STRAIGHT ALLIES: PERCEPTIONS, BELIEFS, AND IDENTIFICATION

by

SARA JOANNE SMITH

B.S., Kansas State University, 2005
M.S., Kansas State University, 2009

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfuillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Psychology
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2011

Abstract

Individuals who associate with a stigmatized group may take on a "courtesy stigma", and this may lead individuals to dissociate from stigmatized individuals for fear of also being stigmatized (Goffman, 1963). However many heterosexual individuals (i.e., straight allies) openly associate with lesbians and gay men (LG), and/or actively engage in LG social activism despite the risk of assuming a courtesy stigma. The current research examined the perceptions of and the identification processes associated with being straight allies. Results revealed that the willingness to take on a courtesy stigma may be influential in the process of straight ally identification. This research has implications for understanding the processes related to straight ally perceptions and identification. The current research will also promote general understanding of individuals who engage in prosocial behaviors despite possible negative consequences.

STRAIGHT ALLIES: PERCEPTIONS, BELIEFS, AND IDENTIFICATION

by

SARA JOANNE SMITH

B.S., Kansas State University, 2005
M.S., Kansas State University, 2009

A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Psychology
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2011

Approved by:

Major Professor
Dr. Donald A. Saucier

Copyright

SARA JOANNE SMITH

2011

Abstract

Individuals who associate with a stigmatized group may take on a "courtesy stigma", and this may lead individuals to dissociate from stigmatized individuals for fear of also being stigmatized (Goffman, 1963). However many heterosexual individuals (i.e., straight allies) openly associate with lesbians and gay men (LG), and/or actively engage in LG social activism despite the risk of assuming a courtesy stigma. The current research examined the perceptions of and the identification processes associated with being straight allies. Results revealed that the willingness to take on a courtesy stigma may be influential in the process of straight ally identification. This research has implications for understanding the processes related to straight ally perceptions and identification. The current research will also promote general understanding of individuals who engage in prosocial behaviors despite possible negative consequences.

Table of Contents

Appendices

List of Tables

List of Figures

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my advisor Dr. Donald Saucier for all of his guidance, mentoring, and encouragement during my time in graduate school. I could not have asked for a better mentor. I would also like to thank my committee for all of their comments, suggestions, and feedback on my dissertation. Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for all of their support over the years. I would not have made it this far without all of their support and words of encouragement.

Expression of Sexual Prejudice

An enormous amount of past research has focused on examining the expression of prejudice toward lesbians and gay men as a result of the prevalence of heterosexuals' anti-gay behaviors toward and victimization of gay men and lesbians (Morrison & Bearden, 2007). For example, according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (2008), hate crimes based on sexual orientation were the third most reported, after race and religion. Further, Franklin (2000) conducted a study with 484 participants to examine anti-gay behaviors toward lesbians and gay men. Results revealed that 163 of the college students in the sample had at one point committed some sort of anti-gay behavior such as assaulting or threatening someone they thought was gay or calling a person with a same-sex sexual orientation a derogatory name. Further, of those participants who had reported not committing an anti-gay behavior, many still reported observing anti-gay behavior being committed. Thus, this research suggests that prejudicial attitudes toward gay men and lesbians are still prevalent.

Despite this past research, not much is known about how sexual prejudice toward lesbians and gay men affects the perceptions of individuals who express overt acceptance of lesbians and gay men despite not being lesbian or gay themselves (known as straight allies) or the processes (e.g., attitudinal beliefs, motivations) that lead individuals to identify themselves as straight allies. Thus, the purpose of this present research is to examine the perceptions of straight allies, and also further examine the identification processes associated with becoming a straight ally.

Importance of Group Membership

Groups are an inevitable part of an individual's social life (Simon, Aufderheude, & Kampmeier, 2001). An individual's physical and social survival is partially a result of his/her intragroup and intergroup interactions (Lücken & Simon, 2004). Ingroup identification is the extent to which the ingroup is part of that person's self-concept. Group identification levels differ depending on the individual. For some, their ingroup is an integral part of their self-concept, while for others their ingroup is not (Tropp & Wright, 2001). Increased group identification can be a way to receive psychological and affective support as well as validation and acceptance (Major & O'Brien, 2005).

A person's self-concept is partially derived from groups that the person sees him/herself belonging to. Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) posits that a person wants to maintain group memberships that will improve or bolster his/her self-concept. This is achieved when a person's ingroup is positively evaluated. According to Tajfel and Turner (1979) social comparisons between a person's ingroup and existing outgroups determines the status of that person's ingroup. When positive social comparisons are made, the ingroup maintains high status. When negative social comparisons are made, the ingroup maintains low status. When a person's ingroup is evaluated negatively, that person may respond by quitting or disidentifying with his/her ingroup and join other high status groups that will lead to a more positive social identity.

Although group membership can have many positive benefits, research suggests that group membership can have negative effects on individuals. For example, Lücken and Simon (2005) in a series of studies examined the differences between minority and majority groups on their preoccupation with their group membership and resulting affect.

Results across the different studies confirmed that members of the minority groups were more focused on their group membership and experienced more negative emotions when compared to members of the majority groups. These studies suggest that individuals are aware of the differences in evaluations between minority and majority groups. And not all group memberships are desirable. And as stated earlier, one of these groups is lesbians and gay men.

Stigmatization and Group Membership

In Goffman's 1963 book *Stigma* he defines stigma toward an individual as an "attribute that is deeply discrediting"… the stigmatized person then "is reduced in our minds from a whole and usual person to a tainted, discounted one" (p. 3). This definition suggests that individuals who become stigmatized possess a distinct characteristic that leads to the devaluation of the stigmatized person (Major & O'Brien, 2005). The stigmatization of an individual can be the result of "physical abnormalities," "blemishes of individual character" (e.g., psychological disorders and addiction) or "tribal stigma" (e.g., race and religion) (Goffman, 1963). Once a negative characteristic becomes stigmatized, the person to whom the attribute belongs connects him/her to negative evaluations and stereotypes by others (Jones, Farina, Hastorf, Markus, Miller, & Scott, 1984). Further, being a member of a stigmatized group can have many negative consequences (for a review see Major & O'Brien, 2005), such as being the target of discrimination (Link & Phelan, 2001), and adverse health outcomes (e.g., Jackson, Brown, Williams, Torres, Sellers, & Brown, 1996; Krieger, 1990; Steffen, McNeilly, Anderson, & Sherwood, 2003).

Lesbians and gay men are stigmatized on the basis of their sexual orientation and

consequently are the targets of discrimination and victimization. The prevalence of anti-gay behaviors committed by heterosexual individuals has been documented in the literature (e.g., Franklin, 2000; Herek, Cogan, & Gillis, 2002). Lesbians and gay men are the targets of both overt and covert forms of prejudice and discrimination (e.g., Gabriel & Banse, 2006; Gray, Russell & Blockley, 1991; Swim, Ferguson, & Hyers, 1999). For example, Hebel, Foster, Mannix, and Dovidio (2002) examined both overt and covert forms of employment discrimination against lesbians and gay men by having male and female confederates wear a cap that either read "Gay and Proud" or "Texan and Proud" and apply for sales jobs at a local mall. Results revealed that although employers did not overtly discriminate (e.g., employers indicated job vacancy and called the applicant back regardless of the applicant's sexual orientation) against the gay applicants, more covert forms of discrimination were present. Employers spoke less and interacted for shorter periods of time when approached by the gay applicant versus the non-gay applicant. Further, as expressed earlier, the presence of overt and subtle forms of prejudice directed at lesbians and gay men leads to an increased risk to suffer from negative physical and mental health outcomes when compared to their heterosexual counterparts (e.g., Lewis, Derlega, Griffin, & Krowinski, 2003; Mays & Cochran, 2001; Meyer, 2003). Further, research shows that this begins at an early age. For example, research on lesbian and gay youth finds that they are at an increased risk for depression, substance abuse, and attempted suicide (Garofalo, Wolf, Kessel, Palfrey, & DuRant, 1998; Marshal, Friedman, Stall, King, Miles, Gold, Bukstein, & Morse, 2008).

Lesbians and gay men comprise a low status, negatively stereotyped, and stigmatized group. Due to their stigmatization, they are often the targets of prejudice and

discrimination which results in negative effects to the members of their group. However, the stigma attached and the resulting prejudice and discrimination against gay men and lesbians may also transfer to heterosexual individuals who associate with them.

Courtesy Stigma and Group Identification

Goffman (1963) suggested that individuals who associate with a stigmatized group may take on a "courtesy stigma." Goffman (1963) proceeded on to argue that taking on a courtesy stigma results in the individual suffering "many of the standard deprivations of his/her courtesy group" (p. 31). Thus, individuals who take on a courtesy stigma for associating with a stigmatized individual may also be the target of the same prejudices and discrimination that befall the stigmatized individual with whom they associate.

The majority of courtesy stigma research has focused on family members who are associated with a stigmatized individual (Sigelman, Howell, Cornell, Cutright, & Dewey, 1991). For example, families of children who suffer from disabilities report feelings of being stigmatized (e.g., Birenbaum, 1970; Gray, 1993). Gray (2002) interviewed parents of autistic children on the effects their child's disability had on the family. Results revealed that many of the parents felt that others questioned their child-raising abilities. Parents also reported acts of staring, evasion, and insulting comments from others while out in public with their children. Further, this courtesy stigma may become more salient when the individual is seen as choosing to associate with a member of a stigmatized group (Goffman, 1963; Sigelman et al., 1991). Research has shown that an increased stigmatization felt by AIDS volunteers may impede individuals from volunteering with AIDS organizations and helping individuals who are inflicted with

AIDS (Snyder, Omoto, & Crain, 1999). The existence of this courtesy stigma also seems to be prominent when individuals are seen as being associated with lesbians and gay men.

Women who engage in female athleticism are often given the "lesbian label" and may become the targets of stigmatization from others. Blinde and Taub (1992), interviewed female varsity athletes on what they felt others' perceptions of female sports and female athletes were. Results revealed that most of the female athletes were aware of the prevalence of the lesbian label present in female athleticism. As a result many of the athletes described ways in which they managed their stigmatization. Different types of stigma management included hiding their engagement in sports from others, interacting only with other athletes, or enhancing their femininity through clothing and makeup, and keeping their hair long. By choosing to engage in sports the female athletes took on a courtesy stigma and as a result had to find ways to manage their stigma. Consistent with this research, Sigelman et al., (1991) examined the perceptions of a male college student who chose to room with a gay male student. The researchers had participants read vignettes about a male college student who either voluntarily chose or was involuntarily assigned to room with a gay male student. Results showed that participants with higher levels of sexual prejudice were more likely to rate the male student who chose to room with the gay male student as having more stereotypical feminine attributes. Conversely, participants did not rate the male student who was involuntarily assigned to the same room as the gay male student as possessing stereotypical feminine attributes. Thus, the fictitious male college student took on a courtesy stigma by choosing to room with a gay male student from high prejudiced perceivers. This research may also suggest that taking on a courtesy stigma may be more prevalent for heterosexual males who openly associate

with gay men and lesbians.

Past research has consistently shown that heterosexual men express more negative attitudes toward gay men than lesbians (Kite & Whitley, 1996; Whitley & Lee, 2000). Further, past research has found that this difference in negative attitudes may be mediated by gender role beliefs (Kite & Whitley, 1996). Kite and Whitely (1996) examined the influence of gender role beliefs (e.g., the idea that men should be masculine and women should be feminine) on attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. Results showed that the relationship between sex of participant and sexual prejudice towards lesbians and gay men was mediated by gender role beliefs. More specifically, gender role beliefs were related to more sexual prejudice toward lesbians and gay men, and that overall, men had higher levels of gender role beliefs than did women. This suggests that men may be more likely to believe that men should be masculine and women should be feminine. Thus, when heterosexual men are seen as associating with gay men and lesbians they may be perceived as not adhering to their gender roles and as a result may be more likely to take on a courtesy stigma.

The reason a courtesy stigma may become more salient when the individual is seen as choosing to associate with a member of a stigmatized group may be explained by the justification-suppression model of prejudice (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003). According to the justification- suppression model of prejudice, the expression of prejudice toward an individual will be enhanced if his/her membership is seen as product of his/her own choices rather than if his/her membership is seen as uncontrollable. For example, individuals appear to inhibit the expression of prejudice toward others when the prejudice is based on race or gender (i.e., uncontrollable attributes) but appear less likely to inhibit

the expression of prejudice toward others when the prejudice is based on sexual orientation, which is often perceived to be a product of choice (Smith, Zanotti, Axelton, & Saucier, in press).

According to the justification-suppression model of prejudice, individuals hold some negativity toward members of other social groups, known as genuine prejudice. However, the expressed prejudice is rarely a pure expression of that individual's genuine prejudice. The motivation to control prejudice is influenced by suppression factors (e.g., egalitarian values, social norms) which help to inhibit the expression of prejudice. Conversely however, justification factors may help to disinhibit the expression of prejudice. More specifically, if the individual believes he/she has a reasonable justification to express his/her prejudice, then genuine prejudice is more likely to be expressed. For example, researchers have found that individuals were more likely to hinder their expression of prejudice toward Blacks and women than toward serial killers and rapists. Because Blacks and females are not able to choose to be Black or female, participants were not able to justify their prejudices. However, because the serial killers and rapists chose to commit anti-social acts, participants could justify their prejudices toward them. Thus, although the participants may have had genuine prejudice toward Blacks, females, serial killers, and rapists, they only felt justified to express their prejudices toward those individuals who chose to be serial killers and rapists. Consistent with this research, it may be that individuals feel more justified to express higher levels of prejudice toward those who are seen as choosing to associate with a member of a devalued social group, which is a product of their own choices. If individuals choose to associate with a lesbian or gay individual than it may be perceived that they deserve the

prejudice and resulting stigmatization directed at them.

Another group of individuals who are targets of prejudicial attitudes by others include those individuals who choose to identify with certain social and political movements. One of these groups is feminists. Past research has found that although individuals may believe in the ideology associated with feminism, they are hesitant to identify themselves as feminists (Burn, Aboud, & Moyles, 2000; Williams & Wittig, 1997). This lack of feminist identification may be due to the negative stereotypes attached to the word "feminist." The term feminist has been associated with masculine attributes (e.g., aggressive, dominant), lesbianism, and being unattractive (Berryman-Fink & Verderber, 1985; Goldberg, Gottesdiener, & Abramson, 1975; Williams & Wittig, 1997). Consistent with this research, Alexander and Ryan (1997) interviewed students regarding their thoughts on feminism and feminist identification. Results revealed that although some students held positive views toward feminism, some of the students interviewed expressed more negative views. Students perceived feminists as being unattractive and also being aggressive and extreme. For example students identified feminists as

> "Mrs. No makeup. All natural. Doesn't shave her arm pits kind-of-gal" (p.559); "I think of the granola type. The Birkenstocks, long skirt, big sweater, no makeup, little round glasses, long hair parted in the middle" (p. 560); "A woman who may go over and beyond equality"; "Overly aggressive; Going overboard. Closing yourself off to other views" (p. 560).

Thus, this past research suggests that although individuals may believe in the feminist ideology they may not self-identify as a feminist because of the stereotypes and stigma

attached to feminism. Further, because of the stereotypes and stigma attached to feminists, this may impede individuals from identifying as feminists for fear of taking on a courtesy stigma.

The existence of this courtesy stigma and the resulting increased negativity from others may lead individuals to dissociate from stigmatized individuals for fear of also being stigmatized (Goffman, 1963). For example, Neuberg, Smith, Hoffman, and Russel (1994) found that after having participants watch a video of a heterosexual man interacting with a gay man, they reported more anxiety about interacting with the heterosexual man portrayed in the video. This suggests that individuals are aware of the stigma attached to being gay, and may socially distance themselves to avoid a courtesy stigma. Heterosexual individuals may also distance themselves from lesbians and gay men for fear of also being identified as lesbian or gay (Dillon, Worthington, Bielston Savoy, Rooney, Becker-Schutte, & Guerra, 2004 ; Duhigg, Rostosky, Gray, & Wimsatt, 2010). However despite the chance of taking on a courtesy stigma, there are many individuals who express overt acceptance of lesbians and gay men who are not lesbian or gay themselves.

Straight Ally Identification

Cortese (2006) described straight allies as straight individuals who may actively engage in the lesbian and gay (LG) movement and social activism to further gay relevant legislation. However, Cortese (2006) also expressed that straight allies could be straight individuals who support LG related causes but do not actively engage in LG social activism. Although relatively ignored in the literature to date, examining perceptions, development, and identification of straight allies is becoming more important. Research

has shown that there is a trend to move away from doing research on factors related to sexual prejudice to doing research on factors related to supportive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men (Stotzer, 2009). Of the few studies that have focused on straight allies, the research has examined factors that are important in increasing the likelihood of aquiring affirmative attitudes toward lesbians and gay men, and engagement in LG social activism (e.g., Dillon et al., 2004; DiStefano, Croteau, Anderson, Kampa-Kokesch, & Bullard, 2000; Duhigg et al., 2010; Stotzer, 2009).

For example, Stotzer (2009) conducted interviews with heterosexual students to qualitatively assess factors that were important in the formation of affirmative attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. The first factor that was identified as being important in the development of positive attitudes was the "normalization" of a same-sex sexual orientation, either through parental influence or LG contact. Many of the participants noted that their parents were significant in the formation of their attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. Over 30% of those interviewed reported that they had parents who openly showed their support of lesbians and gay men. Twenty-six percent reported that they had been taught the importance of respecting other individuals. For example one participant was quoted as saying that he was taught

> "basic virtues… treat everyone equally.. but I don't remember a specific occasion on which it was like, you should treat homosexuals as equally as heterosexuals. But at the same time, I don't remember them ever saying you should treat Black people like you treat white people, or Hispanic people like you treat white people," (p. 72).

Participants also reported that another important influence on their attitudes was

contact with LG individuals through popular media, or contact with LG adults as a child. Many of the participants interviewed stated that they knew an LG adult while growing up. Of the participants who reported not knowing any LG adults while growing up, they reported at some point being exposed to LG peers. Along with parental influence and contact with LG individuals, other factors that were found to be important in the formation of attitudes included empathy toward LG peers and resistance to those individuals who were not tolerant of LG individuals. For example, one participant said she empathized with her friend when she came out to her in college.

"A friend of mine that I'd known for a long time came out in college. That solidified [my attitude] because how could anybody find any justification for discriminating against this person for this particular aspect of their personality that had always been there," (p.74).

Finally, participants reported that they felt strong resistance to those who were intolerant toward LG individuals, and that intolerance helped to confirm their supportive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. For example, one student noted that she had always grown up around acceptance of gay men and lesbians, and it was not until her school put on the "Laramie Project" (a play about the killing of Matthew Shepard) that she realized the intolerance held by some toward lesbians and gay men.

"It was kind of scary because I'd never been around people that hadn't been accepting…people from some town in Kansas or something started coming to our school and started protesting. They told us we were all going to hell for watching it. So that really scared me and had a huge effect on me because I didn't know that people could be like that," (p. 75).

Resistance to the protesters at her school helped reaffirm her positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. Thus, although not the only factors, Stotzer (2009) was able to identify important factors that affected later development of positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men.

Consistent with this research, Duhigg et al., (2010) qualitatively examined factors important in the development of straight allies who engaged in LG social activism. Similar to Stotzer (2009) participants in this study reported that early parental influence and LG contact helped form their attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. Participants in this study also noted their recognition of or experience with oppression as being important in their attitude formation. For example, one woman recounts her own experiences with discrimination, and how those experiences affected her attitudes toward LG individuals.

"I think all women have the experience of having been second-class citizens, so to speak. And I think, you know, people in the gay and lesbian community feel they have been second-class citizens also. Yes, I know about discrimination from having been discriminated against and yes, that's wrong, you know. I can't understand about being LGBT, but I can understand about discrimination," (p. 7).

Other important factors that were identified by the researchers as being important in the participants' attitudes formation and engagement in LG social activism included having egalitarian values, and having an active emotional response (e.g., guilt, anger) once they recognized their heterosexual privilege. Researchers also identified that participants were more likely to continue LG social activism if they received positive support from their families and friends, and felt that they were intrinsically (e.g., feeling good about oneself,

knowing they are making a difference) or extrinsically (e.g., friendships, recognition) rewarded for their ally work.

These past studies provide important insight into factors that are important in the formation of affirmative attitudes toward lesbians and gay men and also the formation of attitudes that lead individuals to engage in LG social activism. However, none of the past research on straight allies has examined the processes that lead individuals to identify themselves as straight allies. According to social identity theory an individual's self-concept is composed of both a personal identity (e.g., personal characteristics) and a social identity (e.g., recognition of group membership) (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner, 1982). Consistent with Williams and Wittig's (1997) work on feminist identification, in order to socially identify as a straight ally a person must internalize his/her group membership and thus, privately call him/herself a straight ally. Then the person must identify him/herself as a straight ally around others. Individuals who are willing to privately identify as a straight ally but are not willing to socially identify as a straight ally may do so because of the courtesy stigma attached to being an ally of lesbian and gay individuals. Thus, although participants in these past studies expressed positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men, and engaged in LG social activism, it is still unknown whether they would be willing to publicly identify themselves to others as straight allies. Thus, the purpose of this present research is to further understand the processes that lead individuals to both privately and publicly identify themselves as straight allies.

Overview of Current Research

Based on this past research, the purpose of this present research was to examine perceptions of straight allies and also further examine the identification processes

associated with becoming a straight ally. Study 1 examined whether a male target engaging in LG activism would be perceived as being more likely to have stereotypically feminine attributes, and whether a female target engaging in LG activism would be perceived as being more likely to have stereotypically masculine attributes. Study 1 also examined whether a male or female target engaging in LG activism would be perceived as more likely being gay or lesbian. Study 2 qualitatively investigated the identification processes that lead individuals to privately vs. publicly identify themselves as straight allies. Study 3 further investigated straight ally identification by examining the attitudes and beliefs of straight allies versus individuals who do not identify themselves as straight allies.

More specifically, in Study 1 we examined participants' perceptions of straight allies by having participants read one of four vignettes describing a man/woman who engaged in either LG social activism or in unspecified activism. It was expected that when compared to the targets engaging in unspecified activism, the male target engaging in LG activism would be rated as having more stereotypical feminine attributes, and the female target would be rated as having stereotypical masculine attributes. Further, it was expected that the male/female target engaging in LG activism would be more likely to be perceived as lesbian or gay than the male/female target engaging in unspecified activism. It was also hypothesized that participants who identified as straight allies would be less likely to rate the male target engaging in LG activism as having stereotypical feminine attributes and would also be less likely to rate the female target engaging in LG activism as having stereotypical masculine attributes. Finally, participants who identified as straight allies would be less likely to perceive the male/female target engaging in LG

activism as being lesbian or gay.

Study 2 qualitatively examined the identification processes that lead individuals to privately vs. publicly identify themselves as straight allies. Participants read a short description of a straight ally and then responded to a series of open ended questions (e.g., "Do you personally identify as a straight ally?", "Why do you/do not personally identify as a straight ally?", "Do you publicly identify as a straight ally?", "Why do you/do not publicly identify as a straight ally?"). Participants then completed a measure that assessed their and others' perceptions of straight allies and also their willingness to engage in public social activism related to lesbian and gay issues. It was expected that the participants' answers on the free response items would be related to their perceptions of straight allies and willingness to engage in different forms of LG activism. More specifically, we expected that participants who were more likely to privately, but not publicly, identify as a straight ally would be more likely to have positive perceptions of straight allies, but think others would have negative perceptions of straight allies, and would be less likely to engage in different forms of LG activism. Conversely, however, participants who both privately and publicly identified as straight allies would be more likely to have positive perceptions of straight allies, but would still think that others would have negative perceptions of straight allies, and would be more likely to engage in different forms of LG social activism. Finally we expected that participants who did not privately or publicly identify as straight allies would have negative perceptions of straight allies, would think others would have negative perceptions of straight allies, and would be less likely to engage in LG activism.

The objective of Study 3 was to examine how straight ally identification was

related to different attitudes and beliefs related to tolerance and equality (e.g., feminist ideology, egalitarianism) versus prejudice and dominance (e.g., sexual prejudice, social dominance orientation). It was expected that no more than small differences would emerge between participants that identify as straight allies and participants that did not identify as a straight allies. Although it was expected that straight allies would probably score lower on prejudicial measures (e.g., modern racism scale, modern sexism scale, ATLG) and score higher on measures related to tolerance and equality (e.g., feminist ideology scale, and empathy and perspective taking scale) it was also expected that there would be participants who did not identify as straight allies but still would have lower levels of prejudicial attitudes, higher levels of beliefs related to tolerance and equality.

Study 1

The objective of Study 1 was to examine whether straight allies who engage in LG activism would be perceived as possessing more stereotypically feminine or masculine attributes than do individuals who do not engage in LG activism. It was hypothesized that when compared to the targets engaging in unspecified activism, the male target engaging in LG activism would be rated as having more stereotypically feminine attributes, and the female target engaging in LG activism would be rated as having more stereotypically masculine attributes. It was also expected that the male or female target engaging in LG activism would be more likely to be perceived as gay or lesbian than the male or female target engaging in unspecified activism. It was hypothesized that participants who identified as straight allies would be less likely to rate the male engaging in LG activism as having stereotypically feminine attributes, and the female engaging in LG activism as having stereotypically masculine attributes. Further,

participants who identified as straight allies would be less likely to perceive the target engaging in LG activism as being gay or lesbian. Finally, the expected pattern of effects of others' perceptions would mirror those of the participants.

Method

Participants

Seventy-one males and 89 females enrolled in introductory psychology classes at Kansas State University participated in the current study. However, 4 participants indicated a sexual orientation other than heterosexuality and were excluded from further analyses leaving us with a sample of 70 males and 86 females. The average age of the participants was 19.22 ($SD = 3.33$) with most of the participants being first year students (70.3%).

Materials

Demographic measure. Participants were asked to respond to a series of items to assess different demographic items (see Appendix A). Participants were first asked to indicate their sex, class year, age, political affiliation, religiosity, spirituality and sexual orientation. Participants were also asked to indicate their sexual orientation, religiosity, and spirituality on a Likert-type scale. Participants were then asked to assess their attitudes concerning foreign policy, economic, and social issues on a Likert-type scale from 1 (*very liberal*) to 9 (*very conservative*).

Quality and quantity of contact with lesbians and gay men. Participants responded to 14 items (see Appendix B) on their previous quantity (*alpha* = .55) and quality of contact (*alpha* = .90) with lesbians and gay men. Items were adapted from previous research examining contact with racial minorities (Plant & Devine, 2003) and previous

research examining contact with individuals who have intellectual disabilities (McManus, Feyes, & Saucier, in press). Example items included "*in college, I have frequent interactions with gay men and/or lesbians*," and "*overall, I have had positive experiences with gay men and/or lesbians*." Participants responded to items on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*).

  Attitudes toward lesbians and gay men scale (ATLG). This scale was developed by Herek (1984) to assess individuals' levels of sexual prejudice (see Appendix C). The attitudes toward lesbians subscale (ATL) includes ten statements pertaining to attitudes toward lesbians (*alpha* = .91). An example of an item on this subscale is: "*The growing number of lesbians indicates a decline in American morals*." The attitudes toward gay men subscale (ATGM) include ten statements regarding attitudes toward gay men (*alpha* = .91). An example item on this subscale is: "*If a man has homosexual feelings, he should do everything he can to overcome them*." Participants responded to items on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*).

  Straight ally identification. Straight ally identification was assessed from a measure by Morgan (1996) adapted by Myaskovsky and Wittig (1997) and adapted again for the purposes of this study (see Appendix D). Participants were first asked to read a short description of a straight ally which explained that a straight ally is a heterosexual individual who may engage in LG activism or may not engage in LG activism but supports gay relevant legislation. After reading the description participants were first asked to indicate by circling yes or no, whether they identify as a straight ally. Participants were then asked to indicate on a 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*) Likert-type scale how much they agreed with 6 different statements. Example

items on this measure are: "*I consider myself a straight ally,*" and "*I call myself a straight ally privately, and call myself a straight ally around others.*"

Straight ally activism vignettes. Participants were asked to read a vignette (see Appendix E) depicting a male or female engaging in either unspecified activism or lesbian and gay related social activism. The following is an excerpt of the vignette in the LG activism condition.

Matt/Katie is a longtime committed activist who fights for **gay and lesbian** equality. Matt/Katie believes it is important to fight against national and state laws which discriminate against **gay and lesbian individuals**. As part of his/her activism Matt/Katie attends the national equality march in D.C. every year. The equality march brings national attention to issues **specific to lesbians and gay men such as the don't ask don't tell policy in the military, national same-sex marriage recognition, and anti-discrimination laws in employment and housing**. Matt/Katie plans on continuing his/her activism until all individuals **including lesbians and gay men** have full equality.

The statements in bold were changed in the non-LG activism to specify that the targets in the unspecified vignette are advocating for equality. For example the statement "Matt/Katie is a longtime committed activist who fights for gay and lesbian quality," was changed to read "Matt/Katie is a longtime committed activist who fights for equality."

Bem sex role inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1974). The BSRI consists of 60 items (20 feminine, 20 masculine and 20 non-gender items) that assess masculine, feminine, and androgynous personality traits among individuals. For the purposes of this study participants were only asked to rate the masculine (*alpha* = .88) and feminine (*alpha* =

.81) characteristics (see Appendix F). Participants completed the BSRI twice. First, participants were asked how they would rate the target in the vignette. Second, participants were asked to rate how they think others would rate the target in the vignette. Participants were asked to rate each characteristic (e.g., *feminine, masculine, aggressive, soft-spoken*) on a Likert-type scale from 1 (*never or almost never true*) to 9 (*always or almost always true*).

 Assessment of sexual orientation. This measure was constructed for the purposes of this study (see Appendix G). Participants were asked to assess the sexual orientation of the target in the vignette on a 1 (*completely homosexual/gay or lesbian*) to 9 (*completely straight/heterosexual*) Likert-type scale. Participants were first asked how they would rate the sexual orientation of the target in the vignette. Participants were then asked how they think others would rate the sexual orientation of the target in the vignette.

