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Studies investigating the relationships between attitude and behavior have proliferated in the past decade, and theories relating these two entities have been formulated and empirically tested. A topic which has not been researched is that of attitude-behavior relationships with respect to homosexuals. The purpose of this study was to both assess the correlates of a specific behavior with respect to homosexuals--support of gay rights legislation--and to extend the Ajzen and Fishbein theory of attitude-behavior relationships to this area of enquiry.

Research was conducted in three phases and utilized a total of 250 undergraduates at the University of Hawaii. The selection of behavior supportive of gay rights was the purpose of the first phase. In the second, beliefs about the consequences of support for the selected behavior--voting in a legislative poll--were collected as well as normative groups whose opinions would influence the voting decision. In the third phase, subjects' beliefs, attitudes and intentions were assessed and related to actual behavior in a legislative poll. Normative expectations, demographic information and attitudes toward homosexuals were also assessed.

Results provided strong support for the Ajzen and Fishbein model. Correlations between intention and behavior
were highly correlated, as was that between intention predicted by weighted combinations of attitudinal and normative components and actual intention. Attitude towards the act (voting) was a significantly better predictor of behavior than was attitude towards the target of the act (homosexuals), thereby validating a major premise of the model. A finding of both theoretical and practical import was that attitudes towards gay rights and normative considerations contributed significantly and equally to the prediction of voting behavior. Also supportive of the model was the finding that demographic variables contributed little to the prediction of behavior after the two model terms had been taken into account.

Of practical import to the Gay Rights Movement was the delineation of issues most related to voting behavior and also the need to alter both beliefs about the consequences of legislation as well as the evaluations of these beliefs.

The failure to find demographic correlates of behavior was discussed, and the limitations of the research were emphasized.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The study of human prejudice and its effects upon stigmatized groups has long been of interest to psychologists. As early as 1934, LaPierre investigated the correlation between verbal intentions to discriminate against Chinese and overt behavior. In his classic book *The Nature of Prejudice*, Allport (1954) outlined in detail a number of topics relevant to psychological inquiry, including the origins of prejudice, its effects upon stigmatized groups, and the prejudiced personality. In the years subsequent to its publication, a host of studies assessing attitude-behavior relationships with respect to Jews, Negroes, and other racial and ethnic groups has been published (see Wicker, 1969, for a review of some of these publications.)

Given that attitude research with respect to stigmatized peoples is a well-established field of psychological inquiry, it is of interest that studies assessing attitudes toward homosexuals have only recently been conducted. In a review of the literature dealing with homosexuality from 1967 through 1974, Morin (1977) found that of 139 works, in only thirteen were attitudes toward homosexuals assessed. The remainder dealt with clinical assessment, etiology and adjustment.

The relative paucity of attitude research may be attributed to several factors. First, research in highly controversial and sensitive areas creates a variety of methodolog-
cal, ethical and practical problems for the researcher. Second, many psychiatrists and psychologists have continued to view homosexual behavior as symptomatic of an underlying personality disorder. Whereas race or religion are difficult to conceptualize as symptoms of abnormality, theories of personality have often started with the viewpoint that homosexuality is a disorder which must be explained and treated. If it is assumed that homosexuals are different from "normals" and that these differences are attributable to an "organism deficiency", then it is not surprising that inquiry into the effects of stigma upon the homosexual has been lacking.

Although attitudes toward homosexuals have only recently been assessed, the effects of stigma upon the homosexual have been well documented both anecdotally and factually. Negative attitudes have been associated with emotional, behavioral, occupational and legal problems for the homosexual. Behaviorally, stigma has led to a strengthening of in-group ties and limited opportunity to readopt conventional roles (Simmons, 1965; Coleman, 1977), thereby causing "role imprisonment". Many homosexuals suffer from the emotional concomitants of living in "a culture where homosexuality has historically been perceived as pathological, immoral, and criminal" (Karr, 1978), which include guilt, fear and problems in personal identity. Discrimination in housing and employment have been well documented (Coleman, 1977) as well as in matters of marriage, adoption, inheritance and taxation.
(Altman, 1971). Legally, homosexual behavior is prosecuted in many states, and homosexuals fear entrapment and are subject to blackmail. Finally, acts of violence perpetrated against homosexuals have been recorded throughout history (Karlen, 1971), a problem for homosexuals which has been compounded by the failure of policemen to give assistance to known homosexuals in distress (Altman, 1971).

In recent years, there has been a growing interest within psychology in a "social deficiency" model which uses as a focus of research the society which stigmatizes the homosexual (MacDonald, 1974). This interest has generated numerous papers which have assessed attitudes towards homosexuals. In none of these studies, however, was discriminatory behavior with respect to these individuals or the attitudinal or demographic correlates of this behavior investigated. In this study, a specific behavior with respect to homosexuals--voting for gay rights in a legislative poll--was related to beliefs, attitudes, and intentions according to a major current theory of attitude-behavior relationships.

This paper consists of seven parts. The first discusses attitude research and outlines the conditions in which attitudes may be expected to be predictive of behavior. Further, the Ajzen and Fishbein model of attitude-behavior relationships will be reviewed. In the second portion of the paper, attitude research in the area of homosexuality will be surveyed and critiqued. The remainder of the paper consists of
a description of the objectives, methods and findings of the study.
CHAPTER II
ATTITUDE-BEHAVIOR RELATIONSHIPS

Introduction

The importance of attitudes in psychology is conveyed by Allport (1935) in the opening of his paper in the Handbook of Social Psychology: "the concept of attitude is probably the most distinctive and indispensable concept in contemporary American social psychology." In 1964, Cohen made a further important statement about attitudes:

Most of the investigators whose work we have examined make the broad psychological assumption that since attitudes are evaluative predispositions, they have consequences for the way people act toward others, for the programs they actually undertake, and for the manner in which they are carried out. Thus attitudes are always seen as precursors of behavior, as determinants of how a person will actually behave in his daily affairs (pp. 137-138).

Dollard (1949) has likewise commented in reference to correspondence between words and acts, "Valid prediction of behavior is not a mere luxury of morality, but a vital social necessity."

Given the importance of attitudinal research to social psychology and what must be considered its primary function, it is surprising that early studies assessing this relationship were so few in number and so scantly recognized. In the now classic LaPierre (1934) study, a Chinese couple and LaPierre took extensive automobile trips. Of the hotels and
restaurants visited, only one denied them service. However, after a subsequent letter to each of the 250 establishments visited asking if Chinese guests would be accepted, over 90% of 128 proprietors indicated that they would not serve Chinese people. It is now recognized that the presence of LaPierre with the couple probably resulted in less discrimination than would have otherwise been the case. Further, the proprietor's letters indicating that they would or would not serve Chinese are measures of behavioral intention, not attitude. Still, the striking discrepancy between verbally expressed intention to discriminate and non-discriminatory behavior should have called into question the predictive utility of other attitudinal measures.

Other early studies include that by Kutner, Wilkins, and Yarrow (1952). These researchers had two white women enter a restaurant. After they had been seated, they were joined by a Negro woman, who in no instance was denied admission. Letters were sent to the restaurant owner asking for reservations for a social group including Negroes. After no replies had been received in seventeen days, the proprietors were called. Six of the eleven refused reservations, although the same restaurants immediately gave reservations to other written requests sent concomitantly by the researchers in which the racial compositions of the groups was not specified. This study is marred by the same methodological considerations as was the previous one, yet again the lack of
consistency is striking. Other early studies failing to find relationships between behavior and verbal "attitude" include the Saenger and Gilbert (1950) study in which white customers were asked whether they would purchase items from black salespeople, and the Corey (1937) study in which responses to questionnaires assessing attitudes toward cheating were related to cheating behavior.

Wicker's (1968) review, which summarizes 31 investigations concludes with the statement that, "is is considerably more likely that attitudes will be unrelated or only slightly related to actions." With the advent of this paper, the utility of attitudes in general was prematurely discounted. It was certainly clear that attitudes could not be expected, a priori, to correlate with behavior, and a major effort within the field became that of determining the conditions in which strong attitude-behavior correlations could be expected. This effort entailed refining measures and clarifying the factors mitigating these relationships. In the next portion of this paper, an attempt will be made to briefly summarize the reasons why attitudes have not successfully been predictive of behavior in many previous studies.

**Correspondence Between Attitudes and Behavior**

Of the explanations cited in the literature for the failure of many researchers to obtain correlations between attitudes and behavior, the most fundamental is that of the
absence of an explicit and unambiguous definition of attitude-behavior consistency (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1977; Raden, 1977; Schuman and Johnson, 1976). Consistency, according to Ajzen and Fishbein, is obtained when favorable behavior is directed towards positively evaluated objects and unfavorable behavior towards negatively evaluated objects. The rating of a behavior along a favorable-unfavorable dimension with respect to a given object is based largely upon intuitive considerations, a task which is made difficult by the fact that many behaviors have no evaluative implications. Contextual considerations further complicate such an evaluation. Advocacy of stringent racial discrimination, for example, would not typically be considered incompatable with the hiring of a Negro servant.

It is probable that low attitude-behavior correlations are frequently due to the fact that the behavioral measures intuitively judged to be consistent with measured attitudes have been selected with no empirical support for this relationship.

The Ajzen and Fishbein notion of consistency is but one of several found in the literature, and this multiplicity of conceptualizations likewise has produced great variability in reported attitude-behavior relationships. Schuman and Johnson (1976) have noted that consistency may be literal (people do what they say they will do) or correlational (persons are similarly ordered on attitudinal measures). In addition, Campbell (1963) has offered a scalogram approach, a topic
which will be discussed below.

Ajzen and Fishbein have clarified the consistency issue by noting that both attitude and behaviors are held and performed with respect to certain entities, each of which consists of four elements: the action, the target to which the action is directed, the context in which the action is performed, and the time of its performance. Before addressing the question of attitude-behavior correspondence, the attitudinal and behavioral entities must be defined in terms of their elements. Donating five dollars at the office to the Heart Foundation on Friday is a behavioral entity in which all four elements are specified. If one were to assess attitudes toward donating five dollars, only the action element would be specified.

Correspondence between attitudinal predictors and behavioral criterion occurs to the extent that the four elements of each entity are identical. Likewise, the strength of an obtained attitude-behavior relationship is expected to be related to the degree of consistency between these entities (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1977; Schuman and Johnson, 1976). Poor correspondence between behavioral and attitudinal entities is a characteristic of a majority of studies in this area; only a few will be cited here for illustrative purposes.

Wicker and Pomazal (1971) hypothesized that the relationship between verbally expressed attitudes and overt behavior would be stronger when the attitude concepts rated were spe-
pecific rather than general. College students' attitudes toward scientific research, psychological research, participating as a subject in a psychology study, and a policy of the Psychology Department regarding participation in research were assessed. Students' willingness to participate in a study served as the behavioral measure and was assessed by asking them to indicate whether or not they were available to participate in the half-hour study. Students who indicated that they were unavailable for the study were assumed to be unwilling to participate, since eight hours daily were made available for the experiment. Correlations between willingness to participate and the four attitude scales were -.04, .06, .17, and .19 respectively. Thus, as the specificity of the attitude scale increased, so did the strength of the attitude-behavior relationship. It will be noted, however, that the correlations are all of a very low magnitude, a fact which is not surprising given the discrepancy between elements in the attitude and behavioral domains. In three of the four attitude scales, only the target element was specified. The scale measuring attitude towards participation in a psychology experiment specifies target and action. The behavioral measure—availability to participate in a specific study in a specific place at a specific time as requested by the course instructor for one-half unit of credit—has all four elements specified. Unfortunately, availability and willingness to participate in the experiment cannot be equa-
ted, and this fact probably attenuated the attitude-behavior correlations. Even if this methodological flaw were not present, though, low correlations would be expected because of the lack of correspondence between the behavioral and attitudinal measures. A likely explanation of the data is that some of the students had unfavorable opinions of psychological research but positive attitudes toward receiving course credit and instructor recognition. Others with positive attitudes in general toward research may have been unwilling to participate in this study because of more pressing interests, a dislike for the instructor and the like.

Another study exemplifying lack of correspondence between attitude and behavioral measures is that by Frideres, Warner, and Albrecht (1971) who related attitudes toward marijuana usage and voting for or against the legalization of marijuana. The attitude scale employed by the authors was derived by factor analysis on the basis of pre-test data and included items such as, "Doctors have not shown that marijuana harms a person physically" and "I would not try marijuana even if I were certain I would not get caught." The resulting attitude score is thus based on an assessment specifying only the target element. The behavior, although specifying the same target element, also specifies an action element with respect to this target in a specific time and setting. Results indicated that the overt behavior of 47 of the 204 subjects was not consistent with the previously
measured attitude. Although this level of discrepancy is relatively low, it would probably have been reduced had the attitude measure corresponded to the behavior in its other three elements. Some subjects, for example, may have had very negative attitudes about marijuana usage but even more negative attitudes about governmental intervention into the private lives of its citizens.

Linn (1965) measured the relationship between racial attitudes and overt behavior, using as the behavioral measure the willingness of subjects to sign release forms for pictures taken with them posing with a Negro. This study is unusual in the literature in that the attitude scale corresponded to the behavioral measure exactly in both the action and target elements. Results of the study indicated that of the subjects low in prejudice, 70% manifested behavior inconsistent with previously expressed attitude. However, 72% of the subjects expressing negative attitudes towards posing with a Negro subsequently refused to have the picture taken. The overall consistency was approximately 49%, a figure which seems quite low given the seemingly high degree of correspondence between the action and target elements of the attitude and behavior measures. A likely explanation of these results is that normative influences operating at the time of attitude assessment differed from those present at the time of behavioral assessment. Whereas the salience of liberal college attitudes was greater in the former, that of more negative attitudes at a general societal level was greater
in the latter. Had time and context elements been specified during attitude assessment, this norm-related discrepancy between attitude and behavior probably would have been reduced.

Compendiums of studies providing evidence that poor correspondence between the elements of attitudinal and behavioral entities attenuates relationships between the two may be obtained from Wicker (1969) and Ajzen and Fishbein (1977). In the latter, 109 studies were reviewed, and the degree of correspondence between entities was determined. The attitude-behavior relations reported in these studies was then related to the degree of consistency between entities. As was expected, attitude-behavior relations were high almost exclusively in those cases in which correspondence was high.

In discussing discrepancies between the elements of attitude-behavior entities in the studies above, several specific explanations of the attenuated relationships obtained were offered. Additional sources of potential discrepancy will now be discussed. Of the four elements, researchers have largely ignored consistency within those of context and time. Also, as was suggested by the Linn (1965) study, the impact of norms may exert a considerable attenuating influence when the contexts in which attitude and behavior are measured differ.

Another potentially important variable is that of the number of alternative behaviors available within a given
situation. Wicker (1969) notes that most attitude scales greatly restrict response alternatives, as well as the fact that the range of behavioral responses on overt measures is typically restricted, particularly in the laboratory. He gives as an example the likelihood that a man who reads a newspaper he detests in a town with no other newspaper is being more consistent than one who reads a disliked paper when there are many from which to choose. Kelman (1974) makes a similar point in noting that attitude-behavior relationships are influenced by the degree to which the context is structured. Whereas survey studies focus on actions freely chosen by the subject (such as what groups he has joined, how he has voted, etc.), experimental studies present the subject with a structured situation in which an action must be made. In this structured context, situational constraints may have a greater impact than in survey studies, thereby attenuating the effect of attitudinal differences.

These specific considerations may be subsumed under the more general concept of "situational thresholds" (Campbell, 1963). Campbell argues that in most cases of alleged inconsistency, verbal attitudes and nonverbal behaviors have different situational thresholds, and correlational inconsistency has been confounded with these differences in threshold. Cohen (1966) offers, as an example, the case of a totalitarian society in which attitudes toward the government are strongly hostile but in which antagonistic behaviors are not
permissible. Here the verbal threshold may be high but much less so than the behavioral one. As Raden (1977) has noted, only the pattern of favorable behavior in relation to unfavorable attitude can be considered as evidence of inconsistency in terms of Campbell's scalogram approach. Raden examined nine studies and found that the threshold in the great majority of cases was higher for behavior than for attitude. He found that there was a sharp drop in inconsistency when Campbell's scalogram method was applied. However, much of the decrease in inconsistency could be attributed to the artifactual element of original item base rates. Consistency can be assessed, _a priori_, on the basis of marginal frequencies for attitude and behavior. This issue of pseudo-consistency is but one of several with the analysis of situational thresholds. A major limitation of Campbell's approach is that it requires knowledge of response thresholds for successful prediction of behavior, and many social psychologists wish to predict behavior prior to the determination of response thresholds. Raden notes also the more fundamental circularity in Campbell's conception of attitude-behavior consistency. Attitudinal dispositions are first defined by their relationship to behavior, and this same relationship to behavior is used as evidence of attitude-behavior consistency. Raden concludes that the notion of a uni-dimensional continuum which includes both verbal and overt responses is questionable as a basis for a definition
of attitude-behavior consistency.

Just as attitude-behavior relationships will in part be determined by contextual consistency, so does consistency in time elements influence measured relationships. The greater the specificity of the time element in the attitude measure, the better will be the behavioral prediction. It should be noted, however, that as the time separating measurement of attitude and behavior increases, the magnitude of the relationship is expected to decrease (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). Schuman and Johnson (1976) note that attitudes do change during this period and thereby attenuate behavioral prediction. Perhaps more typical is the effect of unexpected events. In Wicker's (1971) study relating attitudes toward the church and corresponding behavior, the best single verbal predictor of overt behavior was the judged influence of extraneous events. As time increases between attitude and behavior measurement, the greater is the likelihood that these extraneous events will occur.

In terms of the action element of Ajzen and Fishbein's conception of consistency, it is not sufficient that attitudes toward actions correspond to the criterion and action elements. In many cases, reference to the person's own performance of the behavior under consideration should be made (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1977). For example, in the Insko, Blake, Cialdini and Mulaik (1970) study in which use of birth control was predicted, attitudes toward "using birth
control methods" were obtained. Some women may have favorable attitudes toward the use of these methods in general but do not use them personally for health reasons. In the Carr and Roberts (1965) study, personal participation in civil rights activities was correlated with measures purportedly assessing attitudes toward such participation. The failure of the study to obtain significant attitude-behavior relationships may be due to the fact that the attitude measure most consistent with the criterion behavior was of "Negro College Students who Do (or Do Not) Take Part in Civil Rights Demonstrations." Clearly, a more appropriate measure would have been attitudes towards personal participation in these activities.

