I would feel flattered					
24. I would feel uncomfortable knowing that my son's male teacher was homosexual					
25. I would feel comfortable working closely with a female homosexual					

Reverse-scored items: 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21, 24

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory proved to be a useful instrument to analyze the relationship of sexism, or traditional and conservative values, sexual preferences and contacts with homosexual individuals to attitudes toward homosexuality. Sexist attitudes, being more traditional and conservative, and not knowing any homosexual individuals all predicted more negative attitudes toward homosexuality (Sakalli 2002a). Due to its good psychometric properties, the IAH has been recently recommended and applied to a student sample of different ages, gender, race and religious affiliation (Siebert et al. 2009). It was proclaimed a valid instrument to measure homophobia, to evaluate antigay bias, to prompt discussion, and to be used as an outcome measure in intervention studies.

2.3 Data analysis

The data was analyzed with the SPSS statistical package, version 18. After calculating the scores on the IAH, they were grouped into two ranges: a score range from 0 to 50 identifying non-homophobic persons, and a score range above 50 identifying homophobic persons. The relationship between being and not being homophobic, socio-demographic variables and other sample features were evaluated by group comparisons on the basis of sex, age, marital status, education, religious beliefs with regard to degree of homophobia and by computing measures of association for dependence or independence of features considered. The relationship between homophobia and support to homosexuals' human rights was analyzed by a similar procedure: comparisons between homophobics and non-homophobics were made for each item addressing Lesbian and Gay human rights issues and measure of association was performed between groups for each item. The following measures of association between variables were calculated: *phi coefficient* ($\varphi = -1, 0, +1$), *V of Cramer*, and, as a control measure in the case of dichotomous variables with unbalanced frequencies, the τ_c ³. Since our sample was not random, inferential statistics techniques were not applied. The findings can be regarded as suggesting what might be found in a study based on a larger representative sample.

3 Results

The results of the IAH administration on our sample were very interesting. The overall mean IAH score for the entire sample was 56.0. Therefore, the sample as a whole could be regarded as 'low grade homophobic': 51.7 % scored in the homophobic range (IAH score from 50 to 75) and 9.7 % were found to be high grade homophobics (IAH score of 75 or more); only 1.7 % were seen as high grade non-homophobic (IAH score of 25 or less) and 37 % were seen as low grade non-homophobic. More than half of the sample, exactly 61.4 % (184 participants), therefore, expressed a tendency toward homophobia (score of 50 and over) versus 38.7 % (116 participants) of tendentially non-homophobic (score from 0 to 50).

³ As is known, analysis of 2×2 tables for dichotomic variables leads to the following conclusion: the more unbalanced the frequencies of a diagonal are, the lower is the variance of each dichotomy, and the less reliable the relative statistical coefficients are (Gangemi 1985). This is true for the *phi* (φ) coefficient which can be calculated only on dichotomies with balanced frequencies. It has been shown that the more unbalanced the frequencies are, the less reliable the *phi* values are, overestimating the existence of a relationship among variables which instead is not there or, if it does exist, is weak. In the case of unbalanced frequencies, the coefficient *tau c* can be used, whose formula is $\tau_c = 4(ad - bc)/N^2$. It varies from +1 to -1 and therefore can be compared to φ . If the frequencies are balanced $\tau_c = \varphi$. But the more unbalanced the frequencies are and therefore the smaller the variance of each variable, the more τ_c tends to reduce its value compared to φ , i.e. it tends to negate the existence of the relationship. In other words, it induces us to deny the existence of a relationship between variables where φ behaves in a less reliable manner tending toward its over estimation.

Table 3 Responses to items on the IAH scale from participants with the highest scores (score of 50 and over) expressed as percentages of the total number $N = 184$