 Social desirability scale. This measure (*alpha* = .78) was developed by Marlowe and Crowne (1964), and consists of 33 true and false items (see Appendix H). This scale assesses the extent to which a person seeks approval from others. Example items in this measure are: *I'm always willing to admit when I make a mistake* and *I am always careful about my manner of dress*.

Procedure

Participants completed the questionnaire in groups of approximately 25. The participants first completed the demographic items, quality and quantity of contact with lesbians and gay men, and the straight ally identification measure. Upon completion participants next read a vignette either about a male or female engaging in LG activism or non-LG activism. After reading the vignette participants then completed the BSRI, the

sexual orientation assessment scale, the ATLG, and the social desirability measure. The measures took no longer than an hour to complete. After completion, participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation.

Results

The purpose of Study 1 was to examine individuals' perceptions of straight allies. It was hypothesized that participants who read about Matt engaging in LG activism would rate Matt as having more stereotypical feminine attributes compared to participants who read about Matt engaging in unspecified activism. Further, it was expected that participants who read about Katie engaging in LG activism would be more likely to rate her as having stereotypical masculine attributes compared to participants who read about Katie engaging in unspecified activism. A breakdown of participants in the activism and gender of target conditions can be seen in Table 1 and 2.

Accordingly, 2 (sex of the participant: male, female) x 2 (sex of target: Matt, Katie) x 2 (type of activism: unspecified activism, LG activism) between-groups ANOVAs were conducted to assess the effects of the vignettes on our dependent measures: The BEM Sex Role Inventory which was completed twice by participants and the assessment of sexual orientation which was also completed twice by participants.

Participants' ratings of masculine and feminine attributes. The participants were first asked how they would rate the target in the vignette on masculine and feminine attributes in the BEM Sex Role Inventory. Thus, ANOVAs were conducted to assess how sex of the participant and the experimental manipulations predicted scores on the masculine and feminine attributes that participants rated. It was expected that participants who read the vignette of the male target engaging in LG activism would perceive the

male depicted in the vignette as having more stereotypical feminine attributes than the male target that was engaging in unspecified activism. Further, it was expected that the participants who read the vignette about the female target engaging in LG activism would perceive the female depicted in the vignette as having more stereotypical masculine attributes than the female target engaging un unspecified activism.

Participants' ratings of masculine attributes. A significant main effect was found for sex of participant, F (1, 142) = 7.52, p = .007, on participants' ratings of the masculine attributes. Results showed that women rated the targets higher on masculine attributes than men. No other significant main effects or interactions were found. Analysis of variance results for participants' ratings of masculine attributes can be seen in Table 3. Means and standard deviations for the main effects and interactions on participants' ratings of masculine attributes can be seen in Table 4.

Participants' ratings of feminine attributes. No significant main effects or interactions were found on participants' ratings of feminine attributes. Analysis of variance results for participants' ratings of feminine attributes can be seen in Table 5. Means and standard deviations for the main effects and interactions on participants' ratings of feminine attributes can be seen in Table 6.

Inconsistent with our hypotheses, the experimental manipulations did not interact to predict scores on the masculine or feminine attributes. Participants who read the vignette about Matt engaging in LG activism did not perceive him as having more stereotypical feminine attributes compared to participants who read about Matt engaging in unspecified activism. Further, participants who read about Katie engaging in LG activism did not perceive her as having more stereotypical masculine attributes compared

to participants who read about Katie engaging in unspecified activism.

Others' ratings of masculine and feminine attributes. Participants were then asked to complete the BEM Sex Role Inventory a second time. This time participants were asked to indicate how they think others would rate the target in the vignette. Thus, ANOVAs were conducted to assess how sex of the participant and the experimental manipulations predicted scores on the masculine and feminine attributes completed by the participants the second time. It was expected that participants who read about Matt engaging in LG activism would feel that others would perceive Matt as having more stereotypical feminine attributes than participants who read about Matt engaging in unspecified activism. It was also expected that participants who read about Katie engaging in LG activism would feel that others would perceive Katie as having more stereotypical masculine attributes than participants who read about Katie engaging in unspecified activism.

Others' ratings of masculine attributes. Significant main effects were found for sex of the target, $F (1, 142) = 7.64$, $p = .006$, and sex of the participant $F (1, 142) = 6.51$, $p = .012$, on others' ratings of the masculine attributes. Results revealed that participants thought others would rate Katie higher on masculine attributes than Matt. Results also revealed that female participants thought others would rate the targets as higher on the masculine attributes than did the male participants. No other significant main effects or interactions were found. Analysis of variance results for others' rating of masculine attributes can be seen in Table 7. Means and standard deviations for the main effects and interactions on others' ratings of masculine attributes can be seen in Table 8.

Others' ratings of feminine attributes. Significant main effects were found for the

sex of the target, F (1, 140) = 7.30, p = .008, and sex of the participant, F (1, 140) = 6.89, p = .010, on others' ratings of feminine attributes. Results revealed that participants thought that others would rate Matt higher on feminine attributes than Katie. Results also revealed that the male participants thought others would report higher ratings for the targets on the feminine attributes than female participants. No other significant main effects or interactions were found on others' ratings of feminine attributes. Analysis of variance results for others' ratings of feminine attributes can be seen in Table 9. Means and standard deviations for the main effects and interactions on others' ratings of feminine attributes can be seen in Table 10.

Inconsistent with our hypotheses, results revealed that participants thought others would rate Katie higher on masculine attributes than Matt. Participants also thought that others would rate Matt higher on feminine attributes than Katie. However, these ratings did not differ by activism condition. Participants who read the LG activism vignette did not feel that others would perceive the target as having more stereotypical masculine or feminine attributes compared to participants who read the unspecified activism vignette. This may suggest that regardless of the type of activism, individuals may perceive females who engage in activism as being more masculine or agentic, while men who engage in activism are more feminine or communal.

ANOVAs were also conducted to assess how the experimental manipulations would predict scores on the assessment of the target's sexual orientation. Consistent with the Bem Sex Role Inventory, participants were asked to complete the assessment of sexual orientation twice. The first time participants were asked how they would rate the sexual orientation of the target in the vignette. Participants were then asked to indicate

how they think others would rate the sexual orientation of the target in the vignette. It was expected that participants who read the vignette about LG activism would be more likely to rate the target in the vignette as having a same-sex sexual orientation compared to participants who read about the target engaging in unspecified activism. Further, it was expected that participants who read the LG activism vignette would be more likely to think that others would perceive the target as having a same-sex sexual orientation compared to participants in the unspecified activism condition.

Participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation. Significant main effects were found for sex of the target, $F (1, 145) = 6.11$, $p = .015$, activism condition, $F (1, 145) = 4.95$, p .028, and sex of participant, $F (1, 145) = 4.32$, $p = .039$, on participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation. Results revealed that participants were more likely to perceive Matt as having a same-sex sexual orientation than Katie. Further, participants were also more likely to perceive the target engaging in LG activism as having a same-sex sexual orientation when compared to the target engaging in the unspecified activism. Results also revealed that male participants were more likely to perceive the target as having a same-sex sexual orientation than did female participants. A significant three-way interaction was found between sex of the target, activism condition, and sex of the participant, $F (1, 145) = 4.02$, $p = .047$, on participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation. We probed the three-way interaction by conducting a 2 (activism: unspecified, LG) x 2 (gender of target: Matt, Katie) between groups ANOVA for men and women separately. Analyses revealed that the two-way interaction between activism condition and sex of the target was significant for men, $F (1, 145) = 4.40$, $p = .04$. We probed the two-way interaction by conducting a one-way

ANOVA to examine the effects of sex of the target on male participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation for the unspecified activism condition and the LG activism condition separately. Analyses revealed that sex of the target did not predict scores on male participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation in the unspecified activism condition, $F (1, 145) = 0.00$, $p > .05$. However, analyses did reveal that the sex of the target did predict scores on the male participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation in the LG activism condition, $F (1, 145) = 7.42$, $p < .05$. Male participants perceived Matt as being more likely to have a same-sex sexual orientation than Katie in the LG activism condition. The means for these analyses can be seen in Figure 1. The two-way interaction between activism condition and sex of the target was not significant for women, $F (1, 145) = 0.31$, $p = .583$, on female participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation. Means for this analysis can be seen in Figure 2. No other significant interactions were found. Analysis of variance results for participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation can be seen in Table 11. Means and standard deviations for the main effects and interactions on participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation can be seen in Table 12.

Others' assessment of the target's sexual orientation. A significant main effect was found for the activism condition, $F (1, 147) = 16.23$, $p < .001$, on others' assessment of the target's sexual orientation. Results showed that participants who read about the target engaging in LG activism thought others would be more likely to perceive the target as having a same-sex sexual orientation compared to the participants who read about the target engaging in unspecified activism. No other significant main effects or interactions were found. Analysis of variance results for others' assessment of the target's sexual

orientation can be seen in Table 13. Means and standard deviations for the main effects and interactions on others' assessment of the target's sexual orientation can be seen in Table 14.

Consistent with our hypotheses participants were more likely to perceive the target engaging in LG activism as having a same-sex sexual orientation compared to the target engaging in unspecified activism. Further, male participants perceived Matt as being more likely to have a same-sex sexual orientation than Katie in the LG activism condition. Finally, consistent with our hypotheses, results showed that participants who read about the target engaging in LG activism thought others would be more likely to perceive the target as having a same-sex sexual orientation compared to the participants who read about the target engaging in unspecified activism.

Straight Ally Identification

It was hypothesized that participants who identified as straight allies and read about Matt engaging in LG activism would be less likely to rate Matt as having more stereotypical feminine attributes than participants who did not identify as a straight ally. Further, it was expected that participants who identified as straight allies and read about Katie engaging in LG activism would be less likely to rate Katie as having stereotypical masculine attributes when compared to participants who did not identify as straight allies. It was also hypothesized that regardless of straight ally identification participants who read the LG activism condition would feel that others would perceive Matt as having more stereotypical feminine attributes, and Katie as having more stereotypical masculine attributes when compared to participants that read about Matt and Katie engaging in unspecified activism.

A breakdown of participants who identified as straight allies can be found in Table 15. A chi-square test of independence revealed that participants who identified as straight allies differed by sex of the participant, $\chi^2(1) = 15.30$, $p < .001$. Women were more likely to identify as straight allies than men.

In order to assess our hypotheses, 2 (sex of target) x 2 (type of activism: unspecified activism, LG activism) x 2 (straight ally identification: yes, no) between-groups ANOVAs were conducted to assess the effects of straight ally identification and the manipulations on our dependent measures: The BEM Sex Role Inventory which was completed twice by participants and the assessment of sexual orientation which was also completed twice by participants. The current sets of analyses are the same as the analyses previously conducted only substituting straight ally identification for sex of participant. Thus, we will only talk about the main and interaction effects that include straight ally identification because the other effects were discussed in the previous analyses.

Participants' ratings of masculine attributes. No significant main effects or interactions were found on participants' ratings of masculine attributes. Analysis of variance results for participants' ratings of masculine attributes can be seen in Table 16. Means and standard deviations for the main effects and interactions on participants' ratings of masculine attributes can be found in Table 17.

Participants' ratings of feminine attributes. No significant main effects or interactions were found on participants' ratings of feminine attributes. Analysis of variance results for participants' ratings of feminine attributes can be found in Table 18. Means and standard deviations for the main effects and interactions on participants' ratings of feminine attributes can be found in Table 19.

Inconsistent with our hypotheses, results revealed that participants who identified as straight allies and read about the targets engaging in LG activism were no less likely to rate Katie as having stereotypical masculine attributes and Matt as having stereotypical feminine attributes.

Others' ratings of masculine attributes. A significant interaction was found between the activism condition and straight ally identification, F (1, 138) = 7.65, p = .006 on others' ratings of the masculine attributes. We probed the two-way interaction by conducting two one-way between groups ANOVAs to examine the effects of straight ally identification on others' ratings of masculine attributes for the LG activism condition and the unspecified activism condition separately. Analyses revealed that straight ally identification did not predict scores on others' ratings of the masculine attributes in the LG activism condition, F (1, 138) = 0.98, p > .05. However, analyses did reveal that straight ally identification did predict scores on others' ratings of the masculine attributes in the unspecified activism condition, F (1, 138) = 9.20, p < .05. Participants who identified as straight allies perceived that others would rate the target higher on masculine attributes in the unspecified activism condition than participants who did not identify as straight allies. The means for the LG activism condition and the unspecified activism condition can be seen in Figure 3. No other significant main effects or interactions were found. Analysis of variance results for others' ratings of masculine attributes can be found in Table 20. Means and standard deviations for the main effects and interactions on others' ratings of masculine attributes can be found in Table 21.

Others' ratings of feminine attributes. No significant main effects or interactions were found on others' ratings of feminine attributes. Analysis of variance results for

others' ratings of feminine attributes can be found in Table 22. Means and standard deviations for the main effects and interactions on others' ratings of feminine attributes can be found in Table 23.

Inconsistent with our hypotheses, results revealed that straight ally identification did not interact with the manipulations to predict participants' ratings of the target on the masculine and feminine ratings. A two-way interaction between straight ally identification and activism condition revealed that participants who identified as straight allies perceived that others would rate the target in the unspecified activism condition as having higher levels of masculine attributes than did participants who did not identify as straight allies. These results suggest that individuals may perceive women who engage in activism as being more masculine overall and possessing more agentic rather than communal traits.

ANOVAs were also conducted to assess how straight ally identification and the experimental manipulations predicted scores on the assessment of the target's sexual orientation. Again, consistent with the Bem Sex Role Inventory, participants were asked to complete the assessment of the target's sexual orientation twice. The first time participants were asked how they would rate the sexual orientation of the target in the vignette. Participants were then asked to indicate how they think others would rate the sexual orientation of the target in the vignette. It was expected that participants who identified as a straight ally and read the vignette about LG activism would be less likely to rate the target in the vignette as having a same-sex sexual orientation when compared to participants who did not identify as a straight ally and read about the target engaging in LG activism. Further, it was expected that participants who read the LG activism vignette

would be more likely to think that others would perceive the target as having a same-sex sexual orientation when compared to participants in the unspecified activism condition regardless of whether the participant identified as a straight ally or not.

Participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation. A significant main effect was found for straight ally identification, $F(1, 141) = 8.43$, $p = .004$, on participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation. Results revealed that participants who did not identify as a straight ally were more likely to perceive the target as having a same-sex sexual orientation than did participants who did identify as a straight ally. No significant interactions were found on participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation. Analysis of variance results for participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation can be found in Table 24. Means and standard deviations for the main effects and interactions on participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation can be found in Table 25.

Others' assessment of the target's sexual orientation. A significant main effect was found for straight ally identification $F(1, 143) = 5.55$, $p = .020$, on others' assessment of the target's sexual orientation. Results revealed that individuals who identified as a straight ally were more likely to think that others would perceive the target as having a same-sex sexual orientation than did participants who did not identify as a straight ally. No significant interactions were found on others' assessment of the target's sexual orientation. Analysis of variance results for others' assessment of the target's sexual orientation can be found in Table 26. Means and standard deviations for the main effects and interactions on others' assessment of the target's sexual orientation can be found in Table 27.

Consistent with our hypotheses, participants rated the target engaging in LG activism as more likely having a same-sex sexual orientation compared to the target in the unspecified activism condition. Further, participants who did not identify as straight allies were more likely to rate the target as having a same-sex sexual orientation than did participants who did identify as straight allies. Results also revealed that participants perceived that others would see Matt as being more likely to have a same-sex sexual orientation than Katie, and would perceive the target engaging in LG activism as more likely to have a same-sex sexual orientation than the target engaging in unspecified activism. Finally, participants who identified as straight allies perceived that others would rate the target as more likely to have a same-sex sexual orientation than did participants who did not identify as straight allies.

Overall, the results of our analyses revealed that participants did not rate the target in the LG vignette as having more stereotypical masculine and feminine attributes than the target in the unspecified activism vignette. However, participants perceived that others would rate Katie higher on masculine traits and Matt higher on feminine traits. Because past research has shown that individuals use their own values and beliefs to make judgments about other individuals (Saucier, 2002), we thought that participants may have used their own prejudices as a baseline when asked to indicate how they perceived others' would rate Matt and Katie on the masculine and feminine attributes. Further, past research has also shown that individuals may engage in the "better-than-average" effect which suggests that individuals assume that others are "worse" than they are. This suggests that an individual who is prejudiced will assume that others are also prejudiced, but are more prejudiced than he/she is (Saucier, 2002). We conducted

correlations on the dependent measures to assess whether there were high correlations between participants' ratings of attributes for Matt and Katie and others' ratings of attributes for Matt and Katie. Results revealed that Participants' ratings of masculine attributes were highly correlated with others' ratings of masculine attributes. Further, participants' ratings of the feminine attributes were highly correlated with others' ratings of the feminine attributes. Participants who rated the target high on masculine or feminine attributes also perceived that others would rate the target high on feminine or masculine attributes. This suggests that individuals may use their own opinions as a guide for what they think others opinions will be as well. The correlation coefficients for these analyses can be found in Table 28.

Influence of Other Individual Difference Factors on the Dependent Variables

In order to examine the influence of other individual difference factors (e.g., class year, political affiliation) on our dependent variables, one-way ANOVAS were conducted. Results revealed that class year did not predict scores on the dependent measures (see Table 29 and Table 30). Analyses also revealed that political affiliation did not predict scores on the dependent measures (see Table 31 and Table 32).

We expected that our other individual difference variables (i.e., straight ally identification, ATLG, social desirability, age, conservatism scale, religious and spiritual scale, and quantity and quality of contact) would be related to our dependent variables. Correlations were conducted in order to assess these relationships. Results of our correlational analyses suggest that our individual difference factors and our dependent measures were intercorrelated. Of most theoretical importance to our current study were the correlations between straight ally identification, ATLG, and the dependent measures.

Analyses revealed that straight ally identification was significantly and negatively correlated with the ATL, and the ATG, and was significantly and positively correlated with rating the target as having a heterosexual orientation. The ATL was significantly and positively correlated with the ATG, and others' ratings of feminine attributes. The ATL was significantly and negatively correlated with rating the target as having a same-sex sexual orientation. The ATG was significantly and positively correlated with others' ratings of feminine attributes, and was negatively and significantly correlated with ratings the target as having a same-sex sexual orientation. See Table 33 for a complete listing of the correlation coefficients.

Discussion

Participants' and Others' Ratings of Masculine and Feminine Attributes

We predicted that participants who read about a male engaging in LG activism would rate the male as being more likely to possess stereotypical feminine attributes than participants who read about a male engaging in unspecified activism. Further, we expected that participants who read about a female engaging in LG activism would rate the female as being more likely to have stereotypical masculine attributes than participants who read about a female engaging in unspecified activism. Inconsistent with our hypotheses, results revealed that our manipulations did not interact to predict scores on the feminine and masculine attributes. Overall, participants who read about the target engaging in LG activism did not rate the target any differently on the masculine and feminine attributes than participants who read about the target engaging in unspecified activism. Further, inconsistent with our hypotheses, results revealed that participants who identified as straight allies and read about the targets engaging in LG activism were no

less likely to rate Katie as having stereotypical masculine attributes and Matt as having stereotypical feminine attributes.

These results are inconsistent with past research that has found a relationship between being seen as associating with gay men and lesbians and taking on the stereotypes of that group. For example, Sigelman et al., (1991) found that heterosexuals who scored high on sexual prejudice were more likely to rate men who chose to room with a gay male roommate higher on feminine attributes than men who lived with a gay male roommate but were not able to choose their living conditions. However, in the current study participants who read about a male or female target engaging in LG activism were no more likely to rate the female as having stereotypical masculine attributes or the male as having stereotypical feminine attributes.

We also predicted that participants who read about a male engaging in LG activism would perceive that others would rate the male target as having more stereotypical feminine attributes. Further, we predicted that participants who read about a female engaging in LG activism would perceive that others would rate the female target as having more stereotypical masculine attributes. Inconsistent with our hypotheses, participants thought that others would rate Katie higher on masculine attributes than Matt, regardless of activism condition. Participants also thought that others would rate Matt higher on feminine attributes than Katie, regardless of condition. Finally, participants who identified as straight allies thought others would rate the target higher on masculine attributes in the unspecified activism condition.

Interestingly, these results suggests that individuals may perceive women who engage in activism as being more masculine or agentic while perceiving men who engage

in activism as being more feminine or communal. Past research has shown that agency is usually ascribed to men who are described as having traits such as ambition and competence, while communion is ascribed to women who are described as having traits such as empathy and a concern for others (e.g., Conway, Pizzamiglio, & Mount, 1996). In regards to the current study, because activism is seen as an assertive act, Katie may be perceived as expressing agency by engaging in activism. Individuals may also believe that to engage in activism one must have empathy, and a concern for others. Thus, by Matt engaging in activism he may be perceived as expressing communion. However, by engaging in activism an individual is also acknowledging that inequality exists. Past research has shown that individuals who come forward and claim discrimination are seen as complainers by others (Kaiser & Miller, 2001). Thus, Matt may also be seen by others as communal because he is publicly acknowledging discrimination and is being seen as a complainer (which is seen as more communal) by the participants.

Participants' and Others' Assessment of the Target's Sexual Orientation

Past research has shown that straight allies think that others may perceive them as being lesbian or gay (Dillion et al., 2004; DiStefano et al., 2000). However, little research exists on whether non-straight allies perceive individuals who openly associate with gay men and lesbians as having a same-sex sexual orientation. We predicted that participants would perceive the target engaging in LG activism as more likely having a same-sex sexual orientation than the target engaging in unspecified activism. Consistent with our hypotheses, participants were more likely to perceive the target as having a same-sex sexual orientation and thought that others would perceive the target as more likely having a same-sex sexual orientation in the LG activism condition than the unspecified activism

condition. We also found that participants who identified as straight allies were less likely to perceive the targets in the vignettes as having a same-sex sexual orientation, but were more likely to think others would perceive the target as having a same-sex sexual orientation.

These results suggest that individuals who openly associate with gay men and lesbians do take on a courtesy stigma from other individuals. Further, even though participants who identified as straight allies were less likely to perceive the target in the LG activism condition as having a same-sex sexual orientation, they were more likely to think that others would perceive the target as having a same-sex sexual orientation. This suggests that participants who identified as straight allies were aware of the stigma attached to associating openly with gay men and lesbians.

Finally, we found that participants were more likely to perceive that Matt had a same-sex sexual orientation than Katie. Further, male participants were more likely to perceive Matt as having a same-sex sexual orientation than Katie in the LG activism condition. This is consistent with past research which has found that, overall, heterosexual individuals express more negative attitudes toward gay men than lesbians, with the effect being more exaggerated for heterosexual males (Whitley & Kite, 1996).

Overall, this study suggests that although individuals may not take on the stereotypes of lesbians and gay men, they are perceived as having a same-sex sexual orientation by others when they are engaging in LG activism. Given the existence of this courtesy stigma, in Study 2 we wanted to examine the identification processes that lead individuals to privately versus publicly identify themselves as straight allies, and to further understand the perceptions of straight allies.

Study 2

The objective of Study 2 was to examine the identification processes that lead individuals to privately vs. publicly identify themselves as straight allies, and to further understand the perceptions of straight allies.

Method

Participants

Ninety-five males and 144 female students, faulty, and alumni from Kansas State University participated in the current study. Thirteen participants indicated a sexual orientation other than heterosexuality, thus they were excluded from analyses, leaving us with a sample of 92 males and 135 females. The average of the participants was 21.33 ($SD = 4.96$). Eighty-five of the participants were first year students, 40 of the participants were sophomores, 35 of the participants were juniors, 60 of the participants were seniors, 2 of the participants were graduate students, 4 of the participants were faculty, and 1 of the participants was a Kansas State University Alumni.

Materials

Demographic measure. Participants were asked to respond to a series of items to assess different demographic items (see Appendix A). Participants were first asked to indicate their sex, class year, age, political affiliation, religiosity, spirituality and sexual orientation. Participants were also asked to indicate their sexual orientation, religiosity, and spirituality on a Likert-type scale. Participants were then asked to assess their attitudes concerning foreign policy, economic, and social issues on a Likert-type scale from 1 (*very liberal*) to 9 (*very conservative*).

Quality and quantity of contact with lesbians and gay men. Participants responded

to 14 items (see Appendix B) on their previous quantity (*alpha* = .73) and quality (*alpha* = .91) of contact with lesbians and gay men. Items were adapted from previous research examining contact with racial minorities (Plant & Devine, 2003) and previous research examining contact with individuals who have intellectual disabilities (McManus, Feyes, & Saucier, in press). Example items included "*in college, I have frequent interactions with gay men and/or lesbians*," and "*overall, I have had positive experiences with gay men and/or lesbians*." Participants responded to items on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*).

Straight ally identification. Participants were asked to read a short description of a straight ally which explained that a straight ally is a heterosexual individual who may engage in LG activism, or is a heterosexual individual who does not engage in LG activism but supports gay relevant legislation. Participants were then asked to respond to a series of items and open ended questions about straight ally identification (See Appendix I). Examples of items included, "*do you personally identify as a straight ally*," "*why do you/do not personally identify as a straight ally,*" "*Do you publicly identify as a straight ally*," "*why do you/do not publicly identify as a straight ally*?"

Perceptions of straight allies. This measure was created for the purposes of this study to assess participants' perceptions of straight allies (see Appendix J). Participants were first asked to indicate the top five words they would use to describe straight allies. Participants were then asked to indicate the top five words they think others would use to describe straight allies. After selecting each word participants were asked to rate the word as being positive, neutral, or negative. Participants were then asked to indicate how much the word describes straight allies on a 1 (*not at all*) to 9 (*very much*) Likert-type scale.

Activism orientation scale (AOS). This scale was developed by Corning and Myers (1999) to assess an individual's willingness to engage in different forms of social activism (*alpha* = .98) (see Appendix K). This scale was adapted for the purposes of this study to assess how much an individual is willing to engage in different forms of social activism related to gay and lesbian issues. Before completing the items, a short description was provided to participants explaining activism that is relevant to lesbian and gay men (e.g., same-sex marriage). An example item from this measure is: "*I would be willing to wear a t-shirt or button that promotes lesbian and gay issues*." Participants were asked to indicate their level of willingness to engage in LG related social activism on a 1 (*extremely unlikely*) to 9 (*extremely likely*) Likert-type scale.

Procedure

Participants completed the demographic measure, quality and quantity of contact, straight ally assessment, perceptions of straight allies, and the AOS. Completion of the measures took about an hour. Upon completion, participants were debriefed and thanked.

Results

The objective of Study 2 was to examine the identification processes that lead individuals to privately vs. publicly identify themselves as straight allies, and to further understand the perceptions of straight allies. To assess this we had participants respond to free response items regarding privately vs. publicly identifying as straight allies. Participants also completed a measure to assess their and others' perceptions of straight allies. Finally, participants completed the activism orientation scale to assess how willing they would be to engage in different forms of LG activism.

To analyze the free response items, procedures similar to Herek (1987) and

Monteith and Spicer (2000) were used. Coders were assigned to read each of the

participant's answers for each response items to detect common themes. According to

Herek (1987) a theme "is any idea or complete thought somehow related to the

respondent's attitudes" (p. 287). Consistent with Monteith and Spicer (2000), coders first

read each of the participant's answers and considered each answer as its own theme.

Once coders prepared a list of themes, they then looked for similarities between themes

and created categories for the list of themes that were generated. Coders then went

through the free response items again and matched the themes provided by the

participants to the list of categories that were prepared. The vast majority of categories

resulted in agreement among coders. To resolve disagreement we examined and clarified

the operational definition and resolved those disagreements using the refined operational

definition. The frequency of the theme's occurrence within each category was then

calculated to determine the most common themes among participant answers. Finally,

participant answers may have had more than one theme; thus, answers could be in more

than one category.

Please Explain Why You Do or Do Not Personally Identify as a Straight Ally

       Participants were first asked to indicate by circling yes or no whether or not they

personally identified as a straight ally. A breakdown of participants who personally

identified as straight allies can be found in Table 34. A chi-square test of independence

revealed that participants who identified as straight allies differed by sex of the

participant, $\chi^2 (1) = 23.42$, $p < .001$. Women were more likely to personally identify as

straight allies than men. Analysis of the qualitative data revealed nine different categories

for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that they would

identify personally as straight allies. The most common category to emerge was the belief in equal right and equal treatment of gay men and lesbians. A comprehensive list of each category and the frequency of its occurrence can be found in Table 35. Sample statements representative of each category can be found in Table 35.

Participants Who Indicated That They Did Not Personally Identify as a Straight Ally

Five categories were also identified as reasons participants indicated that they did not personally identify as straight allies. The most common category that emerged was not supporting the gay and lesbian lifestyle and/or gay and lesbian relevant legislation. A comprehensive list of each category and the frequency of its occurrence can be found in Table 36. Representative samples for each category can be found in Table 36.

Please Explain Why You Do or Do Not Privately Call Yourself a Straight Ally

Participants where asked to indicate by circling yes or no whether or not they privately identified themselves as straight allies. A breakdown of participants who privately identified as straight allies can be found in Table 37. A chi-square test of independence revealed that participants who identified as straight allies differed by sex of the participant, χ^2 (1) = 4.37, p = .036. Women were more likely to identify as straight allies than men. Participants were then asked to explain why they did or did not privately call themselves a straight ally. Analysis of the qualitative data revealed ten different categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that they would privately identify as straight allies. The most common category to emerge was the belief in equal rights and support for gay and lesbian relevant legislation. A comprehensive list of each category and the frequency of its occurrence can be found in Table 38. Representative statements for each category can be found in Table 38.

Participants Who Indicated That They Did Not Identify Privately as a Straight Ally

Analysis of the qualitative data also revealed nine different categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that they did not privately identify as straight allies. The most common category to emerge was openly supporting lesbians and gay men. A comprehensive list of each category and the frequency of its occurrence can be found in Table 39. Representative statements for each category can be found in Table 39.