A final but very important contextual consideration is that of normative influences present in the situations in which attitudes and behavior are measured (Fendrich, 1967; Linn, 1965; Schuman and Johnson, 1976; Schwartz and Tessler, 1972; Wicker, 1969). That verbal responses are not constrained by consideration of external forces or events is suggested by the Fendrich (1967) study in which the order of attitudes and behavior measures was varied. When behavioral commitments were made before attitude measurements, strong relationships were obtained. However, only a weak relationship was obtained when attitudes were measured first.

The effect of immediate social influence has been measured in several studies. Frideres, Warner and Albrecht
(1971) obtained a measure of attitude toward marijuana and later had subjects vote on the legalization of marijuana. Two confederates either voted consistent with the subject's expressed attitude or in opposition to it. Also manipulated was the level of disclosure of the subject's voting behavior. Results indicated that the attitude-behavior relationship was significantly greater in the congruent condition, although the association was significant in the incongruent condition. The disclosure manipulation had little influence on the obtained consistency.

Attitude towards legalization of marijuana was also measured by Acock and DeFleur (1972). Included in the study was an assessment of the subjects' perceptions of the positions of family and peers of this issue. Although attitude was found to explain 27.6% of the variance in behavior in this study, only 1.3% of this variation was explained by perceived family position. However, the perception of one's peers was strongly related to behavior. These studies thus indicate that normative influence is a variable which may exert considerable weight in the attitude-behavior relationship.

In summary, the lack of a concise conceptualization of attitude-behavior consistency undoubtedly has contributed to the low relationships reported. Evidence supporting the hypothesis that increased consistency between the four elements of attitude and behavioral entities leads to greater obtained relationships was reported. Finally, specific variables
and issues relating to these elements were briefly discussed.

**Subject Characteristics**

A source of attitude-behavior discrepancy which is undoubtedly important is the fact that behavior is subject to the various personal attributes of the subjects. These include opportunities, abilities, personality and demographic characteristics, norms, conflicting attitudes, and the like (Schwartz and Tessler, 1972; Wicker, 1969). Many writers have argued that many attitudes may be relevant to a given behavior, and thus the relationships between any one of them and the behavior may appear inconsistent because other attitudes have not been considered. Or, the behavior may be consistent with one or more attitudes more strongly held (Insko and Schopler, 1967). Likewise, as Wicker (1969) notes, there may be many possible behaviors relevant to a given attitude.

Similar to the aspect of other attitudes is that of competing motives. A person may not behave in accordance with a previously expressed attitude because other conflicting motives in the behavioral situation may be more potent than those motives underlying the attitude. Thus, as in the Kutner, Wilkins and Yarrow (1952) study in which restaurant owners' discriminatory behavior was not consistent with their verbal intent to discriminate, the motive to do nothing and avoid a disturbance may have been greater than that to deny
admission to Negroes.

An obvious cause of attitude-behavior inconsistency is the intrinsic inability of the subject involved to perform a given behavior due to low intelligence, ignorance, poor hearing or reading ability, or a lack of social skills. Thus, a person who has a favorable attitude toward low social distance from a given ethnic group may not behave consistently with this attitude if the requisite social skills are lacking.

Methodological Considerations

Attitude Measurement

Strong relationships between attitude and behavior obviously are predicated by accurate and reliable measures of each. The most basic demand upon any verbal attitude scale is that it reliably reflect the "true" attitude of a subject (Alwin, 1973). Failure to consider measurement error in this regard, which can be estimated by methods proposed by Alwin (1973, 1979), has led to the underestimation of true attitude-behavior correlations in past studies (Schuman and Johnson, 1976). Sensitization and reactivity of measurement are potentially serious contributors to this error. That attitudinal responses may be heavily influenced by a desire to please the interviewer is suggested by a "bogus pipeline" study by Jones and Sigall (1971) in which white students gave more negative stereotypes of blacks when they believed them-
selves to be monitored by an advanced lie detector. In a study by VanderKolk (1976) in which physiological reactions to eleven labels of disability and deviance as measured by the Psychological Stress Evaluator were compared with subjects' ratings of the desirability of each condition, it was found that the stress elicited by the various labels did not correspond with the reported desirability of each condition. Being black, for example, was rated as one of the most desirable of the given labels, yet this label elicited high levels of stress. A likely explanation of the data is that normative elements in the assessment situation influenced the ratings of the various labels. Schuman and Johnson (1976) imply that "captive" student populations are more susceptible to demand characteristics than are subjects in more neutral settings.

Several methods for improving attitude measurement have appeared in the literature. The first and most obvious is the building of multi-item indexes in order to achieve high reliability, as estimated by the alpha coefficient. Tittle and Hill (1967) reviewed fifteen attitude-behavior studies and concluded that low correlations were due in part to the use of single-item measures presumably low in reliability. Multi-item measures have the added advantage of allowing respondents to be classified in terms of strength of attitude (Schuman and Johnson, 1976). These authors emphasize the point that although few attitude-behavior studies have ex-
plicitly investigated the relation of strength and clarity of measured attitude to the likelihood of corresponding behavior, there are at least theoretical reasons for expecting such a relationship.

Although high reliability may be achieved by increasing the size of the attitude index, it must be taken into account that behavioral prediction is probably best made by measures of specific attitudes. Adding items may increase the reliability of an index, but this increases its generality and thereby decreases its relevance to criterion behavior.

A very important aspect of attitude assessment is that of the scaling technique utilized. Of the Guttman, Thurstone and category partition techniques, Likert items are the only ones, according to both Schuman and Johnson (1976) and Tittle and Hill (1967), which incorporate an internal measure of strength of feeling. This information provides greater differentiation and perhaps a more appropriate ordering of respondents. The authors note, however, that simple Likert techniques may not work as well with general populations as opposed to student populations since less educated persons appear to be especially susceptible to acquiescence sets. Kamenetsky, Burgess and Rowan (1956) write, "An immediately apparent characteristic of the use of the Likert is its arbitrariness, not only in the method used to determine the discrimination values of individual items, but also in respect to the lack of adherence to the postulates of order
(transitivity and asymmetry)."

The Guttman procedure was intended as a test for the unidimensionality of a set of items. It may, however, be used as a method of item selection in that it enables the researcher to detect items which do not fall within the desired dimension. A limitation of this procedure, as noted by Tittle and Hill (1967), is that as ordinarily practiced, it lacks the advantage of permitting individual scores to be "corrected for intensity." Nunnally (1959) has further noted that collecting a set of statements which meet the strict lawfulness of scalability criterion is extremely difficult. In cases where criteria have been met, items have been virtually identical. Another major limitation of this procedure as noted by Nunnally is that multiple correlation and factor analytic techniques must be abandoned with rank-order scaling.

The semantic differential, though used frequently in attitude research, suffers several disadvantages. This technique tends to abstract verbal labels from meaningful contexts. Perhaps a more serious limitation is the fact that subjects tend to respond in a set. As Tittle and Hill (1967) claim, subjects self-evaluate overall attitude and mark scales accordingly, with little distinction between the attitude pairs. For this reason, the semantic differential procedure may produce high reliability and low predictive validity.

The Thurstone procedure likewise has several shortcomings. As both Schuman and Johnson (1976) and Tittle and
and Hill (1967) note, it is common for respondents to fail to endorse contiguous items. They often endorse a wide range of items, a fact which is contrary to the rationale of the procedure. Additionally, the technique requires both the scaling of items and the process of measuring attitudes once the items are scaled, often a lengthy process. The judging procedure itself introduces a number of perceptual variables.

The predictive validity of various scaling procedures has been assessed by several researchers. In a study assessing the relation between attitude towards and actual participation in student political activity, Tittle and Hill (1967) obtained the following correlations between attitude measures and behavioral indexes: 15-item Likert scale - .543; 10-item Likert - .518; Guttman - .419; semantic differential - .419; and Thurstone - .255. In the Wicker (1971) study relating attitudes toward the church to behavior in the church setting, the Thurstone procedure produced higher correlations with behavioral criteria than did several semantic differentials. The correlations obtained were relatively low; the highest was .35. Methodological considerations with these two studies make it difficult to generalize from the findings. Still, in conjunction with the scale attributes listed above, these data suggest the Likert procedure as being the one of choice in attitude research.
Behavior Measurement

The need for improved measurement of behavior has been emphasized by many researchers (Schuman and Johnson, 1976; Wicker, 1969; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1977). Although it is often assumed that incongruence between expressed attitude and behavior reflects measurement error in the assessment of attitude, it is equally plausible that behavior in many situations may not reflect "true" attitudes. Given that attitudes and behavior are most typically measured in the same setting by the same investigator, the influence of experimental demand upon behavior should be expected. For this reason, both Wicker (1969) and Schuman and Johnson (1976) have stressed the need for unobtrusive behavioral measures made in situations other than the one in which attitude measures were taken. A measure which is particularly prone to bias is that of the self-reporting of behavior.

As with attitude assessment, multi-item indices of behavior are apt to increase the reliability and generality of the assessment. Unlike attitude assessment, as the generality of the behavioral assessment increases, so consistency between attitude and behavior is expected to increase. For, although general attitudes may not predict a specific behavior, attitudes toward a specific behavior should predict general responding in the domain from which that specific behavior is drawn. Tittle and Hill (1967) argue moreover that congruence will be highest in those situations which the individual has
come to define as normal and common; environments characterized by unfamiliar contingencies are not as likely to have well structured attitudinal organization relevant to behavior in that environment. Five criterion indexes were used in their study to measure the same behavioral pattern, and their data offered support for the argument that greater congruence can be obtained when the behavioral criterion includes a wide range of activity with respect to the attitude object.

In discussing attitude-behavior consistency, the problem of pseudo-consistency caused by various combinations of base rates was mentioned. If the behavioral base rate is too high or too low, it will fail to reflect the initial variations in subjects' attitudes. This is one aspect of the more general problem of using criterion behavior which do not represent the behavioral construct they were assumed to tap (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1974). The Carr and Roberts (1965) study in which attitudes and behavior with respect to civil rights were correlated may exemplify this issue. Active involvement in civil rights was defined as "participation in a minimum of one sit-in or stand-in." Participation in a steering committee or involvement in group work such as poster making without participation in a sit-in led to a classification of moderate involvement. Even on logical grounds these behavioral criteria appear inadequate.
Measures of Association

Schuman and Johnson (1976) have noted that the question of how best to estimate and compare the sizes of attitude-behavior correlations has received little attention in the literature. Although discrepancies between various measures of association are seldom extreme, these authors report a case in which a biserial correlation of .83 and a rho of .22 were obtained from the same data. They also imply that even when researchers have employed the same type of measure, the size of the obtained association may be influenced by numerous factors, such as the amount of variance in the population samples.

Given that a primary purpose for assessing attitude is that of behavioral prediction, it is important to address the fact that so many studies reported in the literature have obtained poor correlations between the two. In the preceding paragraphs, an attempt has been made, not to demonstrate that high correlations have been obtained, but rather to specify those factors which influence the magnitude of this relationship. That which has probably been most deleterious in previous studies is the lack of correspondence between the elements of the attitudinal and behavioral entities. The failure to take into account subject characteristics, measurement error in both the attitudinal and behavioral domains, base rates for attitude and behavior, differences in scaling procedures, the reliability and construct
validity of the measurement instruments, and differences in
the measures of association utilized has likewise caused
great variability in reported attitude-behavior correlations.

Theoretical Models for the Prediction of Behavior
from Attitude

Many of the factors mediating attitude-behavior relationships have been outlined above. In this portion of the
paper, the Ajzen and Fishbein model which incorporates these
considerations into a theoretical approach relating attitudes
and behavior will be described in some detail. Brief mention
will also be made of alternative approaches, and empirical
support for each will be provided. Limitations of each will
also be discussed.

The need to consider situational and normative influen­
ces on the attitude-behavior relationship has been discussed
above. All major current models incorporate these inter­
vening variables in the prediction of behavior; models are
differentiated by the methods by which they utilize them in
prediction. The "contingent consistency" approach, evolved
from the research of DeFleur and Westie (1958), Warner and
DeFleur (1969), Albrecht, DeFleur and Warner (1972), and
Acock and DeFleur (1972), suggests that the strength of atti­
tude behavior relationships is modified by contingent con­
ditions, namely social constraints such as group norms and
and visibility of behavior. The identification and measurement of the effects of these intervening variables is the main task of the investigator, accordingly. The "configurational approach" proposed by Acock and DeFleur (1972) follows from this previous position and asserts that "when attitude is combined with social influence variables in configurations, (theoretically) the predictive power is greater than when these variables operate separately." Thus, attitudes are viewed as but one of the components of a typically complex prediction equation. Further, this model assumes that interactions between variables increase the predictive ability of the variable complex over and above the effects of each variable operating separately.

Wicker (1969) has been associated with the "other variables" approach, a model which differs from the configurational approach only in the enlarged specification of variables which may influence behavior. These variables include subject characteristics, situational factors, the actual or considered presence of other people, normative prescriptions, unforeseen events, and expected consequences of behavior.

The approaches listed above share a central and fundamental problem, that of establishing parsimony (Albrecht and Carpenter, 1976). Of the multiplicity of social constraint variables, which are most crucial for a given attitude-behavior relationship? As Schwartz and Tessler (1972) note, "the number of causal variables potentially worthy of
consideration is almost infinite." Schuman and Johnson (1976) also make the point that attitudinal variables are often added with no clear theoretical rationale. It is thus not surprising that research has failed to justify the inclusion of a number of these variables. In the Warner and DeFleur (1969) experiment, for example, the effects of external disclosure of behavior were found to be weak. Frideres et al. (1971) likewise found little evidence to support the effect of a visibility manipulation. Green (1972) did find that willingness to pose for inter-racial photographs was related to racial attitudes, and thus the effects of visibility may well vary with the nature of the behavior and its relation to external norms (Schuman and Johnson, 1976).

In terms of the interaction assumption of the configurational model, Schuman and Johnson, after reviewing studies incorporating measures of perceived reference group support, concluded "no compelling evidence is available as yet that an interaction term is needed, although it is not difficult to imagine behavioral situations where reference group constraints are so extreme that attitude would have no effect regardless of its strength." Thus, although considerable evidence indicates the utility of including an assessment of norms, a basic tenent of the configurational model has yet to be empirically validated.
The Fishbein and Ajzen Model

This model, presented in detail in Fishbein and Ajzen (1975), asserts that the best predictor of behavior is that of behavioral intention. The goal of the model is to predict the intention to perform a particular overt response in a given situation.

Two major factors are postulated which determine specific behavioral intentions: a personal or "attitudinal" factor and a social or "normative" factor. Each of these components is given an empirical weight, such that:

\[ B \sim BI = [ATA]w_1 + [SN]w_2 \]

where \( B \) = overt behavior, \( BI \) = behavioral intention, \( ATA \) = attitude toward the act, \( SN \) = subjective norm, and \( w_1 \) and \( w_2 \) are empirically determined weights.

It will be immediately noticed that this model differs from its predecessors in that the attitudinal measure is of an act in a given situation, not an object or class of objects. Attitude towards an act is conceptualized in terms of an expectancy-value model; it is a function of the expected consequences of the act and the evaluations of these consequences. Although a subject may indicate that a certain consequence of a given behavior is highly likely, this information if of indeterminate value in the prediction of overall attitude in the absence of an evaluation of the consequence. Likewise, a consequence may be rated extremely negatively, but for it to influence overall attitude, the
subject must first believe this consequence to be probable. Thus, prediction of attitude requires both probability estimates for each consequence of a behavior and the evaluations corresponding to these consequences.

According to the model, \( \text{ATA} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (p_i e_i) \) where \( p_i \) refers to the individual's estimation of the probability that a behavior will lead to consequence \( i \), \( e_i \) is the evaluation of consequence \( i \), and \( n \) is the number of beliefs. For purposes of simplification, predicted attitude will be represented in this paper by the expression \( PT(\text{pe}) \), with "PT" referring to "product total".

The use of product totals for the prediction of attitude is but one of several possible methods for combining probability estimates and evaluations. Other possibilities include \( \sum (p + e) \) and \( (\sum p)(\sum e) \). Additive methods are empirically invalid, as the following example illustrates:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
p & e & p+e & pxe \\
1 & +3 & +4 & +3 \\
1 & +3 & +4 & +3 \\
1 & +2 & +3 & +2 \\
6 & -3 & +3 & -18 \\
6 & -2 & +4 & -12 \\
6 & -3 & +3 & -18 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[ \sum p = 21 \quad \sum e = 0 \quad \sum (p+e) = 21 \quad PT(\text{pe}) = -40 \]

\[ \sum p \times \sum e = 0 \]

Since the items considered highly likely are rated very nega-
tively, and those rated as being unlikely are rated positively, the overall attitude should be very negative. The \( (p+e) \) and \( p \times e \) equations predicted positive and neutral attitudes respectively, whereas \( PT(pe) \) predicted a negative attitude. The discrepancies between the predictions of the various methods can be attributed to the fact that the multiplicative method allows for the evaluations corresponding to low probability consequences to be given lower weights than for those corresponding to high probabilities. Also, whereas a negative evaluation always lowers the overall attitude by the method of product totals, it may actually raise the attitude if it is added to a consequence with a high probability, as in the above case.

The normative belief component of the theory entails measuring the actor's beliefs about the likelihood that members of given reference groups expect him to perform the behavior at hand. Each belief is then multiplied by the degree to which the individual is motivated to comply with that respective reference group. Thus, \( SN = (nb_1mc_1) \) where \( nb_i \) refers to an individual's belief about the expectations of referent i, \( mc_i \) is the individual's motivation to comply with that referent, and \( n \) is the number of referents. This expression will be simplified to \( PT(nb \cdot mc) \) for the remainder of this paper.