Items	Strongly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly disagree (%)
1. I would feel comfortable working closely with a male homosexual	7 (3.8)	44 (23.9)	97 (52.7)	21 (11.4)	15 (8.2)
2. I would enjoy attending social functions at which homosexuals were present	0 (0)	14 (7.6)	102 (55.4)	49 (26.6)	19 (10.3)
3. I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my neighbour was homosexual	14 (7.7)	19 (10.4)	99 (54.1)	40 (21.9)	11 (6.0)
4. If a member of my sex made a sexual advance toward me I would feel angry	73 (39.7)	69 (37.5)	28 (15.2)	9 (4.9)	5 (2.7)
5. I would feel comfortable knowing that I was attractive to members of my sex	8 (4.4)	14 (7.7)	58 (31.7)	54 (29.5)	49 (26.8)
6. I would feel uncomfortable being seen in a gay bar	48 (26.2)	57 (31.1)	59 (32.2)	15 (8.2)	4 (2.2)
7. I would feel comfortable if a member of my sex made an advance toward me	13 (7.1)	13 (7.1)	25 (13.7)	68 (37.2)	64 (35.0)
8. I would be comfortable if I found myself attracted to a member of my sex	4 (2.2)	3 (1.6)	12 (6.6)	55 (30.2)	108 (59.3)
9. I would feel disappointed if I learned that my child was homosexual	48 (26.7)	86 (47.8)	25 (13.9)	14 (7.8)	7 (3.9)
10. I would feel nervous being in a group of homosexuals	31 (17.0)	66 (36.3)	70 (38.5)	14 (7.7)	1 (0.5)
11. I would feel comfortable knowing that my clergyman was homosexual	13 (7.1)	13 (7.1)	72 (39.1)	43 (23.4)	43 (23.4)
12. I would be upset if I learned that my brother or sister was homosexual	53 (29.4)	83 (46.1)	28 (15.6)	14 (7.8)	2 (1.1)
13. I would feel that I had failed as a parent if I learned that my child was gay	35 (19.1)	45 (24.6)	30 (16.4)	61 (33.3)	12 (6.6)
14. If I saw two men holding hands in public I would feel disgusted	18 (9.9)	32 (17.6)	99 (54.4)	21 (11.5)	12 (6.6)
15. If a member of my sex made an advance toward me I would be offended	44 (24.2)	70 (38.5)	43 (23.6)	21 (11.5)	4 (2.2)
16. I would feel comfortable if I learned that my daughter's teacher was a lesbian	11 (6.0)	15 (8.2)	61 (33.2)	58 (31.5)	39 (21.2)

Table 3 continued

Items	Strongly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly disagree (%)
17. I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my spouse or partner was attracted to members of his or her sex	102 (52.0)	51 (28.0)	9 (4.9)	13 (7.1)	7 (3.8)
18. I would feel at ease talking with a homosexual person at a party	9 (4.9)	40 (21.9)	82 (45.4)	30 (16.4)	21 (11.5)
19. I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my boss was homosexual	12 (6.6)	29 (15.9)	107 (58.8)	27 (14.8)	7 (3.8)
20. It would not bother me to walk through a predominantly gay section of town	8 (4.4)	27 (14.8)	76 (41.8)	42 (23.1)	29 (15.9)
21. It would disturb me to find out that my doctor was homosexual	25 (13.7)	46 (25.1)	99 (54.1)	10 (5.5)	3 (1.6)
22. I would feel comfortable if I learned that my best friend of my sex was homosexual	13 (7.1)	21 (11.5)	66 (36.3)	54 (29.7)	28 (15.4)
23. If a member of my sex made an advance toward me I would feel flattered	3 (1.7)	10 (5.6)	34 (18.9)	72 (40.0)	61 (33.9)
24. I would feel uncomfortable knowing that my son's male teacher was homosexual	49 (26.8)	59 (32.2)	62 (33.9)	10 (5.5)	3 (1.6)
25. I would feel comfortable working closely with a female homosexual	14 (7.7)	20 (11.0)	108 (59.3)	22 (12.1)	18 (9.9)

Table 4 Relationship between socio-demographic characteristics of the participants and their attitudes toward homosexuals