Please Explain Why You Do or Do Not Publicly Identify as a Straight Ally

Participants where asked to indicate by circling yes or no whether or not they publicly identified themselves as straight allies. A breakdown of participants who publicly identified as straight allies can be found in Table 40. A chi-square test of independence revealed that participants who identified as straight allies differed by sex of the participant, χ^2 (1) = 11.56, *p* = .001. Women were more likely to identify publicly as straight allies than men. Participants were then asked to explain why they did or did not publicly call themselves a straight ally. Analysis of the qualitative data revealed eight different categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that they would publicly identify as straight allies. The most common category to emerge was the willingness to publicly support gay men and lesbians. A comprehensive list of the categories and its frequency can be found in Table 41. Representative statements for each category can be found in Table 41.

Participants Who Did Not Publicly Identify as a Straight Ally

Analysis of the qualitative data also revealed nine different categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that they did not publicly

identify as straight allies. The three most common categories that emerged included not supporting gay men and lesbians, not being involved in LG activism, and not being publicly opened about their support for lesbians and gay men. A comprehensive list of the categories and its frequency can be found in Table 42. Representative statements for each category can be found in Table 42.

Please Explain Why You Would or Would Not Identify as a Straight Ally Around Others

Participants where asked to indicate by circling yes or no whether or not they would identify as a straight ally around others. A breakdown of participants who publicly identified as straight allies can be found in Table 43. A chi-square test of independence revealed that participants who identified as straight allies differed by sex of the participant, $\chi^2 (1) = 15.04$, $p < .001$. Women were more likely to identify publicly as straight allies than men. Participants were then asked to explain why they would or would not identify as a straight ally around others. Analysis of the qualitative data revealed twelve different categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that they would identify as a straight ally around others. The most common category that emerged was not being ashamed of their support for lesbians and gay men. A comprehensive list of each category and the frequency of its occurrence can be found in Table 44. Representative statements for each category can be found in Table 44.

Participants Who Would Not Identify as Straight Allies Around Others

Analysis of the qualitative data also revealed eight different categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that would not identify as a straight ally around others. The most common category that emerged was participants indicating that they were not at straight ally. A comprehensive list of each category and

its frequency of occurrence can be found in Table 45. Representative statements for each category can be found in Table 45.

Please Explain Why You Would Respond That Way if Someone Asked You if You Were a Straight Ally

Participants where asked to indicate by circling yes or no how they would respond if someone asked them if they were a straight ally. A breakdown of participants who publicly identified as straight allies can be found in Table 46. A chi-square test of independence revealed that participants who identified as straight allies differed by sex of the participant, χ^2 (1) = 20.49, $p < .001$. Women were more likely to identify as straight allies than men. Participants were then asked to explain why they would respond yes or no if someone asked them if they were a straight ally. Analysis of the qualitative data revealed twenty different categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that they would identify as a straight ally if someone asked them. The most common category that emerged was participants indicating that them being a straight ally was the truth. A comprehensive list of each category and the frequency of its occurrence can be found in Table 47. Representative statements for each category can be found in Table 47.

Participants Who Would Not Identify as a Straight Ally if Asked by Someone

Analysis of the qualitative data also revealed thirteen different categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that would not identify as a straight ally if asked by someone. The most common categories that emerged included not supporting lesbians and gay men and not identifying as a straight ally. A comprehensive list of each category and its frequency of occurrence can be found in

Table 48. Representative statements for each category can be found in Table 48.

Please Explain Why You Would or Would Not Identify as a Straight Ally Around Others

Who Held Prejudicial Attitudes

Participants where asked to indicate by circling yes or no if they would identify as a straight ally around other who held prejudicial attitudes. A breakdown of participants who publicly identified as straight allies can be found in Table 49. A chi-square test of independence revealed that participants who identified as straight allies differed by sex of the participant, χ^2 (1) = 27.72, p < .001. Women were more likely to identify publicly as straight allies than men. Participants were then asked to explain why they would or would not identify as straight allies around others who held prejudicial attitudes. Analysis of the qualitative data revealed eighteen different categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that they would identify as a straight ally around others that held prejudicial attitudes. The most common categories that emerged included the willingness to state their opinion to others and wanting to change the attitudes of others, and knowing that their beliefs would not be influenced by others. A comprehensive list of each category and the frequency of its occurrence can be found in Table 50. Representative statements for each category can be found in Table 50.

Participants Who Indicated That They Would Not Identify as a Straight Ally Around

Others Who Held Prejudicial Attitudes

Analysis of the qualitative data also revealed eleven different categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that would not identify as a straight ally around others who held prejudicial attitudes. The most common category that emerged was participants indicating that they did not identify as a straight ally. A

comprehensive list of each category and its frequency of occurrence can be found in

Table 51. Representative statements for each category can be found in Table 51.

Please Explain How You Perceive Someone Who Identifies as a Straight Ally

Participants where asked to explain how they perceive someone who identifies as

a straight ally. Analysis of the qualitative data revealed nine different categories for the

list of themes that was generated by participants regarding their perceptions of straight

allies. The most common category that emerged was the perception that straight allies

were supportive of lesbian and gay men and were supportive of gay and lesbian relevant

legislation. A comprehensive list of each category and the frequency of its occurrence

can be found in Table 52. Representative statements for each category can be found in

Table 52.

Please Explain How You Feel Others Would Perceive Someone Who Identifies as a

Straight Ally

Participants where asked to explain how they feel others would perceive someone

who identifies as a straight ally. Analysis of the qualitative data revealed twelve different

categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants regarding their

perceptions of straight allies. The most common categories that emerged included the

belief that the perceptions being drawn would depend on the person, and also the belief

that others would have negative perceptions of straight allies. A comprehensive list of

each category and the frequency of its occurrence can be found in Table 53.

Representative statements for each category can be found in Table 53.

Please Explain Why You Would or Would Not Identify as a Straight Ally Around Others

Even if You Would be Perceived by Others as Being Gay or Lesbian

        Participants where asked to indicate by circling yes or no whether or not they would identify as a straight ally around others even if they felt they would be perceived by others as being gay or lesbian. A breakdown of participants who identified as straight allies can be found in Table 54. A chi-square test of independence revealed that participants who identified as straight allies differed by sex of the participant, $\chi^2 (1) =$ 33.37, $p < .001$. Women were more likely to identify as straight allies than men. Participants were then asked to explain why they would or would not call themselves an ally if it meant that they might be perceived as others by gay or lesbian. Analysis of the qualitative data revealed thirteen different categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that they would identify as straight allies. The most common category that emerged was not caring how they were perceived by others. A comprehensive list of the categories and its frequency of occurrence can be found in Table 55. Representative statements for each category can be found in Table 55.

Participants Who Would Not Identify as Straight Allies Around Others if it Meant That

They Would be Perceived as Gay or Lesbian

        Analysis of the qualitative data also revealed eleven different categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that they would not identify as straight allies if they might be perceived as lesbian or gay by others. The most common categories that emerged were that the participants did not identify as a straight ally and they did not want to be perceived as lesbian or gay. A comprehensive list of each category and its occurrence can be found in Table 56. Representative statements for each

category can be found in Table 56.

Explain Why You Feel a Heterosexual Individual Who Identifies as a Straight Ally Would or Would Not be Perceived by Others as Being Gay or Lesbian

Participants were asked to indicate by circling yes or no whether or not they felt a heterosexual individual who identified as a straight ally would or would not be perceived by others as being gay or lesbian. A breakdown of participants who indicated yes and no can be found in Table 57. A chi-square test of independence revealed that participants who indicated yes or no did not vary by sex of the participant, χ^2 (1) = 1.25, *p* = .263. Participants were then asked to explain why they did or did not feel that a heterosexual individual who identified as a straight ally would be perceived as lesbian or gay by others. Analysis of the qualitative data revealed eleven different categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that a heterosexual individual who identified as a straight ally would be perceived as being lesbian or gay by others. The most common category that emerged was that straight allies are associated with lesbians and gay men. A comprehensive list of each category and its occurrence can be found in Table 58. Representative statements for each category can be found in Table 58.

Participants Who Indicated That a Straight Ally Would Not be Perceived as Lesbian or Gay by Others

Analysis of the qualitative data also revealed fifteen different categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that straight allies would not be perceived as lesbian or gay by others. The most common categories that emerged were the belief that straight allies are just supporting a cause, and it just depends on the

person or group. A comprehensive list of each category and the frequency of its occurrence can be found in Table 59. Representative statements for each category can be found in Table 59.

Explain Why You Would or Would Not be Willing to Identify as a Straight Ally if it Meant That Others Would Perceive You Negatively

Participants where asked to indicate by circling yes or no whether or not they would identify as a straight ally if it meant that others would perceive you negatively. A breakdown of participants who identified as straight allies can be found in Table 60. A chi-square test of independence revealed that participants who identified as straight allies differed by sex of the participant, χ^2 (1) = 25.22, $p < .001$. Women were more likely to identify as straight allies than men. Participants were then asked to explain why they would or would not call themselves an ally if it meant that they might be perceived negatively by others. Analysis of the qualitative data revealed ten different categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that they would identify as a straight ally even if it meant that they would be perceived negatively by others. The most common categories that emerged included not caring what others think and being strong in their beliefs about being a straight ally. A comprehensive list of each category and the frequency of its occurrence can be found in Table 61. Representative statements for each category can be found in Table 61.

Participants Who Indicated That They Would Not Identify as Straight Allies if it Meant They Would be Perceived Negatively by Others

Analysis of the qualitative data also revealed eleven different categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that they would not

identify as a straight ally if it meant that others would perceive them negatively. The most common categories that emerged included not wanting to be perceived negatively and that they did not identify as a straight ally. A comprehensive list of each category and the frequency of it occurrence can be found in Table 62. Representative statements for each category can be found in Table 62.

Explain Why You Would or Would Not be Willing to Identify as a Straight Ally if it Meant That Others Would See You as Being Associated With Gay Men and/or Lesbians

Participants where asked to indicate by circling yes or no whether or not they would identify as a straight ally if it meant that others would see you as being associated with gay men and/or lesbians. A breakdown of participants who identified as straight allies can be found in Table 63. A chi-square test of independence revealed that participants who identified as straight allies differed by sex of the participant, χ^2 (1) = 37.31, $p < .001$. Women were more likely to identify as straight allies than men. Participants were then asked to explain why they would or would not call themselves an ally if it meant that they would be seen as being associated with lesbians and gay men. Analysis of the qualitative data revealed ten different categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that they would identify as a straight ally even if it meant that they would be perceived negatively by others. The most common category to emerge was participants indicating that they have lesbian and gay friends. A comprehensive list of each category and the frequency its occurrence can be found in Table 64. Representative statements for each category can be found in Table 64.

Participants Who Indicated That They Would Not Identify as a Straight Ally if it Meant That They Would be Seen as Associating With Lesbians and Gay Men

Analysis of the qualitative data also revealed eleven different categories for the list of themes that was generated by participants who indicated that they would not identify as a straight ally if it meant that they would be seen as associating with lesbians and gay men. The most common category that emerged was participants indicating that they did not identify as a straight ally. A comprehensive list of categories and the frequency of its occurrence can be found in Table 65. Representative statements for each category can be found in Table 65.

Straight Ally Identification, Perceptions of Straight Allies, and Engagement in Lesbian and Gay Activism

It was expected that the participants' answers on the free response items would be related to their perceptions of straight allies and willingness to engage in different forms of LG activism. More specifically, we expected that participants who were more likely to privately, but not publicly, identify as a straight ally would be more likely to have positive perceptions of straight allies, but think others would have negative perceptions of straight allies, and would be less likely to engage in different forms of LG activism. Conversely, however, participants who both privately and publicly identified as straight allies would be more likely to have positive perceptions of straight allies, but would still think that others would have negative perceptions of straight allies, and would be more likely to engage in different forms of LG social activism. Finally we expected that participants who did not privately or publicly identify as straight allies would have negative perceptions of straight allies, would think others would have negative

perceptions of straight allies, and would be less likely to engage in LG activism.

However, examination of the data suggested that participants misunderstood the free response items such that many of the participants identified publicly as a straight ally but not privately. Further, very few participants identified as a straight ally privately but not publicly. Therefore we used whether or not participants personally identified as a straight ally as our measure of straight ally identification because we believed it was the clearest and therefore the best assessment of whether or not the participant identified as a straight ally or not.

Straight Ally Identification on the Dependent Measures

Participants were asked to complete the measure of perceptions of straight allies twice. The first time the participants were asked to indicate the top five words that they would use to describe straight allies and identify whether that word was positive, negative, or neutral. It was expected that individuals who identified as straight allies would use more positive words and fewer negative words to describe straight allies than would individuals who did not identify as straight allies. We then asked participants to complete the measure of perceptions of straight allies again, this time having them indicate the top five words that they thought others would use to describe straight allies and to identify whether the word was positive, negative, or neutral. We expected that both participants who identified and did not identify as straight allies would think that others would use fewer positive and more negative words to describe straight allies. Independent samples *t*-tests were conducted in order to assess our hypotheses. To see a breakdown of participants who identified personally as straight allies refer to Table 34.

Participants' perceptions of straight allies. Consistent with our hypotheses,

results of the independent sample *t*-tests revealed that, overall, participants who identified as straight allies were more likely to use positive words, t (218) = 10.94, $p < .001$, and were less likely to use negative words, t (215) = -9.85, $p < .001$, and neutral words, t (217) = -4.03, $p < .001$, than participants who did not identify as straight allies. Means and standard deviations for these analyses can be found in Table 66. A comprehensive description of the relationships between straight ally identification on participants' perceptions of straight allies can be found in Table 67, 68, and 69.

Others' perceptions of straight allies. Consistent with our hypotheses, no differences were found for straight ally identification on the number of positive words, t (207) = 0.64, $p = .524$, negative words, t (213) = 0.88, $p = .378$, or neutral words, t (205) = -1.00, $p = .317$, reported. Means and standard deviations for these analyses can be found in Table 70. A comprehensive description of straight ally identification on others' perceptions of straight allies can be found in Table, 71, 72, and 73.

Participants and others' perceptions of straight allies. Paired-samples *t*-tests were also conducted to assess whether there was a significant difference in the number of positive, negative, and neutral words reported by participants versus what participants felt others would report. Results revealed that participants were more likely to report positive words, t (208) = 16.66, $p < .001$, and were less likely to report negative words, t (210) = -15.38, $p < .001$, than what participants felt others would report. No difference was found on the number of neutral words reported, t (206) = -0.85, $p = .398$. Means and standard deviations for these analyses can be found in Table 74.

Straight ally identification on the willingness to engage in LG activism. Independent samples *t*-tests were also conducted to examine the differences between

straight ally identification on the willingness to engage in LG activism. It was expected

that individuals who identified as straight allies would be more likely to engage in LG

activism than participants who did not identify as straight allies. Consistent with

hypotheses, results revealed that participants who identified as straight allies were more

likely to engage in LG activism, $t(214) = 11.96$, $p < .001$, than participants who did not

identify as straight allies. Means and standard deviations for this analysis can be seen in

Table 75.

Consistent with our hypotheses participants who identified as straight allies had

more positive perceptions of straight allies than participants who did not identify as

straight allies. Further, individuals who did not identify as straight allies had more

negative perceptions of straight allies. Results also revealed that participants who

identified as straight allies were just as likely to think that others would have negative

perceptions of straight allies as participants who did not identify as straight allies. Finally,

consistent with our expectations, participants who identified as straight allies reported

more willingness to engage in LG activism than participants who did not identify as

straight allies.

Influence of Straight Ally Identification and Other Individual Difference Factors on the

Dependent Measures

In order to examine the relationship of straight ally identification with

other individual difference measures (e.g., religious orientation, spiritual orientation,

quality and quantity of contact, conservatism), independent samples *t*-tests were

conducted. Results revealed that participants who identified as straight allies scored

higher on quantity, $t(223) = 4.95$, $p < .001$, and quality of contact with lesbians and gay

men, $t(223) = 9.58$, $p < .001$, and lower on conservatism, $t(217) = -6.45$, $p < .001$ and religiosity, $t(224) = -3.77$, $p < .001$. No differences were found for straight ally identification on spirituality, $t(222) = -0.42$, $p = .674$. Means and standard deviations for these analyses can be seen in Table 76.

Discussion

The objective of Study 2 was to examine the identification processes that lead individuals to privately vs. publicly identify themselves as straight allies. To assess this we had participants respond to free response items regarding privately vs. publicly identifying as straight allies. The objective of the qualitative free response items was to better understand straight ally identification, thus, we made no a priori hypotheses.

Results of the qualitative items showed that participants who believed in equal rights and those that had past and current experiences with gay men and lesbians were more likely to identify as straight allies, which is consistent with past research which has found these factors to be influential in the development of positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men (e.g., Duhigg et al., 2010; Stotzer, 2009). Analysis of the qualitative items also revealed that categories including not wanting to be associated with gay men and lesbians, the failure to see straight allies as straight, not wanting to be perceived negatively, and not wanting to be perceived as lesbian or gay consistently emerged as reasons participants did not want to publicly identify as straight allies. Further, we asked participants how they and others perceive straight allies and although not many participants indicated that they perceived straight allies as lesbian or gay, many of the participants felt that others would perceive straight allies as lesbian or gay. This is consistent with past research which has found that straight allies are concerned about

being perceived as lesbian or gay (Dillion et al., 2004; DiStefano et al., 2000).

We expected that the participants' answers on the free response items would be related to their perceptions of straight allies and willingness to engage in different forms of LG activism. More specifically, we expected that participants who were more likely to privately, but not publicly, identify as a straight ally would be more likely to have positive perceptions of straight allies, but think others have negative perceptions of straight allies, and would be less likely to engage in different forms of LG activism. Conversely, however, participants who both privately and publicly identified as straight allies would be more likely to have positive perceptions of straight allies, may still think that others have negative perceptions of straight allies, and be more likely to engage in different forms of LG social activism.

However, examination of the data suggested that participants misunderstood the free response items such that many of the participants identified publicly as a straight ally but not privately. This suggests that participants did not understand what we meant by privately identifying as a straight ally, which is necessary in order to identify publicly (Williams & Wittig, 1997). Therefore, participants who did or did not personally identify as a straight ally was used as a measure of straight ally identification.

It was expected that individuals who identified as straight allies would use more positive words to describe straight allies, and individuals who did not identify as straight allies would use more negative words to describe straight allies. We then asked participants to complete the measure of perceptions of straight allies again, this time having them indicate the top five words that they think others would use to describe straight allies and to identify whether the word was positive, negative, or neutral. We

expected that both participants who identified and did not identify as straight allies would think that others would use more negative words to describe straight allies.

We found that participants who identified as straight allies were more likely to report positive words and were less likely to report negative and neutral words when compared to individuals who did not identify as straight allies. No differences in straight ally identification were found on the type of words reported by others. Results also revealed that overall, participants, regardless of straight ally identification, were more likely to report positive words and less likely to report negative words than what they felt others would report. Finally, participants that identified as straight allies were more likely to engage in LG activism than participants who did not engage in LG activism.

Results of Study 2 found that individuals may have negative perceptions of straight allies, and may believe that straight allies are lesbian or gay, which suggests that the willingness to take on a courtesy stigma and be perceived negatively may be an influential factor in whether or not an individual decides to identify as a straight ally. Given the results of Study 2 the objective of Study 3 is to further investigate straight ally identification by examining the beliefs of straight allies versus individuals who do not identify themselves as straight allies.

Study 3

The objective of Study 3 was to examine how straight ally identification was related to different attitudes and beliefs related to tolerance and equality (e.g., feminist ideology, egalitarianism) versus prejudice and dominance (e.g., sexual prejudice, social dominance orientation). It was expected that no more than small differences would emerge between participants that identify as straight allies and participants that do not

identify as straight allies. Although straight allies will probably be more tolerant and hold

egalitarian values and have lower levels of prejudicial attitudes, it was expected that there

will be participants who do not identify as straight allies but still have lower levels of

prejudicial attitudes and possess tolerance and hold egalitarian beliefs.

Method

Participants

Seventy-three male and 77 female students enrolled in introductory psychology

classes at Kansas State University participated in the current study. Four participants

indicated a sexual orientation other than heterosexuality and were excluded from further

analyses leaving us with a sample of 71 male and 75 female participants. The average age

of the participants was 19.22 (*SD* = 3.38) with the majority of the participants being first

year students (76.7%).

Materials

Demographic measure. Participants were asked to respond to a series of items to

assess different demographic items (see Appendix A). Participants were first asked to

indicate their sex, class year, age, political affiliation, religiosity, spirituality and sexual

orientation. Participants were also asked to indicate their sexual orientation, religiosity,

and spirituality on a Likert-type scale. Participants were then asked to assess their

attitudes concerning foreign policy, economic, and social issues on a Likert-type scale

from 1 (*very liberal*) to 9 (*very conservative*).

Quality and quantity of contact with lesbians and gay men. Participants responded

to 14 items (see Appendix B) on their previous quantity (*alpha* = .69) and quality (*alpha*

= .89) of contact with lesbians and gay men. Items were adapted from previous research

examining contact with racial minorities (Plant & Devine, 2003) and previous research examining contact with individuals who have intellectual disabilities (McManus, Feyes, & Saucier, in press). Example items included "*in college, I have frequent interactions with gay men and/or lesbians,*" and "*overall, I have had positive experiences with gay men and/or lesbians.*" Participants responded to items on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*).

Liberal feminist attitude and ideology scale (LFAIS). This measure was developed by Morgan (1996) to asses the extent of an individual's belief in feminist ideology (*alpha* = .88) (see Appendix L). The scale consists of three subscales with a total of 40 items. The three subscales include: gender role beliefs (e.g., *it is insulting to the husband when his wife does not take his last name*), attitudes toward global feminist ideology (e.g., *access to education is a crucial part of gaining equal rights for women*), and attitudes toward specific feminist ideology (e.g., *there are circumstances in which women should be paid less than men for equal work*). Participants indicated their level of agreement on a 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*) Likert-type scale.

Straight ally identification. Straight ally identification (see Appendix D) was assessed from a measure created by Morgan (1996), adapted by Myaskovsky and Wittig (1997), and adapted again for the purposes of this study. Participants were first asked to read a short description of a straight ally, and then were asked to indicate by circling yes or no, whether they identify as a straight ally. Participants were then asked to indicate on a 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*) Likert-type scale how much they agree with 6 different statements. Example items on this measure are: "*I consider myself a straight ally,*" and "*I call myself a straight ally privately, and call myself a straight ally*

around others."

Activism orientation scale (AOS). This scale was developed by Corning and Myers (1999) to assess an individual's willingness to engage in different forms of social activism (*alpha* = .98). This scale was be adapted for the purposes of this study to assess how much an individual is willing to engage in different forms of social activism related to gay and lesbian issues (see Appendix K). Before completing the items, a short description was provided to participants explaining activism that is relevant to lesbian and gay men (e.g., same-sex marriage). An example item from this measure is: "*I would be willing to wear a t-shirt or button that promotes lesbian and gay issues.*" Participants indicated their level of willingness to engage in LG related social activism on a 1 (*extremely unlikely*) to 9 (*extremely likely*) Likert-type scale.

Attitudes toward lesbians and gay men scale (ATLG). This scale was developed by Herek (1984) to assess individuals' levels of sexual prejudice (see Appendix C). The attitudes toward lesbians subscale (ATL) includes ten statements pertaining to attitudes toward lesbians (*alpha* = .89). An example of an item on this subscale is: "*The growing number of lesbians indicates a decline in American morals.*" The attitudes toward gay men subscale (ATGM) include ten statements regarding attitudes toward gay men (*alpha* = .88). An example item on this subscale is: "*If a man has homosexual feelings, he should do everything he can to overcome them.*" Participants indicated their level of agreement to each statement on a 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*) Likert-type scale.

Modern homonegativity scale (MHS). This scale was developed by Morrison and Morrison (2002) to assess more covert forms of sexual prejudice (*alpha* = .93) (see

Appendix M). The scale consists of thirteen items and an example item is: "*Homosexuals have been far too confrontational in their demand for equal rights*." Participants indicated their level of agreement to each statement on a 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*) Likert-type scale.

Homopositivity scale (HPS). This scale was developed by Morrison and Bearden (2007) to assess the extent to which an individual endorses positive stereotypes toward gay men (*alpha* = .91) (see Appendix N). This scale consists of nine items and an example item is: *"Gay men are more in touch with their emotions than are straight men."* Participants indicated their level of agreement for each item on a 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*) Likert-type scale.

Humanitarianism-egalitarianism scale (HE) (Katz & Hass, 1988). This measure assessed the extent to which individuals endorse humanitarianism and egalitarianism (*alpha* = .85) (see Appendix O). The HE is a ten item scale and a sample item on this scale is: "*A good society is one in which people feel responsible for one another*." Participants indicated their level of agreement for each item on a 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*) Likert-type scale.

Modern racism scale (MRS) *(*McConahay, Hardee, & Batts*, 1981).* This scale contains 7 items and assesses individuals' levels of prejudice (*alpha* = .78) (see Appendix P). An example item includes "*Discrimination against Blacks is no longer a problem in the United States*." Participants indicated their level of agreement for each item on a 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*) Likert-type scale.

Modern sexism scale (MSS) *(*Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995*).*The MSS assesses more covert forms of prejudice toward women (*alpha* = .80) (see Appendix Q).

This scale contains 8 items and an example item includes "*Discrimination against women is no longer a problem in the United States.*" Participants indicated their level of agreement for each statement on a 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*) Likert-type scale.

Ambivalent sexism inventory (ASI) (Glick & Fiske, 1996). This scale measures a participant's level of hostile and benevolent sexism (see Appendix R). The hostile sexism subscale contains 11 items and assesses the extent to which an individual holds negative stereotypes about women (*alpha* = .88). An example item includes "*When women lose fairly, they claim discrimination.*" Benevolent sexism involves having positive, but role restricting stereotypes about women (*alpha* = .77). The benevolent sexism subscale contains 11 items and an example item includes "*A good woman should be set on a pedestal.*" Participants indicated their agreement for each item on a 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*) Likert-type scale.

Social dominance orientation (SDO) (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). The SDO scale contains 16 items, and assesses how much individuals believe in the appropriateness of a social hierarchy (*alpha* = .84) (see Appendix S). An example item on this measure is: "*Inferior groups should stay in their place.*" Participants will indicated their levels of agreement on Likert-type scales from 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*).

Empathic concern and perspective taking scale (ECPT) (Davis, 1983). The ECPT is a 14 item measure, and assesses an individual's level of empathic concern (*alpha* = .80) and perspective taking (*alpha* = .77) while engaging with others (see Appendix T). An example item on this measure is: "*When I see someone being treated unfairly, I*

sometimes don't feel very much pity for them," and "*I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision*." Participants indicated how much each item describes them on a 1 (*does not describe me well*) to 9 (*describes me very well*) Likert-type scale.

Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice (IERP) (Plant & Devine, 1998). The IERP is a 10 item scale and assesses the internal and external motivations a participant may have to act nonprejudiced (see Appendix U). The measure was adapted for the current study to assess motivations to be nonprejudiced toward lesbians and gay men rather than Black individuals. The internal motivation to respond without prejudice subscale (*alpha* = .84) has 5 items and assesses to what extent an individual holds internal (e.g., internalized nonprejudiced beliefs) motivations to respond without prejudice. An example item on this measure is: "*Being nonprejudiced toward people of other races is important to my self-concept*." The external motivation to respond without prejudice subscale (*alpha* = .90) has 5 items and assesses to what extent an individual may have external (e.g., afraid of appearing prejudiced to others) motivations to respond without prejudice. An example item on this measure is: "*I attempt to appear nonprejudiced toward lesbians and gay men in order to avoid disapproval from others*." Participants indicated their level of agreement on a 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*) Likert-type scale.

Right wing authoritarianism (RWA) (Funke, 2005). This measure has 12 items and assesses an individual's levels of obedience to authority (*alpha* = .60) (see Appendix V). An example item on this measure includes, "*what our country really needs instead of more "civil rights" is a good stiff dose of law and order*." Participants indicated their

level of agreement on a 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*) Likert-type

scale.

Social vigilantism (SV) (Saucier & Webster, 2010). This measure contains 14

items and assesses the extent to which an individual withstands persuasion, forces their

beliefs upon others, and believes that their opinions are of higher quality to others (*alpha*

= .83) (see Appendix W). An example item on this measure includes "*I feel that my ideas*

should be used to educate others." Participants indicated their level of agreement for each

item on a 1 (*disagree very strongly*) to 9 (*agree very strongly*) Likert-type scale.

Social desirability scale. This measure was developed by Marlowe and Crowne

(1964), and consists of 33 true and false items (*alpha* = .72) (see Appendix H). This scale

assesses the extent to which a person seeks approval from others. Example items in this

measure are: *I'm always willing to admit when I make a mistake* and *I am always careful*

about my manner of dress.

Procedure

Participants completed the questionnaire in groups of approximately 25.

Completion of the measures took no longer than an hour. After completion participants

were debriefed and thanked for their participation.

Results

The objective of Study 3 was to examine how straight ally identification was

related to different attitudes and beliefs related to tolerance and equality (e.g., feminist

ideology, egalitarianism) versus prejudice and dominance (e.g., sexual prejudice, social

dominance orientation). Participants completed both a dichotomous straight ally

identification measure where participants were asked to indicate by circling yes or no if

they identified themselves as a straight ally and continuous straight ally identification measure which assessed the strength of their identification.

It was expected that on the dichotomous measure of straight ally identification that no more than small differences would emerge between participants that identified as straight allies and participants that did not identify as a straight allies. Although it was expected that straight allies would probably score lower on prejudicial measures (e.g., modern racism scale, modern sexism scale, ATLG) and score higher on measures such as the feminist ideology scale, and empathy and perspective taking scale, it was also expected that there would be participants who did not identify as straight allies but still would have lower levels of prejudicial attitudes, higher levels of beliefs in the feminist ideology, and empathy and perspective taking. To assess this independent samples *t*-tests were conducted to examine the differences between participants who identified as straight allies versus participants who did not identify as straight allies on our demographics (e.g., conservatism, contact, religious and spiritual orientation) and the dependent measures: LFAIS, ATLG, HPS, HE, MRS, MSS ASI, SDO, RWA, ECPT, IERP, and SV scale. A breakdown of participants who identified as straight allies can be seen in Table 77. A chi-square test of independence revealed that participants who identified as straight allies differed by sex of the participant χ^2 (1) = 9.04, *p* = .003. Women were more likely to identify as straight allies than men.