It has been made clear that normative influences differ from situation to situation, and thus the researcher must be
careful in selecting the relevant reference groups for a given behavior in a given situation. Ajzen and Fishbein (1973) note that the motivation to comply term may be viewed in several ways. First, one may wish to comply or not comply with a given person in general. Or, one may comply or not comply with a specific demand from the individual. For both theoretical and empirical reasons, the more general case is that which should be measured.

Just as the selection of relevant reference groups is dependent upon the given behavior and situation, so also the values of \( w_1 \) and \( w_2 \) will vary according to the kind of behavior, the context in which it is performed, and the characteristics of the performer. Thus, the effects of "other" variables thought to mediate attitude-behavior relationships are incorporated in the model by differentially assigning weights to the attitudinal and normative components of the model. The values of these weights can be ascertained from the regression equations where the two predictors are \( PT(pe) \) and \( PT(nb·mc) \).

Although the intention to perform a behavior is assumed to be the best predictor of overt behavior, Ajzen and Fishbein (1973) note the conditions under which this relationship will be expected to be diminished. As was discussed above, if the behavior is measured long after the behavioral intention is obtained, new information about the consequences of the behavior or normative information may have occurred,
thereby changing the behavioral intention. The authors note that abstract or generalized measures of intention will likewise tend to lower correlations, as will the inclusion of behavior not entirely under the volitional control of the subject.

The effects of unforeseen events and personality characteristics, as stated above, are thought to have an indirect influence on behavior by influencing behavioral intentions either through effecting the attitudinal or normative components of the model or their weights. Likewise, a person's attitude towards the target of the action (e.g. blacks, homosexuals, etc.) is expected to influence behavioral intentions only insofar as it alters these three components. Thus, though a person may have highly prejudiced feelings toward a group, behavior towards the group may not be influenced by this prejudice if the attitudinal component of the model carries a low weight.

**Empirical Support for the Model**

For the Ajzen and Fishbein model to be empirically justified, its several assumptions must be individually tested. First, it must be demonstrated that $\text{ATA} = \text{PT(pe)}$. Second, that the $\text{PT(pe)}$ and $\text{PT(nb·mc)}$ terms, appropriately weighted, closely approximate $\text{BI}$ must be shown. Finally, the critical assumption that $\text{BI} \sim \text{B}$ must be validated if
the model is to have any degree of utility.

\[ \text{ATA} = \text{PT} (\text{pe}) \]

Before providing support for this assumption of the model, it is first relevant to discuss the issues involved in computing the two terms. As was discussed previously, attitude may be assessed by a variety of scales, each of which has methodological considerations. Ajzen and Fishbein have used, as a measure of ATA, several seven-point evaluative semantic differential scales (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1973). The PT(pe) term requires an assessment of belief strength that an object has a given characteristic and an evaluation of that characteristic. The former has been measured on a seven-point probability scale and the latter on a seven-point "good-bad" scale, eg. Kaplan and Fishbein (1969).

A more thorny issue is that of obtaining the beliefs salient to a given object or action. It seems logical to elicit from a given subject his most central beliefs, but this procedure has shown no advantage over that of simply presenting to all subjects a set of primary attributes determined in pre-tests. Kaplan and Fishbein (1969) had each subject rate a standard set of Negro traits, all of the Negro traits previously elicited from the subject, the first six traits given by the individual, and the first nine traits given by the subject. Correlations between the resulting
attitude estimates and a semantic differential attitude score were .37, 121, .32, and .36 respectively. The major reason for the superiority of a standard set of items is that an elicitation procedure encourages individuals to elicit beliefs which are not salient to the attitude hierarchy. For example, in the above study, the subjects may have indicated strong belief that Negroes have two hands, but this belief is probably quite unrelated to attitudes held with respect to Negroes.

Jaccard and Davidson (1972) assessed the relationship between ATA and PT(pe) with respect to the use of birth control pills. ATA was evaluated on a seven-point good-bad scale, and relevant beliefs pertaining to the use of birth control pills were obtained from an independent sample of subjects. Evaluation of the consequences of using the pills were likewise rated on a seven-point good-bad scale. The correlation obtained between the two terms was .792, p<.01.

In a study of voting behavior, Fishbein and Coombs (1974) obtained estimates of attitudes toward political candidates using five bipolar attitude scales. In order to obtain a set of belief statements that would be as salient as possible for the given election and population under consideration, respondents were asked to list the issues and characteristics they thought would be most important in the coming campaign. Each issue or characteristic was evaluated on a good-bad scale, and the perceived support of each can-
didate on each position was measured on a probable-improbable scale. The correlation between ATA and PT(pe) ranged from .69 to .87, thus supporting the model.

In a study similar to that of Kaplan and Fishbein (1969), Fishbein (1963) had subjects rate a standard set of ten traits, and then asked them to give the probability that Negroes were characterized by each of these traits. The value of this procedure is that had the traits been evaluated subsequent to the probability ratings, attitudes towards Negroes may have been influenced the trait evaluations. The semantic differential assessment of attitudes toward Negroes had a .801 correlation with the predicted attitudes obtained from beliefs x evaluation of beliefs.

As a final indication of the validity of the assumption under consideration, Ramsay and Case (1970) had subjects rate each of ten countries on each of ten properties. The properties were rated on a good-bad dimension, and preferences for countries were obtained by having each subject indicate his preference for one of two countries in each of 45 pairs. The validity of the model was assessed by predicting preferences with regression equations using as predictors the differences on properties between the two countries in each pair. The average multiple correlation between the preferences and scale value differences was .85, indicating that the properties and the model were successful in predicting preference judgements.
The use of $p \times e$ product totals as opposed to the sum of belief or attitude scores alone or an additive combination of the two has been justified on theoretical grounds. Several studies have been conducted which provide empirical support for this procedure. In research by Fishbein, Landy and Hatch (1969), $\Xi p$, $\Xi e$ and $PT(pe)$ were correlated with a single-item measure of attitudes towards a co-worker. The correlations were $-.113$, $.325$ and $.361$ respectively. In the Insko, Blake, Cialdini and Mulaik (1970) study, correlations of these three terms with attitude towards the use of birth control were $.44$, $.12$, and $.42$. In this research, the great majority of attitudes were positive. Thus, the multiplication of $p$ by $e$ did not result in increased prediction over and above that provided by $p$ alone. When data was broken into subsets of positive belief-positive attitude, negative belief-positive attitude, positive belief-negative attitude, and negative belief-negative attitude, the correlations of $\Xi p$, $\Xi e$, and $PT(pe)$ became $-.10$, $.07$, and $.41$. It thus may be argued that only in cases where it is known in advance that either all $p$ or $e$ items will be either positive or negative can a simple $\Xi p$ or $\Xi e$ be used in replacement of $PT(pe)$.

**The Prediction of Behavioral Intention from $PT(pe)$ and $Pt(nb\cdot mc)$**

Before reviewing evidence relating to this assumption.
of the model, the procedure for determining the normative (PT(nb.mc)) component will be discussed.

As mentioned previously, the reference groups of importance in any given study will depend upon many factors, including the type of behavior, the conditions in which it is elicited, and the visibility of its performance. Most researchers have specified several reference groups. Acock and DeFleur (1972) and Mezei (1971) selected as their reference groups family and peers in studies of attitudes toward marijuana usage and race vs belief prejudice. Goldstein and Davis (1972), also studying race vs belief prejudice, presented their subjects with six social groups: your parents, your home community, your school friends, your close friends, American society in general, and your friends in general. A different procedure is that of allowing the subject to specify the reference groups relevant to a given situation (eg. DeFleur and Westie, 1958; Ewens and Ehrlich, 1972). In the former, 46 subjects listed 60 reference groups as being influential in their decision-making regarding the signing of photographic releases. Finally, Schwartz and Tessler (1972) used in their study a measure in which subjects were asked "how much the people whose opinions you value most would react if you discussed with them whether or not you should be a transplant donor." Each method may be seen to have merits and disadvantages; as yet, only convention suggests the use of a standard set of groups over the other
two methods.

Normative beliefs in most cases have been measured on seven-point probability scales. Likewise, motivation to comply has been assessed on seven-point scales asking the subject how much he wishes to do what each referent expects of him, from "want very much to" to "want very much not to." Behavior intention is also assessed most frequently on a seven-point probability scale. Jaccard and Davidson, for example, had as their measure: "I intend to use birth control pills:"
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Evidence supporting the general claim of the model is presented in Table I, most of which has been reproduced from Fishbein and Ajzen (1975). It will be observed in Table I that predicted intentions highly correlated with reported intentions, with correlations ranging from .566 to .869.

Thus, there is ample evidence to support the tenet of the model that intention to perform a behavior can be predicted as a sum of the weighted normative and attitudinal components of the model.

Although the Fishbein and Ajzen model is designed to predict intention, its major premise is that intention is the best general predictor of behavior. Table II presents a number of studies in which both intention and behavior have been assessed.

That correlations range in Table II from the relatively
Table I

Multiple Correlation Coefficients for the Prediction of Intentions to Perform Various Behaviors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Intention</th>
<th>Multiple Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fishbein (1966)</td>
<td>Engage in premarital sexual intercourse</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson (1968)</td>
<td>Perform 30 behaviors toward an African Negro</td>
<td>.839*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishbein et al (1970)</td>
<td>Send communications to coworkers</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow the instructions of coworkers</td>
<td>.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajzen and Fishbein (1970)</td>
<td>Perform 8 leisure-time activities</td>
<td>.766*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornik (1970)</td>
<td>Maintain missiles in an experimental game</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajzen and Fishbein (1970)</td>
<td>Choose alternative X or Y in 2 Prisoner's Dillema Games</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajzen (1971b)</td>
<td>Choose alternative X or Y in Prisoner's Dillema Game</td>
<td>.716*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeVries and Ajzen (1971)</td>
<td>Cheat in college</td>
<td>.869*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copy from other student's test paper. Allow other students to copy from one's own paper</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darroch (1971)</td>
<td>Sign two interracial photographic releases</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajzen and Fishbein (1972)</td>
<td>Perform 4 risk behaviors.</td>
<td>.793*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaccard and Davidson (1972)</td>
<td>Use birth control pills.</td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McArdle (1972)</td>
<td>Sign up for alcoholic treatment unit</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glassman (1971)</td>
<td>Buy 8 products.</td>
<td>.665*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Average multiple correlation coefficients.
** From Ajzen and Fishbein (1975), p.310
Table II

Multiple Correlation Coefficients for the Prediction of Behavior from Behavior Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Multiple Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajzen and Fishbein (1970)</td>
<td>Cooperation in Prisoner's Dilemma</td>
<td>.897, .841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajzen (1971)</td>
<td>Cooperation in Prisoner's Dilemma</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornik (1970)</td>
<td>Three strategy conditions, Extended Prisoner's Dilemma game</td>
<td>.867*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darroch (1971)</td>
<td>Interracial picture releases</td>
<td>.462*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajzen and Fishbein (1974)</td>
<td>Communication on triangle board -pre, post</td>
<td>.690, .883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance on triangle board -pre, post</td>
<td>.211, .502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishbein and Coombs (1974)</td>
<td>Vote for goldwater</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for Johnson</td>
<td>.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwartz and Tessler (1972)</td>
<td>Donation of bone marrow</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishbein (1966)</td>
<td>Intention to engage in pre-marital sexual intercourse: Female:</td>
<td>.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male:</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intention to engage in pre-marital sexual intercourse this semester:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female:</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male:</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Average multiple correlation
low .211 to .897 is hardly surprising, given the number of factors which influence this relationship. The data presented above support the notion that the closer in time the two measures are taken, the higher will be the correlation between them. In the Schwartz and Tessler (1972) study, for example, behavioral measures were obtained three months after intention was assessed. The fairly low correlation obtained (.375) may also be due to the fact that the predictors of intention were not analogous to those required by the model. Even when measures are separated by very close time intervals, new information during this period may greatly affect the attitude-behavior relationship. This is seen in the Ajzen and Fishbein (1974) study in which post-test intention was much more highly related to behavior than was pre-test intention. The need for specificity in the measure of intention is shown in the Fishbein (1966) study. Whereas a measure of the general intention to engage in premarital sexual intercourse correlated with actual behavior at the end of the semester .564 and .174 for males and females respectively, the intention to engage in this behavior during the course of the semester produced correlations of .676 and .394. In summary, there is evidence to support the thesis that behavior can be accurately predicted from the model. The size of the correlation between BI and B is expected to vary, however, according to the number and kind of intervening events, the specificity of the measures, and the like.
Critique of the Ajzen and Fishbein Model

Theoretical and empirical support for the Ajzen and Fishbein model has been presented. Of considerable merit is its recognition of the multitude of factors which mediate attitude-behavior relationships and the incorporation of these factors into the two terms of the model. The emphasis upon measuring attitude towards an act when predicting a specific behavior is a second noteworthy contribution of the model. The specificity of the model's terms, however, while being mandatory for high correlations, may also be considered a primary limitation. Since a person may emit any number of behaviors consistent with a given attitude, it may be less important to predict a specific act than to obtain a general range of a person's response probabilities in a given situation. In terms of time specificity, best predictions occur when behavior is obtained immediately after the assessment of intention. It is easily argued that prediction of the immediate future is not nearly so useful as is that of the more distant future. A second problem with the model is that of determining the beliefs and normative groups relevant to attitude and prediction of behavior. To quote Davey (1976), "any serious theory for predicting desires and beliefs requires a quantitative calculus which brings all relevant beliefs and desires into the picture. It is doubtful that such a calculus could ever be constructed." The research cited
above indicates that even given this difficulty, reasonable degrees of accuracy in prediction may be obtained. The point is that though the model has only two terms, the estimation of these components may be laborious and will inevitably entail a certain margin of error.
Chapter III
ATTITUDINAL RESEARCH IN
THE AREA OF HOMOSEXUALITY

In this portion of the paper, attitudinal research in the area of homosexuality will be discussed. There are two reasons for surveying the literature--to examine attitude scales used previously and to make a compendium of beliefs about homosexuals which appear to determine these attitudes.

In the studies reviewed by this author, over thirty attitudinal instruments were employed. Of these, only thirteen were designed to measure attitudes toward homosexuals. The remainder were used to obtain personality characteristics of the raters themselves. The most common research strategy has been that of correlating scores on tests assessing variables such as sexual conservatism (Brown and Amoroso, 1975; Dunbar, Brown and Amoroso, 1973), acceptance of self and others (Sobel, 1976), sexual permissiveness (MacDonald, 1974), etc. with attitudes toward homosexuals. The thrust of research has been to ascertain the traits of those holding negative attitudes toward homosexuals rather than an assessment of attitudes per se. The scales have been appropriately labeled scales of Homophobia (Smith, 1971), Homosexophobia (Levitt and Klassen, 1974), Index of Homophobia (Hudson and Ricketts, 1979) and Anti-Homosexual (Dunbar, Brown and Amoroso, 1973).
Determining the characteristics of those holding prejudicial attitudes has some theoretical merit. However, in the field of homosexual research, this strategem has been employed at the expense of failing to develop adequate attitude scales with respect to homosexuals, as the literature review will soon indicate. The great variability in the obtained correlations of "homophobia" reported in the literature is due at least in part to inadequacies in attitude assessment.

**Attitude Scales**

**National Survey Data**

Levitt and Klassen (1974) reported the results of two-hour interviews administered to a nation-wide probability sample of 3,018 American adults, a portion of which assessed the public's attitude towards homosexuality.

Consistent with their general finding that the majority of Americans consider extra-marital sex always wrong, the authors found the majority to express moral repugnance for sexual behavior between members of the same sex. This moral disapproval was supplemented by the advocacy of a substantial majority of those polled of discrimination against homosexuals in professions involving influence and authority. Three-quarters felt that jobs such as ministers, school teachers and judges should be denied homosexuals, whereas two-thirds felt they should be barred from medicine and governmental service. Beliefs associated with these discriminatory inten-
tions included: homosexuals seek out children for sexual purposes (35% strongly agreed); they are a high risk in government jobs (60% agreed); and they corrupt coworkers (40% agreed). Half of the respondents felt that homosexuals corrupt and can cause the downfall of society, and two-thirds said that they find homosexuality very much obscene and vulgar to them. Another stereotype which emerged from the data was the view that homosexuals act like members of the opposite sex (70% agreed).

An the area of gay rights, Levitt and Klassen found the following: 75% of the sample objected to homosexuals dancing in public; 46% felt that they should not be allowed to organize for social and recreational purposes; and 43% would not permit bars to serve homosexuals. However, 74% felt that they should be allowed to form organizations to deal with their social problems, and 80% disagreed with a policy of discrimination from church membership. Interestingly, 68% "cautiously asserted" that "what consenting adults do in private is no one else's business." However, when asked their opinion of laws in Connecticut which do not forbid sex acts between persons of the same sex, 60% disapproved of such laws, feeling that there should be laws against such behavior. This figure is more than double that of those favoring such a law against heterosexual intercourse between unmarried adults.

In terms of causes and cures of homosexuality, 62% said
that is is a sickness which can be cured. Forty-two per cent felt that many young homosexuals became that way because of older homosexuals, but less than 30% felt that a failure to attract the opposite sex resulted in homosexuality. Other explanations included that some are born that way (30%) or that some are raised that way by their parents (40%).

The Levitt and Klassen study is a particularly valuable one, both because of its large sample size and sampling distribution and because it is one of the few available works in which public attitudes are actually reported. These data suggest that the prevalent perception of homosexuals is that of immoral, potentially dangerous and sick people whose behavior should be legally restricted. Although the authors do provide a set of five Thurstone-scaled items called the "Homosexophobia Scale," the clear value of the study lies in the accumulation of the opinions reported above.

It must be noted that personal interview data are prone to bias, a fact which is suggested by the contradiction inherent in the simultaneous advocacy of laws against private sex behavior and the statement that "what consenting adults do in private is no one else's business."