Socio-demographic characteristics	H (above 50) %	NH (0–50) %	Statistics
Gender			
Men	93 (70.5)	39 (29.5)	$\phi = 0.16$
Woman	91 (54.2)	77 (45.8)	$\tau_c = 0.16$
Age			
18–25	59 (59.0)	41 (41.0)	$V \text{ di Cramer} = 0.114$
25–45	56 (56.0)	44 (44.0)	
45–65	69 (69.0)	31 (31.0)	
Educational level			
Elementary school	29 (85.2)	4 (14.8)	$V \text{ di Cramer} = 0.19$
H-S graduate	129 (59.2)	89 (40.8)	
University	32 (58.2)	23 (41.8)	
Marital status			
Single	108 (59.3)	74 (40.7)	$V \text{ di Cramer} = 0.08$
Married	66 (66.7)	33 (33.3)	
Separated/divorced	10 (52.6)	9 (47.4)	
Religious belief			
Believer/practicing	69 (69.7)	30 (30.3)	$V \text{ di Cramer} = 0.123$
Believer/not practicing	105 (57.7)	77 (42.3)	
No religious belief	10 (52.6)	9 (47.4)	
Knowledge of homosexuals			
Friends/colleagues	39 (42.9)	52 (57.1)	$\phi = 0.25$
No friends or colleagues	145 (69.4)	64 (30.6)	$\tau_c = -0.22$

NH non-homophobic, H homophobic

As seen in Table 3, the items that received the highest interviewee consensus, in comparing the items of the IAH scale, were those dealing with evaluating personal feelings (possible fear, anger, upset, discomfort, disgust. . .) in situations where the homosexuals in question were sons and daughters, siblings or close friends, as well as facing the possibility of same sex advances or discovering one's own homosexuality. In reference to these items the number of "indifferent replies" is lower than other items. In other terms, it is easier to be indifferent and not have feelings of discomfort or comfort in learning that our neighbour is gay, rather than in finding out that our son or our partner is. In these cases there is no doubt nor hesitation: feelings of discomfort, or even failure, seem to prevail. The same can be said in reference to being considered attractive to members of the same sex.

As far as the relationship between homophobia and respondents' socio demographic features is concerned, there is a weak although not negligible relationship between attitudes toward homosexuals, gender and education level (Table 4). Males were more homophobic than females (70.5% of male participants (93) vs 54.2 % (91) of females). The relationship between the variables was acceptable but weak ($\phi = 0.16$). There is, in fact, 54 % of women who obtained a score of 50 and upwards vs 45 % of non-homophobic women (a $\phi^2 = 0.025$ indicates that only a 2 % variance for each variable is predicted by the relationship with the other). Better educated people were more tolerant and less homophobic

(Cramer's $V = 0.19$). The age factor does not seem to influence homophobic orientation thus far in this sample. There is a little association between the variables, although older respondents were more homophobic than younger ones (69 vs 59 %, Cramer's $V = 0.114$). The value of the V coefficient indicates an association equal to 11 % of the maximum possible value (1 or complete association). In a similar way, being single or married does not influence homophobic attitudes. There were no differences among the marital status groups with respect to their scores (V di Cramer = 0.08 or no association). A weak relationship was found between homophobia and religious belief: those who identified themselves as having no religious beliefs were uniformly distributed between homophobia and non-homophobia (V di Cramer = 0.123; if we combine in the same group practicing and non-practicing believers, the V falls to 0.04, coinciding with the ϕ value, and the τ_c is actually 0.02. This shows a complete absence of association between the two variables). Instead, more significant differences were found with respect to personal knowledge of homosexuals. Those who did not have homosexual friends or colleagues were more homophobic than those having homosexual friends (69.4 % (145) vs 42.9 % (39), $\phi = 0.25$). The association between the variables is the strongest, indicating a greater dependence of homophobic orientation on interactions with homosexuals.

Our results appear to be in line with those obtained from other research on homophobia which found the relationship between homophobia, gender, level of education, and knowing homosexuals, significant. Research conforms to theoretical expectations according to which the higher the education level the more tolerance of alternative life-styles there is (Hudson and Ricketts 1980). Less tolerance, instead, is expected from males due to the influence of cultural hetero-sexism. This 'conformity' does not astonish us at all, considering that Sicilian culture is traditionally constructed around values which privilege male domination and virility as guarantees of descendants and preservation of the family patrimony. This cultural factor still persists today, involving all age brackets (the small association between homophobia and age shows this general tendency). Despite the non-randomness of the sample, the findings can be regarded as suggesting what might be found in a study based on a larger representative sample. This applies also to the research project's main question, i.e. what is the relationship between the emotional and cognitive response towards homosexuality. If there were a consequential relationship we might expect those with higher scores on the scale to be less likely to recognize equal rights to lesbians and gay men compared to non-homophobic individuals having lower scores on the IAH. On the other hand, non-homophobics would be expected to be more open minded, and thus more supportive of homosexuals human rights issues. Table 5 illustrates the distribution of the two groups of homophobics and non-homophobics referring to items which ask participants to say whether they are in favor or not in favor of recognizing homosexuals the same rights which are presently enjoyed by heterosexuals. These rights include not being discriminated in the work place, i.e. not being hired or being fired or not being promoted because of their sexuality, the right to be married; the right to enjoy all the benefits of heterosexual unions which many believe should also be afforded to heterosexual couples who are living together regardless of whether they are legally married or not; the right to adopt children; the right to run for public office).