Straight Ally Identification and Demographics

Significant differences in straight ally identification were found on the conservatism, religion, and quantity and quality of contact measures. Participants who identified as straight allies scored lower on the conservatism measure, *t* (126) = -3.08, *p* =

.003, and religious orientation, t (126) = -3.32, p = .001, than participants who did not

identify as straight allies. Results also revealed that participants who identified as straight

allies had more quantity, t (125) = 5.66, p < .001, and quality of contact, t (126) = 6.45, p

< .001, with lesbians and gay men than did participants who did not identify as straight

allies. No differences were found between straight ally identification on strength of

spirituality, t (126) = -.869, p = .386. Means and standard deviations for these analyses

can be seen in Table 78.

Categorical Straight Ally Identification and the Dependent Measures

Independent sample t-tests were first conducted to examine the differences of

straight ally identification on measures that were related to tolerance and equality.

Consistent with our hypotheses, significant differences in straight ally identification were

found on the internal motivation to respond without prejudice scale and the LFAIS.

Results revealed that participants who identified as straight allies scored higher on the

internal motivation to respond without prejudice scale, t (126) = 6.62, p < .001, and the

LFAIS (M = 6.74, SD = .78), t (116) = 5.46, p < .001, than participants who did not

identify as straight allies. No significant differences in straight ally identification were

found on empathic concern, t (125) = .373, p = .710, perspective taking, t (124) = 1.05, p

= .298, and humanitarianism and egalitarianism, t (123) = .939, p = .349. Means and

standard deviations for these analyses can be seen in Table 79.

Independent samples t-tests were also conducted to examine the differences in

straight ally identification on the measures related to prejudice and dominance.

Consistent with our hypotheses, significant differences in straight ally identification were

found on the attitudes toward lesbians and gay men scale, homopositivity scale, modern

homonegativity scale, modern sexism, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, right wing

authoritarianism, and social dominance orientation. Results revealed that participants

who did not identify as straight allies scored higher on the ATL, t (117) = -7.13, $p < .001$,

ATG, t (122) = -10.42, $p < .001$, modern homonegativity scale, t (124) = -8.11, $p < .001$,

modern sexism, t (125) = -3.03, $p = .003$, hostile sexism, t (124) = -2.73, $p = .007$,

benevolent sexism, t (125) = -2.27, $p = .025$, right wing authoritarianism, t (123) = -6.60,

$p < .001$, and social dominance orientation, t (121) = -2.46, $p = .015$, than participants

who did identify as straight allies. Participants who did not identify as straight allies

scored lower on the homopositivity scale than participants who identified as straight

allies, t (123) = 3.85, $p < .001$. Finally, no significant differences in straight ally

identification were found on the external motivation to respond without prejudice scale, t

(125) = -1.14, $p = .259$, the modern racism scale, t (122) = -1.36, $p = .178$, and the social

vigilantism scale, t (125) = -.64, $p = .525$. Means and standard deviations for these

analyses can be seen in Table 80.

 Results of the independent sample t-tests revealed that our hypotheses were

partially supported. Individuals who identified as straight allies scored higher on some of

the measures related to tolerance and equality such as the IMRP and the LFAIS.

However, no significant differences emerged between straight ally identification on

empathic concern, perspective taking, and humanitarianism-egalitarianism. Further,

individuals who identified as straight allies scored lower on many of the measures related

to prejudice and discrimination. Individuals who identified as straight allies scored lower

on the ATL, ATG, homonegativity, modern sexism, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism,

RWA, and SDO. Individuals who identified as straight allies scored higher on

homopositivity. No differences emerged between straight ally identification on EMRP, modern racism, or SV.

Relationships Between Continuous Straight Ally Identification and the Individual Difference Measures

Straight ally identification was also assessed by having participants complete a continuous straight ally identification measure. The objective was to examine how the strength of straight ally identification was related to different attitudes and beliefs. It was expected overall that higher levels of straight ally identification would be positively related to the LFAIS, HE, ECPT, HPS, and SV measures and the internal motivation to respond without prejudice subscale. It was also expected that overall higher levels of straight ally identification would be negatively related to the ATLG, MRS, HS, MSS, ASI, SDO, and RWA measures and the external motivation to respond without prejudice subscale.

Correlations were conducted in order to examine how the individual difference measures were related to one another. Results revealed that the individual difference measures were generally correlated with one another (see Table 81). Of most importance were the correlations between straight ally identification and the other individual difference measures. Analyses revealed that the straight ally identification measure was significantly and negatively correlated with conservatism, religiosity, RWA, SDO, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, modern sexism, modern racism, modern homonegativity, ATL, and the ATG. Analyses also revealed the straight ally identification measure was positively and significantly related to the activism orientation scale, quantity and quality of contact, homopositivity, IMRP, and the LFAIS.

We also conducted regression analyses to examine how straight ally identification was related to the individual difference measures. Sex of the participant, straight ally identification and the activism orientation scale were entered into the same step of all the regressions conducted to examine how these measures predicted scores on the individual difference measures: LFAIS, ATLG, HPS, HE, MRS, MSS, ASI, SDO, RWA, ECPT, IERP, HS, and SV scale. Before the variables were entered into each regression, sex of the participant was dummy coded (men = 0; women = 1), and straight ally identification and the activism orientation scale were standardized. Again, it was expected overall that higher levels of straight ally identification and engagement in LG social activism would be positively related to the LFAIS, HE, ECPT, HPS, and SV measures and the internal motivation to respond without prejudice subscale. However, we did expect the magnitude of the *beta*s to be low since it was expected that individuals with lower levels of straight ally identification may also indicate higher scores on the HE, ECPT, and SV measures and the internal motivation to respond without prejudice subscale. Conversely, it was expected that overall higher levels of straight ally identification and engagement in LG social activism would be negatively related to the ATLG, MRS, HS, MSS, ASI, SDO, and RWA measures and the external motivation to respond without prejudice subscale. Again, we expected that the magnitude of the *beta*s to be low, since again it was expected that individuals with lower levels of straight ally identification may also indicate lower scores on the ATLG, MRS, MSS, ASI, SDO, and RWA measures and the external motivation to respond without prejudice subscale.

Measures related to tolerance and equality. Results revealed that being female was uniquely related to higher scores on the LFAIS (See Table 82) and empathic concern

(see Table 83) (βs = .25 - .33, *p*s = .005 - < .001). Sex of the participant was not related to scores on the HE scale (Table 84), perspective taking (Table 85), or the IMRP (see Table 86) (βs = -.06 – 11, *p*s = .12 - .95). Higher scores on the straight ally identification measure were uniquely related to higher scores on the LFAIS and IMRP (βs = .27 - .30, *p*s = .002 - < .001) but not related to scores on the HE scale, empathic concern, or perspective taking (βs = -.09 - .05, *p*s = .38 - .64). Results also revealed that higher scores on the activism orientation scale were uniquely associated with higher scores on the LFAIS, HE scale and the IMRP (βs = .25 - .37, *p*s = .01 - < .001), but were not related to scores on empathic concern or perspective taking (βs = .14 - .17, *p*s = .11 - .21).

 Measures related to prejudice and discrimination. Results revealed that being male was uniquely associated with higher scores on the ATG (see Table 87), homonegativity scale (see Table 88), modern racism (see Table 89), modern sexism (see Table 90), and hostile sexism (see Table 91) (βs = -.35 - -.14, *p*s = .03 - <.001). Being female was uniquely related to higher scores on the homopositivity scale (see Table 92) (β = .19, *p* = .03). Sex of the participant was not related to scores on SV (see Table 93), ATL (see Table 94), Benevolent sexism (see Table 95), RWA (see Table 96), SDO (see Table 97), and the EMRP (see Table 98) (βs = -.06 - .11, *p*s = .16 - .52). Higher scores on the activism orientation scale were uniquely associated with lower scores on the ATL, ATG, homonegativity, modern sexism, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, RWA, EMRP, and SDO (βs = -.42 - -.20, *p*s = .04 - < .001). Scores on the activism orientation scale were not related to scores on homopositivity, SV, or the MRS, (βs = -.11 - .06, *p*s = .27 - .92). Higher scores on the straight ally identification measure were uniquely associated with lower scores on the ATL, ATG, homonegativity, and RWA (βs = -.40 - -.29, *p*s =

.001 - < .001). Scores on the straight ally identification measure were not associated with scores on the homopositivity scale, SV, MSS, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, EMRP, SDO, and the MRS (βs = -.12 - .08, ps = .19 - .62).

Regression analyses revealed that our hypotheses were only partially supported. Greater scores on the straight ally identification measure and the activism orientation scale were uniquely associated with higher scores on the LFAIS and IMRP. In contrast to our hypotheses higher scores on the straight ally identification measure and the activism orientation scale were not related to higher scores on ECPT, HPS, and SV. Although higher scores on the activism orientation scale were uniquely associated with higher scores on the HE scale, straight ally identification was not associated with this individual difference measure. Consistent with our hypotheses, higher scores on the straight ally identification measure and the activism orientation scale were uniquely associated with lower scores on the ATL, ATG, and HS scale. However, although higher scores on the activism orientation scale were uniquely associated with lower scores on MS, ASI, SDO, RWA, and EMRP, the straight ally identification measure was not associated with any of these individual difference measures.

We also examined how the individual difference measures were uniquely related to the activism orientation scale and the straight ally identification measure. To assess this, the individual difference measures were entered into regressions to examine how each individual difference measure predicted unique portions of the variance on the activism orientation scale and the straight ally identification measure.

Prediction of the individual difference measures on the activism orientation scale. Results revealed that scores on some of the measures related to prejudice and dominance

were uniquely related to scores on the activism orientation scale (see Table 98). Lower

scores on the ATG and EMRP were uniquely related to higher scores on the activism

orientation scale (βs = -.44 - -.22, ps = .01 - .003). Scores on the SV, RWA, SDO, hostile

sexism, benevolent sexism, modern sexism, modern racism, modern homonegativity,

homopositivity, and the ATL scales, were not related to scores on the activism orientation

scale (βs = -.20 - .18, ps = .08 - .43). Results revealed that the measures related to

tolerance and equality were not related to scores on the activism orientation scale. Scores

on the IMRP, empathic concern, HE, perspective taking, and the LFAIS were not

associated with scores on the activism orientation scale (βs = -.03 - .16, ps = .13 - .73).

Prediction of the individual difference measures on straight ally identification.

Results revealed that the measures related to prejudice and dominance were uniquely

related to straight ally identification (see Table 99). Higher scores on the ATL, (β = .32,

p = .02), and lower scores on the ATG and modern homonegativity (βs = -.45 - -.30, ps =

.01 - .04) were related to higher scores on straight ally identification. However scores on

SV, RWA, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, modern sexism, modern racism,

homopositivity and the EMRP were not related to scores on straight ally identification (βs

= -.10 - .15, ps = .13 - .94). Results also revealed that the measures related to tolerance

and equality were not related to straight ally identification (see Table 100). Scores on the

IMRP, empathic concern, perspective taking, HE scale, and the LFAIS were not related

to scores on straight ally identification (βs = -.11 - .22, ps = .06 - .49).

Summary of Results

The objective of Study 3 was to examine how straight ally identification was

related to different attitudes and beliefs related to tolerance and equality (e.g., feminist

ideology, egalitarianism) versus prejudice and dominance (e.g., sexual prejudice, social dominance orientation). It was expected that a profile of a straight ally would emerge such that higher levels of straight ally identification would be associated with lower levels of prejudicial attitudes. More specifically, it was expected that higher levels of straight ally identification would be related to lower scores on the ATLG, MRS, HS, MSS, ASI, SDO, and RWA scale. It was also expected that higher levels of straight ally identification would be related to lower scores on the external motivation to respond without prejudice subscale, but related to higher scores on the internal motivation to respond without prejudice subscale. Further, it was expected that higher levels of straight ally identification would be related to higher levels of empathy and perspective taking, egalitarian beliefs, belief in the feminist ideology, and engagement in different public forms of LG activism. Finally, we expected that higher levels of straight ally identification would be related to higher scores on the social vigilantism measure.

Analyses on the dichotomous measure of straight ally identification revealed that our hypotheses were partially supported. On the measures related to beliefs about tolerance and equality, individuals who identified as straight allies scored higher on the IMRP and the LFAIS. However, no differences emerged between straight ally identification on, empathic concern, perspective taking, and humanitarianism-egalitarianism. In relation to beliefs related to prejudice and discrimination, again, our hypotheses were partially supported. Individuals who identified as straight allies scored lower on the ATL, ATG, homonegativity, modern sexism, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, RWA, and SDO. Individuals who identified as straight allies scored higher on the homopositivity scale. No differences emerged between straight ally identification on

EMRP, modern racism, or the SV measure.

Analyses on the continuous measure of straight ally identification revealed that on the measures related to tolerance and equality our hypotheses were again partially supported. Higher scores on the straight ally identification measure were uniquely associated with higher scores on the LFAIS and IMRP. Straight ally identification was not uniquely associated with scores on the other measures related to tolerance and equality. In relation to the measures related to prejudice and discrimination our hypotheses were again partially supported. Higher scores on the straight ally identification measure were uniquely associated with lower scores on the ATL, ATG, and homonegativity. Straight ally identification was not uniquely associated with scores on the other measures related to prejudice and discrimination.

Discussion

In study 3 it we hypothesized that higher levels of straight ally identification would be related to lower scores on the measures related to prejudice and dominance. More specifically, we expected that straight ally identification would be related to lower scores on the ATLG, MRS, HS, MSS, ASI, SDO, and RWA scale. It was also expected that higher levels of straight ally identification would be related to lower scores on the external motivation to respond without prejudice subscale, but related to higher scores on the internal motivation to respond without prejudice subscale. Further, it was expected that higher levels of straight ally identification would be related to higher scores on the measures related to tolerance and equality. More specifically, we expected that straight ally identification would be related to higher levels of empathy and perspective taking, egalitarian beliefs, belief in the feminist ideology, and engagement in different public

forms of LG activism. Finally, we expected that higher levels of straight ally identification would be related to higher scores on the social vigilantism measure.

Although we expected a profile of a straight ally to emerge we did expect that no more than small differences would emerge between participants who identified as straight allies and participants who did not identify as straight allies. Results of the independent sample t-tests revealed that individuals who identified as straight allies scored higher on some of the measures related to tolerance and equality such as the IMRP and the LFAIS. However, no significant differences emerged between straight ally identification on empathic concern, perspective taking, and humanitarianism-egalitarianism. Further, results of the independent sample t-tests revealed that while there were differences between participants who identified as straight allies and individuals who did not identify as straight allies on the measures related to tolerance and equality non-straight ally means were still moderate to high on the 9 point Likert type scale (Ms = 5.26 – 7.09).

Results of the independent sample t-tests also revealed that individuals who identified as straight allies scored lower on many of the measures related to prejudice and discrimination. Individuals who identified as straight allies scored lower on the ATL, ATG, homonegativity, modern sexism, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, RWA, and SDO. Individuals who identified as straight allies scored higher on homopositivity. No differences emerged between straight ally identification on EMRP, modern racism, or SV. However, while there were differences between participants who identified as straight allies and individuals who did not identify as straight allies on the measures related to prejudice and discrimination, non-straight ally means were still moderate to low on the 9 point Likert type scale (Ms = 3.11 – 5.87).

We also expected that even though the strength of straight ally identification would be related to different attitudes and beliefs, the results of our regressions would show the magnitude of the *beta*s to be moderate to low. Results of the analyses revealed that straight ally identification was uniquely related to some of the measures related to tolerance and equality. Higher levels of straight ally identification were uniquely related to higher scores on the LFAIS and the IMRP, but were not related to scores on the HE scale, empathy, and perspective taking scale. Results of our analyses revealed that overall, consistent with our expectations the magnitude of the *beta*s were moderate to low for the measures related to tolerance and equality (βs = -.09 - .30.). Results also revealed that straight ally identification was uniquely related to some of the measures related to prejudice and discrimination. Higher levels of straight ally identification were uniquely related to lower scores on the ATL, ATG, homonegativity, and the RWA scale, but were not related to scores on SDO, EMRP, homopositivity, modern sexism, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, or the SV scale. Further, results of our analyses revealed that overall, the magnitude of the betas were also moderate to low for measure related to prejudice and discrimination (βs = -.40 - .20). Finally, as mentioned above scores on the straight ally identification measure were not associated with scores on many of the measures related to tolerance and equality and prejudice and discrimination.

The results of these analyses suggest that although straight allies held moderately more tolerant and egalitarian values and had lower levels of prejudicial attitudes, there were participants who did not identify as straight allies that still had lower levels of prejudicial attitudes and possessed tolerance and egalitarian beliefs. This may suggest that other factors such as the willingness to take on a courtesy stigma may be influential

in the process of identifying as a straight ally beyond differences in attitudes toward tolerance and equality versus prejudice and discrimination.

General Discussion

The purpose of the present research was to examine the perceptions of straight allies and the processes that lead to straight ally identification. Across the three studies we found that the willingness to take on a courtesy stigma may be influential in the process of straight ally identification.

In Study 1 we found that participants who read about the target engaging in LG activism did not rate the target any differently on the masculine and feminine attributes than participants who read about the target engaging in unspecified activism, which is inconsistent with past research (Sigelman et al., 1991). Participants who identified as straight allies and read about Matt engaging in LG activism were no less likely to rate Matt as having stereotypically feminine attributes. Further, participants who identified as straight allies and read about Katie engaging in LG activism were no less likely to rate Katie as having stereotypically masculine attributes. However, we found that participants were more likely to perceive the target as having a same-sex sexual orientation and thought that others would perceive the target as more likely having a same-sex sexual orientation in the LG activism condition than in the unspecified activism condition. We also found that participants who identified as straight allies were less likely to perceive the targets in the vignettes as having a same-sex sexual orientation, but were more likely to think that others would perceive the target as having a same-sexual orientation.

The results of Study 1 showed that even though straight allies may not take on the stereotypes of lesbians and gay men, they are perceived as having a same-sex sexual

orientation. Further, although straight allies were less likely to perceive the target as having a same-sex sexual orientation, they thought that others would perceive the target as having a same-sex sexual orientation. This suggests that individuals who openly associate with gay men and lesbians do take on a courtesy stigma from other individuals, and that straight allies are aware of this courtesy stigma attached those who to openly associate with or advocate for gay men and lesbians.

Results of Study 2 showed that individuals who believe in equal rights and those that had past and current experiences with gay men and lesbians were more likely to identify as straight allies, which is consistent with past research (e.g., Duhigg et al., 2010; Stotzer, 2009). Results also revealed that not wanting to be associated with gay men and lesbians, the failure to see straight allies as straight, not wanting to be perceived negatively or as lesbian or gay consistently emerged as reasons participants did not publicly identify as straight allies. Further, when asked how others would perceive straight allies, many of the participants indicated that they felt that others would perceive straight allies as being lesbian or gay themselves. We also found that participants who identified as straight allies had more positive perceptions of straight allies than participants who did not identify as straight allies and that participants, regardless of identification, had more positive perceptions of straight allies than participants reported that others would. Therefore, the results of Study 2 suggest that the willingness to take on a courtesy stigma and to be perceived negatively may influence whether or not an individual identifies as a straight ally.

Finally, in Study 3 we found that straight ally identification was uniquely related to some of the measures related to tolerance and equality. Higher levels of straight ally

identification were uniquely related to higher scores on the liberal feminist ideology and internal motivation to respond without prejudice scales, but were not related to scores on the humanitarianism-egalitarianism, empathy, and perspective taking scales. Results of our analyses revealed that, consistent with our expectations, the magnitude of the relationships were moderate to low in size for the measures related to tolerance and equality. Results also revealed that straight ally identification was uniquely related to some of the measures related to prejudice and discrimination. Higher levels of straight ally identification were uniquely related to lower scores on the attitudes toward lesbians, attitudes toward gay men, homonegativity, and right wing authoritarianism scales, but were not related to scores on the social dominance orientation, the external motivation to respond without prejudice, homopositivity, modern sexism, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, or social vigilantism scales. Further, results of our analyses revealed that the relationships were also moderate to low in size for measures related to prejudice and discrimination.

Therefore, the results of Study 3 showed that although a profile of a straight ally did emerge, there were participants who did not identify as straight allies that still had lower levels of prejudicial attitudes and also possessed tolerance and egalitarian beliefs. This suggests that the willingness to take on a courtesy stigma may be influential in the identification process beyond individuals' attitudes related to prejudice and discrimination versus tolerance and equality.

Together, the present research shows that individuals who identify as straight allies do take on a courtesy stigma and may be perceived more negatively by others. The results of these studies are consistent with past research which has found that individuals

who associate with a stigmatized person or group also feel the effects of that stigmatization (e.g., Gray, 2002; Snyder, Omoto, & Crain, 1999). For example, Gray (2002) found that parents of disabled children felt stigmatized by others. Further, research has shown that AIDS volunteers feel stigmatized by others (Snyder, Omoto, & Crain, 1999).

Understanding the processes related to social identification has many implications. First, the results of the present research add increased evidence for the justification-suppression model of prejudice (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003). By identifying as a straight ally, individuals are choosing to take on a courtesy stigma. According to the justification-suppression model of prejudice, when individuals are seen as choosing their membership, the expression of prejudice may be enhanced toward those individuals, and seen as justified since the individuals chose to identify as a straight allies.

Second, a person's self-concept is obtained partially from the group memberships that the person maintains (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). By socially identifying with a group a person "takes on shared meanings of that categorical label's implication, as well as assuming elements of common agenda for action" (Deaux, Reid, Mizrahi, & Cotting, 1997, p. 91). Thus, individuals want to maintain memberships that are positively evaluated and will enhance their social identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Because gay men and lesbians often are not positively evaluated, straight individuals may take on a courtesy stigma by associating with lesbians and gay men and engaging in the LG movement, and this may keep some individuals who express positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men from identifying as straight allies.

Finally, past research has also shown that increased identification with an activist group is positively related to engagement in social activism. For example, across a series of studies Simon, Loewy, Stürmer, Weber, Freytag, Habig, Kampmeier, and Spahlinger (1998) examined how participants' identification levels with two different social movements (i.e., gray panthers, LG movement) were related to their involvement in social activism. Results revealed that across the two studies identification was positively related to willingness to engage in collective action. Similarly, research has shown a meditational relationship between social identification, motivation, and resulting behavior (Deaux, Reid, Mizrahi, & Cotting, 1997). This suggests that increased identification with a social movement (e.g., gay movement) motivates the individual to engage in collective social action. Thus, the existence of this courtesy stigma may keep individuals who express positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men from engaging in relevant social activism.

This research has implications for understanding the processes related to straight ally perceptions and identification, and will promote general understanding of involvement in prosocial behaviors that may bring social penalties. However, as in all studies, limitations of the current research must be considered. One of the limitations of the current research is the lack of understanding in regards to straight ally identification. In Study 2, participants were asked to indicate whether they privately identified as a straight ally and whether they publicly identified as a straight ally. Consistent with past work on feminist identification it is suggested that to socially identify as a straight ally a person must internalize his/her group membership, and identify with their group around others (Williams & Wittig, 1997). In regards to the current study many of the participants

did not seem to understand what we meant by privately identifying as a straight ally. Many of the participants indicated that they did not privately identify as a straight ally, but did publicly identify as a straight ally. For example, participants who did not privately identify as straight allies were quoted as saying "*I outwardly call myself a straight ally*," "*There is no need to private*," and "*If I can say it in public no need to be private. I speak my mind without regard to what others believe, say, or feel*." This suggests that participants may have thought that one did not need to privately identify as a straight ally to publicly identify as a straight ally. Future research should clarify the difference between privately and publicly identifying as straight allies in order to get a better understanding of the processes related to straight ally identification.

Another limitation of the current research is the use of self-reports. Participants were able to deliberate their responses before answering items on the questionnaire. It is unclear from these results whether participants who identified as straight allies on the questionnaire would be willing to actually identify themselves as straight allies around others given the existence of this courtesy stigma. Future research should examine participants' willingness to identify as straight allies in actual interactions with individuals who hold negative perceptions of straight allies.

Finally, the current research is an attempt to understand the processes that lead to straight ally identification. However, the factors examined in the current research are not the only factors related to straight ally identification. For example, past research has found feminist identification to be related to exposure to feminism and believing in a common fate with other women (Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997; Reid & Purcell, 2004). Further, research on factors related to increased positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay

men has revealed that factors important in the acquisition of positive attitudes include contact with LG individuals, resistance to intolerance, experience with oppression and influence from family (Stotzer, 2009; Duhigg et al., 2010). Future research should examine how these factors and others not addressed in the current research are related to straight ally identification.

The current research will provide further insight into the perceptions of straight allies and the processes that lead individuals to identify themselves as straight allies. The current research contributed to the current literature by showing that individuals do take on a courtesy stigma by associating with lesbians and gay men and engaging in the LG movement and may do so knowingly. As a result, this courtesy stigma may keep some individuals who express positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men from publicly identifying as straight allies. Further, we found that it is not necessarily egalitarian beliefs that lead to straight ally identification but other processes, such as the willingness to take on a courtesy stigma, may be involved. This suggests that some individuals are willing to identify with members of stigmatized groups and may actively engage in different forms of social activism to promote the rights and liberties of stigmatized groups. Further, these individuals may knowingly take on a courtesy stigma to do so.

At the outset of this research it was expected that there would be a lack of participants who would identify as a straight ally. The current research was conducted at a Midwestern university placing the studies in a conservative political climate, which we thought would make it difficult to obtain participants who identified as straight allies. However, we were pleasantly surprised to find the increased number of participants who identified themselves as straight allies. This suggests that even in a more conservative

political climate there are an increasing number of individuals who are willing to engage in prosocial behaviors at the risk of social penalties, including taking on a courtesy stigma. The results of the current research and the willingness of so many of the participants to identify as straight allies gives hope in regards to the future rights of lesbians and gay men.

References

Alexander, S., & Ryan, M. (1997). Social constructs of feminism: A study of undergraduates at a women's college. *College Student Journal, 31*, 555-567.

Altemeyer, B. (2001). Changes in attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality, 42*, 63-75.

Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*, 155-162.

Berryman-Fink, C., & Verderber, K. S. (1985). Attributions of the term feminist: A factor analytic development of a measuring instrument. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9*, 51-64.

Birenbaum, A. (1970). On managing a courtesy stigma. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 11*, 196-206.

Blinde, E. M., & Taub, D. E. (1992). Women athletes as falsely accused deviants: Managing the lesbian stigma. *The Sociological Quarterly, 33*, 521-533.

Burn, S. M., Aboud, R., & Moyles, C. (2000). The relationship between gender social identity and support for feminism. *Sex Roles, 42*, 1081-1089.

Conway, M. M., Pizzamiglio, T., & Mount, L. (1996). Status, communality, and agency: Implications for stereotypes of gender and other groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 25-38.

Corning, A. F., & Myers, D. J. (2003). Individual orientation toward engagement in social action. *Political Psychology, 23*, 703-729.

Cortese, D. K. (2006). *Are we thinking straight? The politics of straightness in a lesbian and gay social movement organization*. New York: Routledge.

Crandall, C.S., & Eshleman, A. (2003). A justification-suppression model of the expression and experience of prejudice. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*, 414-446.

Crowne, D., & Marlowe, D. (1964). *The approval motive*. New York: Wiley.

Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44*, 113-126.

Deaux, K., Reid, A., Mizrahi, K., & Cotting, D. (1997). Connecting the person to the social: The functions of social identification. In T. R. Tyler, R. Kramer, & O. John (Eds.), *The psychology of the social self* (pp. 91-114). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Dillion, F. R., Worthington, R. L., Savoy, H. B., Rooney, S. C., Becker-Schutte, A., & Guerra, R. M. (2004). On becoming allies: A qualitative study of lesbian, gay, and bisexual-affirmative counselor training. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 43*, 162-178.

DiStefano, T. M., Croteau, J. M., Anderson, M. Z., Kampa-Kokesch, S., & Bullard, M. A. (2000). Experiences of being heterosexual allies to lesbian, gay, and bisexual people: A qualitative exploration. *Journal of College Counseling, 3*, 131-141.

Duhigg, J. M., Rostosky, S. S., Gray, B. E., & Wimsatt, M. K. (2010). Development of heterosexuals into sexual-minority allies: A qualitative exploration. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy, 7*, 2-14.

Franklin, K. (2000). Antigay behaviors among young adults: Prevalence, patterns, and motivators in a noncriminal population. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*, 339-362.

Funke, F. (2005). The dimensionality of right-wing authoritarianism: Lessons from the

    dilemma between theory and measurement. *Political Psychology, 26*, 195-218.

Gabriel, U., & Banse, R. (2006). Helping behavior as a subtle measure of discrimination

    against lesbians and gay men: German data and a comparison across countries.

    Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36, 690-707.

Garofalo, R., Wolf, R. C., Kessel, S., Palfrey, J., & DuRant, R. H. (1998). The

    association between health risk behaviors and sexual orientation among a school-

    based sample of adolescents. *Pediatrics, 101*, 895-902.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile

    and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 491-

    512.

Gray, D. E. (1993). Perceptions of stigma: The parents of autistic children. *Sociology of

    Health and Illness, 15*, 102-120.

Gray, D. E. (2002). Everybody just freezes. Everybody is just embarrassed: Felt and

    enacted stigma among parents of children with high functioning autism. *Sociology

    of Health and Illness, 24*, 734-749.

Gray, C., Russell, P., & Blockley, S. (1991). The effects upon helping behaviour of

    wearing pro-gay identification. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 30*, 171-178.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New York:

    Prentice Hall.