Nyberg and Alston (1976) likewise analyzed data from a probability sample of noninstitutionalized American adults conducted by the National Opinion Research Center. Unlike the previous study, only one item in the survey related to homosexuality: "what do you think about relations between
two adults of the same sex-- do you think that it is always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all?" Consistent with Levitt and Klassen's findings, 72% of the sample believed that homosexual relations were always wrong. Although no sex differences were found, college education, being non-religious or Jewish, being young, and living in large urban areas were associated with smaller percentages of respondents checking the "always wrong" category. A major conclusion of the article was that in spite of public relations efforts of gay rights groups, media exposure, and the removal by the APA of homosexuality from its list of psychiatric disorders, public disapproval of homosexual sex apparently did not change during the four-year period between the data collection of Levitt and Klassen in 1972 and the Nyberg and Alston research. Given that the question assesses beliefs about the morality of homosexual sex rather than affective responses to homosexual persons, this result is not surprising. It is possible that whereas attitudes toward the morality of homosexual behavior did not change, changes in feelings about gay people and their civil rights status may have been affected by the Gay Rights Movement.

A unique and valuable study in the area of attitudes toward homosexuals is that of Simmons (1965). In the first portion of the study, he asked 180 subjects selected by a quota formula to "list those things or types of persons whom you regard as deviant." Although a huge variety of acts and
persons was obtained, homosexuals were the most often mentioned group, being indicated by 49% of the sample. A group of 89 students was asked to stereotype beatniks, adulterers, homosexuals, and political radicals. Seventy traits were extracted via content analysis, including positive, negative, and neutral attributes. Then, 134 subjects selected on a quota sampling basis were asked to indicate which of these traits applied to each group. Traits ascribed to homosexuals were, in order of their popularity: sexually abnormal (72%); perverted (52%); mentally ill (40%); maladjusted (40%); effeminate (29%); lonely (22%); insecure (21%); immoral (16%); repulsive (14%); weakminded (12%); lacking self-control (12%); sensual (11%); secretive (11%); oversexed (10%); dangerous (10%); sinful (10%); and sensitive (10%).

The Simmons study in the only one known to this author in which subjects were allowed to give their own stereotypes as opposed to indicating agreement with pre-selected traits. Although 70 traits were presented from which subjects could choose, they were encouraged to add any words of their own if they considered them descriptively important. Few did so. This method has the advantage of allowing subjects to give the most salient traits associated with homosexuals. As suggested in a previous portion of this paper, all people would agree that homosexuals have arms and legs, but assuredly this fact would have had no weight in determining overall attitudes toward gays. It is probably this difference in as-
essment which accounts for the differences in results between this study and that by Levitt and Klassen. Whereas immoral, sick, dangerous, and obscene were traits obtaining high levels of endorsement in the Levitt and Klassen research, only the mentally ill characteristic was frequently applied in the Simmons study. Dangerous and repulsive were traits listed spontaneously by only a few subjects.

One striking aspect of the Simmons study is that virtually all of the traits listed by subjects had negative connotations. It is well-known that many of the world's great creative geniuses were homosexual, and it is interesting that this artistic stereotype was ignored. It is possible that the context of rating five deviant groups created a negative response set. It may also be that the generally negative images of homosexuals are insular to the extent that more positive traits are selectively ignored.

In a study by Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier (1974), it was stated that "Of the cultural stereotypes ascribed to homosexuals, seemingly the most prevalent is that of viewing the homosexual as 'sick'. Also common is the 'swish' stereotype......Finally, there is the stereotype that homosexuals are dangerous." (p.54) Accordingly, these authors had 373 students rate on a six-point scale their agreement with the sick, swish, and danger stereotypes for male and female homosexuals respectively. Results indicated that 86% of the subjects had moderate or high agreement with the sick stereo-
type, 53% with the danger stereotype, and 40% with the swish stereotype. The authors also administered a ten-item social distance scale, ranging from "would allow to live in my nation" to "would have as a close friend." Data were collected with male and female homosexuals specified. The results are presented in Table III.

In examining the results presented in Table III, it is noteworthy that even in a traditionally liberal environment, social distance scores were so high. Less than half of the men would allow male homosexuals to be on a first-name basis with them, join campus social organizations, or sit next to them during class lectures. An explanation of these results is that these verbal behavioral intentions are largely under the control of perceived negative social norms with respect to homosexuals. It is likely that discrimination would not occur in face-to-face encounters. Another contributing factor is the lack of specificity of the target element of the scale items (male or female homosexual). Given the high number of respondents holding negative images of homosexuals, it is likely that social distance scores are based on a theoretical person corresponding to these stereotypes. Given that few homosexuals in reality conform to this characterization, it would be expected that low correspondence would obtain between the measured behavioral intentions and overt behavior with respect to specific situations and individuals. An important point which may be made here is that social distance
Table III
Percentage Distribution of Social Distance Scale Items for Each of Four Subsamples*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collapsed Rejection Category</th>
<th>% agreement</th>
<th>Male Target</th>
<th>Female Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Male S's</td>
<td>Female S's</td>
<td>Male S's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Would have as a close friend</td>
<td>6.1 7.8 18.6 15.5</td>
<td>4.9 9.8 8.1 16.5</td>
<td>26.8 24.5 33.7 33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Would invite home to spend Easter vacation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Would support if running for an office in a campus election.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Would work with on class assignments.</td>
<td>32.9 38.2 45.3 47.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Would sit next to during a class lecture.</td>
<td>31.7 61.8 54.7 55.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Would allow to join a campus organization to which I belong.</td>
<td>46.3 64.7 57.0 57.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Would have as someone who calls me by my first name.</td>
<td>47.6 66.7 61.6 68.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Would allow to take part in campus social activities.</td>
<td>61.0 78.4 67.4 77.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Would allow to attend my university.</td>
<td>76.8 94.1 86.0 91.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Would allow to live in my nation.</td>
<td>86.6 95.1 93.0 93.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

scores are not expected to be a good index of attitudes toward homosexuals. Given that association with known homosexuals is apt to result in suspicion and potential social ridicule, a person may have neutral or sympathetic attitudes yet still prefer to maintain social distance from homosexuals.

Three studies of attitudes of mental health professionals toward homosexuals have been reported. Fort, Steiner and Conrad (1971) collected a random sample of 163 therapists in private practice in San Francisco. Sixty-four per cent of the 147 therapists responding to a questionnaire stated that they did not consider homosexuality an illness or disease. When asked if it were possible for homosexuals to function effectively, 98% responded affirmatively. Likewise, 99% opposed laws against consenting adult sexual behavior. In terms of employment, 27% supported discrimination from security-sensitive federal employment, 12% for the armed services, 8% for teaching positions, 2% for civilian federal employment, and 5% for other employment.

Davison and Wilson (1973) sent a 35-item questionnaire and ten seven-point scales to 224 members of the Association of Behavior Therapy and the British Behavior Therapy Association. Only 86 (38%) were returned. Of relevance to this topic, 87% of the respondents did not consider homosexuality as prima facie evidence of psychopathology, and 91% felt it possible for homosexuals to be happy and well adjusted. The semantic differential scales used the following concepts in
rating both homosexuality and heterosexuality: good-bad; relaxed-tense; dominant-submissive; masculine-feminine; moral-immoral; deep-shallow; rational-irrational; dynamic-static; active-passive; and stable-changeable. In all cases, homosexuality was rated as "worse off" than heterosexuality, but the significance of these differences was not reported. The average distance between the two groups was approximately 1.5 scale points.

A much more limited survey was conducted by Barr and Catts (1974) who polled 100 psychiatrists and 93 psychiatric trainees. Of three choices pertaining to the normalcy of homosexuality, 35% and 13% of the psychiatrists and trainees respectively selected one stating, "homosexuality is a neurotic disorder," 52% and 60% chose, "homosexuality is a developmental anomaly not necessarily or commonly associated with neurotic symptoms," and 13% and 21% stated that "homosexuality is a normal variant like left-handedness."

Specific Attitude Scales

The Attitude Toward Homosexuality Scale (ATHS), developed by MacDonald and Huggins (1972), has generated studies assessing attitudes toward homosexuals (MacDonald, Huggins, Young and Swanson, 1973; MacDonald, 1974a; MacDonald and Games, 1974; MacDonald, 1976). The scale was developed by administering 30 statements presumed to reflect evaluative attitudes toward homosexuality to 59 social work students.
Two were dropped for low correlations with the total score. The remaining 28 items, rated on a nine-point Likert scale, were administered to 101 university students and 23 members of a homophile organization for an assessment of the validity of the scale. Means were 49.09 and 67.67 respectively, the difference between the two being significant. An internal reliability coefficient of .93 was reported for the ATHS.

Sample items from the ATHS are presented in Appendix I. As can be seen, beliefs are assessed with respect to homosexuals as a general group. Feeling that most people think of male homosexuals when the term "homosexual" is employed, MacDonald specified male and female homosexual in subsequent research, thereby creating from the earlier scale an ATHSF and ATHSM scale.

In his 1974 study, MacDonald administered the ATHSM and ATHSF to 197 undergraduates. Also employed were two sets of semantic differential scales designed to measure an Evaluative and Potency dimension. The former included the pairs sociable-unsociable, bad-good, kind-cruel, and selfish-unselfish, and the latter included strong-weak, constrained-free, severe-lenient, and soft-hard. The term "man", "woman", "homosexual man" and "homosexual woman" were rated on seven-point scales on each of these bipolar concepts. Results indicated high reliability for both the ATHSF and ATHSM, with alphas being .90 for both. Of interest are the correlations between the evaluative semantic differential ratings and the scores
from the attitude scales, since both theoretically measure the same dimension. Correlations between the two for male homosexuals and lesbians were -.31 and -.26 respectively. Although both correlations are statistically significant, they are considerably lower than those typically reported by Ajzen and Fishbein in their research. A likely explanation for the relatively low correlations is that some of the beliefs assessed by the scales probably have little attitudinal impact. The item, "homosexuals are very unhappy people who wish they could be heterosexual" may be endorsed by many respondents with neutral attitudes or favorable ones toward homosexuals. Further, some items refer to homosexuality while others refer to homosexuals. While people may be repulsed by homosexual acts or find them immoral, they may respond to people whose behavioral repertoires include these acts quite differently.

As in the MacDonald research, attitudes toward homosexuals were assessed in research by Morin (1974) by means of semantic differentials. Thirteen concepts (bisexual, me, homosexual, lesbian, gay person, woman, queer, boy, girl, man, dyke, queen, homophobic) were rated on each of sixteen adjectives selected to reflect Evaluative, Potency, and Activity dimensions. Pairs included fast-slow, honest-dishonest, large-small, heavy-light, rugged-delicate, kind-cruel, active-passive, sharp-dull, nice-awful, clean-dirty, beautiful-ugly, pleasant-unpleasant, strong-weak, sacred-
profane, hot-cold, and good-bad. Scores for analysis consisted of the scale distance for each adjective between the ratings given for the concept and an "ideal person."

Ratings were made before and after an educational program. Of interest here is the fact that although some of the concepts referred to the same stimulus person (e.g., homosexual, gay person, queer, queen), ratings differed considerably (for the concepts above: 5.63, 6.06, 6.15, 6.94). These findings indicate that the choice of terms used to describe the stimulus may determine to a large extent the evaluation of that stimulus. As Allport (1954) has discussed, labels acquire negative meanings in children before the referents of the labels are associated with them. Aside from the conditioned responses to terms, differential ratings may be a result of different groups evoked by the terms. "Gay person" may be associated with political activism, "queen" with cross-dressing and effeminate behavior, and so on.

The technique of measuring the distance of the rating of a concept from that given an "ideal person" is of dubious merit. In a sexist society, the traits of an ideal person are highly sex-related. On the "rugged-delicate" adjective pair, it is likely that many respondents would prefer that men be rugged and that women be delicate. The "ideal" person might be given a mid-score in that dimension as a compromise. If a homosexual man is rated as delicate, the large difference between actual and ideal for a man would be at-
tenuated by use of the ideal person rating.

Another scale assessing attitudes toward homosexuals is the anti-homosexual (anti-H) scale designed by Dunbar, Brown and Amoroso (1973). This scale was designed to tap affective responses toward, rather than knowledge of, homosexuality, and initial items were drawn from the California F scale, a Psychology Today survey, and major tenets of Gay Lib groups in North America. Of this pool of items, fifteen were selected for inclusion in a preliminary scale, and one was dropped after item analysis. These items, rated on a six-point Likert format, are presented in Appendix II.

Internal consistency was assessed for the scale by computing part-whole correlations and alpha coefficients for a group of 126 college students in Canada. Correlations between each item and the total score were above .40 for all with the exception of one which was subsequently dropped. The alpha coefficient was .86. The scale was used in subsequent research (Dunbar, Brown and Vuorinen, 1973; Brown and Amoroso, 1975; and Turnbull and Brown, 1977) with samples from Brazil and the West Indies, but scale characteristics were not included in either report.

An examination of the items of the scale presented in Appendix II reveals a number of methodological flaws which mitigate the utility of the scale as an assessment device. As was the case with the ATHS scale, both homosexuals and
homosexuality serve as targets in the scale. Also, items assess beliefs about the morality of homosexuality and its legal status, none of which are expected to have high correlations, a priori, with affective responses to homosexuals per se. This issue will be discussed in more detail below. A number of items contain several beliefs (e.g. "Homosexuality is a rotten perversion and ought to be suppressed.") , and it is conceivable that respondents could agree with one of the percepts and not the other.

In reviewing the above studies, the effect of the lack of specificity in the target element has been discussed. In a study by Glassner and Owen (1976), social distance measures were assessed for the general target "homosexual" and for a specific homosexual described in a vignette in which the sex of the homosexual was unspecified or indicated as either male or female. The social distance measures included the following four items: would work with a homosexual, the government should give clearance to homosexuals, would hire a homosexual, and would not be upset if a family member were homosexual. The 61 subjects in the study were given response options of agree, disagree and other. Results indicated that specifying an individual rather than a category led to large differences in social distance ratings on several measures. Whereas 75% of the subjects said that they would work with a homosexual, only 36% said that they would work with the character in the vignette (sex unspecified). Like-
wise, 30% of them would not be upset if a family member were
the male character in the vignette whereas only 21% would
not be upset if a family member were homosexual. Thus, the
results clearly indicate that attitude towards homosexuals,
as assessed in this relatively small set of social distance
items, does depend to some extent upon the specificity of
the homosexual target. Further, increasing the specificity
will not in all cases make attitudes more or less favorable.
This will depend upon the characteristics of the individual
or sub-group specified.

A further study in which attitudes toward homosexuality
were measured was that by Sobel (1976). In his Attitudes
Toward Homosexuality Scale, sixteen items from the Sorenson
Survey Questionnaire were used which had previously been
validated. These items, rated on a five-point Likert-type
scale, were administered to 41 male subjects to obtain re-
liability coefficients. Cronbach's alpha coefficient for
internal consistency for this sample was .75. In a subse-
quently sample of 50 adolescent males, the coefficient was .85.
Scale items and results are presented in Appendix II.

Although the validity of this scale was not reported in
the Sobel study, the data provided are useful in terms of
suggesting beliefs which may be salient in the determination
of attitudes toward homosexuals. Of the subjects, 54% agreed
with the perspective that homosexual behavior reflects emo-
tional disturbance, whereas 23% disagreed. Forty-one per
cent felt sexual activity between members of the same sex to be immoral, as opposed to 39% who did not. Interestingly, although 44% of the subjects agreed that homosexuality is wrong under all circumstances, 53% reported that sex between consenting adults is all right, and 70% felt that homosexuals should not be legally punished. These findings have very important implications. They suggest that attitudes toward an act or the people performing it may not be accurate predictors of support for legal prescriptions of that act. If the scale purports to assess attitudes toward homosexuals, and if negative attitudes may be held concomitant to support for legal rights, then the latter should not be used as part of the initial attitude measurement. In any case, these relatively recent data suggest that large segments of the population still adhere to the sickness/immoral conception of homosexuality and find it personally disgusting, but approve of the right of consenting adults to engage in this behavior.

One of several other scales to be reviewed in this section includes the Homophobia (H-scale) developed by Smith (1971). The intent of the scale was to measure negative or fearful responding to homosexuality. Nine items, the selection criteria for which was not reported, are included in the scale. Response options for each item consist of "agree" or "disagree"; total scores may range from zero to nine. Reliability coefficients for the scale, the items of which are presented in Appendix IV, were not reported.
The H-scale suffers from the obvious difficulty of few items and no gradation of support for each statement to be rated. Many of the prominent beliefs about homosexuals discussed previously are not included in the scale, and the probability that the scale yields a general attitude towards homosexuals is low. Of use, however, are the responses to some of the items. Only 12% of the 42 respondents felt that homosexuals should be locked up to protect society (danger stereotype). Approximately 70% said that they should be allowed to hold government jobs, with 57% stating that a homosexual could make a good president. Likewise, 57% said that they would not be afraid for their child to have a homosexual teacher (perversion of youth stereotype). Still, almost 50% of the respondents found the act itself disgusting. Given that the respondents were students enrolled in psychology classes, liberal findings are not surprising. What is important is that the students in general were far more approving of the rights of homosexuals to live and work in society than they were of homosexual behavior.

In spite of the limitations of the H-scale, its use in research has produced significant findings. Karr (1978) administered a modified form to 90 male college students previous to experimental procedures. In the experiment, subjects in one condition were told that one member of a group (a confederate) was homosexual, whereas the same confederate in a control condition was given a more neutral
label. Dependent variables included seating distance from the labelee, communications received by the labelee in a group communication task, group problem-solving efficiency, semantic differential ratings of group members, and preference rankings of group members. Persons scoring in the homophobic range on the H-scale sat further from the person labeled homosexual, worked less efficiently on the problem solving task, and rated the labelee as being less masculine in the experimental than in the control condition.

Aside from the findings pertaining to the H-scale, this study is important in that it demonstrates the effects of the homosexual label on a variety of responses to an individual so labeled. Overall ratings of the same person shifted from "most preferred" to "least preferred" when the homosexual label was applied.

Lumby (1976) also developed a modified version of Smith's scale in which the previous yes/no categories were extended to five-point scales. The scale also included several attitudinal items from the Levitt and Klassen (1974) work. Lumby administered scale items to 120 middle-class male subjects from metropolitan, rural and urban areas of Illinois, sixty of which were heterosexual and sixty of which were homosexual. It was reasoned that if Smith's items measured dread of being in close quarters with homosexuals, then the heterosexuals should score higher on the scale than should the homosexuals.