As we can see from the table, there are no significant differences between homophobics and non with regard to the first two, the sixth and the last item. Most homophobics equal to most non-homophobics expressed agreement with the statements that "homosexuality should not be a cause for job discrimination in any situation" (97.1 and 99.1 % respectively, $\tau_c = 0.0198$), "Lesbians and Gay men are entitled to stand for election like heterosexuals" (76.2 and 85.7 %, $\tau_c = 0.0943$), "Homosexual couples should be entitled to the same benefits as heterosexual couples (married or *de facto*) with regard to health aid in case of

Table 5 Relationship between Homophobia and support of lesbian and gay human rights issues

Items	Agree/strongly agree (% of <i>N</i>)	Disagree/strongly disagree (% of <i>N</i>)	<i>N</i>	Statistics
Homosexuality is merely a different kind of lifestyle that should not be condemned (ATLG)				
NH (0–50)	106 (95.5)	5 (4.5)	111	$\phi_i = 0.085$
H (above 50)	143 (91.1)	14 (8.9)	157	$\tau_c = 0.0428$
Homosexuality should not be a cause for job discrimination in any situation (ATLG)				
NH (0–50)	113 (99.1)	1 (0.9)	114	$\phi_i = 0.070$
H (above 50)	165 (97.1)	5 (2.9)	170	$\tau_c = 0.0198$
Lesbian and gay male couples should be legally permitted to marry, just as heterosexual couples are (SLGHR)				
NH (0–50)	59 (67.8)	28 (32.2)	87	$\phi_i = 0.514$
H (above 50)	23 (17.0)	112 (83.0)	135	$\tau_c = 0.4841$
Homosexuals couples should be entitled to the same benefits as heterosexuals couples (married or defacto) with regard to family allowances				
NH (0–50)	82 (87.2)	12 (12.8)	94	$\phi_i = 0.391$
H (above 50)	64 (49.6)	65 (50.4)	129	$\tau_c = 0.3669$
Homosexuals couples should be entitled to the same benefits as heterosexuals couples (married or defacto) with regard to pension rights (SLGHR)				
NH (0–50)	88 (90.7)	9 (9.3)	97	$\phi_i = 0.18$
H (above 50)	101 (76.5)	31 (23.5)	132	$\tau_c = 0.1387$
Homosexuals couples should be entitled to the same benefits as heterosexuals couples (married or defacto) with regard to assistance right in case of partner's serious illness				
NH (0–50)	97 (96.0)	4 (4.0)	101	$\phi_i = 0.14$
H (above 50)	123 (87.9)	17 (12.1)	140	$\tau_c = 0.0797$
Homosexuals couples should be entitled to the same benefits as heterosexuals couples (married or defacto) with regard to heredity issues				
NH (0–50)	89 (94.7)	5 (5.3)	94	$\phi_i = 0.248$
H (above 50)	97 (76.4)	30 (23.6)	127	$\tau_c = 0.1789$
Gay man couples should be allowed to adopt children as heterosexual couples (ATLG, or SLGHR)				
NH (0–50)	17 (17.5)	80 (82.5)	97	$\phi_i = 0.305$
H (above 50)	2 (1.2)	166 (98.8)	168	$\tau_c = 0.1516$
Lesbian couples should be allowed to adopt children as heterosexual couples (ATLG or SLGHR)				
NH (0–50)	27 (27.0)	73 (73.0)	100	$\phi_i = 0.307$
H (above 50)	9 (5.4)	159 (94.6)	168	$\tau_c = 0.2025$
Lesbian and gay men are entitled to stand for election as heterosexuals				
NH (0–50)	90 (85.7)	15 (14.3)	105	$\phi_i = 0.120$
H (above 50)	93 (76.2)	29 (23.8)	122	$\tau_c = 0.0943$