Goldberg, P. A., Gottesdiener, M., & Abramson, P. R. (1975). Another put-down of

    women?: Perceived attractiveness as a function of support for the feminist

    movement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32*, 113-115.

Hebl, M. R., Foster, J. B., Mannix, L. M., & Dovidio, J. F. (2002). Formal and interpersonal discrimination: A field study of bias toward homosexual applicants. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 815-825.

Herek, G. M. (1984). Attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. A factor analytic study. *Journal of Homosexuality, 10*, 39-51.

Herek, G. M. (1987). Can functions be measured? A new perspective on the functional approach to attitudes. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 50*, 285-303.

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

Herek, G. M., Cogan, J. C., & Gillis, J. R. (2002). Victim experiences in hate crimes based on sexual orientation. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*, 319-339.

Jackson, J. S., Brown, T. N., Williams, D. R., Torres, M., Sellers, S. L., & Brown, K. (1996). *Ethnicity and Disease, 6*, 132-147.

Jones, E. E., Farina, A., Hastorf, A. H., Markus, H., Miller, D. T., & Scott, R. A. (1984). *Social stigma: The psychology of marked relationships*. New York: Freeman and Company.

Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2001). Stop complaining! The social costs of making attributions to discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 254-263.

Katz, I., & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and American value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Personality and Social Psychology, 55*, 893-905.

Kite, M. E., & Whitley, B. E. (1996). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexual persons, behaviors, and civil rights. A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 336-353.

Krieger, N. (1990). Racial and gender discrimination: Risk factors for high blood pressure? *Social Science and Medicine, 30*, 1273-1281.

Lewis, R. J., Derlega, V. J., Griffin, J. L., & Krowinski, A. C. (2003). Stressors for gay men and lesbians: Life stress, gay-related stress, stigma consciousness, and depressive symptoms. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 22*, 716-729.

Link, B. G., & Phelan, J. C. (2001). Conceptualizing stigma. *Annual Review of Sociology, 27*, 363-385.

Lücken, M., & Simon, B. (2005). Cognitive and affective experiences of minority and majority members: The role of group size, status, and power. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 41*, 396-413.

Major, B., & O'Brien, L. T. (2005). The social psychology of stigma. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56*, 393-421.

Marshal, M. P., Friedman, M. S., Stall, R., King, K. M., Miles, J., Gold, M. A., Bukstein, O. G., & Morse, J. Q. (2008). Sexual orientation and adolescent substance use: A meta-analysis and methodological review. *Addiction, 103*, 546-556.

Mays, V. M., & Cochran, S. D. (2001). Mental health correlates of perceived discrimination among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health, 91*, 1869-1876.

McConahay, J. B., Hardee, B. B., & Batts, V. (1981). Has racism declined in America? It depends on who is asking and what is asked. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 25*,

563-579.

McManus, J. L., Feyes, K. L., & Saucier, D. A. (in press). Knowledge and contact as
*predictor of attitudes toward individuals with intellectual disabilities. Journal of
Social and Personal Relationships.*

Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and
bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological
Bulletin, 129*, 674-697.

Monteith, M. J., & Spicer, C. V. (2000). Contents and correlates of whites' and blacks'
racial attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36*, 125-154.

Morgan, B. L. (1996). Putting the feminism into feminism scales: Introduction of a
liberal feminist attitude and ideology scale. *Sex Roles, 34*, 359-390.

Morrison, T. G., & Bearden, A. G. (2007). The construction and validation of the
homopositivity scale: An instrument measuring endorsement of positive
stereotypes about gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality, 52*, 63-89.

Myaskovsky, L., & Wittig, M. A. (1997). Predictors of feminist social identity among
college women. *Sex Roles, 37*, 861-883.

Neuberg, S. L., Smith, D. M., Hoffman, J. C., & Russell, F. J. (1994). When we observe
stigmatized and "normal" individuals interacting: Stigma by association.
Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20, 196-209.

Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (1998). Internal and external motivation to respond without
prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 811-832.

Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (2003). The antecedents and implications of interracial
anxiety. *Personality and Social Psychology, 29*, 790-801.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance

   orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes.

   Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67, 741-763.

Reid, A., & Purcell, N. (2004). Pathways to feminist identification. *Sex Roles, 50*, 759-

   769.

Saucier, D. A. (2002). Self-reports of racist attitudes for oneself and for others.

   Psychologica Belgica, 42, 99-105.

Saucier, D. A., & Webster, R. J. (2010). Social vigilantism: Measuring individual

   differences in belief superiority and resistance to persuasion. *Personality and*

   Social Psychology Bulletin, 36, 19-32.

Sigelman, C. K., Howell, J. L., Cornell, D. P., Cutright, J. D., & Dewey, J. C. (1991).

   Courtesy stigma: The social implications of associating with a gay person. *The*

   Journal of Social Psychology, 131, 45-56.

Simon, B., Loewy, M., Stürmer, S., Weber, U., Freytag, P., Habig, C., Kampmeier, C., &

   Spahlinger, P. (1998). Collective identification and social movement

   participation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 646-658.

Simon, B., Aufderheide, B., & Kampmeier., C. (2001). The social psychology of

   minority-majority relations. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell*

   handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes (pp. 303-323). Oxford,

   England: Basil Blackwell.

Smith, S. J., Zanotti, D., Axelton, A., & Saucier, D. A. (in press). Individuals' beliefs

   about the etiology of homosexuality. *Journal of Homosexuality*.

Snyder, M., Omoto, A. M., & Crain, A. L. (1999). Punished for their good deeds.

American Behavioral Scientist, 42, 1175-1192.

Steffen, P. R., McNeilly, M., Anderson, N., & Sherwood, A. (2003). Effects of perceived racism and anger inhibition on ambulatory blood pressure in African Americans. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 65*, 746-750.

Stotzer, R. L. (2009). Straight allies: Supportive attitudes toward lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals in a college sample. *Sex Roles, 60*, 67-80.

Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 199-214.

Swim, J. K., Ferguson, M. J., & Hyers, L. L. (1999). Avoiding stigma by association: Subtle prejudice against lesbians in the form of social distancing. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 21*, 61-68.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterrey, CA: Brooks-Cole.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.) *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Turner, J. C. (1982). Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. In H. Tajfel (Ed.) *Social identity and intergroup relations* (pp. 15-40). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tropp, L. R., & Wright, S. C. (2001). Ingroup identification as the inclusion of ingroup in the self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 585-600.

Whitley, B. E., & Lee, S. E. (2000). The relationship of authoritarianism and related

constructs to attitudes toward homosexuality. *Journal of Applied Social

Psychology, 30*, 144-170.

Williams, R., & Wittig, M. A. (1997). I'm not a feminist but: Factors contributing to the

discrepancy between pro-feminist orientation and feminist social identity. *Sex

Roles, 37*, 885-903.

Appendix A

Your sex (please circle one):   *Male*   *Female*

Your class year (e.g., sophomore, etc.):   _____ **Your age:**   _____

Political Party Affiliation: _____

Please circle your sexual orientation:

      Heterosexual   **Homosexual**   **Bisexual**   **Other**

Please use the 9 point scale below to indicate your sexual orientation.

    1   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5**   **6**   **7**   **8**   **9**
  Completely   **Completely**
Homosexual/Gay or lesbian   **Straight/Heterosexual**

Do you consider yourself to be religious? (please circle one)   Yes   No

How religious are you? (please circle a number from 1 to 9)

Not at all   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9 *Very Much*

Do you consider yourself to be spiritual? (please circle one)   Yes   No

How spiritual are you? (please circle a number from 1 to 9)

Not at all   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9 *Very Much*

Religious Denomination: _____

Conservatism Scale
Please use the 9 point scale below to report your positions on the following three issues.
    1   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5**   **6**   **7**   **8**   **9**
  Very Liberal   **Very Conservative**

1. _____ Foreign policy issues.
2. _____ Economic issues.
3. _____ Social issues.

Appendix B

Quantity and Quality of Contact
Please use the 9 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each statement.
1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
Disagree Very Strongly   Agree Very Strongly

1. _____ In the past, I have interacted with gay men and/or lesbians in many areas of my life (e.g., school, friends, work, clubs).

2. _____ The neighborhood(s) I grew up in had mostly people who were not homosexual.

3. _____ The high school I attended had mostly students who were not homosexual.

4. _____ In the past, I have rarely interacted with individuals who are gay and/or lesbian.

5. _____ In elementary school, I had frequent interactions with gay men and/or lesbians.

6. _____ In high school, I had frequent interactions with gay men and/or lesbians.

7. _____ In college I have frequent interactions with gay men and/or lesbians.

8. _____ I have a close family member who is gay and/or lesbian.

9. _____ I have a close friend who is gay and/or lesbian.

10. _____ In the past, my experiences with gay men and/or lesbians has been pleasant.

11. _____ I have had many positive experiences with gay men and/or lesbians.

12. _____ Over the course of my life, I have had many friends who are gay and/or lesbian.

13. _____ Overall I have had positive experiences with gay men and/or lesbians.

14. _____ I have enjoyed the experiences I have had with gay men and/or lesbians.

Appendix C

Attitudes toward Lesbians and Gay Men Scale
Please use the 9 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each statement.
1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
Disagree Very Strongly   Agree Very Strongly

1. _____ Lesbians just can't fit into our society.
2. _____ A woman's homosexuality should <u>not</u> be a cause for job discrimination in any situation.
3. _____ Female homosexuality is detrimental to society because it breaks down the natural divisions between the sexes.
4. _____ State laws regulating private, consenting lesbian behavior should be loosened.
5. _____ Female homosexuality is a sin.
6. _____ The growing number of lesbians indicates a decline in American morals.
7. _____ Female homosexuality in itself is no problem, but what society makes of it can be a problem.
8. _____ Female homosexuality is a threat to many of our basic social institutions.
9. _____ Female homosexuality is an inferior form of sexuality.
10. _____ Lesbians are sick.
11. _____ Male homosexual couples should be allowed to adopt children the same as heterosexual couples.
12. _____ I think male homosexuals are disgusting.
13. _____ Male homosexuals should <u>not</u> be allowed to teach school.
14. _____ Male homosexuality is a perversion.
15. _____ Just as in other species, male homosexuality is a natural expression of sexuality in human men.
16. _____ If a man has homosexual feelings, he should do everything he can to overcome them.
17. _____ I would *not* be too upset if I learned that my son was a homosexual.
18. _____ Homosexual behavior between two men is just plain wrong.
19. _____ The idea of male homosexual marriages seems ridiculous to me.
20. _____ Male homosexuality is merely a different kind of lifestyle that should *not* be condemned.

Appendix D

Straight Ally Identification

A straight ally is a **heterosexual** individual who may engage in lesbian and gay social activism to further gay relevant legislation such as national same-sex marriage recognition, adoption, and non-discrimination laws. A straight ally may also be an individual who does not engage in lesbian and gay social activism but who expresses positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men and supports gay relevant legislation.

Do you consider yourself to be a straight ally?   Yes   No

Please use the 9 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each statement.
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

Disagree Very Strongly   Agree Very Strongly

1. _____ I consider myself a straight ally.
2. _____ I believe that gay men and lesbians are harmful to family life and undermine relations between men and women.
3. _____ I agree with some of the objectives of the lesbian and gay movement.
4. _____ I call myself a straight ally privately, but not around others.
5. _____ I call myself a straight ally privately, and call myself a straight ally around others.
6. _____ I am currently active in the gay and lesbian movement.

Appendix E

Male/LG Activism Vignette:
Matt is a longtime committed activist who fights for gay and lesbian equality. Matt believes it is important to fight against national and state laws which discriminate against gay and lesbian individuals. As part of his activism Matt attends the national equality march in D.C. every year. The equality march brings national attention to issues specific to lesbians and gay men such as the don't ask don't tell policy in the military, national same-sex marriage recognition, and anti-discrimination laws in employment and housing. Matt plans on continuing his/her activism until all individuals including lesbians and gay men have full equality.

Female/LG Activism Vignette:
Katie is a longtime committed activist who fights for gay and lesbian equality. Katie believes it is important to fight against national and state laws which discriminate against gay and lesbian individuals. As part of her activism Katie attends the national equality march in D.C. every year. The equality march brings national attention to issues specific to lesbians and gay men such as the don't ask don't tell policy in the military, national same-sex marriage recognition, and anti-discrimination laws in employment and housing. Katie plans on continuing her activism until all individuals including lesbians and gay men have full equality.

Male/Unspecified Activism Vignette:
Matt is a longtime committed activist who fights for equality. Matt believes it is important to fight against national and state laws which discriminate against any group of individuals. As part of his activism Matt attends the national equality march in D.C. every year. The equality march brings national attention to issues specific to reaching equality for everyone. Matt plans on continuing his activism until all individuals have full equality.

Female/Unspecified Activism Vignette:
Katie is a longtime committed activist who fights for equality. Katie believes it is important to fight against national and state laws which discriminate against any group of individuals. As part of her activism Katie attends the national equality march in D.C. every year. The equality march brings national attention to issues specific to reaching equality for everyone. Katie plans on continuing his activism until all individuals have full equality.

Appendix F

Bem Sex Role Inventory

Using the scale below, how would **YOU rate MATT/KATIE** on the following characteristics.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Never or almost				**Somewhat true**					**Always or almost**
never true of him/her				**of him/her**					**always true of him/her**

1. _____ Self-reliant
2. _____ Yielding
3. _____ Defends own beliefs
4. _____ Cheerful
5. _____ Independent
6. _____ Shy
7. _____ Athletic
8. _____ Affectionate
9. _____ Assertive
10. _____ Flatterable
11. _____ Strong personality
12. _____ Loyal
13. _____ Forceful
14. _____ Feminine
15. _____ Analytical
16. _____ Sympathetic
17. _____ Has leadership abilities
18. _____ Sensitive to the needs of others
19. _____ Willing to take risks
20. _____ Understanding

21. _____ Makes decisions easily
22. _____ Compassionate
23. _____ Self-sufficient
24. _____ Eager to soothe hurt feelings
25. _____ Dominant
26. _____ Soft spoken
27. _____ Masculine
28. _____ Warm
29. _____ Willing to take a stand
30. _____ Tender
31. _____ Aggressive
32. _____ Gullible
33. _____ Acts like a leader
34. _____ Childlike
35. _____ Individualistic
36. _____ Does not use harsh language
37. _____ Competitive
38. _____ Loves children
39. _____ Ambitious
40. _____ Gentle

Bem Sex Role Inventory

Imagine that you are the person depicted in the vignette you just read. Using the scale below, how do you think **OTHERS would rate MATT/KATIE** on the following characteristics.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Never or almost			**Somewhat true**			**Always or almost**		
never true of you			**of you**			**always true of you**		

21. _____ Self-reliant
22. _____ Yielding
23. _____ Defends own beliefs
24. _____ Cheerful
25. _____ Independent
26. _____ Shy
27. _____ Athletic
28. _____ Affectionate
29. _____ Assertive
30. _____ Flatterable
31. _____ Strong personality
32. _____ Loyal
33. _____ Forceful
34. _____ Feminine
35. _____ Analytical
36. _____ Sympathetic
37. _____ Has leadership abilities
38. _____ Sensitive to the needs of others
39. _____ Willing to take risks
40. _____ Understanding

21. _____ Makes decisions easily
22. _____ Compassionate
23. _____ Self-sufficient
24. _____ Eager to soothe hurt feelings
25. _____ Dominant
26. _____ Soft spoken
27. _____ Masculine
28. _____ Warm
29. _____ Willing to take a stand
30. _____ Tender
31. _____ Aggressive
32. _____ Gullible
33. _____ Acts like a leader
34. _____ Childlike
35. _____ Individualistic
36. _____ Does not use harsh language
37. _____ Competitive
38. _____ Loves children
39. _____ Ambitious
40. _____ Gentle

Appendix G

Sexual Orientation

Using the scale below, circle which number below best describes how would **YOU rate MATT/KATIE** on their sexual orientation.

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**

Completely Homosexual/   **Completely Straight/**
Gay or lesbian   **Heterosexual**

Sexual Orientation

Imagine that you are the person depicted in the vignette you just read. Using the scale below, circle which number below best describes how you think **OTHERS would rate MATT/KATIE** on their sexual orientation.

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**

Homosexual/   **Straight/Heterosexual**
Gay or lesbian

Appendix H

Social Desirability Scale

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally. **Write "T" (for true) or "F" (for false) beside each item to indicate your answers.**

1. _____ Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.
2. _____ I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.
3. _____ It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
4. _____ I have never intensely disliked someone.
5. _____ On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.
6. _____ I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
7. _____ I am always careful about my manner of dress.
8. _____ My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.
9. _____ If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it.
10. _____ On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability
11. _____ I like to gossip at times.
12. _____ There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
13. _____ No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.
14. _____ I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.
15. _____ There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
16. _____ I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
17. _____ I always try to practice what I preach.
18. _____ I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people.
19. _____ I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget.
20. _____ When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.
21. _____ I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
22. _____ At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.
23. _____ There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.
24. _____ I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.
25. _____ I never resent being asked to return a favor.
26. _____ I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
27. _____ I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.
28. _____ There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
29. _____ I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.
30. _____ I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.

31. _____ I have never felt that I was punished without cause.
32. _____ I sometimes think when people have a misfortune that they only got what they deserve.
33. _____ I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feeling

Appendix I

Straight Ally Identification

Below is a description of a straight ally. After reading the description, please answer the questions below as honestly as you can.

A straight ally is a **heterosexual** individual who may engage in lesbian and gay social activism to further gay relevant legislation such as national same-sex marriage recognition, adoption, and non-discrimination laws. A straight ally may also be an individual who does not engage in lesbian and gay social activism but who expresses positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men and supports gay relevant legislation.

Do you personally identify as a straight ally?   Yes   No

Please explain why you do or do not personally identify as a straight ally.

Do you privately call yourself a straight ally?   Yes   No

Please explain why you do or do not privately call yourself a straight ally.

Do you publicly identify as a straight ally?   Yes   No

Please explain why you do or do not publicly identify as a straight ally.

Would you call yourself a straight ally around others?   Yes   No

Please explain why you would or would not call yourself a straight ally around others.

If someone asked you if you were a straight ally how would you respond?   Yes   No

Please explain why you would respond that way if someone asked you if you were a straight ally.

Would you identify yourself as a straight ally around others who held prejudicial attitudes toward lesbians and gay men?   Yes   No

Please explain why you would or would not identify as a straight ally around others who held prejudicial attitudes.

Please explain how **you perceive** someone who identifies as a straight ally.

Please explain how you feel **others would perceive** someone who identifies as a straight

ally.

Would you identify yourself as a straight ally around others even if you felt you would be perceived by others as being gay or lesbian?   Yes   No

Please explain why you would or would not identify as a straight ally around others even if you felt you would be perceived by others as being gay or lesbian.

Do you think a heterosexual individual who identifies as a straight ally would be perceived by others as being gay or lesbian?   Yes   No

Explain why you feel a heterosexual individual who identifies as a straight ally would or would not be perceived by others as being gay or lesbian.

Would you be willing to identify as a straight ally if it meant that others would perceive you negatively?   Yes   No

Explain why you would or would not being willing to identify as a straight ally if it meant that others would perceive you negatively.

Would you be willing to identify as a straight ally if it meant that others would see you as being associated with gay men and/or lesbians?   Yes   No

Explain why you would or would not be willing to identify as a straight ally if it meant that others would see you as being associated with gay men and/or lesbians.

Appendix J

Perceptions of Straight Allies

In the spaces below please indicate the top five words **YOU would use** to describe straight allies. After listing each word, indicate whether you believe the word is "positive", "negative", or "neutral", and rate how much you think this word describes straight allies. These responses should reflect WHAT YOU HONESTLY BELIEVE.

Word 1: _____

This word is: (circle one)   POSITIVE   NEUTRAL   NEGATIVE

How much does this word actually describe straight allies? (circle a number below)

Not at all   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5**   **6**   **7**   **8**   **9**   *Very much*

Word 2: _____

This word is: (circle one)   POSITIVE   NEUTRAL   NEGATIVE

How much does this word actually describe straight allies? (circle a number below)

Not at all   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5**   **6**   **7**   **8**   **9**   *Very much*

Word 3: _____

This word is: (circle one)   POSITIVE   NEUTRAL   NEGATIVE

How much does this word actually describe straight allies? (circle a number below)

Not at all   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5**   **6**   **7**   **8**   **9**   *Very much*

Word 4: _____

This word is: (circle one)   POSITIVE   NEUTRAL   NEGATIVE

How much does this word actually describe straight allies? (circle a number below)

Not at all   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5**   **6**   **7**   **8**   **9**   *Very much*

Word 5: _____

This word is: (circle one)   POSITIVE   NEUTRAL   NEGATIVE

How much does this word actually describe straight allies? (circle a number below)

Not at all   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5**   **6**   **7**   **8**   **9**   *Very much*

Perceptions of Straight Allies

In the spaces below please indicate the top five words you think **<u>OTHERS would use</u>** to describe straight allies. After listing each word, indicate whether you believe the word is "positive", "negative", or "neutral", and rate how much you think this word describes straight allies. These responses should reflect WHAT YOU HONESTLY BELIEVE.

Word 1: _____

<u>This word is:</u> (circle one)   POSITIVE   NEUTRAL   NEGATIVE

How much does this word actually describe straight allies? (circle a number below)

     Not at all   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5**   **6**   **7**   **8**   **9**   *Very much*

Word 2: _____

<u>This word is:</u> (circle one)   POSITIVE   NEUTRAL   NEGATIVE

How much does this word actually describe straight allies? (circle a number below)

     Not at all   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5**   **6**   **7**   **8**   **9**   *Very much*

Word 3: _____

<u>This word is:</u> (circle one)   POSITIVE   NEUTRAL   NEGATIVE

How much does this word actually describe straight allies? (circle a number below)

     Not at all   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5**   **6**   **7**   **8**   **9**   *Very much*

Word 4: _____

<u>This word is:</u> (circle one)   POSITIVE   NEUTRAL   NEGATIVE

How much does this word actually describe straight allies? (circle a number below)

     Not at all   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5**   **6**   **7**   **8**   **9**   *Very much*

Word 5: _____

<u>This word is:</u> (circle one)   POSITIVE   NEUTRAL   NEGATIVE

How much does this word actually describe straight allies? (circle a number below)

     Not at all   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5**   **6**   **7**   **8**   **9**   *Very much*

Appendix K

Activism Orientation Scale

Using the scale below please indicate your willingness to engage in the different forms of social activism to further lesbian and gay relevant legislation (e.g., same-sex marriage, adoption, non-discrimination laws)

Please use the 9 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each statement.
  1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
Extremely Unlikely   **Extremely Likely**

1. _____ Display a poster or bumper sticker that promotes lesbian and gay issues?
2. _____ Invite a friend to attend a meeting regarding lesbian and gay social activism?
3. _____ Purchase a poster, t-shirt, etc. that endorses lesbian and gay issues?
4. _____ Serve as an officer in a lesbian and gay activist organization?
5. _____ Attend an informational meeting of a lesbian and gay political group?
6. _____ Organize a lesbian and gay political event?
7. _____ Give a lecture or talk about a lesbian or gay social or political issue?
8. _____ Go out of your way to collect information on gay and lesbian social and political issues?
9. _____ Campaign door-to-door for a political candidate who endorses gay and lesbian rights?
10. _____ Present facts to contest another person's social or political statement about lesbians and gay men
11. _____ Donate money to a political candidate who promotes gay and lesbian rights?
12. _____ Vote in a non-presidential federal, state, or local election?
13. _____ Send a letter or e-mail expressing a political opinion about lesbian and gay rights to the editor of a periodical or television show?
14. _____ Confront jokes, statements, or innuendoes that opposed lesbian and gay rights?
15. _____ Boycott a product from a company that opposed lesbian and gay rights?
16. _____ Distribute information about a group's cause that promotes lesbian and gay rights?
17. _____ Send a letter of e-mail about lesbian and gay political/social issues to a public official?
18. _____ Attend a talk on a particular group's concerns regarding the rights of lesbians and gay men?
19. _____ Attend a lesbian and gay political organization's regular planning meeting?
20. _____ Sign a petition that promotes lesbian and gay issues?
21. _____ Encourage a friend to join a cause that promotes lesbian and gay issues?
22. _____ Try to change a friend's or acquaintance's mind regarding the rights of lesbians and gay men?
23. _____ Donate money to a lesbian and gay political organization?
24. _____ Try to change a relative's mind about rights in regards to lesbians and gay men?
25. _____ Wear a t-shirt of button that promotes lesbian and gay issues?
26. _____ Keep track of the view of members of Congress regarding lesbian and gay issues?

27. _____ Participate in discussion groups designed to discuss issues or solutions reading the rights of lesbian and gay individuals?
28. _____ Campaign by phone for a political candidate who endorses lesbian and gay rights?
29. _____ Engage in a political activity which promoted lesbian and gay rights, in which you knew you would be arrested?
30. _____ Engage in a physical confrontation at a rally that promoted lesbian and gay rights?
31. _____ Engage in a political activity that promoted lesbian and gay rights, in which you feared that some of your possessions would be damaged?
32. _____ Engage in an illegal act as part of a political protest in regard to lesbian and gay rights?
33. _____ Engage in a political activity that promoted lesbian and gay rights, in which you suspect there would be a confrontation with the police or possible arrest?
34. _____ Block access to a building or public area with your body?
35. _____ Engage in a political activity that promoted lesbian and gay rights, in which you feared for your personal safety?

Appendix L

Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale
Please use the 9 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each statement.
1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
Disagree Very Strongly   Agree Very Strongly

1. _____ It is insulting to the husband when his wife does not take his last name.
2. _____ If the husband is the sole wage earner in the family, the financial decisions should be his.

3. _____ When they go out, a man and a woman should share dating expenses if they both have the same income.
4. _____ As head of the household, the father should have final authority over his children.
5. _____ Both husband and wife should be equally responsible for the care of young children.
6. _____ The first duty of a woman with young children is to home and family.

7. _____ A man who has chosen to stay at home and be a house-husband is not less masculine than a man who is employed full-time.
8. _____ An employed woman can establish as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who is not employed.
9. _____ A woman should not let bearing and rearing children stand in the way of a career if she wants it.
10. _____ Women should be more concerned with clothing and appearance than men.
11. _____ Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States.
12. _____ Access to education is a crucial part of gaining equal rights for women.

13. _____ Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders.
14. _____ A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man.
15. _____ Boys and girls should be able to be whatever they want to be provided that they have the skills and training the job demands.
16. _____ Equality between the sexes is a worthwhile goal.

17. _____ Men should respect women more than they currently do.
18. _____ Stereotypes of men and women hurt everyone.
19. _____ Men and women should be able to freely make choices about their lives without being restricted by their gender.
20. _____ Childrearing, whether done by men or women, needs to be valued more by society.
21. _____ There are circumstances in which women should be paid less than men for equal work.
22. _____ Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more.

23. _____ Homemakers deserve to earn social security benefits for their work in the home.

24. _____ The government has not given enough attention to providing quality low-cost daycare to parents.

25. _____ It is our society's responsibility to provide good daycare for children.

26. _____ Abortion is an issue of women's rights.

27. _____ A woman should not have to get permission from important people in her life in order to get an abortion.

28. _____ Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously.

29. _____ If men were the sex who got pregnant, more reliable and convenient birth control would be available.

30. _____ Legislation is needed to insure that a woman can keep her job after she has a baby.

31. _____ America should pass the Equal Rights Amendment.

32. _____ There are too few admirable roles for women on T.V.

33. _____ It is reasonable to boycott a company's product if you think that their commercials are sexist.

34. _____ Violence against women is not taken seriously enough.

35. _____ There is no such thing as rape between a man and his wife.

36. _____ Sexual harassment is a serious problem in America's workplaces.

37. _____ The prior sexual conduct of a rape victim should be admissible as evidence in court.

38. _____ Gay and lesbian couples should be able to publicly show their affection for one another, for instance by holding hands while walking.

39. _____ Gay and lesbian couples should be provided with "spousal privileges" such as the extension of medical insurance to one's partner.

40. _____ A woman who has many sexual partners is not necessarily a slut.

Appendix M

Modern Homonegativity Scale
Please use the 9 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each statement.
        1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
        Disagree Very Strongly   Agree Very Strongly

1. _____ Many gay men and lesbians use their sexual orientation so that they can obtain special privileges.
2. _____ Homosexuals seem to focus on the ways in which they differ from heterosexuals, and ignore the ways in which they are the same.
3. _____Gay men and lesbians do not have all the rights they need.
4. _____The notion of universities providing students with undergraduate degrees in Gay and Lesbian studies is ridiculous.
5. _____The media devote far too much attention to the topic of homosexuality.
6. _____Celebrations such as "Gay Pride Day" are ridiculous because they assume that an individual's sexual orientation should constitute a source of pride.
7. _____Gay men and lesbians still need to protest for equal rights.
8. _____Homosexuals should stop shoving their lifestyle down our throats.
9. _____If homosexuals wanted to be treated like everyone else, then they need to stop making such a fuss about their sexuality/culture.
10. _____Gay men and lesbians who are "out of the closet" should be admired for their courage.
11. _____Homosexuals should stop complaining about the way they are treated in society and simply get on with their lives.
12. _____In today's tough economic times, Americans' tax dollars should not be used to support pro-gay organizations.
13. _____ Homosexual have been far too confrontational in their demand for equal rights.

Appendix N

Homopositivity Scale
Please use the 5 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each statement.
  1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
Disagree Very Strongly   Disagree Very Strongly

1. _____ Gay men are more in touch with their emotions than are straight men.
2. _____ Gay men are better able than straight men to understand the emotional needs of women.
3. _____ Most gay men have a flawless sense of taste.
4. _____ Gay men are more articulate than straight men.
5. _____ Gay men tend to be less vulgar than straight men.
6. _____ Straight men could learn a thing or two from gay men about how to treat women.
7. _____ Gay men are better dancers than straight men.
8. _____ Give the average gay man 20 minutes in the kitchen, he'll manage to whip up something delicious.
9. _____ Most gay men have very stylish homes.