Responses to scale items which achieved significant
differences are indicated in Appendix IV. Although differences are significant, it should be noted that subjects did not express clear agreement with any of the items. This may be due to the fact that all subjects had agreed to participate in a study in which erotic photographs would be viewed, thereby producing perhaps a more liberal sample than would otherwise have been the case.

Examination of the scale items reveals that some items refer to affective responses to homosexuals as well as to homosexual acts, beliefs about homosexuals, and intentions to interact with homosexuals. Thus, scale items lack content validity in terms of the intent of the scale, which is to measure homophobia. No reliability or validity data were included in the report.

One of the final scales to be reviewed in this paper is the Homosexuality Attitude Scale (Millham, San Miguel and Kellogg, 1976), which is presented in Appendix V. Recognizing that cognitive reactivity to homosexuals is multidimensional, the authors included items pertaining to emotional reactivity to homosexuals, their status under the law, their mental health, moral-ethical aspects of homosexuality, and acceptance of various behavioral stereotypes. Dual forms were made, specifying male on one and female on the other as the sex of the homosexual. The resulting 76 items, scored in a true-false format, were administered to 795 heterosexual undergraduates.
Principal components analyses were performed for each target, revealing six factors: repressive-dangerous, personal-anxiety, preference for female over male homosexuals, cross-sexed mannerisms, moral reprobation, and preference for male over female homosexuals. Males in the sample obtained significantly higher scores on the Personal Anxiety-male target but significantly lower scores on the Personal Anxiety-female target factor. Males likewise advocated more repression against male homosexuals. Thus, the results suggested that people experience more anxiety in the presence of same-sexed as opposed to opposite-sexed homosexuals. Another factor which appeared to influence anxiety was experience with a homosexual. Subjects who had had a male or female homosexual friend or relative obtained significantly lower scores on personal anxiety, advocacy of repression, and advocacy of moral reprobation for both male and female targets. No effects of ethnic background, marital status, or geographical background were found.

The research above is important in demonstrating that responses to homosexuality are composed of separate and independent factors, thereby justifying the criticism of scales collapsing beliefs about homosexuals, homosexuality, and legal and moral issues into one bipolar scale. Also of importance is its specification of male and female targets. The utility of the scale is mitigated by several factors. Content validity for the "Personal Anxiety" factor is ques-
tionable; the items "Male homosexuals are sick," "Male homosexuals should be allowed to teach young children," and "Male homosexuality is a perversion" which load on this factor are beliefs which are inconsistent with both the scale title and the general concept of negative emotional responsiveness in the presence of homosexuals. As has been noted by Hudson and Ricketts (1979), items which do belong on a homophobia measure are not so-weighted on the scale. Aside from the fact that the Personal Anxiety Scale is not purely affective, it has been criticized for its inability to measure degree of response for a particular item and ambiguity in the wording of some items.

A study in which the Homosexuality Attitude Scale (HAS) was employed was conducted by San Miguel and Millham (1976). Prior to the study, subjects were rated on the Repressive-Dangerous factor. In one experimental condition, subjects were asked to participate in pairs in another research project while waiting for the current one to begin. This project entailed an interaction task with a partner, who was in reality a confederate. Outcomes were manipulated such that half of the outcomes were positive and the other half were negative. Subsequent to this task, the experimental subjects were led to believe that their partner was either homosexual or heterosexual and either similar to or dissimilar to themselves. The experimental task entailed rating the partner on his performance as an interviewer. Since payment
of the interviewer was purportedly determined by a subject's rating, this rating was also considered a measure of aggression. In another experimental condition, subjects received no interaction prior to the experimental task. The first phase of research for these subjects thus entailed leading them to believe that the interviewer was homosexual or heterosexual and similar to or dissimilar to themselves.

Results indicated that subjects with a negative attitude towards homosexuals rated the similar homosexual interviewer significantly lower than the dissimilar interviewer, whereas the heterosexual target was rated significantly higher in the similar condition. Whereas a positive previous interaction outcome attenuated "aggression" (low ratings) in neutral subjects, negative attitude subjects aggressed highly towards a homosexual target regardless of the previous outcome of previous interaction with the homosexual. Consistent with the findings of the Karr study, subjects in this research showed increased negative responsiveness when the target was identified as homosexual.

The use of interviewer ratings (attitudes) as a measure of aggression (a behavior) in this study is invalid. Subjects were told to evaluate the performance and were given the additional information that this evaluation would determine the interviewer's payment. Subjects may have been more anxious in the presence of the homosexual interviewer, a factor which caused them to lower their ratings. Another
possibility is that although performances were seen as adequate by the subjects, they may have lowered their ratings as an expression of aggression. It is impossible to determine which was the case. The study is, however, valuable in that it does indicate that general responsiveness to a target is more negative when that target is given a homosexual label.

The HAS also was employed by Weinberg and Millham (1978) in their research assessing the influence of subjects' identity with traditional role behavior, beliefs about the equality between the sexes, and attitudes and beliefs concerning deviations in sexual orientation. Results of the study included the finding of three factors describing beliefs and attitudes toward homosexuality, only one of which was congruent with an overall "homophobic" style. The multi-dimensionality of attitudes concerning homosexuality was thus affirmed. It was also found that persons who perceived themselves as incongruent with traditional sex roles reacted less negatively toward others who deviate from established value patterns than do persons who described themselves in traditional sex role terms. Another general finding was that homophobic responding was more a function of concern about distinctions between masculinity and femininity than beliefs about the equality of the sexes.

The last scale to be reviewed in this report is the Index of Homophobia (IHP) devised by Hudson and Ricketts
(1979). In their research, the authors were careful to distinguish the domain of responses to homosexuality, which they refer to as homonegativism, from affective responses to homosexuals, which they refer to as homophobia. The former category includes beliefs about the morality, legality and social desirability of homosexual acts. The latter subsumes the spectrum of feelings experienced in the presence of gay people. As such, the 25 items of the IHP are intended to assess affective responses to homosexual persons. These items are presented in Appendix VI.

The IHP provides scores ranging from 0 to 100 and places a respondent into one of the four categories; high and low-grade non-homophobic, and high and low-grade homophobic. The reliability and validity of the scale were assessed by administering it to 300 university students and to faculty members from the School of Social Work. The alpha coefficient was .90, reflecting high reliability for the scale. The standard error of measurement was low (4.75).

Construct validity for the scale was assessed by administering a sexual attitude scale as a criterion variable. It was reasoned that persons who are conservative in the expression of human sexuality would tend to be more homophobic. The .53 correlation between scores on the two scales supports this hypothesis and is used as evidence for the construct validity of the scale.

The authors also predicted that highly homophobic in-
dividuals would have in their backgrounds social learning and training which would make them more susceptible to a variety of personal problems. To test this hypothesis, a psycho-social screening questionnaire was administered to all respondents, on which they were to rate a variety of problem areas on a five-point scale. It was reasoned that if the hypothesis were correct, correlations between scores on the IHP and the 20 problem areas assessed would be either low and statistically insignificant or high and statistically significant (as opposed to negative and statistically significant). Results indicated that on only one of the 20 items was a negative correlation obtained. It should be noted, however, that the correlations were in general quite low, the highest being .244.

In terms of the content validity of the scale, items demanding judgements concerning the morality of homosexuality, decisions about personal relationships involving homosexuals, and responses involving beliefs, legality and desirability can not be deemed valid. Four items were found in the authors' inspection of the items which fell into these categories. These were items 12, which represented a decision about social relations, 18 and 20 which represented preference statements, and 21, which was a judgement concerning one's sexual status.

Factorial validity of the scale was assessed by correlating each of the IHP scores with the total IHP and SAS
scores. It was reasoned that if the IHP is factorially valid, individual scores would correlate more highly with the IHP total than with a different scale. This was found to be true with all but one IHP item, with virtually all the item-total correlations being statistically significant.

In discussing the IHP, it must be emphasized that the scale is intended to measure negative affect towards homosexuals and is thus not a general attitude scale. Even so, the content validity of several items remains dubious. The item, "I would feel uncomfortable being seen in a gay bar," for example, has no bearing on affective responses to homosexuals. Many homosexuals would not want to be seen in a gay bar for a host of reasons unrelated to anxiety or dread of being in the presence of homosexuals. Likewise, the item assessing the belief that one would feel uncomfortable upon learning of same-sex attractions of the spouse does not appear valid. It is more likely that the respondent would fear loss of the spouse more than the aspect of living in close quarters with a homosexual. Item 23, which states, "I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my best friend was homosexual," may also be criticized. Given that homosexuals are subject to discrimination, acts of violence and the like, uncomfortableness may reflect concern for the well-being of the friend rather than negative affect towards homosexuals. The relatively high correlations between these items and total IHP scores suggests that the contingencies
listed above apply to relatively few persons. However, in all cases it is the person tolerant of homosexuals whose scores would be affected, and for this group, the negative bias may be of import. In any case, the face validity of the scale has not been convincingly demonstrated.

**Behavioral and Physiological Measures of Responses to Homosexuals**

Although the majority of studies in the area of attitudes toward homosexuals have employed verbal attitudinal measures, several have had criterion variables employing behavioral and physiological measures respectively. As in the Karr (1978) study, Barrios, Corbitt, Estes and Topping (1976) measured the distance a subject sat from an experimental confederate identified in a brief written character sketch as a self-pronounced bisexual or not so identified in an otherwise identical character sketch. Results indicated that subjects in the stigmatized condition sat significantly further away from persons identified as bisexual \(p < .05\) and that subjects sat closer to a female confederate than to a male, regardless of imputed sexual preference \(p < .01\). A limitation of the findings results from the fact that no condition was included controlling for sexual content. As the authors noted, the differences in interaction distances may be due to the sexual content of the interview.
rather than to bisexuality per se. The effect of sex differences in interaction suggests that attitudinal research employing the term "homosexual" should specify the sex of the homosexual. The main concern of the study, however, is its use of a non-verbal measure presumed to tap attitudes.

Millham and Weinberger (1977) assessed how information pertaining to the sexual orientation and sex-role behavior of an individual described in a character sketch would influence willingness of subjects to interact with this individual in three interaction conditions (self-disclosure, cooperation and competition). Subjects were classified on the basis of sex-role identity prior to the experiment. Results indicated that subjects were less willing to interact with a homosexual target, with males being significantly less willing than females. Whereas subjects were more willing to interact with role-congruent than role-incongruent female homosexuals, role incongruence did not influence ratings for male homosexuals. Interestingly, when role behavior was incongruent with anatomical sex, ratings did not decrease if the target was described as heterosexual. Subjects preferred not to interact with male homosexuals, regardless of their role congruence.

The dependent measure used in the study, willingness to interact with a homosexual, was in actuality a belief rather than a behavior. The study is, however, mentioned here because the methodology would easily lend itself to actual
behavioral assessment. In the Karr (1978) study mentioned previously, behavior with respect to homosexuals was assessed in a group interaction task. In this study, the number of communications received by the target in experimental and control conditions did not differ, in spite of the fact that semantic differential and preference ratings were significantly different for the two conditions. Thus, attitudes and beliefs did not seem to be correlated with actual behavior in this study.

VanderKolk (1976) in his study asked 20 college students to rank eleven labels of disability and deviancy by desirability of acquisition and then had them verbalize these labels. In the latter condition, the Psychological Stress Evaluator, an instrument which measures a person's affective responses by charting voice modulations, was employed. Results indicated little consistency between measured stress and ranking of the labels. For example, the term "black" was found second highest in the stress list but also second highest in desirability of acquisition. The inconsistency found may be a result of dishonesty in ratings, due largely to social influences. Another possibility is that the labels have conditioned affective responses quite independent of intellectual judgements of the actual persons corresponding to the label. "One-arm amputee" is a term infrequently used, and a stress response is far less likely to have been acquired than to one such as "black", which is paired almost daily in
the media with undesirable events. Perhaps a more useful use of the PSE would be that of rating the same set of sentences spoken in the presence of members of the categories listed above. In spite of the methodological considerations, the study is valuable because it suggests the possibility of refining a technique for assessing affective responses which does not employ the more typical attitude scale.

**Summary and Discussion**

The research in the area of attitudes toward homosexuals has been surveyed to provide data concerning beliefs and attitudes with respect to this group and to examine approaches to their measurement. A number of methodological problems mitigate the utility of the scales presented, the most salient of which were:

1.) Failure to provide validity and reliability statistics

2.) The inclusion of items pertaining to both homosexuals and homosexuality

3.) The inclusion of items rating responses to legal and moral issues as well as affective responses toward homosexuals in a single bipolar continuum

4.) Intuitive rather than empirical selection of scale items

As was mentioned at the beginning of this section of
the paper, the purpose of the scales listed above has been that of distinguishing individuals who exhibit negative evaluations of homosexuals from those who do not. The IHP appears to be a promising tool in this respect. Two major points pertaining to the utility of these scales need to be made. The first is that scales of this sort do not measure attitudes toward homosexuals but rather evaluations of being in their presence or interacting with them. The second and more important point is that no data has ever been collected demonstrating the utility of the data provided by "homophobia" scales or more general attitude scales with respect to homosexuals. It is expected that persons who verbally express dread of interacting with homosexuals will in fact differ in their behavior toward this group from those who do not express this aversion. If they do not, then there is no practical reason of much import for collecting such data.

The attitudinal research presented in this paper suggests that attitude-behavior consistency studies utilizing any of the above scales would produce low correlations. Reasons for this expectation are as follows:

1.) In no case did a scale assess attitudes toward a specific behavior with respect to homosexuals as opposed to homosexual acts or people. Further, neither the time nor situational elements were specified. Given the diverse images associated with the term "homosexual", even the target element is loosely spe-
cified. Some authors have specified male or female homosexuals as target elements, but undoubtedly responses will vary as a function of the great latitude of stereotypes associated with each sex.

2.) Of great import in the study of homosexuality is the concept of norms. Because most homosexuals are not readily identifiable by appearance, fraternizing with known homosexuals or acts supporting them are generally taken as evidence of homosexuality. Thus, one may have sympathetic attitudes but non-supportive behavior in certain situations because of normative influences. One would expect the verbal threshold to be lower than the behavioral in a more liberal college setting, thereby producing inflated attitudinal scores. However, due to the particular stigma attached to homosexuality in our society, this may not be so even in a verbal domain. It may well be that persons scoring in the homophobic range would not hesitate to interact with homosexuals in face-to-face encounters. The ways in which norms and situational factors interact to influence attitude and attitude-behavior relationships with respect to homosexuals is as yet unknown. However, it is clear that any prediction of behavior from attitude scores must take this factor into account.

3.) The scales reviewed in this paper included both "yes/no" and Likert-type response formats. The latter
clearly allows more precision in terms of assessing belief strength. However, in no case was a scale constructed such that beliefs were evaluated. As was previously mentioned, many beliefs may be strongly held but irrelevant to the attitude in question.

In summary, research in the area of homosexuality has indicated that the majority of Americans have negative and disapproving images of homosexuals. Inadequacies in assessment have been noted, but by far a more important issue is that of the utility of scores on "homophobia" scales in predicting behavior.
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Introduction

A major percept of this paper has been that the value of assessing attitudes lies primarily in the potential prediction of subsequent behavior. With the exception of the Karr (1978) study, a review of attitudinal literature pertaining to homosexuals has revealed no instance of a study in which attitudes toward homosexuals were related to behavior towards these individuals. In the Karr research, labeling a person homosexual influenced ratings of that individual and the task performance of subjects with homophobic scores but not the actual behavior directed towards the homosexual target. The goal of this research was to determine the utility of attitude assessment in the prediction of behavior, following the Ajzen and Fishbein model.

A second goal of the research was to assess the importance of normative variables in predicting behavioral intentions and overt behavior. To the extent that behavior is a function of normative as opposed to attitudinal components, then attempts to change beliefs about homosexuals would be expected to have little effect in altering behavior with respect to this group.

A third purpose of this research was to determine which beliefs in particular, if any, are highly related to overt
behavior. Although people are likely to hold many beliefs about this group, only some will be salient in terms of attitudes held and, ultimately, behavior. To the extent that the PT(pe) component of the behavioral intention equation has predictive validity, then delineating these central beliefs is important in terms of changing attitudes toward homosexuals.

An important feature of this study is that it provided an extension of the Ajzen and Fishbein model to a new area of research. Several specific predictions were made from this model:

1.) PT(pe) should correlate highly with ATA.
2.) BI should correlate highly with B and be its best predictor.
3.) The equation of $b_1PT(pe) + b_2PT(nb\cdot mc)$ should correlate highly with BI.
4.) Inclusion of the PT(nb\cdot mc) term should significantly improve prediction of BI.
5.) The attitude towards the act term PT(pe) should correlate more highly with BI than should a measure of attitude towards the class of targets (IHP).
6.) The inclusion of demographic data should not significantly increase prediction of BI or B.

A final purpose of this research was to provide demographic correlates of actual behavior with respect to homo-
sexuals. As was mentioned previously, the bulk of the literature in the area has correlated attitudes toward homosexuals with various personality traits and demographic variables. Although this literature will not be reviewed here, variables which have been found to distinguish those with negative responses from others include: religious fundamentalism and church attendance (Levitt and Klassen, 1974; Nyberg and Alston, 1976; Smith, 1971; Turnbull and Brown, 1977); authoritarianism (MacDonald, 1974; Smith, 1971; Sobel, 1976; Berry and Marks, 1969); age (Nyberg and Alston, 1976; Jenkins, 1976); nationality (Brown and Amoroso, 1975; Dunbar, Brown and Vuorinen, 1973; Dunbar, Brown and Amoroso, 1973); regional variables (Levitt and Klassen, 1974; Turnbull and Brown, 1977); sexual conservatism (Brown and Amoroso, 1975; Dunbar, Brown and Amoroso, 1973; Dunbar, Brown and Vuorinen, 1973; Turnbull and Brown, 1977; Levitt and Klassen, 1974; Smith, 1971); socioeconomic status (Glassner and Owen, 1976; Smith, 1971; Jenkins, 1976); support of traditional sex roles (Dunbar, Brown and Vuorinen, 1973; Dunbar, Brown and Amoroso, 1973; MacDonald et al., 1972; MacDonald, 1974(b); sex of subject (Glassner and Owen, 1976; Rooney and Gibbons, 1966; Kinsey et al., 1953; Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier, 1974; Turnbull and Brown, 1977; Barrios et al., 1976); and greater personal contact (Glassner and Owen, 1976).
CHAPTER V.