partner's serious illness"⁴ ($\tau_c = 0.0797$)⁵. No significant difference was found even referring to the statement "Homosexuality is merely a different kind of lifestyle that should not be condemned". In fact 91.1 % of homophobics and 95.5 % of non homophobics agreed on considering homosexuality a *different* style of life which is not to be condemned for this ($\tau_c = 0.0428$). From our interviews, we found that reactions such as ridicule, ostracism, social segregation or arrest were considered totally unacceptable from the interviewees' point of view. In fact, τ_c values lower than 0.10 express an absence of relationship between homophobia and degree of agreement with these statements. The situation remains stable until the rights in question deal with a sensitive issue like marriage. In this case, the difference between homophobics and non-homophobics becomes more relevant: 83 % of homophobics disagree with the statement that Lesbian and Gay male couples can be legally permitted to marry versus 32.2 % of non-homophobics. Therefore 67.8 % of non homophobics believe it just to extend the right to marry to Lesbian and Gay couples versus only 17 % of homophobics. A relation between homophobia and support to human rights in this case does exist and is on the average strong— $\phi = 0.501$, $\tau_c = 0.4841$. However other significant results do not allow to attribute this finding to homophobic attitudes *sic et simpliciter*. On the one hand, in the case of adoption right the relation between degree of homophobia and support to human rights exists but is decisively weaker ($\tau_c = 0.1516$ for gay men couples, $\tau_c = 0.2025$ for lesbian couples). In fact, most non-homophobics (82.5 %) do not agree on giving this right to homosexuals as well as most homophobics (98.8 %). On the other hand, in reference to other items such as those relating to rights to pension reversion and direct personal property inheritance most of homophobics generally are agree with most non homophobics to extend these rights not only to *defacto* hetero-sexual couples but to Gay and Lesbian couples as well. The exception is granting family allowances, with a stronger relationship corresponding to a τ_c value equal to 0.37.

4 Discussion and conclusions

The results of our analysis delineate a rather complex rapport between emotional reactions and cognitive reactions in regard to homosexuality. On the whole, the findings show that there is no necessarily consequential relationship between emotional and cognitive response. In light of these results, in fact, we can draw a general picture whose protagonist is an actor model with the following features. When facing possible institutionalized discrimination against homosexuals, there appears to be an actor who supports lesbian and gay human rights regardless of homophobia level. The majority of those who scored high on the IAH scale agreed substantially to accord common civil liberties to homosexuals thereby refusing certain forms of discrimination against them. It is possible to feel uncomfortable in associating or interacting with homosexuals but to consider the discrimination against them on the job or their being banned from politics wrong. Moreover, the majority of the sample absolutely agreed on considering homosexuality a 'different life style, not to be condemned'. The only exceptions to this rule concerned sensitive issues such as marriage and adoption. Most homophobics, in fact, are not in favor of recognizing the right to marry and to adopt children to Lesbian and Gay couples. And however this negative orientation seem cannot be attributed

⁴ In Italy, any possible assistance to the sick partner still depends on the ill partner's family permission even in heterosexual or *defacto* relationships.

⁵ Here the opportune use of τ_c is evident. Since the frequencies are unbalanced, ϕ assumes higher values than τ_c inducing the acceptance of a relationship, even if somewhat weak, between the variables which τ_c leads instead to exclude.

to homophobic attitudes *sic et simpliciter*, in so far as high number of homophobics showing a favorable orientation regarding homosexual marriage do not agree on giving them the adoption right as well. The denial of right to marry and adopt children to Gay and Lesbian couples may be explained by the fact that certain traditional values regarding the concept of family remain rooted in a rather widespread way and influence the judgment of human rights recognition to homosexuals when these rights involve family issues. In conclusion recognizing or not civil rights does not necessarily depend on being homophobic or not. As well as it seems that it is possible to feel uncomfortable associating with homosexuals without necessarily refusing them social and political equality, likewise it is possible to tolerate and sympathize with homosexuals and nevertheless deny them certain civil rights.