Appendix 0

Humanitarianism-Egalitarianism Scale
Please use the 9 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each
statement.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

Disagree Very Strongly   **Agree Very Strongly**

1. _____ One should be kind to all people.
2. _____ One should find ways to help others less fortunate than oneself.
3. _____ A person should be concerned about the well-being of others.
4. _____ There should be equality for everyone- because we are all human beings
5. _____ Those who are unable to provide for their basic needs should be helped by others.
6. _____ A good society is one in which people feel responsible for one another.
7. _____ Everyone should have an equal chance and an equal say in most things.
8. _____ Acting to protect the rights and interests of other members of the community is a major obligation for all persons.
9. _____ In dealing with criminals the courts should recognize that many are victims of circumstances.
10. _____ Prosperous nations have a moral obligation to share some of their wealth with poor nations.

Appendix P

Modern Racism Scale

Please use the 9 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each statement.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9

Disagree Very Strongly   Agree Very Strongly

1. _____ Over the past few years, Blacks have gotten more economically than they deserve.

2. _____ Blacks should not push themselves where they are not wanted.

3. _____ Blacks are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights.

4. _____ It is easy to understand the anger of Black people in America.

5. _____ Blacks have more influence upon school desegregation plans than they ought to have.

6. _____ Over the past few years, the government and news media have shown more respect to Blacks than they deserve.

7. _____ Discrimination against Blacks is no longer a problem in the United States.

Appendix Q

Modern Sexism Scale
Please use the 9 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each statement.
1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
Disagree Very Strongly   Agree Very Strongly

1. _____ Discrimination against women is no longer a problem in the United States.
2. _____ Women often miss out on good jobs due to sexual discrimination.

3. _____ It is rare to see women treated in a sexist manner on television.
4. _____ On average, people in our society treat husbands and wives equally.
5. _____ Society has reached the point where women and men have equal opportunities for achievement.
6. _____ It is easy to understand the anger of women's groups in America.

7. _____ It is easy to understand why women's groups are still concerned about societal limitations of women's opportunities.
8. _____ Over the past few years, the government and news media have been showing more concern about the treatment of women than is warranted by women's actual experiences.

Appendix R

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory
Please use the 9 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each statement.
         1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
Disagree Very Strongly   Agree Very Strongly

1. _____ Women exaggerate problems at work.
2. _____ Women are too easily offended.

3. _____ Most women interpret innocent remarks as sexist.
4. _____ When women lose fairly, they claim discrimination.
5. _____ Women seek special favors under guise of equality.
6. _____ Feminists are making reasonable demands.

7. _____ Feminist are not seeking more power than men.
8. _____ Women seek power by gaining control over men.
9. _____ Few women tease men sexually.
10. _____ Once a man commits, she puts him on a tight leash.
11. _____ Women fail to appreciate all men do for them.
12. _____ A good woman should be set on a pedestal.
13. _____ Women should be cherished and protected by men.
14. _____ Men should sacrifice to provide for women.
15. _____ In a disaster, women need not be rescued first.
16. _____ Women have a superior moral sensibility.
17. _____ Women have a quality of purity few men possess.
18. _____ Women have a more refined sense of culture, taste.
19. _____ Men are complete without women.
20. _____ Every man ought to have a woman he adores.
21. _____ Despite accomplishment, men are incomplete without women.
22. _____ People are often happy without heterosexual romance.

Appendix S

Social Dominance Orientation
Please use the 9 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each statement.
1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
Disagree Very Strongly   Agree Very Strongly

1. _____ Group equality is not a worthwhile ideal.
2. _____ Increased social equality would be a bad thing.
3. _____ It would be good if all groups could be equal.
4. _____ Superior groups should not seek to dominate inferior groups.
5. _____ Treating different groups more equally would create more problems that it would solve.
6. _____ No one group should dominate in society.
7. _____ There is no point in trying to make incomes more equal.
8. _____ All groups should be given an equal chance in life.
9. _____ If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.
10. _____ Inferior groups should stay in their place.
11. _____ It's a real problem that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom.
12. _____ No group of people is more worthy than any other.
13. _____ In getting what your own group wants, it should never be necessary to use force against other groups.
14. _____ Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place.
15. _____ We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.
16. _____ To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups.

Appendix T

Empathic Concern and Perspective Taking Scales
The following statements inquire about your thoughts and feelings in a variety of situations. For each item, indicate how well it describes you by choosing the appropriate number on the scale at the top of the page. When you have decided on your answer, fill in the letter on the answer sheet next to the item number. READ EACH ITEM CAREFULLY BEFORE RESPONDING. Answer as honestly as you can.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Does not describe   **Describes me**
me well   **very well**

1. _____ I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.
2. _____ I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the "other guy's" point of view.
3. _____ Sometimes I don't feel very sorry for other people when they are having problems.
4. _____ I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision.
5. _____ When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them.
6. _____ I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective.
7. _____ Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal.
8. _____ If I'm sure I'm right about something, I don't waste much time listening to other people's arguments.
9. _____ When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them.
10. _____ I am often quite touched by things that I see happen.
11. _____ I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both.
12. _____ I would describe myself as a pretty softhearted person.
13. _____ When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in his shoes" for a while.
14. _____ Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place.

Appendix U

Internal and External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice

<u>Instructions:</u> The following questions concern various reasons or motivations people might have for trying to respond in nonprejudiced ways toward lesbians and gay men. Some of the reasons reflect internal-personal motivations whereas others reflect more external-social motivations. Of course, people may be motivated for both internal and external reasons; we want to be clear that we are not evaluating you or your individual responses. All your responses with be completely confidential. We are simply trying to get an idea of the types of motivations that students in general have for responding in nonprejudiced ways. If we are to learn anything useful, it is important that you respond to each of the questions openly and honestly. Please give your response according to the scale below.

Please use the 9 point scale below to rate your level of agreement with the following statements.
      1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
      Disagree Very Strongly   Agree Very Strongly

1. _____ Because of today's PC (politically correct) standards I try to appear nonprejudiced toward lesbians and gay men.

2. _____ I try to hide any negative thoughts about lesbians and gay men in order to avoid negative reactions from others.

3. _____ If I acted prejudiced toward lesbians and gay men, I would be concerned that others would get angry with me.

4. _____ I attempt to appear nonprejudiced toward lesbians and gay men in order to avoid disapproval from others.

5. _____ I try to act nonprejudiced toward lesbians and gay men because of pressure from others.

6. _____ I attempt to act in nonprejudiced ways toward lesbians and gay men because it is personally important to me.

7. _____ According to my personal views, using stereotypes about lesbians and gay men is OK.

8. _____ I am personally motivated by my beliefs to be nonprejudiced toward lesbians and gay men.

9. _____ Because of my personal values, I believe that using stereotypes about lesbians and gay men is wrong.

10. _____ Being nonprejudiced toward lesbians and gay men is important to my self-concept.

Appendix V

Right Wing Authoritarianism
Please use the 9 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each statement.
1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
Disagree Very Strongly   Agree Very Strongly

1. _____ What our country really needs instead of more "civil rights" is a good stiff dose of law and order.
2. _____ It is important to protect the rights of radicals and deviants in all ways.
3. _____ The real keys to the "good life" are obedience, discipline, and sticking to the straight and narrow.
4. _____ Homosexual long-term relationships should be treated as equivalent to marriage.
5. _____ A "woman's place" should be wherever she wants to be. The days when women are submissive to their husbands and social conventions belong strictly to the past.
6. _____ It is good that nowadays young people have greater freedom "to make their own rules" and to protest against things they don't like.
7. _____ The withdrawal from tradition will turn out to be a fatal fault one day.
8. _____ Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
9. _____ Being virtuous and law-abiding is in the long run better for us than permanently challenging the foundation of our society.
10. _____ What our country really needs is a strong determined leader who will crush evil, and take us back to our true path.
11. _____ There is no such crime to justify capital punishment.
12. _____ People should develop their own personal standards about good and evil and pay less attention to the Bible and other old, traditional forms of religious guidance.

Appendix W

Social Vigilantism

Please use the 9 point scale below to indicate your agreement with each statement.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

Disagree Very Strongly   **Agree Very Strongly**

1. _____ I feel that my ideas should be used to educate others.
2. _____ I feel as if it is my duty to enlighten other people.
3. _____ I need to win any argument about how people should live their lives.
4. _____ I like to imagine myself in a position of authority so that I could make the important decisions around here.
5. _____ I try to get people to listen to me, because what I have to say makes a lot of sense.
6. _____ Those people who are more intelligent and informed have a responsibility to educate the people around them who are less intelligent and informed.
7. _____ I feel a social obligation to voice my opinion.
8. _____ If everyone saw things the way that I do, the world would be a better place.
9. _____ I think that some people need to be told that their point of view is wrong.
10. _____ There are a lot of ignorant people in society.
11. _____ Some people just believe stupid things.
12. _____ I often feel that other people do not base their opinions on good evidence.
13. _____ It frustrates me that many people fail to consider the finer points of an issue when they take a side.
14. _____ I frequently consider writing a "letter to the editor."

Table 1

Breakdown of the Number of Participants in Each Condition

Condition	Katie	Matt
LG activism	37	39
Unspecified activism	40	40

Table 2

Breakdown of the Number of Men and Women in Each Condition

Condition	Men	Women
LG activism	30	46
Unspecified activism	40	40

Table 3

Analysis of Variance Results for Participants' Ratings of Masculine Attributes

Source	df	F	p
Sex of participant	1, 142	7.52	.007
Sex of target	1, 142	1.00	.320
Activism condition	1, 142	1.14	.287
Sex x Sex of target	1, 142	0.46	.499
Sex x Activism	1, 142	0.23	.630
Sex of target x Activism	1, 142	0.03	.868
Sex x Sex of target x Activism	1, 142	0.75	.389

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for the Main Effects and Interactions on Participants'

Ratings of Masculine Attributes

	Relevant	
Effect	M	SD
Main effect for participant sex		
Male participants	6.83	1.08
Female participants	7.28	0.81
Main effect for sex of target		
Matt	7.01	1.05
Katie	7.14	0.87
Main effect for activism condition		
LG condition	7.18	0.88
Unspecified condition	6.98	1.04
Two-way between participant sex and sex of target		
Male participants, Matt	6.68	1.19
Male participants, Katie	6.97	0.97

Female participants, Matt	7.25	0.88
Female participants, Katie	7.31	0.72

Two-way between participant sex and

    activism condition

Male participants, LG condition	6.98	0.87
Male participants, unspecified condition	6.73	1.21
Female participants, LG condition	7.31	0.86
Female participants, unspecified condition	7.24	0.76

Two-way between sex of target and

    activism condition

Matt, LG condition	7.11	0.90
Matt, unspecified condition	6.92	1.18
Katie, LG condition	7.25	0.86
Katie, unspecified condition	7.03	0.88

Three-way between participant sex,

    sex of target, and activism condition

Male Ps, Matt, LG condition	6.89	0.79
Male Ps, Katie, LG condition	7.05	0.96
Male Ps, Matt, unspecified condition	6.53	1.40
Male Ps, Katie, unspecified condition	6.91	1.01

Female Ps, Matt, LG condition	7.22	0.95
Female Ps, Katie, LG condition	7.43	0.74
Female Ps, Matt, unspecified condition	7.29	0.82
Female Ps, Katie, unspecified condition	7.18	0.70

Table 5

Analysis of Variance Results for Participants' Ratings of Feminine Attributes

Source	df	F	p
Sex of participant	1, 136	1.87	.174
Sex of target	1, 136	0.06	.808
Activism condition	1, 136	2.25	.136
Sex x Sex of target	1, 136	0.42	.519
Sex x Activism	1, 136	0.10	.750
Sex of target x Activism	1, 136	1.00	.319
Sex x Sex of target x Activism	1, 136	0.01	.928

Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations for the Main Effects and Interactions on Participants'

Ratings of Feminine Attributes

Effect	Relevant	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Main effect for participant sex		
Male participants	5.48	0.97
Female participants	5.28	0.77
Main effect for sex of target		
Matt	5.34	0.95
Katie	5.40	0.78
Main effect for activism condition		
LG condition	5.47	0.81
Unspecified condition	5.27	0.92
Two-way between participant sex and sex of target		
Male participants, Matt	5.51	1.13
Male participants, Katie	5.45	0.82

Female participants, Matt	5.22	0.80
Female participants, Katie	5.36	0.74

Two-way between participant sex and

     activism condition

Male participants, LG condition	5.58	0.96
Male participants, unspecified condition	5.40	0.99
Female participants, LG condition	5.40	0.70
Female participants, unspecified condition	5.15	0.84

Two-way between sex of target and

     activism condition

Matt, LG condition	5.36	0.84
Matt, unspecified condition	5.33	1.06
Katie, LG condition	5.59	0.77
Katie, unspecified condition	5.22	0.74

Three-way between participant sex,

     sex of target, and activism condition

Male Ps, Matt, LG condition	5.54	1.03
Male Ps, Katie, LG condition	5.61	0.95
Male Ps, Matt, unspecified condition	5.50	1.22
Male Ps, Katie, unspecified condition	5.30	0.69

Female Ps, Matt, LG condition	5.27	0.74
Female Ps, Katie, LG condition	5.57	0.61
Female Ps, Matt, unspecified condition	5.17	0.88
Female Ps, Katie, unspecified condition	5.14	0.81

Table 7

Analysis of Variance Results for Others' Ratings of Masculine Attributes

Source	df	F	p
Sex of participant	1, 142	6.51	.012
Sex of target	1, 142	7.64	.006
Activism condition	1, 142	0.52	.474
Sex x Sex of target	1, 142	0.67	.413
Sex x Activism	1, 142	0.28	.599
Sex of target x Activism	1, 142	1.88	.172
Sex x Sex of target x Activism	1, 142	1.71	.193

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations for the Main Effects and Interactions on Others' Ratings
of Masculine Attributes

	Relevant	
Effect	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Main effect for participant sex		
Male participants	6.71	1.27
Female participants	7.11	0.96
Main effect for sex of target		
Matt	6.70	1.14
Katie	7.17	1.06
Main effect for activism condition		
LG condition	6.86	0.98
Unspecified condition	6.99	1.24
Two-way between participant sex and sex of target		
Male participants, Matt	6.37	1.22
Male participants, Katie	7.02	1.26

Female participants, Matt	6.93	1.03
Female participants, Katie	7.32	0.82

Two-way between participant sex and

    activism condition

Male participants, LG condition	6.69	0.98
Male participants, unspecified condition	6.73	1.45
Female participants, LG condition	6.96	0.97
Female participants, unspecified condition	7.27	0.92

Two-way between sex of target and

    activism condition

Matt, LG condition	6.53	1.00
Matt, unspecified condition	6.87	1.25
Katie, LG condition	7.26	0.79
Katie, unspecified condition	7.11	1.24

Three-way between participant sex,

    sex of target, and activism condition

Male Ps, Matt, LG condition	6.35	0.99
Male Ps, Katie, LG condition	7.00	0.89
Male Ps, Matt, unspecified condition	6.39	1.38
Male Ps, Katie, unspecified condition	7.03	1.48

Female Ps, Matt, LG condition	6.62	1.02
Female Ps, Katie, LG condition	7.46	0.67
Female Ps, Matt, unspecified condition	7.33	0.93
Female Ps, Katie, unspecified condition	7.20	0.94

Table 9

Analysis of Variance Results for Others' Ratings of Feminine Attributes

Source	df	F	p
Sex of participant	1, 140	6.89	.010
Sex of target	1, 140	7.30	.008
Activism condition	1, 140	0.04	.834
Sex x Sex of target	1, 140	0.10	.759
Sex x Activism	1, 140	1.46	.229
Sex of target x Activism	1, 140	0.02	.877
Sex x Sex of target x Activism	1, 140	0.20	.659

Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations for the Main Effects and Interactions on Others' Ratings of Feminine Attributes

Effect	Relevant	
	M	SD
Main effect for participant sex		
Male participants	5.35	1.17
Female participants	4.89	1.00
Main effect for sex of target		
Matt	5.30	1.09
Katie	4.86	1.06
Main effect for activism condition		
LG condition	5.06	1.02
Unspecified condition	5.12	1.17
Two-way between participant sex and sex of target		
Male participants, Matt	5.61	1.19
Male participants, Katie	5.09	1.12

Female participants, Matt	5.08	0.97
Female participants, Katie	4.65	0.98

Two-way between participant sex and

    activism condition

Male participants, LG condition	5.19	1.14
Male participants, unspecified condition	5.45	1.19
Female participants, LG condition	4.98	0.94
Female participants, unspecified condition	4.79	1.06

Two-way between sex of target and

    activism condition

Matt, LG condition	5.27	0.97
Matt, unspecified condition	5.33	1.21
Katie, LG condition	4.81	1.03
Katie, unspecified condition	4.91	1.10

Three-way between participant sex,

    sex of target, and activism condition

Male Ps, Matt, LG condition	5.53	1.08
Male Ps, Katie, LG condition	4.88	1.15
Male Ps, Matt, unspecified condition	5.67	1.28
Male Ps, Katie, unspecified condition	5.24	1.10

Female Ps, Matt, LG condition	5.14	0.90
Female Ps, Katie, LG condition	4.76	0.96
Female Ps, Matt, unspecified condition	5.01	1.08
Female Ps, Katie, unspecified condition	4.53	1.02

Table 11

Analysis of Variance Results for Participants' Assessment of the Target's Sexual

Orientation

Source	df	F	p
Sex of participant	1, 145	4.32	.039
Sex of target	1, 145	6.11	.015
Activism condition	1, 145	4.95	.028
Sex x Sex of target	1, 145	0.58	.449
Sex x Activism	1, 145	0.22	.637
Sex of target x Activism	1, 145	1.70	.194
Sex x Sex of target x Activism	1, 145	4.02	.047

Table 12

Means and Standard Deviations for the Main Effects and Interactions on Participants'

Assessment of the Target's Sexual Orientation

	Relevant	
Effect	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Main effect for participant sex		
Male participants	4.93	2.20
Female participants	5.44	1.88
Main effect for sex of target		
Matt	4.90	2.11
Katie	5.54	1.92
Main effect for activism condition		
LG condition	4.91	2.15
Unspecified condition	5.49	1.91
Two-way between participant sex and sex of target		
Male participants, Matt	4.47	2.30
Male participants, Katie	5.32	2.06

Female participants, Matt	5.19	1.94
Female participants, Katie	5.76	1.79

Two-way between participant sex and

    activism condition

Male participants, LG condition	4.48	2.23
Male participants, unspecified condition	5.25	2.15
Female participants, LG condition	5.18	2.07
Female participants, unspecified condition	5.74	1.62

Two-way between sex of target and

    activism condition

Matt, LG condition	4.46	2.28
Matt, unspecified condition	5.32	1.86
Katie, LG condition	5.40	1.90
Katie, unspecified condition	5.67	1.96

Three-way between participant sex,

    sex of target, and activism condition

Male Ps, Matt, LG condition	3.31	2.06
Male Ps, Katie, LG condition	5.44	1.93
Male Ps, Matt, unspecified condition	5.26	2.16
Male Ps, Katie, unspecified condition	5.24	2.19

Female Ps, Matt, LG condition	5.04	2.20
Female Ps, Katie, LG condition	5.37	1.92
Female Ps, Matt, unspecified condition	5.38	1.60
Female Ps, Katie, unspecified condition	6.17	1.58

Table 13

Analysis of Variance Results for Others' Assessment of the Target's Sexual

Orientation

Source	df	F	p
Sex of participant	1, 147	0.23	.634
Sex of target	1, 147	2.03	.156
Activism condition	1, 147	16.23	< .001
Sex x Sex of target	1, 147	3.13	.079
Sex x Activism	1, 147	0.13	.720
Sex of target x Activism	1, 147	1.53	.219
Sex x Sex of target x Activism	1, 147	0.01	.909

Table 14

Means and Standard Deviations for the Main Effects and Interactions on Others'

Assessment of the Target's Sexual Orientation

	Relevant	
Effect	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Main effect for participant sex		
Male participants	3.81	2.18
Female participants	3.55	2.02
Main effect for sex of target		
Matt	3.44	1.99
Katie	3.99	2.20
Main effect for activism condition		
LG condition	3.01	1.89
Unspecified condition	4.36	2.11
Two-way between participant sex and sex of target		
Male participants, Matt	4.03	2.28
Male participants, Katie	3.81	2.18

Female participants, Matt	3.04	1.68
Female participants, Katie	4.15	2.23

Two-way between participant sex and

    activism condition

Male participants, LG condition	3.10	1.72
Male participants, unspecified condition	4.50	2.36
Female participants, LG condition	2.96	2.00
Female participants, unspecified condition	4.23	1.83

Two-way between sex of target and

    activism condition

Matt, LG condition	2.54	1.45
Matt, unspecified condition	4.33	2.07
Katie, LG condition	3.53	2.17
Katie, unspecified condition	4.40	2.17

Three-way between participant sex,

    sex of target, and activism condition

Male Ps, Matt, LG condition	2.92	1.66
Male Ps, Katie, LG condition	3.25	1.81
Male Ps, Matt, unspecified condition	4.79	2.37
Male Ps, Katie, unspecified condition	4.24	2.39

Female Ps, Matt, LG condition	2.35	1.32
Female Ps, Katie, LG condition	3.75	2.45
Female Ps, Matt, unspecified condition	3.90	1.70
Female Ps, Katie, unspecified condition	4.58	1.95

Table 15

Breakdown of Straight Ally Identification by Sex of Participant

Straight ally identification	Male	Female
Yes	23	59
No	43	30

Table 16

Analysis of Variance Results for Participants' Ratings of Masculine Attributes

Source	df	F	p
Sex of target	1, 137	0.55	.459
Activism condition	1, 137	0.96	.328
Straight ally identification	1, 137	1.55	.216
Sex of target x Activism	1, 137	0.30	.587
Sex of target x Ally identification	1, 137	0.25	.618
Activism x Ally identification	1, 137	0.51	.475
Sex of target x Activism x Ally identification	1, 137	1.25	.266

Table 17

Means and Standard Deviations for the Main Effects and Interactions on Participants'

Ratings of Masculine Attributes

Effect	Relevant	
	M	SD
Main effect for straight ally identification		
Yes	7.20	0.89
No	6.96	1.07
Main effect for sex of target		
Matt	7.04	1.03
Katie	7.13	0.85
Main effect for activism condition		
LG condition	7.17	0.85
Unspecified condition	7.01	1.02
Two-way between sex of target and activism vignette		
Matt, LG condition	7.10	0.91
Matt, unspecified condition	6.98	1.15

Katie, LG condition	7.25	0.79
Katie, unspecified condition	7.03	0.89

Two-way between sex of target and

      straight ally identification

Matt, yes	7.18	0.82
Matt, no	6.89	1.19
Katie, yes	7.21	0.79
Katie, no	7.03	0.91

Two-way between activism condition

      and straight ally identification

LG condition, yes	7.21	0.89
LG condition, no	7.10	0.80
Unspecified condition, yes	7.18	0.69
Unspecified condition, no	6.86	1.22

Three-way between sex of target

      activism condition and straight

      ally identification

Matt, LG condition, yes	7.24	0.85
Matt, LG condition, no	6.90	0.97
Matt, unspecified condition, yes	7.11	0.81
Matt, unspecified condition, no	6.89	1.35

Katie, LG condition, yes	7.19	0.96
Katie, LG condition, no,	7.36	0.39
Katie, unspecified condition, yes	7.24	0.59
Katie, unspecified condition, no	6.82	1.09

Table 18

Analysis of Variance Results for Participants' Ratings of Feminine Attributes

Source	df	F	p
Sex of target	1, 132	0.04	.835
Activism condition	1, 132	1.07	.302
Straight ally identification	1, 132	0.02	.880
Sex of target x Activism	1, 132	0.59	.442
Sex of target x Ally identification	1, 132	0.06	.807
Activism x Ally identification	1, 132	0.51	.478
Sex of target x Activism x Ally identification	1, 132	0.02	.894

Table 19

Means and Standard Deviations for the Main Effects and Interactions on Participants'

Ratings of Feminine Attributes

	Relevant	
Effect	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Main effect for straight ally identification		
Yes	5.37	0.75
No	5.33	0.97
Main effect for sex of target		
Matt	5.33	0.96
Katie	5.36	0.72
Main effect for activism condition		
LG condition	5.43	0.77
Unspecified condition	5.27	0.92
Two-way between sex of target		
and activism vignette		
Matt, LG condition	5.35	0.85
Matt, unspecified condition	5.31	1.07

Katie, LG condition	5.52	0.67
Katie, unspecified condition	5.22	0.74

Two-way between sex of target and

      straight ally identification

Matt, yes	5.33	0.77
Matt, no	5.34	1.13
Katie, yes	5.40	0.73
Katie, no	5.31	0.71

Two-way between activism condition

      and straight ally identification

LG condition, yes	5.49	0.74
LG condition, no	5.35	0.82
Unspecified condition, yes	5.22	0.74
Unspecified condition, no	5.31	1.06

Three-way between sex of target

      activism condition and straight

      ally identification

Matt, LG condition, yes	5.38	0.75
Matt, LG condition, no	5.31	1.00
Matt, unspecified condition, yes	5.26	0.82
Matt, unspecified condition, no	5.36	1.24

Katie, LG condition, yes	5.59	0.73
Katie, LG condition, no,	5.40	0.54
Katie, unspecified condition, yes	5.19	0.69
Katie, unspecified condition, no	5.26	0.81

Table 20

Analysis of Variance Results for Others' Ratings of Masculine Attributes

Source	df	F	p
Sex of target	1, 138	4.55	.035
Activism condition	1, 138	0.37	.543
Straight ally identification	1, 138	1.49	.224
Sex of target x Activism	1, 138	1.77	.185
Sex of target x Ally identification	1, 138	1.33	.250
Activism x Ally identification	1, 138	7.65	.006
Sex of target x Activism x Ally identification	1, 138	0.00	.992

Table 21

Means and Standard Deviations for the Main Effects and Interactions on Others' Ratings of Masculine Attributes

Effect	Relevant	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Main effect for straight ally identification		
Yes	7.05	1.03
No	6.80	1.21
Main effect for sex of target		
Matt	6.73	1.14
Katie	7.15	1.06
Main effect for activism condition		
LG condition	6.85	0.96
Unspecified condition	7.01	1.25
Two-way between sex of target and activism vignette		
Matt, LG condition	6.56	1.01
Matt, unspecified condition	6.91	1.25

Katie, LG condition	7.21	0.76
Katie, unspecified condition	7.11	1.26

Two-way between sex of target and

    straight ally identification

Matt, yes	6.71	1.00
Matt, no	6.75	1.28
Katie, yes	7.38	0.96
Katie, no	6.86	1.13

Two-way between activism condition

    and straight ally identification

LG condition, yes	6.75	0.98
LG condition, no	7.01	0.93
Unspecified condition, yes	7.40	0.98
Unspecified condition, no	6.66	1.36

Three-way between sex of target

    activism condition and straight

    ally identification

Matt, LG condition, yes	6.35	0.89
Matt, LG condition, no	6.84	1.11
Matt, unspecified condition, yes	7.21	0.92
Matt, unspecified condition, no	6.69	1.42

Katie, LG condition, yes	7.19	0.89
Katie, LG condition, no	7.26	0.51
Katie, unspecified condition, yes	7.56	1.02
Katie, unspecified condition, no	6.63	1.32

Table 22

Analysis of Variance Results for Others' Ratings of Feminine Attributes

Source	df	F	p
Sex of target	1, 136	6.92	.010
Activism condition	1, 136	0.30	.587
Straight ally identification	1, 136	2.71	.102
Sex of target x Activism	1, 136	0.17	.681
Sex of target x Ally identification	1, 136	0.00	.949
Activism x Ally identification	1, 136	0.53	.468
Sex of target x Activism x Ally identification	1, 136	0.09	.768

Table 23

Means and Standard Deviations for the Main Effects and Interactions on Others' Ratings of Feminine Attributes

	Relevant	
Effect	M	SD
Main effect for straight ally identification		
Yes	4.90	1.00
No	5.25	1.15
Main effect for sex of target		
Matt	5.30	1.11
Katie	4.81	1.01
Main effect for activism condition		
LG condition	5.01	0.97
Unspecified condition	5.12	1.19
Two-way between sex of target and activism vignette		
Matt, LG condition	5.27	0.98
Matt, unspecified condition	5.33	1.23

Katie, LG condition	4.71	0.87
Katie, unspecified condition	4.90	1.12

Two-way between sex of target and

     straight ally identification

Matt, yes	5.15	0.90
Matt, no	5.44	1.27
Katie, yes	4.66	1.05
Katie, no	5.01	0.93

Two-way between activism condition

     and straight ally identification

LG condition, yes	4.93	0.92
LG condition, no	5.13	1.03
Unspecified condition, yes	4.87	1.10
Unspecified condition, no	5.34	1.23

Three-way between sex of target

     activism condition and straight

     ally identification

Matt, LG condition, yes	5.18	0.87
Matt, LG condition, no	5.38	1.13
Matt, unspecified condition, yes	5.12	0.96
Matt, unspecified condition, no	5.49	1.39
Katie, LG condition, yes	4.67	0.93

Katie, LG condition, no	4.79	0.79
Katie, unspecified condition, yes	4.66	1.19
Katie, unspecified condition, no	5.15	1.00

Table 24

Analysis of Variance Results for Participants' Assessment of the Target's Sexual

Orientation

Source	df	F	p
Sex of target	1, 141	3.64	.059
Activism condition	1, 141	4.11	.045
Straight ally identification	1, 141	8.43	.004
Sex of target x Activism	1, 141	0.37	.546
Sex of target x Ally identification	1, 141	0.20	.659
Activism x Ally identification	1, 141	3.52	0.06
Sex of target x Activism x Ally identification	1, 141	0.15	.699

Table 25

Means and Standard Deviations for the Main Effects and Interactions on Participants'