METHOD

Introduction

Data were collected in three stages. The purpose in the first stage was the selection of a behavior directed towards homosexuals and an assessment of base rates for this behavior. Beliefs about the consequences of the selected behavior as well as normative beliefs were collected in the second phase. The scales constructed in this portion of the research were used in the third and most central stage of data collection, this being the assessment of beliefs, attitudes, intentions and behavior.

Survey I: Selection of Behavior

The behavior of choice with respect to homosexuals for this research was that of support of homosexual rights legislation. Reasons for this selection were as follows:

1.) Homosexual rights legislation is of great significance to homosexuals. Many gay men and women keep their identities in strict secrecy for fear of losing their jobs and housing. Actual cases of discrimination are not uncommon.

2.) The homosexual rights issue was current and polemical at the time of the study. Voters in many
states had recently decided for or against such legis­
lation in campaigns which had received national pub­
licity. Most subjects were aware of the issue and
probably had specific attitudes for or against such
legislation. Importantly, research investigating
attitudes in this area would be seen by subjects as
relevant.

3.) Support of legislation was easily quantifiable
(eg. voting behavior, letters of support, etc.)

4.) In terms of practicality, such a behavior was particu­
larly germane insofar as gay rights legislation was
to be debated in the Hawaii House of Representatives
and Senate in the coming year, thereby providing an
opportunity to observe behavior in a realistic
setting.

Possible supportive behaviors included any of the following:

Voting anonymously for or against the measure in a poll.

Signing a petition for or against gay rights under each
of the following conditions:

a. to be seen only by the experimenter
b. to be sent to legislators
c. to be circulated publicly
d. to be published in the Honolulu newspapers

Signing a form letter in favor of gay rights to be sent
to legislators.

Writing a personal letter to or phoning legislators.
Writing and copying a testimonial to House or Senate Judiciary committees.
Presenting in person a testimonial to the committees.
Writing a letter to the student newspaper to support or oppose the bill.
Writing a letter to the editor of the Honolulu newspapers.

In selecting a behavior, two basic questions were addressed. First, how many of these behaviors should be used? Second, which should be used?

In response to the first question, it was logical to assume that support of gay rights would be most accurately assessed by a multi-item index of behavior. However, if this research was to be in keeping with the Ajzen and Fishbein model, the prediction of each behavior would have to have been based upon a scale designed to measure beliefs about that specific behavior. Another salient consideration was the methodological point that assessment of behavior should be made independently of attitude assessment (Schuman and Johnson, 1976). Whereas some of the behaviors listed above could have been assessed without informing the subject of previous verbal commitment to perform the behavior, it would have been exceedingly difficult to have done so with others. Further, since some behaviors were time-restricted whereas others were not, a confounding would have existed. For these reasons, it appeared wisest to select one behavior
from the above list as a criterion variable.

The selection of this variable had to take into account base rates of the behavior (Raden, 1977) and be amenable to quantifiable assessment.

A survey was conducted to aid in this assessment. Four behaviors were selected from the above list: voting in an anonymous poll; signing a public petition; writing or telephoning a legislator, and speaking publicly in a legislative hearing. Since it was not likely that any one of the subjects had engaged in any one of these behaviors with respect to gay rights legislation in the past, subjects were asked to indicate their intention to engage in each if asked to do so in the future. To avoid any perceived demand effects, the Gay Rights issue was assessed concurrently with four other controversial legislative bills. These bills dealt with pornography, abortion, equal rights for women, and capital punishment. Each of the proposed bills was described on the questionnaire. To deter subjects from blanket support or rejection of each bill, behaviors were listed in separate categories with each of the five bills presented in a counterbalanced design under each behavior. Subjects indicated whether they would engage in the behavior with respect to that bill.

Subjects consisted of 67 students enrolled in undergraduate psychology classes at the University of Hawaii. The sample included 33 males and 34 females. Each volunteered
for the study and was given a bonus point for completing the survey, a task which took less than ten minutes.

Results of the survey are presented in Table IV. In general, subjects were highly in favor of the Equal Rights Amendment and opposed to legislation restricting the sale of pornographic materials. The responding on the abortion, gay rights and capital punishment bills was more evenly distributed. With respect to the Gay Rights Bill, the majority of subjects (70%) indicated that they would vote in an anonymous poll in favor of the bill. As was anticipated, subjects were less willing to engage in behaviors supportive of gay rights which could not be performed anonymously. Likewise, as the effort entailed by each behavior increased, intention to engage in that behavior decreased. Thus, only 44% of the sample indicated that they would be willing to state in a hearing that they supported the bill.

Thus, results of the survey revealed that none of the behavioral intentions with respect to the gay rights issue had markedly skewed response distributions. Approximately 50% of the subjects said that they would sign a public petition or would write or phone their legislator in favor of the bill. Given the liberal normative influences operative in the setting in which these intentions were assessed, and given the more conservative influences operative in the settings in which actual behavior would be assessed, it was felt that actual behavioral base rates for these two behaviors
Table IV

Percentages of Subjects Indicating Willingness to Engage in Behaviors Supportive of Five Controversial Legislative Bills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Gay Rights</th>
<th>Abortion</th>
<th>Capital Punishment</th>
<th>Equal Rights Amendment</th>
<th>Pornography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vote in an anonymous student poll</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign a public petition</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write or phone legislator in support of the bill</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly state in legislative hearing support of the bill</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
would be considerably lower than were those predicted by the measure of intention.

The behavior selected as a criterion for this study was voting in an anonymous student poll. A primary reason for this selection was that of practicality. Phoning or writing a legislator would have entailed cooperation from each of the legislators in the Hawaii legislature. Giving a testimonial at a hearing was ruled out due to the fact that no hearings were scheduled at the time of the study. A public petition would have entailed seeking out each student in his or her residence, since it was deemed important to assess behavior in a setting other than that in which intentions were measured. An anonymous poll, on the other hand, could be circulated by mail, thereby greatly reducing labor expenditures.

Another factor leading to the selection of an anonymous poll for this study was that voting was a behavior which was within the repertoires of most subjects whereas personal contact with legislators and the preparation of testimonials for hearings were not.

Finally, due to support by members of the Hawaii legislature, it was possible to create a poll which was both realistic and meaningful. The Chairperson of the House Committee on Public Employment agreed to have a poll printed on official stationary and sent from the State Capital to the subjects of the study. Since legislative polls on controversial bills were common and since the outcome of the poll would ostensi-
bly have a major impact on the dispensation of the bill in the House Judiciary Committee, it was felt that this measure would seem realistic to the subjects and would generate honest responding.

Survey II: The Assessment of Beliefs About the Gay Rights Bill and Selection of Relevant Normative Others

According to the Ajzen and Fishbein model, attitudes toward a given action may be predicted by taking into account a person's beliefs about the consequences of the behavior, the strength with which these beliefs are held, and the affective response to each belief.

All of the attitude scales assessing responses to homosexuals reviewed in this paper employed items which the researchers themselves selected. Even when items were selected in an effort to assure face validity, the saliency of items in determining subjects' attitudes remains unknown. A more useful approach was that employed by Jaccard and Davidson (1972) who related beliefs about the use of birth control pills to attitudes about and intentions to use them. These researchers asked subjects prior to the experiment to give their beliefs about the use of birth control devices. In this study, subjects in a second survey were likewise asked to give their most important considerations concerning the
consequences of voting for or against the Gay Rights Bill in a legislative poll.

A sample of 44 subjects participated in this survey, all of whom were students enrolled in undergraduate psychology classes at the University of Hawaii. There were 20 males and 24 females in the sample. Each volunteered for the research and received a bonus point for completing the anonymous survey. Completion time was approximately 20 minutes.

Instructions to subjects were as follows:

This is part of a study designed to investigate how people's beliefs and attitudes help them to make decisions with respect to complex social issues. A current and controversial issue is that of gay rights: should it be made illegal to discriminate against homosexuals in jobs and housing? In the Hawaii legislature, such legislation has been proposed. Due to the controversial nature of the bill, legislators are particularly concerned about public reaction to it. If your representative or senator were to ask you to advise him or her in an anonymous poll, what specific factors would you consider in making your decision? In the space provided below, please list the main reasons why you would or would not support the Gay Rights Bill. We are not interested in your attitude toward Gay Rights per se but rather the considerations you feel important in deciding how to behave in this particular situation. You may, for example, be in favor of the bill but for a variety of reasons not wish to support it in a poll. If you have mixed feelings about the poll, please put down all of the pros and cons you feel to be important.

Although the Ajzen and Fishbein model specifies the assessment of consequences of a given behavior, subjects were asked here to give considerations relevant to their decisions. The main reason for doing this was that many of the reasons
for supporting the bill would have been difficult to verbalize in the form of consequences. Many subjects, for example, expressed support of the bill because the American Constitution guarantees equal rights for all. It is probable that this response would have been emitted more spontaneously than would the response, "A consequence of voting for this bill would be that of helping to keep legal practices in this country within the guidelines set by the Constitution."

Of the 236 responses emitted by the subjects, 61% were listed under the heading, "Reasons which would tend to make me advise the legislator to vote for the Gay Rights Bill."

The reason given most frequently by subjects for supporting the bill was that gay people are human and deserve the same rights as any other human being; with 52% of the subjects giving this consideration. The second most frequent response in this category was one which pertained to fairness in hiring. Thirty-one per cent of the subjects indicated that gay people should be hired on the basis of their capabilities and that their sexual orientation should not be considered in hiring them. Other primary responses in their order of occurrence were: people should have the right to express their sexuality in any way they choose (24%); gays pose no threat to others or society (21%), discrimination against gay people is a violation of the Constitution (19%), the passage of the Gay Rights Bill would signify social progress and would be a needed change in the social structure
passage of the bill would help to alleviate social ostracism of gay people and change stereotypes (17%); failure to pass the bill would encourage and sanction discrimination of gay people (10%); passage of the bill would help gays to lead more open and honest lives (5%); and violence would result if the bill were not passed (5%).

The reason most frequently given by the subjects for not passing the bill was that its passage would allow gay teachers to influence children (34%). Twenty-six per cent of the subjects expressed in this category the belief that passage of the bill would encourage an unnatural and irresponsible lifestyle. The other most frequently given responses were: homosexuality is sinful, and support of the bill would be counter to religious faith (24%); passage of the bill would force people to work with and live next to homosexuals (22%); passage of the bill would deprive employers of the right to exercise personal choice and discretion in hiring (17%); since gays pose a threat to society, to give rights to this minority would be to the detriment of the majority (12%); gays tend to corrupt co-workers (5%); and the bill is unnecessary since equal rights are already guaranteed by the Constitution (5%).

The issue of the number of beliefs to be included in the attitude scale has been discussed previously. In accordance with the theoretical and empirical evidence presented, it was decided that not more than fifteen beliefs
should be utilized in the scale. Accordingly, the seven most frequently given responses in each category were used in the construction of the scale.

The attitude scale, presented in its entirety in Appendix VII, was constructed by first wording the reasons for subjects' intended voting behavior in terms of consequences. Thus, the first item of the scale was, "Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would give recognition and encouragement to the gay lifestyle." A seven-point Likert-type probability scale was placed under each belief, with end-points of "improbable" and "probable." The items provided the "p" term in the Ajzen and Fishbein equation. The evaluations of each belief followed the assessment of the probability that each consequence would occur. Thus, after the first belief item was presented, subjects were asked to give their attitude towards "giving encouragement and recognition to the gay lifestyle." This assessment was accomplished by use of a seven-point semantic differential with "bad" and "good" as endpoints. These items provided the "e" term of the Ajzen and Fishbein equation.

It will be recalled that Ajzen and Fishbein recommend assessing evaluations of beliefs (e) prior to belief strength (p) when the target of attitude assessment is a person or object. This is to ensure that general attitudes with respect to the object do not bias the ratings of the object's characteristics. Musical ability, for example, might be
given a high rating when evaluated independently. However, if subjects were first to indicate strength of belief in the statement, "Negroes have unusual musical ability", and then to evaluate the characteristic, the second evaluation might have been lower than was the first. In the present research, beliefs were evaluated with respect to behavior, and the above consideration was not applicable since the target of the behavior in many cases was included with or implied by the concept to be evaluated. For example, in the belief, "Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would lead to open homosexual behavior in public", the concept to be evaluated was "open homosexual behavior in public." Therefore, there was no advantage in having evaluations made before the assessment of belief strength, and thus beliefs and attitudes were assessed concomitantly in the Attitudes Toward Gay Rights Scale.

It will be also noted that the belief statements did not specify the sex of homosexuals. It has been demonstrated that attitudes toward homosexuals are influenced by their sex, but since the measure was of an act with respect to homosexuals in this research, the sex demarcation was less clearly needed. Since the target of the behavior of interest was the group as a whole, and since an act such as voting for gay rights would not specify male or female in a realistic setting, it was felt that belief statements should have as the target element the group as a whole.
Normative Beliefs

The crucial issue of normative beliefs with respect to predicting behavior with respect to homosexuals has been discussed. Likewise, the methods for and issues pertaining to the selection of relevant reference groups in various studies have been mentioned. One approach has been to give subjects a standard set of reference groups and have them rate each in terms of the probability of their wanting the subject to perform the given act. Another has been to have subjects list their own relevant reference groups. The former has been the more frequently used and was thus employed in this research.

To insure that relevant reference groups were selected, the 44 subjects in the second survey were given the instructions:

The opinions of others are often important in helping us to decide upon a course of action. In making your decision to either support or oppose the Gay Rights Bill in the legislative poll, what individuals (e.g., your minister, mother, best friend, boss, etc.) or groups (church, family, peer group) have opinions on the issue which you would consider in making your decision?

Please list all the people or groups whose opinion would be relevant to your decision.

The groups most often selected were as follows: parents (40%), friends (36%), peers (26%), gay friends or acquaintances (14%), teachers (12%), siblings (12%), church (10%), gay organizations (7%), best friend (5%), lover or spouse (5%), minister (5%), and mental health professionals (5%).
Scales assessing subjects' normative expectations and motivation to comply with these expectations were constructed utilizing the thirteen individuals or groups listed above. The scale assessing perceived normative expectations, presented in Appendix VIII, consisted of thirteen statements of the format, "My _______ would want me to vote for the bill", followed by seven-point Likert-type probability scales with end-points of "improbable" and "probable". The scale assessing motivation to comply, presented in Appendix IX, consisted of thirteen seven-point Likert-type scales with endpoints, "I very much want to" and "I very much want not to", followed by statements "do what my ____________ wants me to do."

Survey III: Assessment of Relationships Between Attitudes, Beliefs, Intentions and Behavior

Subjects

The sample of this phase of the research consisted of 151 college students enrolled in psychology classes at the University of Hawaii. There were 43 males and 106 females in the sample, and the mean age of the participants was 21.3. Subjects were told prior to entry in the study that it would entail responding to a variety of questionnaires dealing with homosexuality and the Gay Rights Bill as well as a poll being conducted by a Hawaii legislator. They were also told that all aspects of the research were anonymous and thus confidential. Participation in the study, which took approximate-
ly thirty minutes for completion, earned all subjects one extra-credit point for their psychology classes.

Materials

The test battery included all the scales necessary to assess the Ajzen and Fishbein model: a set of probability scales corresponding to beliefs about gay rights legislation interspersed with a set of scales evaluating each belief (the Attitude Towards Gay Right Legislation Scale), a semantic differential scale assessing attitude towards voting in the legislative poll, a set of scales assessing the degree to which subjects wished to conform with the expectations of normative persons or groups, scales assessing the perceived expectations of each group with respect to voting in the poll, and a measure of behavioral intention.

Attitude towards voting in the poll (ATA) was assessed by use of a seven-point semantic differential scale following the statement, "With respect to the legislative poll to be sent to me in the mail, my voting for the Gay Rights Bill would be:". End points for the scale were "bad" and "good". To assess behavioral intention (BI), subjects were given the following instructions:

In several days, you will receive in the mail a poll from Representative Stanley asking you to indicate either your support or your opposition to the Gay Rights Bill. The poll is anonymous, but we would like to know how you intend to vote in this poll. Please circle below the number which corresponds with the level of probability that you will vote in favor of the bill.
A seven-point probability scale with end points of "probable" and "improbable" followed under the heading, "I intend to vote for the Gay Rights Bill in the legislative poll."

In addition to these scales, a modified version of the Hudson-Ricketts Index of Attitudes Towards Homosexuals Scale (IAH) was employed in which four of the items in the original scale were replaced by alternatives suggested by the authors. Substitutes included, "I would feel upset if I learned that my brother or sister were homosexual" for the former item 12, "I would feel at ease talking with a homosexual at a party" for the previous item 18, "It would not bother me to walk through a predominantly gay section of town" for item 20, and "It would disturb me to find out my doctor was homosexual" for item 21. By utilizing this scale, it was possible to test the hypothesis central to the Ajzen and Fishbein model that an assessment of attitude towards a specific act will better predict behavior than will a general measure of attitude towards a class of targets of that act.

Also included in the test booklet were questions pertaining to the backgrounds of the subjects. Items pertaining to sex, age, grade level, occupation and ethnicity of father and mother, religious affiliation, church attendance, parent's marital status, number of people living with the subject, family size, and type of environment in which raised were included to determine whether or not the inclusion of these variables in the model would significantly improve prediction
of behavioral intention and behavior.

Also, several items pertaining to experience with homosexuals were included in the booklet. These were:

1.) Have you ever personally known or come into personal contact with a person you knew to be homosexual?
2.) Do you have any friends you know to be homosexual?
3.) Are any of your family members homosexual?
4.) Have you ever been sexually propositioned by a member of your sex?
5.) Have you had any homosexual sexual experiences?

The order of presentation of the scales in the booklet was of some consequence. Motivation to comply with reference groups, for example, was to be a general measure, so scales assessing this information had to precede those assessing perceived expectations of those reference persons or groups. The order of presentation was guided by that employed by Jaccard and Davidson (1972): motivation to comply with reference others, beliefs, attitude towards the act, evaluations of beliefs, normative beliefs, and behavioral intention. The survey of background information was collected prior to these variables, and experience with homosexuals was included as the final item in the booklet. The IAH was placed immediately after the survey of background information.