In addition, the results show a peculiarity. Negative emotional reactions against homosexuals are much more frequent as homosexuality crosses the threshold of our intimate lives involving our loved ones or threatens our own gender identity. This seems to be confirmed by the high number of 'indifferent' replies even among high scoring scale participants regarding issues such as learning that one's own neighbour, boss, doctor or work colleague is homosexual. When homosexuality comes knocking at the door of our private spheres, uncomfortable feelings arise: the fear of discovering our homosexuality, the fear of being labeled one, the uneasiness (or even anger, disgust, and in any case the absence of any feeling of flattery) in front of eventual sexual advances from same sex individuals, the fear of being seen in gay bars or being in the company of homosexuals, the feelings of discomfort and failure in finding out that your child, sibling, or closest friend, with whom you have shared so much of your life, is homosexual. In other words, homophobia seems to celebrate the psychological need to strengthen one's own membership to the hetero-sexual and therefore a strong need of *social conformism*, a strong need to conform to gender social order. Our concluding reflection must necessarily derive from this last consideration. We cannot deny the importance of pressures for equal civil rights from Gay Rights movements. Nevertheless, the belief, as understood from the contents of the so called 'homosexual cause', that the legal recognition of Gay rights *per se* can automatically cancel from our minds the idea of homosexuality as a form of 'non normal' sexuality (so that we do not feel *hurt* from the least hint of anguish if our own son turns out to be homosexual or even if we ourselves are found out to be homosexual) is a very problematic conviction. In the light of the findings of our investigation this seems a very difficult logical implication to sustain. In view of our results we modestly propose the following conclusion: We welcome Civil Rights pressure from Gay activists but we must be cautious about the provocative caricature of homosexuality exhibited, for example, in Gay Pride parades. Provocation might not be useful at all to the 'homosexual cause'. Indeed, it might widen that gap which gay movements aspire to fill, a gap between *us* and *them*, a *them* we do not condemn and whom we want to civilly protect but to whom deep down inside we wish... not to belong!

References

- Amnesty International Report: Sesso, amore, omofobia (2004)
- Borrillo, D.: Omofobia. Storia e critica di un pregiudizio (transl. Caiati D., Borrillo, D.: L'homophobie. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris (2001)). Edizioni Dedalo, Bari (2009)
- Borrillo, D., Fassin, E., Iacub, M. (eds.): Au-delà du PaCS. L'expertise familiale à l'épreuve de l'homosexualité. PUF, Paris (1999)
- D'Augelli, A.R., Hershberger, S.L.: A multiyear analysis of changes in AIDS concerns and homophobia on a university campus. *J. Am. Coll. Health* **44**, 3–10 (1995)