Assessment of the Target's Sexual Orientation

	Relevant	
Effect	M	SD
Main effect for straight ally identification		
Yes	5.62	1.75
No	4.76	2.20
Main effect for sex of target		
Matt	4.90	1.99
Katie	5.56	1.95
Main effect for activism condition		
LG condition	4.96	2.13
Unspecified condition	5.45	1.89
Two-way between sex of target and activism vignette		
Matt, LG condition	4.55	2.24

Matt, unspecified condition	5.23	1.78
Katie, LG condition	5.41	1.92
Katie, unspecified condition	5.68	1.99

Two-way between sex of target and

    straight ally identification

Matt, yes	5.37	1.88
Matt, no	4.44	2.10
Katie, yes	5.85	1.61
Katie, no	5.16	2.30

Two-way between activism condition

    and straight ally identification

LG condition, yes	5.59	1.97
LG condition, no	3.96	2.01
Unspecified condition, yes	5.66	1.45
Unspecified condition, no	5.29	2.19

Three-way between sex of target

    activism condition and straight

    ally identification

Matt, LG condition, yes	5.32	2.17
Matt, LG condition, no	3.50	1.93
Matt, unspecified condition, yes	5.44	1.46

Matt, unspecified condition, no	5.09	2.00
Katie, LG condition, yes	5.86	1.75
Katie, LG condition, no	4.58	2.02
Katie, unspecified condition, yes	5.84	1.46
Katie, unspecified condition, no	5.53	2.44

Table 26

Analysis of Variance Results for Others' Assessment of the Target's Sexual

Orientation

Source	df	F	p
Sex of target	1, 143	4.05	.046
Activism condition	1, 143	15.28	<.001
Straight ally identification	1, 143	5.55	.020
Sex of target x Activism	1, 143	0.93	.336
Sex of target x Ally identification	1, 143	1.02	.315
Activism x Ally identification	1, 143	0.52	.470
Sex of target x Activism x Ally identification	1, 143	0.96	.329

Table 27

Means and Standard Deviations for the Main Effects and Interactions on Others'

Assessment of the Target's Sexual Orientation

Effect	Relevant	
	M	SD
Main effect for straight ally identification		
Yes	3.28	1.76
No	4.19	2.29
Main effect for sex of target		
Matt	3.40	1.89
Katie	4.01	2.20
Main effect for activism condition		
LG condition	3.01	1.88
Unspecified condition	4.35	2.03
Two-way between sex of target and activism vignette		
Matt, LG condition	2.58	1.45
Matt, unspecified condition	4.21	1.95

Katie, LG condition	3.49	2.19
Katie, unspecified condition	4.49	2.13

Two-way between sex of target and

    straight ally identification

Matt, yes	3.05	1.61
Matt, no	3.74	2.10
Katie, yes	3.49	1.88
Katie, no	4.74	2.42

Two-way between activism condition

    and straight ally identification

LG condition, yes	2.84	1.64
LG condition, no	3.29	2.23
Unspecified condition, yes	3.83	1.78
Unspecified condition, no	4.79	2.15

Three-way between sex of target

    activism condition and straight

    ally identification

Matt, LG condition, yes	2.36	1.22
Matt, LG condition, no	2.88	1.71
Matt, unspecified condition, yes	4.00	1.63
Matt, unspecified condition, no	4.35	2.17
Katie, LG condition, yes	3.30	1.87

Katie, LG condition, no	3.83	2.76
Katie, unspecified condition, yes	3.70	1.92
Katie, unspecified condition, no	5.32	2.06

Table 28

Correlations between the Dependent Measures

Measures	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Participants' ratings of masculine attributes	--					
2. Participants' ratings of feminine attributes	.23**	--				
3. Others' ratings of masculine attributes	.71**	.13	--			
4. Others' ratings of feminine attributes	.03	.67**	-.07	--		
5. Participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation	.06	.05	.11	-.18*		
6. Others' assessment of the target's sexual orientation	-.09	.05	.07	-.01	.46**	--

*p < .05, **p < .001

Table 29

Analysis of Variance Results for Class Year on the Dependent Measures

Dependent measure	df	F	p
Participants' ratings of masculine attributes	4, 148	0.50	.735
Participants' ratings of feminine attributes	4, 142	1.45	.220
Others' ratings of masculine attributes	4, 149	0.30	.876
Others' ratings of feminine attributes	4, 147	1.39	.239
Participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation	4, 152	0.65	.629
Others' assessment of the target's orientation	4, 154	2.23	.069

Table 30

Means and Standard Deviations for the Main Effects of Class Year on the Dependent

Measures

	Relevant	
Effect	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Participants' ratings of masculine attributes		
First year	7.09	0.94
Sophomore	7.20	0.84
Junior	6.97	1.25
Senior	6.47	1.51
Graduate student	6.60	
Participants' ratings of feminine attributes		
First year	5.34	0.78
Sophomore	5.44	1.21
Junior	5.31	0.67
Senior	6.80	1.27
Graduate student	5.35	
Others' ratings of masculine attributes		
First year	6.88	1.07

Sophomore	7.05	1.00
Junior	7.05	1.58
Senior	6.72	1.84
Graduate student	7.70	

Others' ratings of feminine attributes

First year	5.08	1.00
Sophomore	5.11	1.39
Junior	4.98	1.11
Senior	6.30	1.61
Graduate student	3.65	

Participants' assessment of the target's

     sexual orientation

First year	5.31	1.90
Sophomore	5.20	2.45
Junior	4.81	2.34
Senior	3.67	2.31
Graduate student	5.00	

Others' assessment of the target's

     sexual orientation

First year	3.61	2.03
Sophomore	4.65	2.21

Junior	3.25	2.24
Senior	2.67	1.53
Graduate student	1.00	

Table 31

Analysis of Variance Results for Political Party on the Dependent Measures

Dependent measure	df	F	p
Participants' ratings of masculine attributes	3, 135	0.78	.507
Participants' ratings of feminine attributes	3, 128	2.29	.082
Others' ratings of masculine attributes	3, 136	0.10	.961
Others' ratings of feminine attributes	3, 133	1.58	.198
Participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation	3, 137	0.65	.584
Others' assessment of the target's orientation	3, 138	1.01	.391

Table 32

Means and Standard Deviations for the Main Effects of Political Party on the Dependent

Measures

	Relevant	
Effect	M	SD
Participants' ratings of masculine attributes		
Republican	7.10	1.02
Democrat	7.35	0.57
Independent/other	7.24	1.58
None	7.00	0.88
Participants' ratings of feminine attributes		
Republican	5.26	0.86
Democrat	5.48	0.75
Independent/other	6.21	1.44
None	5.34	0.87
Others' ratings of masculine attributes		
Republican	6.95	1.20
Democrat	7.06	0.85
Independent/other	6.94	1.51

None	6.91	0.99

Others' ratings of feminine attributes

Republican	5.04	1.16
Democrat	5.24	1.00
Independent/other	5.84	1.83
None	4.91	1.00

Participants' assessment of the target's

    sexual orientation

Republican	5.15	1.96
Democrat	5.54	2.12
Independent/other	5.14	2.48
None	4.82	2.04

Others' assessment of the target's

    sexual orientation

Republican	3.82	2.12
Democrat	3.04	1.93
Independent/other	3.71	2.50
None	3.87	2.15

Table 33

Correlations between Individual Difference Factors and Dependent Variables

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Straight ally ID	--															
2. ATL	-.60**	--														
3. ATG	-.67**	.87**	--													
4. Participants' ratings of masculine attributes	.15	-.10	-.13	--												
5. Participants' ratings of feminine attributes	.13	.02	.05	.23**	--											
6. Others' ratings of masculine attributes	.12	-.01	-.05	.71**	.13	--										
7. Others' ratings of feminine attributes	-.06	.18*	.19*	.03	.67**	-.07	--									
8. Participants' assessment of sexual orientation	.27**	-.23**	-.37**	.06	.05	.11	-.18*	--								
9. Others' assessment of sexual orientation	-.07	.05	.05	-.09	.05	.07	-.01	.47**	--							
10. Religiosity	-.30**	.49**	.41**	.05	-.05	.01	-.04	.01	.07	--						
11. Spirituality	-.00	.28**	.19*	.08	.04	.01	.04	.08	.05	.60**	--					
12. Conservatism	-.23**	.35**	.30**	-.07	.02	-.06	.16	-.07	.10	.33**	.17	--				
13. Quantity of contact	.44**	-.33**	-.44**	.23**	-.11	.17*	-.21*	-.21*	-.07	-.08	.13	-.15	--			
14. Quality of contact	.53**	-.38**	-.50**	.26**	.01	.23**	-.16	.19*	-.11	-.04	.19*	-.14	.71**	--		
15. Age	-.02	-.13	-.02	-.10	.20*	-.15	.16	-.06	-.15	-.14	.02	-.00	-.00	.10	--	
16. Social desirability	.00	.07	.10	.05	.11	.01	.02	.04	.08	.16	.09	.12	-.05	.01	-.07	--

*p < .05, ** p < .001

Table 34

Breakdown of Participants Who Personally Identified as Straight Allies by Sex of

Participant

Straight ally identification	Male	Female
Yes	44	107
No	47	28

Table 35

Comprehensive List of Each Category, Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence, and

Representative Statements for Participants Who Personally Identified as a

Straight Ally

Category	Frequency	Percent
The belief in equal rights and equal treatment of gay men and lesbians	81	55.86

"I believe that gay individuals have rights and should be

treated in the same manners and same respect as heterosexual

individuals."

"I believe that homosexual individuals should be treated the

same manner in society that heterosexuals are."

Everyone should be able to live as they choose	26	17.93

"I believe they have every right to choose a partner

who loves them no matter the sex."

"Because no one should face persecution for any personal

reason. All are free to love without bias or harm."

Contact with gay men and/or lesbians	24	16.55

"My best friend is gay and I support him and feel that

he should have equal rights."

"My best friend of 22 years is homosexual. I have always

supported him and his decision. Since coming to college I have

participated in anti-hate and gay awareness events."

Support for gay men and lesbians, and gay and lesbian relevant   20   13.8

   legislation

   "I have been supportive and nonjudgmental during two of

   my friends coming out and do not engage in homophobic jokes

   or ideas/conversations."

   "I totally except [sic] gay marriage or any other choices

   they make. I may not make gay or lesbian decisions

   but I support others."

The belief that gay men and lesbians should be happy   16   11.03

   "I don't have a problem with same sex marriage as long as

   the individual is happy."

   "It is their life and I feel they should be able to be just as happy

   as heterosexuals get to be."

The belief that discrimination toward lesbians and gay men is   13   8.96

   wrong

   "Because they should not be discriminated against because of

   a choice that they made."

   "I am appalled by homophobia. I cannot understand the

   defensiveness around heterosexuality. I'm totally an ally –

   I actually try to avoid defining myself as straight

   (the need to declare that seems to make the term an oxymoron)."

Express positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men   11   7.58

"I certainly express positive attitudes toward homosexuals

with students, colleagues and friends/acquaintances,

and include all sexual orientations as acceptable.

I also support gay relevant legislation."

Do not have any problems with lesbians and gay men   7   4.82

    "Because I don't have any problems with gay men/or lesbians,

    I just don't hangout with them."

Identify personally as a straight ally despite religious teachings   4   2.75

    "I know the church is against gay marriage, but personally

    having gay people in my life I choose to support if for their sake."

_____

Table 36

Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence,

and Representative Statements for Not Personally Identifying as a Straight Ally

Category	Frequency	Percent
Do not support the gay and lesbian lifestyle and/or gay and lesbian relevant legislation	30	41.66

   "Because I think being gay is wrong and it should

   not be furthered."

   "I don't support it and I don't understand it."

Not involved in LG activism	15	20.83

   "I don't really commit any time to these types of

   organizations in order to be an ally."

   "I don't participate or haven't participated in any

   activism."

No opinion on issues regarding gay men and lesbians	14	19.44

   "I don't actively participate in activism to further

   any legislation and don't express any attitudes

   towards support or non-support of the legislation."

   "I don't have a strong opinion, positive or

   negative, as to gay rights."

Against participants' religious beliefs	13	18.06

   "I follow the word of God as absolutely true and

cannot support behavior that is sin, however,

this does not mean I cannot be a friend to an

individual living a homosexual life."

Do not want to be associated with gay men and/or lesbians 3   4.17

"I do not like or surround myself around any male

that is gay."

_____

Table 37

Breakdown of Participants Who Privately Identified as Straight Allies by Sex of

Participant

Straight ally identification	Male	Female
Yes	27	57
No	64	74

Table 38

Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence,

and Representative Statements for Privately Identifying as a Straight Ally

Category	Frequency	Percent
Belief in equal rights and support for gay and lesbian relevant legislation	31	38.75

"I support equal rights."

"I know that I identify as one because I do encourage

gay rights."

Support for the LG lifestyle	15	18.75

"I don't use the term straight ally but I am very open

about my support of the lesbian and gay culture."

"I support them and I tell myself as well as others this."

"I want to support my best friend."

Contact with lesbians and/or gay men	7	8.75

"I do so privately and publicly for my homosexual

friends and family."

"I am not ashamed of my homosexual friends."

No problems with the LG lifestyle	6	7.50

"There is nothing wrong with the way they are."

I believe they can do what they want I just don't want to

be involved."

Being a straight ally is a big part of participants' lives and they   6   7.50

    want to be true to themselves

    "It's my personal decision," and "*because I know I am*."

The belief that gay men and lesbians should be happy   4   5.00

    "I have learned that trying to deny who you are or what

    you believe is counterproductive to being happy."

    "I believe that everyone has the right to be happy –

    regardless of whether they are straight, gay, or lesbian."

Have positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men   3   3.75

    "For much the same reason as the previous answer. I

    have a positive attitude toward those that are homosexual

    because it would be unreasonable and irrational not to."

Belief that they should privately identify because they also   3   3.75

    publicly identify as straight allies

    "*Because I can't be a public straight ally but not a*

    private one. It's hypocritical and I am not."

No ill intentions toward lesbians and gay men   2   2.50

    "*I don't do anything to harm gay individuals I would*

    help them."

Do not need to inform everyone of their identification as a   2   2.50

    straight ally

    "*I do not feel the need to broadcast it radically to*

    everyone, but if asked I will happily explain my views

and thoughts on the subject."

Table 39

Comprehensive list of each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence

and Representative Statements for not Privately Identifying as a Straight Ally

Category	Frequency	Percent
Openly support lesbians and gay men	46	34.32

"I openly support gay and lesbian people."

"I am open about why I consider myself a straight ally."

Do not support lesbians and gay men and/or gay and lesbian	20	14.92
relevant legislation		

"It is from my own personal decisions and beliefs that I

disagree with homosexuality."

"I do not believe what straight allies are fighting for."

Do not actively engage in LG social activism	15	11.19

"I chose not to engage myself in gay and lesbian politics."

"I have positive attitudes toward the gay members of my

family but have done nothing toward supporting gay rights

and legislation."

Do not identify as straight allies	11	8.20

"Because I'm not an ally as described earlier."

"Why would I privately call myself something that I do

not identify as?"

No opinion on issues related to lesbians and gay men	11	8.20

"I'm not anti-gay but I'm also not pro-gay. I've never

really took much thought to it. They have no direct impact

on me, so I've kept my nose out of the debate. I've worked

with two gay men before, and they were great. But on a

personal level, I'm not sure I would fit in real well."

Unfamiliar with the term straight ally   10   7.46

"Never heard this term before this questionnaire."

Against participants' religious beliefs   7   5.22

"It is against my religious beliefs."

Do not want to be associated with lesbians and gay men   4   2.98

"Don't deal with lesbians and gay men."

"I don't affiliate with gays at all."

Failure to see straight allies as straight   4   2.98

"I like boys, only."

"Because I am not gay or a lesbian."

_____

Table 40

Breakdown of Participants Who Publicly Identified as Straight Allies by Sex of

Participant

Straight ally identification	Male	Female
Yes	34	57
No	81	53

Table 41

Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence,

and Representative Statements for Publicly Identifying as a Straight Ally

Category	Frequency	Percent
Willingness to publicly support gay men and lesbians	60	56.07

> *"I have nothing to hide or be ashamed of. If people can't*
>
> *accept me for who I am or what I believe and support,*
>
> *those are not people I want to surround myself with."*
>
> *"I want those around me to know I support them,*
>
> *no matter what."*

Category	Frequency	Percent
The belief in equal rights	17	15.88

> *"Yes, equal rights are necessary for a equitable*
>
> *environment."*
>
> *"I vote for pro-homosexual legislation and participate*
>
> *in pro-homosexual activities."*

Category	Frequency	Percent
Contact with lesbians and/or gay men	15	14.02

> *"I call myself a straight ally because I am very proud*
>
> *to be one. My gay and lesbian friends have enriched*
>
> *my life in enormous ways."*

Category	Frequency	Percent
Desire to inform society and change attitudes	15	14.02

> *"A heterosexual, I can non-threateningly work to change*
>
> *homophobic individuals, and I am much less likely to*

be harassed, assaulted, or murdered for my actions than

my queer friends. I use my hetero privilege to act as a

go between."

Actively engaged in LG activism	6	5.60

"I have attended rallies/protest for the LGBT

community and I educate people about members of

the LGBT community."

Desire to help lesbians and gay men	5	21.40

"I hang out with my gay friend in public and stick up for

him when people trash talk him."

Belief that gay men and lesbians should do what they want	4	3.73

"Nothing is wrong with being gay."

Religious belief that you should love everyone	1	0.93

"I am because the bible said yes that homosexual

relationships were bad, but it also said that you should

love everyone no matter their sexual orientation. Just took

different words to heart."

Table 42

Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence and Representative Statements for Not Publicly Identifying as a Straight Ally

Category	Frequency	Percent
Do not support gay men and lesbians	26	24.29
"Not moral/natural to be homosexual."		
"Because I do not support gay rights."		
Not involved in LG activism	20	18.69
"No participation or advocacy."		
"I don't engage in gay activism."		
Not publicly open about their support for lesbians and gay men	17	15.88
"No one needs to know what I am or what I do. Actions speak louder than words."		
"It's controversial. I don't like arguments."		
Do not consider themselves allies	8	7.47
"I am not a straight ally."		
"No because I do not believe I am one."		
Against participants' religious beliefs	6	5.60
"It is against my religious beliefs."		
"Whether alone or in public I stay true to my religious beliefs."		
No opinion on issues related to lesbians and gay men	4	3.73

"personal believer – even though I don't support,

I won't hinder it either."

"It's their battle not mine. I'm not for it nor against it.

Do not want to be stigmatized	3	2.80

"I don't want to be looked upon as gay."

"Too many stereotypes out there, and unwanted rumors

would likely start up about me."

Unfamiliar with the term straight ally	2	1.86

"Never heard the term until now."

Have not associated with gay men and lesbians	2	1.86

"No, I have never had a gay encounter publicly."

Table 43

Breakdown of Participants Who Would and Would Not Identify as Straight Allies Around

Others

Straight ally identification	Male	Female
Yes	40	91
No	51	39

Table 44

Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence and Representative Statements for Participants That Would Identify as a Straight Ally Around Others

Category	Frequency	Percent
Not ashamed of their support for lesbians and gay men	72	56.69
"I do not mind telling people I support gays and lesbians."		
"I'm not ashamed to support them."		
Are not bothered by gay men and lesbians	11	8.66
"Again, no problem, they have their place in society while I have mine."		
"Because I don't see anything wrong with homosexuals."		
Belief in equal rights	9	7.08
"All people should have respect and be treated equally."		
"Because I believe in individual rights."		
Important to discuss issues related to lesbians and gay men with others	9	7.08
"Maybe letting them see my point of view will change theirs."		
"Again, being public about these issues will help to change peoples' perceptions regarding homosexuality."		
Contact with lesbians and gay men	6	4.72

"I have gay friends that are very nice people."

Important to stand up for lesbians and gay men	5	3.93

"I'll stand up for gays when need be."

It is who they are	4	3.14

"It would be me saying who I am."

Involved in LG activism	2	1.57

"I have gone to rallies and such with friends."

Identify as a straight ally despite religious beliefs	1	0.78

"I am catholic and even though the church has much

more conservative views on homosexuality, I strongly

believe in my views and what I do or don't support."

Will identify now that the participant knows what the term means	1	0.78

"I guess so now that I know what it means."

Not a bitch	1	0.78

"I'm not a bitch."

Individuals close to participant except his/her beliefs	1	0.78

"My friends accept my beliefs."

Table 45

Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence and Representative Statements for Participants That Would Not Identify as a Straight Ally Around Others

Category	Frequency	Percent
Not a straight ally	27	31.03
"I don't think I am a straight ally so I would not call myself one in front of others."		
Do not support the lesbian and gay lifestyle	19	21.83
"Because I do not support gay rights."		
"I am not a straight ally because I don't support homosexuality."		
No opinion on issues related to lesbians and gay men	9	10.34
"I am just not one, I don't engage in any activity against or for."		
Not involved in LG activism	9	10.34
"I am nice to everyone but I don't really activate for them."		
Do not want to be perceived negatively	7	8.04
"Same reason as the one before. People are too judgmental."		
"I would be called gay."		

Not open about their support for lesbians and gay men	6	6.89

"I don't announce it to people."

"I don't voice my opinion about gays and lesbians."

Against their religious beliefs	4	4.59

"I follow the word of God as absolutely true and cannot

support behavior that is sin, however, this does not mean

I cannot be a friend to an individual living a homosexual

life."

Unfamiliar with the term straight ally	3	3.44

"Until now I wasn't aware of the term."

_____

Table 46

Breakdown of Participants Who Would and Would Not Identify as a Straight Ally if Asked

by Someone

Straight ally identification	Male	Female
Yes	44	101
No	46	28

Table 47

Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence, and Representative Statements for Participants That Would Identify as a Straight Ally if Asked by Someone

Category	Frequency	Percent
It is the truth	41	29.07
"Because I am honest.'		
"Yes, because I am."		
Believe in equal rights and equal treatment	20	14.18
"Equal rights for all."		
"I believe everyone should have equal rights."		
Support lesbians and gay men	16	11.34
"I believe in their cause."		
"I would want the individual to know that I am a supporter		
of gay/lesbians."		
Do not have a problem with lesbians and gay men	12	8.51
"I don't have a problem with homosexuals."		
"I would let them know I have no problem with what		
others want to do."		
Contact with lesbians and gay men	10	7.09
"It is important to me that my gay/lesbian friends have		
all the support I can offer."		

Strong in their beliefs	9	6.38

"Because it is my personal belief and I am okay

with expressing it."

Not ashamed of their beliefs	9	6.38

"There is no reason to hide it."

Think that lesbians and gay men should do what they want	7	4.96

"If that's what makes someone happy let them live

their life."

Do not care what others think	7	4.96

"I wouldn't care what they thought I would give them

my honest opinion."

Want to help lesbians and gay men	4	2.83

"If it's politically beneficial to LGBTQ folks I'm happy

to be called whatever helps. I think it's a flawed term

so I've said in previous questions."

Can inform and give individuals knowledge	3	2.12

"I believe that people need knowledge regarding

homosexuality so they can learn to accept the idea."

Assert their heterosexuality	3	2.12

"I would just tell them I'm heterosexual."

Do not discriminate	2	1.41

"Because I do not believe we should discriminate based

on orientation choices."

Will identify now that they are familiar with the term straight ally 2   1.41

> *"I think knowing what it is now probably I would."*

Gay men and lesbians cannot choose their sexual orientation   2   1.41

> *"I would say yes because of the biological research*
>
> *that has been done."*

Have positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men   1   0.70

> *"I would say yes because I don't participate in gay/lesbian*
>
> *activism, but I have positive attitudes toward some*
>
> *gay/lesbians."*

Support lesbians and gay men due to religious teachings   1   0.70

> *Again, because I am Christian and true Christians are not*
>
> *to judge by any standards, but are to love everyone and*
>
> *grant them grace."*

Important to be a good ally   1   0.70

> *"If I break under the pressure, I'm not a good*
>
> *ally to have."*

Hope that they would not be judged   1   0.70

> *"I would hope no one judges me for who I am."*

Individuals who ask would understand what the term means   1   0.70

> *"Them asking demonstrates that they know what the term*
>
> *means and understand the implications."*

Table 48

Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence, and Representative Statements for Participants that would not Identify as a Straight Ally if Asked by Someone

Category	Frequency	Percent
Do not support lesbians and gay men	24	33.33
"I would say no and follow with a statement indicating I do not approve at all."		
"I would say no I don't support gay rights."		
Not a straight ally	19	26.38
"I am not a straight ally."		
No opinion on issues related to lesbians and gay men	11	15.27
"I do not do things to further them but I don't hate them."		
"Neutral. I would explain I don't support it, but won't hinder it."		
Do not engage in LG activism	6	8.33
"I'm not actively engaged with protests for their cause and other things."		
Against religious beliefs	4	5.55
"I follow the bible."		
Not informed enough to make a decision	1	1.38
"I don't know enough about either side to make		

a well-though decision so I'm N/A."

Dislike the term straight ally	1	1.38

"I would say that I support social equality, but that I

dislike the term ally."

Belief that being a straight ally is the same as being gay or lesbian	1	1.38

 "I would tell them I'm not a straight ally because even

 though I'm straight heterosexual I would never do anything

 with another guy."

Desire to not be harassed	1	1.38

 "so I wouldn't be harassed by their firm beliefs in

 their cause."

Would act uninformed about straight allies	1	1.38

 "I would act like I don't know what they are

 talking about."

Uncomfortable around lesbians and gay men	1	1.38

 "Because I am uncomfortable around homosexuals."

Does not engage in that lifestyle	1	1.38

 "I don't engage in that lifestyle."

Would not be asked if they were a straight ally	1	1.38

 "Because no straight person would ask you if you were

 a straight ally."

Table 49

Breakdown of Participants Who Would and Would Not Identify as a Straight Ally Around

Others Who Held Prejudicial Attitudes

Straight ally identification	Male	Female
Yes	38	101
No	53	31

Table 50

Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence,

and Representative Statements for Participants That Would Identify as a Straight Ally

Around Others That Held Prejudicial Attitudes

Category	Frequency	Percent
Would state their opinion to others and try to change the attitudes of others	47	35.33
"Yes, maybe we could exchange views and come to an agreement. I don't think anyone has any real reason to be prejudice against lesbians/gay men."		
Beliefs will not be influenced by others	30	22.55
"I don't care how others feel about my beliefs."		
Everyone is entitled to their opinion	17	12.78
"I have my beliefs and they have theirs."		
Cannot stand for judgmental and prejudicial attitudes	16	12.03
"Nobody has the right to judge others because we are not God."		
Belief in equal rights	10	7.51
"I believe equality is important and the views of others cannot affect that."		
Lesbians and gay men should be able to do what they want	5	3.75
"I don't like it when people make is seem like gay people		

are not equal to straight people. They should be able to

do what they want.”

Even more important to identify as a straight ally around   4   3.00

     individuals who hold prejudicial attitudes

“I especially identify as an ally around these people. I

want to show them, up close and personal and right in their

face that they are wrong. If my being there, my being open

and bold and proud, can make even the tiniest difference

and push them one step closer to my side, it’s certainly

worth it.”

Contact with lesbians and gay men   3   2.25

“My experiences with gay men would make me defend

them. My neighbors were two of the nicest men I’ve ever

met and they make me feel that way.”

Lesbians and gay men need to be defended   3   2.25

“I think it’s most important to identify as an ally in these

situations. To say no it is not okay to behave this way

because it hurts other people.”

Individuals are misinformed   2   1.50

“Prejudice is usually rooted in ignorance/misinformation.

I do my best to correct and educate people when I can.”

Important to be a good straight ally   2   1.50

“A debate never killed anyone. I am not a very good

ally if I pick and choose when I want to support them."

Important to see acceptance in action	2	1.50

"They need a positive influence."

No reason	1	0.75

"Def [sic]!! Just because."

Homophobic individuals might be gay	1	0.75

"People who argue that being gay is wrong are usually

sexually stimulated by images of gay porn. which I enjoy

bringing up."

Would identify but would not debate	1	0.75

"I would identify but I wouldn't debate with them because

it would be pointless."

Would identify if asked	1	0.75

"As said above, I would respond yes if asked, but I would

not bring it up myself."

Participant is a straight ally	1	0.75

"I am a straight ally."

Depends on the individuals who held prejudicial attitudes	1	0.75

"It would depend on the group if they are hardcore haters

then I would likely leave before admitting it

(but if it is a calm level headed group who enjoy a

debate then yes)."

Table 51

Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence,
and Representative Statements for Participants That Would Not Identify as a Straight
Ally Around Others That Held Prejudicial Attitudes

Category	Frequency	Percent
Not a straight ally	28	35.89
"I am not a straight ally so I wouldn't identify myself as one."		
Do not support lesbians and gay men	15	19.23
"I do not support gay rights."		
Do not want to deal with the consequences	13	16.66
"They would act rude to me."		
"I'm a coward and would be afraid of social and physical retaliation."		
"They might discriminate against me."		
Hold prejudicial attitudes	6	7.69
"Probably because I am the prejudicial one."		
No opinion on issues related to lesbians and gay men	5	6.41
"Because I don't care much about it."		
Strong in their beliefs	5	6.41
"I'd be honest and tell them my belief."		
Everyone is entitled to their own opinion	3	3.84

"Arguing with them does nothing and they can have

their beliefs. I will just listen to what they have to say and

only express my views if prompted."

Would identify if it became necessary	3	2.56

"If it becomes an issue I would have to take the pro-gay

stance but I would not try to change their views."

Do not engage in LG activism	2	2.56

"I don't engage in gay activism."

Views would change after interacting with prejudicial attitudes	1	1.28

"I would probably view things differently hearing their

side."

Against religious beliefs	1	1.28

"God says being gay is wrong."