The final page of the booklet asked for the name and address of the subject, so that ballots could be sent to each
student. It also included a postcard with blanks for the subject's name and course for which credit was to be received on one side, and the experimenter's name and address on the other.

The behavioral assessment in the study consisted of responding to a poll sent from the State Capital to each subject. The envelope included a cover letter hand-signed by Representative Stanley, a ballot with return envelope, and the stamped credit card addressed to the Psychology Department at the University of Hawaii. The cover letter and ballot are presented in Appendices XI and XII.

Method

Subjects were allowed to complete the test booklets at any time during continuous testing over a two-week period. As each entered the testing room, he or she was given a booklet. The experimental rationale was placed on the cover of the booklet (see Appendix XIII), and subjects were asked to read it carefully. Each was told to ask for clarification from the test monitor if ever it was needed during the completion of the booklet.

A procedural difficulty in the study was that of matching survey data with the behavioral criterion while maintaining anonymity of the subjects. Another area of concern was the probability of low response rates for the anonymous poll. The latter was mitigated by making responding to the poll a required part of the study, with the rationale that the re-
search was attempting to examine the cognitive processes involved in making realistic decisions with respect to controversial issues. Subjects were told that the stamped credit cards would be sent to them with their ballots. When they mailed the ballot to the State Capital, the credit card was likewise to be sent to the experimenter at the University of Hawaii. Since the survey and the poll were anonymous, failure to send in the card would result in no experimental credit for the subject.

To insure anonymity, test booklets and the sheets containing subjects' names and addresses were inconspicuously coded. At the completion of the survey, subjects were instructed to detach the name sheets from the test booklets and deposit them in a box entitled "To Representative Stanley's Office." In this way, their names were not associated with the test booklets. Envelopes with names and addresses were typed, and ballots were inserted in them after having been coded in the same fashion as the name sheets. At this point, name sheets were destroyed such that ballots could be matched with the surveys but with no other identifying information.

The envelopes containing ballots were sent from the State Capital, and the completed ballots were returned to the office of the Chairperson of the Committee on Public Employment. After the data had been transcribed from them, the ballots were returned to Representative Stanley.
Data Analysis

Scoring and Computation of Model Terms

1.) Father and mother occupation: Occupation was assigned a number from one to eight on the basis of the scoring method devised by Hollingshead (1958).

2.) Father and mother ethnicity: For purposes of analysis, ethnicity was scored as Caucasian, Oriental, or other.

3.) Religious affiliation: Affiliation was scored as Christian, Buddhist or other.

4.) Parent's marital status: Marital status was coded as married or non-married.

5.) Environment in which raised: The four levels of this variable were considered to constitute an interval scale on the basis of population density. Responses were thus coded one through four.

6.) PT(pe) term of the Ajzen and Fishbein equation: The fourteen beliefs about the Gay Rights Bill (p in the PT(pe) term) were scored from one to seven, whereas evaluations (e in the PT(pe) term) were scored from -3 to +3. By employing this scoring system, the greater the judged probability of a given consequence, the greater was the weight given to the evaluation of that consequence. A highly negative rating of an event deemed improbable
would, by this scoring system, contribute little to the overall product total. Had beliefs been scored from -3 to +3, then a negative evaluation of a consequence deemed highly unlikely would have contributed as positively to the product total as would have a positive evaluation of a highly likely consequence. That a negatively evaluated event is thought to be an unlikely consequence of a behavior is unlikely to contribute strongly to a positive attitude towards performing that behavior. With the exception of the last belief item (failure to pass the bill would encourage and sanction discrimination against gay people), all belief items were worded such that the higher the belief x attitude product, the more favorable was the response towards the Gay Rights Bill. This last item was thus reverse scored for the computation of the PT(pe) term.

The PT(pe) term was calculated by multiplying each of the fourteen beliefs by its corresponding evaluation. These products were then summed. In cases of missing data, the mean of the available products was calculated and multiplied by fourteen.

7.) PT(nb·mc) term of the Ajzen and Fishbein equation: All items assessing motivation to comply with normative others ("mc" in the PT(nb·mc) term) and perceived expectations of normative others ("nb" in
the PT(nb·mc) term) were scored from -3 to +3. The PT(nb·mc) term was calculated by first multiplying each expectation by its corresponding motivation to comply score and then summing the thirteen products. In cases where data was missing, the mean of the available products was calculated and multiplied by 13.

8.) Attitude Towards the Gay Rights Bill (ATA) and Behavioral Intention (BI): Each was coded from one to seven.

9.) IAH Scale: All items were scored such that the higher the score on that item, the more homophobic the response for that item. The IAH total score was calculated by computing the mean of all scorable responses, multiplying this mean by 25, and subtracting 25.

Data Questions and Analyses

All analysis was performed using the Statistical Analysis System (Helwig, 1978) with the exception of the computation of alpha statistics and corrected item-total correlations, which were performed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, 1975).

Means and standard deviations were computed for every variable assessed in the research for the group as a whole,
males and females, those who voted for the bill and those who voted against it, and those who returned their ballots and those who did not. The effects of demographic variables were assessed via F-tests and correlation coefficients.

In addition to the assessment of sex differences, differences between those who voted for and those who voted against the bill, and those who completed the study as opposed to those who did not return their ballots, analyses addressed the predictions derived from the Ajzen and Fishbein model. Questions which directed analyses were as follows:

1.) To what extent were PT(pe) and ATA correlated?
2.) How well did the sum of $b_1PT(pe) + b_2PT(nb\cdot mc)$ predict BI and B?
3.) Of the predictors PT(pe) and PT(nb\cdot mc), which carried more weight in the prediction of BI and B?
4.) What was the correspondence between BI and B?
5.) Of the IAH score and the PT(pe) term, which had the higher correlation with BI and B?
6.) Which beliefs about the act and normative beliefs most highly correlated with BI and B?
7.) Did the inclusion of demographic variables in the regression equation predicting BI significantly improve prediction? Likewise, did the model add significantly to this prediction after demographic variables had already been entered in the regres-
The reliability of the IAH scale was assessed by the computation of corrected item-total correlations and the alpha coefficient.
CHAPTER VI.
RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Demographic Variables and Experience with Homosexuals

Descriptive statistics for demographic variables are presented in Table V.

Examination of Table V reveals that the majority of the subjects in the study came from homes in which one or both parents held professional or administrative positions. Approximately 65% of the fathers and 28% of the mothers fell in these categories. The percentage of working mothers in the sample (61%) probably reflects the high rate of employment of women in Hawaii rather than an atypical sample in this respect.

Although the sample contained a large variety of racial types, the majority of subjects had Oriental parents (68% of the fathers and 72% of the mothers). Caucasian parents were the second most frequent in representation (21% of the fathers and 19% of the mothers).

It was interesting to note that although 71% of the subjects reported a religious affiliation, 71% reported that they never attended church. Only 18% of the sample attended church more than once monthly. The majority of
Table V
Descriptive Statistics for Demographic Data
and Experience with Homosexuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Father Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1: Executives and major professionals</td>
<td>11.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2: Business managers and lesser professionals</td>
<td>16.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3: Administrative personnel</td>
<td>37.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4: Clerical and sales workers</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 5: Skilled manual workers</td>
<td>16.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 6: Machine operators and semi-skilled workers</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 7: Unskilled employees</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mother Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1: Executives and major professionals</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2: Business managers and lesser professionals</td>
<td>15.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3: Administrative personnel</td>
<td>8.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4: Clerical and sales workers</td>
<td>22.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 5: Skilled manual workers</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 6: Machine operators and semi-skilled workers</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 7: Unskilled employees</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houscwives:</td>
<td>38.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Father Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian:</td>
<td>20.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental:</td>
<td>68.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>11.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table V. (Continued) Descriptive Statistics for Demographic Data and Experience with Homosexuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Mother Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian:</td>
<td>19.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental:</td>
<td>72.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Religious Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian:</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist:</td>
<td>13.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>28.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number of monthly church attendances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>71.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 or more</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Parents' marital status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married:</td>
<td>82.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-married:</td>
<td>17.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Number of persons living with subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table V. (Continued) Descriptive Statistics for Demographic Data and Experience with Homosexuals

9. Number of children in subject's family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 or more</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Environment in which raised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural area</td>
<td>19.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small town</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb of large city</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large city</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Experience with homosexuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Male No</th>
<th>Male Yes</th>
<th>Female No</th>
<th>Female Yes</th>
<th>Combined No</th>
<th>Combined Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personally known or has contact with:</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has homosexual friend:</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A family member is homosexual:</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been propositioned by a homosexual:</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has had homosexual experience:</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
subjects reporting a religious affiliation were Christian (58%), with Buddhism being the second most frequently listed affiliation (13%).

The family constellations of the subjects appeared normal with respect to parent's marital status, family size, and environment in which raised. Eighty-three per cent of the parents of the subjects in the sample were married, and the average family size was five. The most frequently selected category for environment in which raised was suburb of large city (42%), followed by small town (22%), rural area (19%), and large city (17%).

With respect to experience with homosexuals, Table V reveals that the majority of subjects (65.3%) reported either knowing or having had personal contact with a homosexual. Many (32%) had friends they knew to be homosexual. The majority responded that they had never been propositioned by a member of the same sex (83.3%). Only a few subjects (4.0%) stated that a member of their family was homosexual, and 8% reported having had homosexual experiences.

Of note were the major sex differences obtained on these variables. Whereas over a third of the males reported having been propositioned, less than 10% of the women reported having been propositioned by a member of the same sex. Also, whereas 21.4% of the men reported homosexual sexual experiences, virtually none of the women did (2.8%). In the Kinsey, Pomeroy and Martin (1953) research, 18-42% of the males and
11-20% of the females reported at least some homosexual experience. Thus, some but not all of the differences found here may be attributed to the apparent fact that heterosexual men in our society more frequently experiment with homosexual behavior. The fact that over 20% of the men reported that they had had at least some homosexual experience supports a contention that subjects were candid in their responses to these items and to others in the questionnaires as well.

Descriptive Statistics for Variables in the Battery

Means and standard deviations for items in the IAH, Motivation to Comply With and Perceived Expectations of Normative Others scales as well as the Beliefs About Gay Rights Legislation and Evaluation of Beliefs about Gay Rights Legislation scales are presented in Tables VI though IX respectively.

a. IAH:

Examination of Table VI reveals that on only one IAH variable was the group mean 4.0 or greater, indicating that the group tendency on all but this item was not in the homophobic direction. The subjects as a group expressed uncertainty for the majority of scale items as to whether or not they would have the affective response to the situation described in the item. The items which had the lowest (least homophobic) scores were, "I would feel at ease talking
Table VI
Descriptive Statistics for Items in the IAH*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I would feel comfortable working closely with a male homosexual.</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would enjoy attending social functions at which homosexuals were present.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my neighbor was homosexual.</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If a member of my sex made a sexual advance toward me I would feel angry.</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would feel comfortable knowing that I was attractive to members of my own sex.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would feel uncomfortable being seen in a gay bar.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I would feel comfortable if a member of my sex made an advance toward me.</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would be comfortable if I found myself attracted to a member of my sex.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I would feel disappointed if I learned that my child was homosexual.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I would feel nervous being in a group of homosexuals.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I would feel comfortable knowing that my clergyman was homosexual.</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I would be upset if I learned that my brother or sister was homosexual.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VI. (Continued) Descriptive Statistics for Items in the IAH*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. I would feel that I had failed as a parent if I learned that my child was gay.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. If I saw two men holding hands in public I would feel disgusted.</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. If a member of my sex made an advance toward me I would be offended.</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I would feel comfortable if I learned that my daughter's teacher was a lesbian.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my spouse or partner was attracted to members of his or her sex.</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I would feel at ease talking with a homosexual at a party.</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I would feel uncomfortable kissing a close friend of my sex in public.</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. It would not bother me to walk through a predominantly gay section of town.</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. It would disturb me to kind out that my doctor was homosexual.</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my best friend of my sex was homosexual.</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. If a member of my sex made an advance toward me I would feel flattered.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I would feel uncomfortable knowing that my son's male teacher was homosexual.</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I would feel uncomfortable working closely with a female homosexual.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Items are scored from 1-5 such that the higher the score, the more homophobic the response.
with a homosexual at a party," "I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my neighbor was a homosexual," and "I would feel comfortable working closely with a male homosexual" in that order. The items with the highest (most homophobic) scores were "I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my spouse or partner was attracted to members of his or her sex," "I would feel comfortable if a member of my sex made an advance toward me," "I would feel uncomfortable being seen in a gay bar," "If a member of my sex made an advance toward me I would feel flattered," and "I would feel comfortable if I found myself attracted to a member of my sex" in that order.

Total IAH scores ranged from 6 to 95, with a mean of 58.5 and standard deviation of 17.65. Only 2.65% of the subjects scored in the high-grade non-homophobic range (below 25), whereas 17.88% scored in the high-grade homophobic range (75-100), indicating that more respondents fell in the homophobic category than in the non-homophobic. Likewise, whereas 27.2% of the subjects were classified as low-grade non-homophobic, 52.3% obtained scores in the low-grade homophobic range.

b. Motivation to Comply with Reference Others (mc)

The data presented in Table VII reveals that subjects wished to comply in general with normative others in the following order of ascendancy: lover or spouse, best friend, father, mother, teachers, friends, brothers and sisters,
Table VII
Descriptive Statistics for
Motivation to Comply With and
Perceived Expectations of Normative Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normative Item</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th></th>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mother</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-.78</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Father</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Friends</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. People my own age</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Brothers and sisters</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gay acquaintances</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teachers</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Church</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Best friend</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lover or spouse</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Gay organizations</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Minister</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Psychologists and</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychiatrists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
people of similar age, the church, ministers and psychologists and psychiatrists. Subjects expressed mild opposition to the expectations of gay groups and individuals. The neutral responses to both the church and minister were unexpected but consistent with the finding that the majority of subjects did not attend church.

c. **Perceived Expectations of Reference Others (nb)**

Table VII also presents the perceived expectations of the subjects of reference others with respect to voting in the Gay Rights Poll. As was anticipated, subjects felt a strong expectation from gay organizations and acquaintances that they vote for the bill. Psychologists and psychiatrists, teachers and people of similar age were seen as being slightly in favor of the bill. Those seen as being opposed to the bill, in order of perceived strength of opposition, were father, church, mother, minister, lover or spouse, brothers and sisters, friends, and best friend. Thus, in general, subjects perceived that the majority of reference groups would expect them to vote against the bill.

The PT(nbc·mc) component of the Ajzen and Fishbein model, one of the two predictors of behavioral intention, was calculated by multiplying motivation to comply scores by their respective perceived expectation scores for each subject and summed. The range of scores for this term was from -80.8 to 57.1, with a mean of -8.06. Fifty-six per cent of the
subjects had scores below zero on this scale. Thus, the general normative influence on the sample was slightly counter to voting for the bill, and likewise, it was counter for just over half of the subjects.

d. Beliefs About the Gay Rights Bill

Means and standard deviations for belief items are presented in Table VIII in order of score magnitude. It will be noted that for none of the possible consequences of passage of the bill did subjects assign a probability of less than 4.00, and mean scores of 5.0 or above were given for eight of the fourteen items. Thus, the voting considerations listed by subjects in the second survey appeared to have been translated into consequences deemed likely by the subjects in this sample.

The consequences judged most probable by the subjects was that voting for the bill would give people in general greater freedom in choosing how they wish to express their sexuality. Rated almost identically in probability was the item, "Endorsement of the bill would affirm the notion that gay people are human and should be treated like everybody else." The item with the next highest probability was similar in content and dealt with the belief that voting for the bill would lead to fairer hiring practices for gay people. Subjects also felt that passage of the bill would lead to exposure of young children to open homosexuals and give encouragement to the gay lifestyle.
Table VII
Descriptive Statistics for Beliefs About Gay Rights Legislation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would give people in general greater freedom in choosing how they wish to express their sexuality.</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Endorsement of the bill would affirm the notion that gay people are human and should be treated like everybody else.</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would help to insure that homosexuals would be judged according to their talents and capabilities and not on the basis of their sexual orientation.</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Endorsement of the bill would lead to the exposure of young children to homosexuals.</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would uphold the American Constitution.</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Failure to endorse the Gay Rights Bill would encourage and sanction discrimination against gay people.</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would give recognition and encouragement to the gay lifestyle.</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Endorsement of the bill would result in people being forced to work with and live near homosexual people.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would help to alleviate the stigmatism and ostracism of gay people in our society.</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VIII. (Continued) Descriptive Statistics for Beliefs About Gay Rights Legislation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would help society move towards more humane values.</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would lead to open homosexual behavior in public.</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would deprive employers and businesses the right to exercise personal choice and discretion in hiring employees.</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would be a violation of religious teachings.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would result in giving rights to a minority to the detriment of the majority.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items are scored on a probability scale from 1 (Improbable) to 7 (Probable)
e. Evaluations of Beliefs About the Gay Rights Bill (e)

Examination of Table IX reveals that subjects as a group felt positively about half of the potential consequences of the bill and negatively about the other half. However, whereas all but one of the positively rated items had scores above one, none of the negatively rated items had scores below negative one. Thus, subjects tended to view the merits of the positive outcomes of the bill as being stronger than the demerits of the negative outcomes.