- D'Augelli, A.R.: Homophobia in a university community: view of prospective resident assistants. *J. Coll. Stud. Dev.* **30**, 547–552 (1989)
- Eliason, M.J.: A survey of the campus climate for lesbian, gay, and bisexual university members. *J. Psychol. Hum. Sex.* **8**, 39–58 (1996)
- Ellis, S.J., Kitzinger, C., Wilkinson, S.: Attitudes towards lesbians and gay men and support for lesbian and gay human rights among psychology students. *J. Homosex.* **44**, 121–138 (2002)
- Elmslie, B., Tebaldi, E.: Sexual orientation and labor market discrimination. *J. Labor Res.* **28**, 436–453 (2007)
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA): Homophobia and Discrimination on Grounds of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in the EU Member States. Part II: The Social Situation. European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2009)
- Gangemi, G.: La logica della comparazione: Controlli statistici e controlli nel disegno della ricerca. EDAS, Messina (1985)
- Gelbal, S., Duyan, V.: Attitudes of university students toward lesbians and gay men in Turkey. *Sex Roles* **55**, 573–579 (2006)
- Herek, G.M., Capitano, J.P.: Black heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men in the United States. *J. Sex Res.* **32**, 95–105 (1995)
- Herek, G.M.: Attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: a factor analytic study. *J. Homosex.* **10**, 39–51 (1984)
- Herek, G.M.: Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: correlates and gender differences. *J. Sex Res.* **25**, 451–477 (1988)
- Herek, G.M.: Assessing heterosexuals attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: a review of empirical research with the ATLG scale. In: Greene, B., Herek, G.M. (eds.) *Psychological Perspectives on Lesbian and Gay Issues*, v.1: Lesbian and Gay Psychology: Theory, Research, and Clinical Applications. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks (1994)
- Hudson, W.W., Ricketts, W.A.: A strategy for the measurement of homophobia. *J. Homosex.* **4**, 357–372 (1980)
- Hudson, W.W., Murphy, G.J.: Liberal vs conservative orientations toward human sexual expressions. University of Hawaii School of Social Work, Honolulu (1978)
- Kite, M.E., Whitley Jr, B.E.: Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexual persons, behaviors, and civil rights: a meta-analysis. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* **22**, 336–353 (1996)
- Kite, M.E., Whitley Jr, B.E.: Do heterosexual women and men differ in their attitudes toward homosexuality? A conceptual and methodological analysis. In: Herek, G.M. (ed.) *Stigma and Sexual Orientation*, pp. 39–61. Sage Publications, Newbury Park (1998)
- Levitt, E.E., Klassen, A.D.: Attitudes toward homosexuality. *J. Homosex.* **1**, 29–43 (1974)
- Lingiardi, V., Falanga, S., D'Augelli, A.: The evaluation of homophobia in an Italian sample: an exploratory study. *Arch. Sex. Behav.* **34**, 81–94 (2005)
- Lumby, M.E.: Homophobia: the quest for a valid scale. *J. Homosex.* **2**, 39–47 (1976)
- Malaney, G.D., Williams, E.A., Geller, W.W.: Assessing campus climate for gays, lesbians, and bisexuals at two institutions. *J. Coll. Stud. Dev.* **38**, 365–375 (1997)
- Millham, J., San Miguel, C.L., Kellogg, R.: A factor analytic conceptualization of attitudes toward male and female homosexuals. *J. Homosex.* **2**, 3–10 (1976)
- Miresghhi, S.I., Matsumoto, D.: Perceived cultural attitudes toward homosexuality and their effects on Iranian and American sexual minorities. *Cult. Divers. Ethn. Minor. Psychol.* **14**, 372–376 (2008)
- Money, J., Tucker, P.: *Sexual Signatures: On Being a Men or a Woman*. Little Brown and Company, Boston (1975)
- Pagtolun-An, I.G., Clair, J.M.: An experimental study of attitudes toward homosexuals. *Deviant Behav.* **27**, 121–135 (1986)
- Pain, M.D., Disney, M.E.: Testing the reliability and validity of the index of attitudes toward homosexuals (IAH) in Australia. *J. Homosex.* **30**, 99–110 (1995)
- Roderick, T., McCammon, S.L., Allred, L.J.: Behavioral aspects of homonegativity. *J. Homosex.* **36**, 79–88 (1998)
- Sakalli, N.: The relationship between sexism and attitudes toward homosexuality in a sample of Turkish college students. *J. Homosex.* **42**, 53–64 (2002a)
- Sakalli, N.: Pictures of male homosexuals in the heads of Turkish college students: the effects of sex difference and social contact on stereotyping. *J. Homosex.* **43**, 111–126 (2002b)
- Schellenberg, E.G., Hirt, J., Sears, A.: Attitudes towards homosexuals among students at a Canadian university. *Sex Roles* **40**, 139–152 (1999)
- Schwanberg, S.L.: Attitudes towards gay men and lesbian women: instrumentation Issues. *J. Homosex.* **26**, 99–136 (1993)
- Serdahely, W.J., Ziemba, G.J.: Changing homophobic attitudes through college sexuality education. *J. Homosex.* **10**, 109–116 (1984)

- Siebert, D.C., Chonody, J., Rutledge, S.E., Killian, M.: The index of attitudes toward homosexuals 30 years later: a psychometric study. *Res. Soc. Work Pract.* **19**, 214–220 (2009)
- Smith, K.T.: Homophobia: a tentative personality profile. *Psychol. Rep.* **29**, 1091–1094 (1971)
- Stoller, R.: Boyhood gender aberrations: treatment issues. *J. Am. Psychoanal. Assoc.* **26**, 541–558 (1978)
- White, S.M., Franzini, L.M.: Heteronegativism? The attitudes of gay men and lesbians toward heterosexuals. *J. Homosex.* **37**, 65–79 (1999)