Table 52

Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence,

and Representative Statements for Participants' Perceptions of Straight Allies

Category	Frequency	Percent
Supportive of lesbians and gay men and/or gay and lesbians relevant legislation	100	44.84
"Someone who is heterosexual yet supports the equality/rights of individuals who are not."		
Participants expressed positive feelings toward straight allies	79	35.42
"I perceive them as being open-minded and accepting of individuals that differ from themselves."		
Had no opinion in regards to the perceptions of straight allies	27	12.10
"I firmly believe that you have a right to believe in whatever you want, so long as it does not hurt others."		
An activist, ally, or advocate of lesbians and gay men	17	7.62
"People who rally for issues in parades, events, etc."		
Associate with and advocate on behalf of lesbian and/or gay friends and family	12	5.38
"Someone who has had or have homosexual friends and want to help them."		
Participants expressed negative feelings toward straight allies	11	4.93
"Stupid."		

"They are mixed up."

Perceived as liberal	7	3.13

"Don't see them as bad just more liberal."

Straight allies are gay or lesbian	7	3.13

"Maybe they secretly are gay or lesbian."

Unclear what participants were expressing	3	1.34

"They might sometimes feel that they need to let people

know in case they are being looked at."

"That it's not their business so why bother."

"Not sure what is being asked exactly."

Table 53

Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence,

and Representative Statements for Others' Perceptions of Straight Allies

Category	Frequency	Percent
The perception depends on the person	75	33.48
"It depends on where they are and who they are around.		
Some people would perceive them positively and some		
negatively."		
Negative perceptions of straight allies	61	27.23
"Mostly negatively."		
"Many people who believe that homosexuality is wrong		
would more than likely view them negatively and disagree		
with their views."		
Someone who is gay or lesbian	52	23.21
"Many people in Kansas may perceive them as		
homosexual or bisexual."		
Supportive of gay and lesbians and/or their rights	35	15.62
"Someone who agrees with homosexuality 100%."		
Positive perceptions of straight allies	31	13.83
"Respectful, courageous, equitable, fair."		
Neutral perceptions of straight allies	16	7.14
"Depends on the person I suppose but it shouldn't		

elicit anything really."

Perceived as liberal	7	3.12

"Very liberal."

Not religious	2	0.89

"In this area probably going against the word of God."

Do not know how others would perceive straight allies	2	0.89

"I have no idea what others would perceive."

Advocating for gay/lesbian family and friends	2	0.89

"They have a very close gay friend are most likely

very democratic."

Would not understand the term straight ally	1	0.44

"I don't know if everyone would know the term straight

ally, yet I feel like it's a common stance/thought."

Did not understand the question	1	0.44

"Not sure what is being asked exactly."

Table 54

Breakdown of Participants Who Would and Would Not Identify as a Straight Ally if They

Were Perceived as Gay or Lesbian

Straight ally identification	Male	Female
Yes	35	102
No	55	30

Table 55

Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence, and Representative Statements for Identifying as a Straight Ally Even if Perceived as Gay or Lesbian

Category	Frequency	Percent
Do not care how they are perceived by others	62	46.96

"I don't mind what others think about me."

"It is only me that matters. I don't care what people think about me."

Comfortable with their sexuality	24	18.18

"I am confident in my sexuality enough to not care if others think of me differently. If they think that about me not only would I consider them to be ignorant but someone who doesn't really know me nor interesting enough for me to get to know."

Comfortable with themselves	19	14.39

"It is only me that matters. I don't care what people think about me."

Strong in their beliefs about being a straight ally	19	14.39

"Peoples' perceptions and opinions should not manipulate how I view myself and what I stand for."

Assure others of their heterosexuality	14	10.60

"Although I would likely preference the statement

with the assurance of my heterosexuality."

Okay if perceived as gay or lesbian by others	14	10.60

"It would not bother me if I were perceived as lesbian."

Individuals important to me know that I am straight	4	3.03

"Because I know that I'm not and those who are close

to me and matter to me know that as well."

Belief in equal rights and equal treatment	4	3.03

"Equal rights."

Do not think they would be perceived as lesbian or gay	3	2.27

"I don't feel like that would happen. And if it did

I wouldn't care."

Sexuality has already been questioned	2	1.51

"Most straight allies have their orientation questioned

at some point during their lives. It's inevitable and I'm

not going to allow the voice of disagreement to stifle my

freedom."

Would identify unless others were hostile	1	0.75

"I would say no to avoid hostility or a useless argument

with passionate antigays who don't really listen."

Positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay men are increasing	1	0.75

"Yes, to some people. I think with the changes in public

attitudes over recent years this is changing. For me, the

fact that I am also a fiercely radical 4 wave feminist means

that many people think this about me anyway. I also think

it has a lot to do with a person's age and background. People

my age grew up in a world that is growing more open and

accepting every year. We grew up with queer people and

allies and so we are more likely to seem them as friends as

people who have fun and love and do the same things they

do. They basically know better because they know us."

Would want someone to stand up for me   1   0.75

"Because I would want someone to do the same for me.

Again this attitude cannot be tolerated."

_____

Table 56

Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence,

and Representative Statements for Participants That Would Not Identify as a Straight

Ally if They Were Perceived as Lesbian or Gay

Category	Frequency	Percent
Not a straight ally	33	41.25
"I am not a straight ally."		
Do not want to be perceived as lesbian or gay	30	37.50
"I really dislike being called gay."		
"I don't want others to think I'm gay."		
Do not agree with the gay and lesbian lifestyle	4	5.00
"Although we all are not perfect I do not support the		
advancement of something immoral/unnatural."		
Do not care what others think	4	5.00
"I don't care what people think."		
Do not want to be judged by others	3	3.75
"Because they might put me down somehow."		
Have no reason why they would not identify	2	2.50
"No reason."		
Do not engage in LG activism	2	2.50
"I do not engage in gay activism."		
Not informed enough on the topic	1	1.25

"I don't care what others think, but I'm not informed

enough to be on one side or the other."

Do not want to be associated with lesbians and gay men	1	1.25

"I want nothing to do with them."

Do not like being labeled	1	1.25

"I do not like being classified."

Do not believe the issue is important	1	1.25

"I don't want that perception of myself and I also don't

believe these issues are important."

Table 57

Breakdown of Participants Who Thought That a Heterosexual Individual Who Identified

as a Straight Ally Would or Would Not be Perceived as Gay or Lesbian by Others

	Male	Female
Yes	51	62
No	34	57

Table 58

Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence, and

Representative Statements for Participants Who Felt That a Heterosexual Individual Who

Identified as a Straight Ally Would be Perceived as Gay or Lesbian by Others

Category	Frequency	Percent
Straight allies are associated with lesbians and gay men	31	28.70

"Guilty by association. Most people believe if you

surround yourself with gays and lesbians you're

probably gay and lesbian yourself."

"I believe some people would think so just because this

person would be supporting gays."

People are judgmental and jump to conclusions	24	22.22

"People throughout society judge others by what they

believe often times prior to getting to know the person."

People are prejudiced and afraid	12	11.11

"There are some people that have many prejudices."

"People who are homophobic are afraid and will try

to pass that fear off as prejudice."

People just would perceive straight allies as lesbian or gay	10	9.25

"Cause people just would. It's society these days."

Do not understand what a straight ally is	8	7.40

"Because some people do not understand the difference

or even care about the difference."

Straight allies are just afraid to admit they are gay or lesbian	8	7.40

"Others may feel they are gauging others reactions and

waiting to come out."

"Because if they support it then they are

probably in the closet."

Will only be perceived as lesbian or gay by some individuals	8	7.40

"It just depends on the company."

People are close-minded	4	3.70

"Some people are just that closed minded."

Unclear what the participants were expressing	2	1.85

"In the Midwest if you're a straight ally you're TOTES

GAY OH EM GEE. I know through personal experience."

"People have ???s [sic] afterwards."

Believe that being a straight ally is the same as being lesbian or gay	1	0.92

"I think a person should be considered gay because doing

something with another person of the same sex is gay."

Would be perceived as kind	1	0.92

"No, they would be perceived as a kind caring person."

Table 59

Comprehensive list of each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence,

and Representative Statements for Participants Who Felt That a Heterosexual Individual

Who Identified as a Straight Ally Would Not be Perceived as Gay or Lesbian by Others

Category	Frequency	Percent
Straight allies are just supporting a cause	29	32.95
"Just because you support something or believe in it does not make you it. I would never assume that."		
Just depends on the person or group	20	22.72
"Not to me, but yes maybe by others."		
"Maybe by some but not the majority."		
They are a straight ally	12	13.63
"Well, they are a straight ally."		
"If they are a straight ally they obviously aren't gay or lesbian."		
Individuals who believe that are close-minded	7	7.95
"That is amazingly close minded assumption. A.K.A. ridiculous."		
"That is a narrow minded view."		
Individuals would not jump to conclusions	5	5.68
"I don't think people would jump to that conclusion but I may be wrong."		

Personal experience	4	4.54

"I know a lot of straight people who support gays and no one thinks we're gay."

"Due to my experiences people are open about being an ally and heterosexual, that I don't feel most people would make that connection."

Do not have a same-sex sexual orientation	4	4.54

"They are not performing homosexual behaviors."

"It wouldn't change his [sic] sexual orientation."

There are many straight allies so individuals would understand the difference	2	2.27

"I think that by now there are enough straight people who support gay rights that they shouldn't be such misconceived perceptions."

Does not matter what others think	2	2.27

"Some might think they are, but it is just their personal opinion. Who cares what they choose to believe?"

If straight allies were gay or lesbian they would have just identified themselves as gay or lesbian	1	1.13

"Because if they say they do not have a problem with people being gay then why wouldn't they admit to being one?"

Individuals would not understand what being a straight ally is	1	1.13

"No, most people would even understand what that is."

Straight allies would be perceived as conflict avoidant	1	1.13

"rather they would be perceived as someone who doesn't

want to step on any toes."

Perceptions of straight allies are influenced by many factors	1	1.13

"it's a touchy topic to talk about because so many

factors effect it."

Dislike the term ally	1	1.13

"Dislike term ally."

Personal romantic information would be disclosed to others	1	1.13

"Not really. Most people know whether your [sic] involved

with someone or married. People in general like to talk about

themselves and their relationships so we would disclose that

information."

Table 60

Breakdown of Participants Who Would and Would Not Identify as a Straight Ally if They Were Perceived Negatively by Others

Straight ally identification	Male	Female
Yes	41	102
No	50	29

Table 61

Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence, and Representative Statements for Participants Who Would Identify as a Straight Ally Even if it Meant That They Would be Perceived Negatively by Others

Category	Frequency	Percent
Do not care what others think	59	44.36
"I don't care how they perceive me for my beliefs and if they will perceive me negatively because of them they are not someone that matters to me then anyways."		
Strong in their beliefs about being a straight ally	56	42.10
"Again, they can think what they want, I'm sticking to my guns."		
Only those close to me matter	11	8.27
"I do not care how others perceive me because those who care about me are the ones I care about."		
Allies are needed	10	7.52
"The shame I would feel for not standing up for someone when I could outweighs the negative judgment of others."		
Everyone is entitled to their opinion	5	3.75
"I would feel better about myself because I would be standing up. They have their beliefs, I don't bother		

them."

Individuals need to learn acceptance	4	3.00

"Others need to get over their negative perceptions

and learn acceptance."

Would identify, but only to a certain extent	3	2.25

"If they perceive me as negative they aren't a friend

so it doesn't matter. However, if I was among superiors

or potential supervisors, who had a hand in progression in

education or enrollment in a program – I would hide my

feeling, if I thought they would get in the way of that

progress."

Information can lead to knowledge	3	2.25

"Debate gets people involved, more involved,

more knowledge."

Already perceived negatively	1	0.75

"As I mentioned before, I believe that some people

believe that I am gay/bisexual/transgendered or something

of the sort when I say I am an ally. Not that being any of

those things is wrong, but some people believe they are,

and if one of those people were to mistakenly believe

that I was gay/bisexual/transgender, they may also

believe that I am a sinner deemed to hell, etc."

Would perceive them negatively	1	0.75

"*The feeling would be mutual.*"

Table 62

Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence,

and Representative Statements for Participants Who Would Not Identify as a Straight

Ally if it Meant That They Would be Perceived Negatively by Others

Category	Frequency	Percent
Do not want to be perceived negatively	22	30.55
"I don't need negative stereotyping.		
"People are quick to judge."		
Not a straight ally	21	29.16
"Not a straight ally."		
Strong in their beliefs	6	8.33
"People can't change the way I feel."		
"I hold to my moral beliefs."		
Do not have strong enough beliefs	4	5.55
"I do not feel strongly enough about the topic to reap		
those negative consequences."		
Do not agree with the lesbian and gay lifestyle	4	5.55
"I'll stand there and tell them how I don't agree		
with people who are gay."		
Not engaged in LG activism	2	2.77
"I don't engage in gay activism."		
Against religious beliefs	1	1.38

"Same as before, Christian beliefs."

Avoid conflict	1	1.38

"I would just quit talking about it until the situation

was over."

Only concerned with him/herself	1	1.38

"I feel mostly because I am self consumed."

No reason why he/she would not identify	1	1.38

"it's what it is."

The participant's actions would change the perceiver's negativity	1	1.38

"I believe others just see me like how I am considerate

kind and eventually the negative will be positive."

_____

Table 63

Breakdown of Participants Who Would and Would Not Identify as a Straight Ally if it

Meant They Were Seen as Being Associated With Lesbians and Gay Men

Straight ally identification	Male	Female
Yes	44	111
No	49	20

Table 64

Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence,

and Representative Statements for Participants Who Would Identify as a Straight Ally if it

Meant That They Would be Seen as Associated With Lesbians and Gay Men

Category	Frequency	Percent
Have lesbian and gay friends	54	37.76
"I am heterosexual and have homosexual friends, so being associated with them is true."		
"I already associate with them, and most people know that, it's too late."		
Do not care what others think	24	16.78
"If someone feels that way I don't particularly care how they feel about me."		
Not bad to be seen as associated with lesbians and gay men	14	9.79
"Yes, because it isn't a negative thing to be associated with homosexuals."		
Gay men and lesbians are no different than anybody else	14	9.79
"They are people just like me they are no different."		
Strong beliefs about being a straight ally	13	9.09
"Others perceptions may be wrong but if you are strong about your decisions and choices you should not be affected by others."		

Do not have a problem being associated with lesbians and gay men	8	5.59

"I wouldn't have a problem with that."

That is what being a straight ally is	7	4.89

"Part of being a straight ally is treasuring the

association with gay men and lesbians. Why deny

something so fabulous?"

Not ashamed of their association with lesbians and gay men	6	4.19

"Some of my friends are gay men, I don't care to hide

that association anyway."

Comfortable with self	4	2.79

"That doesn't matter. I know what I am and who I like."

Positive experiences with lesbians and gay men	3	2.09

"Gay people are usually cool, who cares."

Want people to see them being associated with lesbians and gay men	3	2.09

"I want people to see me being associated with

homosexuals."

Gay men and lesbians deserve equality	2	1.39

"We are all human beings and we all deserve equality."

Would be associated with gay men and lesbians but only to a certain extent	2	1.39

"I have no problem being associated with gays it

just bothers me when people make judgments on me.”

Would not want to be friends with close-minded individuals	1	0.69

“Yes, because I wouldn't want to date/befriend a small

minded person anyway.”

Need to learn acceptance	1	0.69

“They need to learn to be more accepting.”

Assert heterosexuality to others	1	0.69

“I would explain the difference and the true meaning

of being a straight ally and how I support equality for all.”

Want lesbians and gay men to be happy	1	0.69

“I have no problem with others being homosexual if that

is what makes them happy.”

Does not hang out with them	1	0.69

“Because I don't hangout with them, I just have neutral

attitudes towards them.”

Table 65

*Comprehensive List of Each Category, the Frequency and Percentage of its Occurrence,
and Representative Statements for Participants Who Would Not Identify as a Straight
Ally if it Meant That They Would be Seen as Associated With Lesbians and Gay Men*

Category	Frequency	Percent
Not a straight ally	24	40.67

I wouldn't say I'm a straight ally in the first place."

Do not want to be associated with gay men and lesbians	12	20.33

*"I would rather not associate with gays and lesbians
on a regular basis since they make me feel uncomfortable.
Not trying to be immature, it's just the way I was brought
up."*

Do not support the lesbian and gay lifestyle	5	8.47

"I don't believe what straight allies are fighting for."

No opinion on issues related to gay men and lesbians	5	8.47

"I just don't have an opinion on the matter."

Do not want to be seen negatively by others	5	8.47

"I don't like to be seen negatively."

Strong in their beliefs	4	6.77

"I hold to my moral beliefs."

Against their religious beliefs	2	3.38

"again, I follow God and everything that's in his bible.

I don't care what the culture thinks."

Belief that being a straight ally is the same as being lesbian or gay	1	1.69

"*Because I am not gay.*"

No reason regarding why the participant would not be associated	1	1.69

with lesbians and gay men

"*No reason.*"

Gay men and lesbians are no different than anyone else	1	1.69

"*I do not care if I am associated with gays or lesbians*

they belong to the same race – human."

Not involved in LG activism	1	1.69

"*I don't engage in gay activism.*"

_____

Table 66

Means and Standard Deviations for Straight Ally Identification on Participants'

Perceptions of Straight Allies

Word description	Yes		No	
	M	SD	M	SD
Positive	3.73	1.25	1.66	1.47
Negative	0.19	0.53	1.54	1.48
Neutral	0.86	0.95	1.45	1.12

Table 67

Straight Ally Identification and the Number of Positive Words Reported by Participants

Identification	0	1	2	3	4	5
Yes	2	8	11	37	37	52
No	20	16	20	8	4	5

Table 68

Straight Ally Identification and the Number of Negative Words Reported by Participants

Identification	0	1	2	3	4	5
Yes	124	17	3	0	1	0
No	20	23	13	7	4	5

Table 69

Straight Ally Identification and the Number of Neutral Words Reported by Participants

Identification	0	1	2	3	4	5
Yes	63	49	26	5	1	1
No	17	22	24	8	2	1

Table 70

Means and Standard Deviations for Straight Ally Identification on Others'

Perceptions of Straight Allies

Word description	Yes		No	
	M	SD	M	SD
Positive	0.94	1.19	0.83	1.13
Negative	2.62	1.55	2.43	1.41
Neutral	1.11	1.09	1.28	1.22

Table 71

Straight Ally Identification and the Number of Positive Words Reported by Others'

Identification	0	1	2	3	4	5
Yes	70	26	27	9	3	2
No	39	15	12	4	1	1

Table 72

Straight Ally Identification and the Number of Negative Words Reported by Others'

Identification	0	1	2	3	4	5
Yes	14	23	30	36	16	24
No	5	16	16	22	4	9

Table 73

Straight Ally Identification and the Number of Neutral Words Reported by Others'

Identification	0	1	2	3	4	5
Yes	52	34	34	12	3	0
No	26	18	12	14	2	0

Table 74

Means and Standard Deviations on Participants and Others' Perceptions of Straight

Allies

Word description	Participants		Others	
	M	SD	M	SD
Positive	3.00	1.65	0.90	1.16
Negative	0.65	1.16	2.55	1.51
Neutral	1.10	1.06	1.17	1.14

Table 75

Means and Standard Deviations for Straight Ally Identification on Willingness to Engage

in LG Activism

Identification	M	SD
Yes	4.82	1.94
No	1.83	1.14

Table 76

Means and Standard Deviations for Straight Ally Identification on Individual Difference

Measures

Measure	Yes			No	
	M	SD		M	SD
Quantity of contact	5.20	1.43		4.19	1.46
Quality of contact	6.42	1.80		3.82	2.14
Conservatism	4.51	1.76		6.11	1.64
Religiosity	4.83	2.65		6.19	2.30
Spirituality	5.82	4.82		6.07	2.34

Table 77

Breakdown of Participants who Identified as a Straight Ally

Condition	Men	Women
Identified as straight ally	27	45
Did not identify as straight ally	36	20

Table 78

Means and Standard Deviations of Straight Ally Identification on Conservatism, Religion,

Spirituality, Quantity, and Quality of Contact

Measure	Yes	No
Conservatism	5.31 (1.73)	6.26 (1.70)
Religion	5.18 (2.22)	6.41 (1.88)
Spirituality	5.41 (2.48)	5.80 (2.53)
Quantity of contact	4.51 (1.41)	3.08 (1.40)
Quality of contact	6.21 (1.85)	4.04 (1.93)

Table 79

Means and Standard Deviations of Straight Ally Identification on the Measures Related to Tolerance and Equality

Measure	Yes	No
IMRP	7.14 (1.40)	5.26 (1.80)
LFAIS	6.74 (0.78)	5.95 (0.78)
Empathic concern	6.77 (1.30)	6.69 (1.11)
Perspective taking	6.33 (1.22)	6.09 (1.28)
Humanitarianism and egalitarianism	7.27 (1.09)	7.09 (1.09)

Table 80

Means and Standard Deviations of Straight Ally Identification on the Measures Related to Prejudice and Discrimination

Measure	Yes	No
ATL	2.80 (1.27)	4.66 (1.58)
ATG	2.75 (1.44)	5.71 (1.72)
Homopositivity scale	5.03 (1.66)	3.87 (1.70)
Modern homonegativity	3.73 (1.47)	5.87 (1.47)
Modern sexism	3.82 (1.61)	4.67 (1.52)
Hostile sexism	4.27 (1.47)	5.01 (1.53)
Benevolent sexism	5.22 (1.32)	5.71 (1.07)
Right wing authoritarianism	4.42 (0.91)	5.71 (1.27)
Social dominance orientation	3.28 (1.13)	3.78 (1.09)
External motivation to respond without prejudice	4.46 (2.00)	4.89 (2.30)
Modern racism	2.78 (1.28)	3.11 (1.42)
Social vigilantism	5.55 (1.23)	5.68 (1.06)

Table 81
Correlations between Individual Difference Measures

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
1. Straight ally ID	--																								
2. AOS	.58**	--																							
3. Conservatism	-.27**	-.32**	--																						
4. Quantity of contact	.41**	.52**	-.25**	--																					
5. Quality of contact	.48**	.61**	-.19**	.75**	--																				
6. Religiosity	-.20*	-.35**	.35**	-.22**	-.14	--																			
7. Spirituality	-.05	-.04	.14	.04	.18*	.62**	--																		
8. SV	-.04	.01	.11	.05	.13	.16*	.26**	--																	
9. RWA	-.48**	-.49**	.42**	-.28**	-.28**	.47**	.23**	.12	--																
10. SDO	-.27**	-.41**	.13	-.29**	-.39**	.10	-.08	.10	.30**	--															
11. Hostile sexism	-.29**	-.38**	.10	-.33**	-.40**	.07	-.09	.15	.17*	.54**	--														
12. Benevolent sexism	-.21*	-.28**	.17*	-.11	-.20**	.25**	.06	.24**	.29**	.17*	.12	--													
13. Modern sexism	-.23**	-.32**	.12	-.26**	-.31**	-.03	-.13	-.02	.20*	.30**	.33**	.07	--												
14. Modern racism	-.19*	-.24**	.11	-.22**	-.27**	-.05	-.10	.06	.22**	.57**	.43**	.12	.43**	--											
15. MHS	-.64**	-.65**	.38**	-.46**	-.54**	.31**	.10	.14	.58**	.55**	.49**	.28**	.29**	.44**	--										
16. ATL	-.51**	-.56**	.26**	-.46**	-.51**	.38**	.15	.04	.64**	.46**	.40**	.28**	.24**	.32**	.73**	--									
17. ATG	-.64**	-.68**	.35**	-.53**	-.62**	.39**	.10	.08	.59**	.52**	.53**	.25**	.33**	.32**	.84**	.81**	--								
18. Homopositivity	.25**	.19*	-.15	.13	.13	-.10	-.05	.12	-.07	.03	.07	.14	-.09	.11	-.20*	-.06	-.25**	--							
19. EMRP	-.07	-.21*	.11	-.13	-.03	.15	.02	.09	.12	-.06	.04	.15	.13	.04	.09	.09	.04	.02	--						
20. IMRP	.50**	.56**	-.20*	.47**	.59**	-.18**	.09	-.03	-.38**	-.52**	-.53**	-.18*	-.31**	-.36**	-.63**	-.63**	-.69**	.12	.20*	--					
21. Empathic concern	.05	.20*	.07	.13	.18*	.07	.24**	.05	-.01	-.35**	-.47**	.10	-.17*	-.29**	-.20**	-.09	-.22**	.00	.15	.39**	--				
22. Perspective taking	.11	.17	-.05	.22**	.29**	.02	.16*	-.15	-.13	-.36**	-.38**	-.07	-.02	-.28**	-.33**	-.24**	-.26**	-.18*	.15	.50**	.40**	--			
23. HE	.09	.25**	-.10	.13	.20*	.10	.23**	.25**	-.12	-.35**	-.19*	-.02	-.16	-.28**	-.32**	-.16	-.21*	.04	.25**	.38**	.52**	.35**	--		
24. LFAIS	.50**	.53**	-.16	.50**	.55**	-.15	.12	.15	-.40**	-.56**	-.60**	-.16	-.52**	-.52**	-.66**	-.55**	-.66**	.13	.02	.59**	.33**	.30**	.36**	--	
25. Social desirability	-.03	.02	.21*	-.03	.01	.10	.02	-.05	.07	-.27**	-.17	.16	-.00	-.01	-.14	-.05	-.03	-.08	.13	.16	.31**	.41**	.24**	.07	--

Table 82

Summary of Regression Analysis on the LFAIS

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	*p*
	.48		<.001
Sex of participant		.33	<.001
Straight ally identification		.30	<.001
Activism orientation scale		.25	.01

Table 83

Summary of Regression Analysis on Empathic Concern

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	*p*
	.10		.004
Sex of participant		.25	.005
Straight ally identification		-.09	.39
Activism orientation scale		.17	.11

Table 84

Summary of Regression Analysis on Humanitarianism-Egalitarianism

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	*p*
	.07		.02
Sex of participant		-.06	.51
Straight ally identification		-.09	.38
Activism orientation scale		.33	.002

Table 85

Summary of Regression Analysis on Perspective Taking

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	*p*
	.03		.26
Sex of participant		.01	.95
Straight ally identification		.05	.64
Activism orientation scale		.14	.21

Table 86

Summary of Regression Analysis on the IMRP

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	*p*
	.38		<.001
Sex of participant		.11	.12
Straight ally identification		.27	.002
Activism orientation scale		.37	<.001

Table 87

Summary of Regression Analysis on the ATG

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	*p*
	.59		<.001
Sex of participant		-.14	<.02
Straight ally identification		-.37	<.001
Activism orientation scale		-.42	<.001

Table 88

Summary of Regression Analysis on the Modern Homonegativity Scale

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	*p*
	.55		<.001
Sex of participant		-.14	.03
Straight ally identification		-.40	<.001
Activism orientation scale		-.38	<.001

Table 89

Summary of Regression Analysis on Modern Racism

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	*p*
	.12		.001
Sex of participant		-.24	.01
Straight ally identification		-.09	.36
Activism orientation scale		-.11	.27

Table 90

Summary of Regression Analysis on the Modern Sexism

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	*p*
	.19		<.001
Sex of participant		-.30	<.001
Straight ally identification		-.05	.62
Activism orientation scale		-.20	.04

Table 91

Summary of Regression Analysis on Hostile Sexism

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	*p*
	.27		<.001
Sex of participant		-.35	<.001
Straight ally identification		-.12	.19
Activism orientation scale		-.21	.03

Table 92

Summary of Regression Analysis on the Homopositivity Scale

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	*p*
	.01		.03
Sex of participant		.19	.03
Straight ally identification		.20	.06
Activism orientation scale		.01	.92

Table 93

Summary of Regression Analysis on Social Vigilantism

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	*p*
	.01		.87
Sex of participant		-.06	.52
Straight ally identification		-.05	.64
Activism orientation scale		.06	.57

Table 94

Summary of Regression Analysis on the ATL

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	*p*
	.37		<.001
Sex of participant		.07	.38
Straight ally identification		-.29	.001
Activism orientation scale		-.41	<.001

Table 95

Summary of Regression Analysis on Benevolent Sexism

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	*p*
	.09		.01
Sex of participant		.09	.32
Straight ally identification		-.08	.43
Activism orientation scale		-.26	.01

Table 96

Summary of Regression Analysis on Right Wing Authoritarianism

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	*p*
	.31		<.001
Sex of participant		.11	.16
Straight ally identification		-.31	.001
Activism orientation scale		-.34	<.001

Table 97

Summary of Regression Analysis on Social Dominance Orientation

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	*p*
	.18		<.001
Sex of participant		-.06	.48
Straight ally identification		-.06	.58
Activism orientation scale		-.36	.001

Table 98

Summary of Regression Analysis on the External Motivation to Respond Without

Prejudice

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	*p*
Sex of participant	.06		.05
Straight ally identification		.09	.44
Activism orientation scale		-.28	.01

Table 99

Summary of Regression Analysis on the Activism Orientation Scale

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	p
	.63		<.001
ATG		-.42	.01
ATL		.21	.12
EMRP		-.23	.002
SV		.14	.07
RWA		-.11	.25
SDO		-.14	.12
Hostile sexism		.05	.63
Benevolent sexism		-.11	.19
Modern sexism		-.05	.55
Modern racism		.17	.08
Modern homonegativity		-.25	.10
Homopositivity		-.09	.28
Empathic concern		-.03	.73
Perspective taking		-.12	.13
HE scale		.05	.56
IMRP		.16	.15
LFAIS		.07	.53

Table 101

Summary of Regression Analysis on Straight Ally Identification

Predictor	ΔR^2	β	p
	.59		<.001
ATG		-.45	.01
ATL		.32	.02
EMRP		-.07	.36
SV		-.01	.89
RWA		-.10	.27
SDO		-.07	.43
Hostile sexism		.07	.48
Benevolent sexism		.04	.59
Modern sexism		-.01	.94
Modern racism		.15	.13
Modern homonegativity		-.30	.04
Homopositivity		-.01	.95
Empathic concern		-.11	.21
Perspective taking		-.08	.34
HE scale		-.06	.49
IMRP		.21	.07
LFAIS		.22	.06

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Means for gender of the target by activism condition on male participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation

Figure 2. Means for gender of the target by activism condition on female participants' assessment of the target's sexual orientation

Figure 3. Means for straight ally identification by activism condition on others' ratings of masculine attributes