The items rated most positively were judging homosexuals on the basis of their abilities rather than their sexual orientation, helping society to move towards more humane values, and upholding the American Constitution. The items receiving lowest evaluations were encouraging and sanctioning discrimination against homosexuals, open homosexual behavior in public, the exposure of children to open homosexuals, and behavior which violates religious teachings. Although scores on open homosexual behavior in public and exposure of children to homosexuals were statistically equivalent, it is interesting to note that the former was rated slightly lower than the latter, given that the subjects in the second survey deemed exposure to be by far the most salient negative consequence of the bill's passage. Also, whereas subjects in the present research were neutral about giving recognition and encouragement to the gay lifestyle, the subjects in the second survey listed this as being a negative
Table IX

Descriptive Statistics for Evaluations of Beliefs about Gay Rights Legislation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Judging homosexuals on the basis of their talents and capabilities instead of their sexual orientation.</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Helping society move towards more humane values.</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The notion that gay people are human and should be treated like everybody else.</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Upholding the American Constitution.</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Giving people in general greater freedom in choosing how they wish to express their sexuality.</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Alleviating the stigmatism and social ostracism of gay people in our society.</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Giving recognition and encouragement to the gay lifestyle.</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Depriving employers and businesses of the right to exercise personal choice and discretion in hiring employees.</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Giving rights to a minority to the detriment of the majority.</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. People being forced to work with and live near homosexuals.</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Behavior which violates religious teachings.</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The exposure of young children to open homosexuals.</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Open homosexual behavior in public.</td>
<td>-.92</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Endorsing and sanctioning discrimination against gay people.</td>
<td>-.92</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items are scored from -3 (bad) to +3 (good).
consequences of the bill. These differences are likely due to the methodological differences between the two studies. Whereas subjects in the first were asked to spontaneously list what they thought would be consequences of bill passage, subjects in this survey were asked to rate a list of predetermined items. Further, whereas all subjects in this survey rated the negative consequences of bill passage, a minority of subjects in the previous one listed spontaneously negative consequences.

f. Beliefs x Evaluations of Beliefs (pe)

To clarify the group tendencies on each scale item, means for each belief multiplied by corresponding attitudinal items are presented in Table X in order of score magnitude.

g. PT(pe) Scores

The sum of the products of beliefs multiplied by their respective evaluations is, in the Ajzen and Fishbein model, one of the two terms in the equation predicting behavioral intention. Scores on this variable ranged from -180 to 201, with an overall mean of 50.37. Since zero on this scale represents neutrality, the mean indicates that the subjects as a group evaluated what they considered to be the probable consequences of passing the Gay Rights Bill positively. Of the subjects, 21.8% had negative total scores on this scale.
Table X  
Descriptive Statistics for Beliefs About  
the Gay Rights Bill  
Multiplied by their Attitudinal Counterparts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief X Attitude Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Judging homosexuals on the basis of their talents and capabilities.</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gay people are human and should be treated like everybody else.</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Helping society move toward humane values.</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Upholding the American Constitution.</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>9.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Giving people in general greater freedom in choosing expression of sexuality.</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>9.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Alleviating the stigmatism and social ostracism of gay people.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.* Encouraging and sanctioning discrimination against gay people.</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>10.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Giving recognition and encouragement to the gay lifestyle.</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Depriving employers and businesses the right to exercise choice in hiring.</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>9.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Giving rights to a minority to the detriment of the majority.</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. People being forced to work with and live next to homosexuals.</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Behavior which violates religious teachings.</td>
<td>-3.06</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The exposure of young children to open homosexuals.</td>
<td>-4.13</td>
<td>9.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Open homosexual behavior in public.</td>
<td>-4.49</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reverse scoring was used on this item such that a previously negative score would indicate support of the bill.
h. **Attitude Towards the Gay Rights Bill (ATA)**

A measure of attitude towards the Gay Rights Bill was included to test the hypothesis central to the Ajzen and Fishbein theory that attitude is composed of the sum of products of beliefs about the consequences of an act multiplied by their respective evaluations (ATA ~ PT(pe)).

The mean response on this variable was .64 on the scale from -3 (bad) to +3 (good). Thus, subjects as a group expressed a slightly positive attitude with respect to voting for the Gay Rights Bill in the legislative poll. Of the subjects, 25.8% responded negatively on this variable, 11.2% were neutral, and 62.9% responded positively.

i. **Behavioral Intention**

Behavioral intention, according to the model, is the single best predictor of behavior. It, in turn, is composed of the sum of the weighted PT(pe) and PT(nb·mc) terms. On the scale assessing this term, scored from one to seven, the mean response was 4.56. Of the subjects, 30.7% responded with probabilities of three or less, thereby indicating in varying degrees that their voting in favor of the bill was unlikely. Probabilities of five or more were indicated by 33.3% of the sample who thus felt it probable that they would vote in favor of the bill. Four was the score midway between the improbable–probable poles, and the 36% of the
subjects who gave this response were thus either neutral or undecided about how they would vote in the poll.

j. Vote in the Legislative Poll (B)

Of the 151 subjects in the sample, 134 sent ballots to the State Capital. This was a response rate of 88.7% and was deemed quite high. Forty-five of the subjects (33.6%) voted against the bill, whereas 66.4% voted in favor of it. The percentage of subjects who voted for the bill was similar to but less than the percentage of subjects who expressed the intention to vote for the bill in Survey I. This was expected, due to the differences in normative influences between the environments in which each was assessed.

Of the 134 respondents in the poll, 9.7% voted in a fashion which was inconsistent with previously expressed behavioral intention. Nine of the discrepancies were due to subjects who expressed an intention to vote for the bill but later voted against it. The remaining four inconsistencies were due to subjects who voted for the bill who previously had expressed a low probability of voting for the bill.

Assessment of the Ajzen-Fishbein Model

BI – B Correspondence
Correlations between terms in the model are presented in Table XI.

With respect to one of the major predictions of the model—that the best predictor of B is BI, inspection of Table XI reveals that the highest correlation between B and model terms obtained was in fact with BI. The correlation obtained was .73 (p < .0001).

The Prediction of BI from
\[ b_1 PT(pe) + PT(nb \cdot mc) + e \]

After determining \( b_1 \) and \( b_2 \) from regression analysis, predicted intentions were computed and correlated with actual intentions. The correlation coefficient obtained, .838 (p < .0001), indicated that the weighted sums of these two variables predicted behavioral intention with a high degree of accuracy. The correlation between the predicted intention and actual behavior was lower (.641, p < .0001).

Correspondence Between ATA and PT(pe)

According to Ajzen and Fishbein, a person's overall attitude is determined by the sum of the products of beliefs relevant to the object of the attitude multiplied by evaluations of these beliefs. In this research, the correlation between ATA and PT(pe) was .839 (p < .0001). This coefficient supports the theoretical model and provides evidence for the validity of the attitude scale employed in the research.
Table XI
Correlations Between Selected Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IAH</th>
<th>PT(pe)</th>
<th>PT(nb:mc)</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Aact</th>
<th>BI</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAH</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-0.671</td>
<td>-0.610</td>
<td>-0.709</td>
<td>-0.670</td>
<td>-0.692</td>
<td>-0.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT(pe)</td>
<td>-0.671</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT(nb:mc)</td>
<td>-0.610</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>0.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted</td>
<td>-0.709</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>-0.670</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aact</td>
<td>-0.692</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>-0.533</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All correlations are significant at the .0001 level.
Correlations Between IAH, BI and B

A major premise of the Ajzen and Fishbein model is that behavioral intention is best predicted by assessing attitudes toward a behavior rather than the target of the behavior. This premise was assessed by comparing the correlations between the IAH score and BI and B with those between the intentions predicted by the model and BI and B. Although the correlations between IAH, BI and B were highly significant (-.692 and -.533 respectively), they were significantly lower than those between predicted intention and BI and B. Thus, an assessment of attitude towards an act did provide better prediction of behavioral intention and behavior than did an assessment of attitude towards the object of the behavior.

PT(nb·mc) in the Prediction of BI and B

One of the most basic premises of the model is that behavior is a function of both attitudes toward a behavior and the perceived expectations of others with respect to that behavior. Given that the PT(pe) and PT(nb·mc) terms correlated highly with each other (.646, p<.0001), it was further thought relevant to assess the contribution of the latter term in the prediction of BI and B over and above that of PT(pe). Stepwise regression analyses were performed using B and BI as dependent variables and PT(pe) and PT(nb·mc) as predictor variables.
Results indicated that when PT(nb·mc) was added subsequent to PT(pe) in the prediction of BI, R-square was increased from .642 to .702 (F = 29.26, df = 1, p<.0001). In the prediction of B, the inclusion of PT(nb·mc) increased R-square from .353 to .416 (F = 14.19, df = 1, p<.001). Thus, the inclusion of this variable in the equation did significantly improve prediction. It may further be inferred that the PT(nb·mc) term was not purely a function of the PT(pe) term. That is, the normative evaluations made by the subjects were to a significant extent independent of the subject's positions on the gay rights issue.

Although the sum of the PT(pe) and PT(nb·mc) terms was a better predictor of BI and B than was the IAH score, the inclusion of the IAH variable with the two model terms did significantly improve prediction of BI (ΔR² = .020, F = 10.55, df = 1, p<.01). This inclusion did not, however, improve the prediction of B at a statistically significant level (ΔR² = .015, F = 2.97, df = 1, p>.05).

Demographic Variables and the Prediction of BI and B

A distinguishing feature of the Ajzen and Fishbein model is its assertion that other variables such as race, age, sex, and the like need not be included in the equation predicting behavioral intention since the effects of these variables, if any, should already have been manifested in the PT(pe) and
PT(nb.mc) terms. To the extent that this is true, then the addition of demographic variables should not significantly improve prediction.

To test this hypothesis, regression analyses were performed in which the predicted BI term was added both prior to and subsequent to demographic variables in the prediction of BI. When predicted intention was added after the twenty demographic variables assessed, R-square was increased from .163 to .715 (F = 238.93, df = 1, p<.0001). When predicted intention was the first variable to enter the equation, the addition of demographic variables increased R-square from .669 to .707 (F = .512, df = 19, p>.05). Although several of the demographic variables explained significant portions of the variance when entered first in the regression equations, none did so when predicted intention was the first variable to enter the equation. Thus, while demographic variables were shown to be significantly related to behavioral intention, their significance was completely mitigated after the effects of the model had been accounted for, thereby providing further support for the Ajzen and Fishbein model.

**Additional Topics**

**Relative Weights of PT(pe) and PT(nb.mc)**

The relative importance of the attitudinal and normative components of the model is of considerable practical
significance to the Gay Rights Movement. The relationships of each term with BI and B were assessed by examining correlation coefficients as well as the standardized regression coefficients from the respective regression equations. Correlation coefficients for PT(pe) and PT(nb.mc) were .802 and .702 with BI and .594 and .582 with B. The standardized regression coefficients were .598 and .320 with BI as the predicted variable, and .378 and .326 with B as the predicted variable. T-tests for the differences between correlation coefficients for correlated samples (Ferguson, 1971) revealed a significant difference between the PT(pe) and PT(nb.mc) coefficients with BI (t = 4.10, p<.01) but not with respect to B (t = 1.15, p>.05). Thus, measured in the experimental setting, the attitudinal component of the model was significantly more important in the prediction of behavioral intention than was the normative component. The two components were equivalent, however, in the prediction of behavior, which occurred in a non-university setting.

Correlations between PT(pe) and PT(nb.mc) and B were computed for subsets of the data to assess the influence of demographic variables on the attitudinal and normative components of behavior. These data are presented in Table XII. Variables assessed included sex, religious status, church attendance, and parent's marital status.

Inspection of Table XII reveals that whereas the norma-
Table XII
Correlations of PT(pe) and PT(nb·mc) With Voting Behavior for Demographic Subsets of the Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>PT(pe)-B</th>
<th>PT(nb·mc)-B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sex:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Racial status of parents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parent's marital status:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-married</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Religion:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Church Attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 times/month</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more/month</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tive component was more highly correlated with behavior than was the attitudinal for Oriental subjects, the attitudinal component was considerably more highly correlated with behavior than was the normative for Caucasians. The latter difference was not statistically significant, however, possibly because of the very small sample size. Similarly, the behavior of subjects who indicated that their parents were divorced, separated or widowed was associated more with the attitudinal than with the normative component, whereas the components were virtually equivalent for subjects whose parents were married. The sample size of the group with non-married parents was again quite small, and the difference between correlations did not approach statistical significance.

In terms of church attendance, the PT(nb·mc) - B correlations were significantly higher for subjects who attended church at least once a month than for whose who never attended church. Related to this finding was the fact that the normative component was more predictive of behavior than was the attitudinal for Christians and Buddhists, whereas the attitudinal was more predictive for those indicating no religious preference. None of these differences achieved statistical significance, however. It was found that the PT(nb·mc) - B correlations for both Christians and Buddhists were significantly higher than those for subjects with no religious preference.
In summary, the relative weights of the two model components appeared to be influenced by several demographic factors. Significant differences occurred only with religious/church attendance variables, and future research with larger samples is needed to assess the reliability of the other differences noted.

Correlations Between Belief x Attitude Items and BI and B

Another question relevant to the Gay Rights Movement was that of which perceived consequences of the bill were most clearly associated with subject behavior. Since expected consequences with neutral attitudinal counterparts or highly negatively or positively rated outcomes with associated low probabilities would have produced misleading statistics had each been analyzed separately, the belief x evaluation products were used for both correlation and regression analyses. Behavior was used as the dependent variable.

Table XIII presents the correlations between the belief x evaluation products and behavior. It reveals that all but two of the fourteen coefficients were significant at the .01 level. These were the items relating to upholding the American Constitution ($r = .208$, $p = .02$) and depriving employers of the right to exercise choice in hiring ($r = .134$, $p>.10$). The items producing highest correlations were, in order of magnitude: exposure of young children to homosexuals, giving
Table XIII
Correlations Between Behavior and the Beliefs About the Gay Rights Bill
Multiplied by Evaluations of these Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief x Evaluation Product</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Giving recognition and encouragement to the gay lifestyle.</td>
<td>.3948</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Upholding the American Constitution.</td>
<td>.2078</td>
<td>.0195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Behavior which violates religious teachings.</td>
<td>.3172</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Helping society move towards more humane values.</td>
<td>.3970</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. People being forced to work with and live by homosexuals.</td>
<td>.4118</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Alleviating the stigmatism and social ostracism of gay people.</td>
<td>.4610</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Depriving employers and businesses the right to exercise choice in hiring.</td>
<td>.1347</td>
<td>.1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The notion that gay people are human and should be treated like everybody else.</td>
<td>.4587</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Open homosexual behavior in public.</td>
<td>.4207</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Judging homosexuals on the basis of their talents instead of orientation.</td>
<td>.4269</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The exposure of young children to open homosexuals.</td>
<td>.5353</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Giving people greater freedom in choosing the expression of sexuality.</td>
<td>.4903</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Giving rights to a minority to the detriment of the majority.</td>
<td>.2340</td>
<td>.0065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Encouraging and sanctioning discrimination against gay people.</td>
<td>.2947</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
people greater freedom in choosing how they wish to express their sexuality, alleviating the stigmatism and social ostracism of gay people in our society, affirming the notion that gay people are human and should be treated like everyone else, insuring that homosexuals would be judged on the basis of their capabilities instead of their sexual orientation, open homosexual behavior in public, and forcing people to work with and live near homosexuals.

Stepwise regression using behavior as the predicted variable and the belief x evaluation products as predictors was also performed. The order of entry of the first five variables into the equation was almost identical to the ordering above based on magnitude of correlation coefficients. How people scored on the item pertaining to the exposure of children to homosexuals was thus the best predictor of vote in the Gay Rights poll. How they scored on the items pertaining to alleviating the ostracism of gay people and giving people greater freedom in expressing their sexuality were the next two most significant predictors.

Correlation of Normative Belief x Motivation to Comply Products with Voting Behavior

The correlations of these products with voting behavior are presented in Table XIV.

Examination of Table XIV reveals that all items had correlations significant at the .01 level with the exception
Table XIV
Correlations Between Products of Perceived Expectations of Normative Others x Motivation to Comply with the Other and Voting Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mother</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Father</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Friends</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. People my own age</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Brothers and sisters</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gay acquaintances</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teachers</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Church</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Best friend</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lover or spouse</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Gay organizations</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Minister</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Psychologists or psychiatrists</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the psychologist/psychiatrist item. Subjects' perceptions of their lovers' or spouses' expectations and their motivation to comply with these expectations was the single best predictor of behavior of the thirteen normative items. The item producing the next highest correlation was minister, followed by friends, best friend, father, same age persons, and mother.

Variables Which Differentiated Subjects

On the Behavioral Measure

One-way analyses of variance were performed for each of the variables assessed in this research, with voting behavior as the grouping variable. Variables on which group means differed significantly are presented in Table XV.

Of interest was the finding that the means of subjects voting for the bill did not differ significantly from those voting against the bill on any of the demographic variables or gay experience variables, with the exception of church attendance. These findings were unexpected since previous research had indicated that males more negatively evaluated homosexuals than did females and that persons with gay friends or relatives were found to have more positive attitudes. The fact that behavior with respect to homosexuals was the criterion in these analyses as opposed to attitudes toward homosexuals may explain these discrepancies.

Subjects who voted for the bill differed significantly
### Table XV

**Variables which Significantly Differentiated Subjects' Voting Behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group for bill</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church attendance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1:</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2:</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>16.23</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3:</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4:</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>.0034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5:</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>.0032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6:</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>12.99</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7:</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8:</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9:</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10:</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>19.96</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11:</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>.0017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12:</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>22.23</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13:</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>33.57</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14:</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 15:</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16:</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>32.42</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17:</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18:</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19:</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>.0171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20:</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21:</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22:</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 23:</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 24:</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>47.30</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 25:</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>.0008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAH Total:</td>
<td>76.78</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>72.15</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>52.44</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Beliefs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother:</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>39.49</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father:</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>-2.13</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>24.84</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends:</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>48.43</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers:</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>37.51</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings:</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>37.43</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Persons:</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>.0245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers:</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>31.23</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church:</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>.0033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Friend:</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>51.83</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lover/Spouse:</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>-1.91</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>55.27</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XV. (Continued) Variables Which Significantly Differentiated Subjects' Voting Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group for bill</th>
<th>Group against bill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Beliefs (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Groups</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with Reference Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Acquaint.</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Groups</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Beliefs x Motivation to Comply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Acquaint.</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best friend</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lover/Spouse</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Groups</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (nb. mc)</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>18.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs About the Gay Rights Bill, Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude 1</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief 2</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief 3</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude 4</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief 4</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude 5</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief 5</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude 6</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief 6</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude 7</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief 7</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude 8</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief 9</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude 9</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude 10</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief 11</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude 11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XV. (Continued) Variables Which Significantly Differentiated Subjects' Voting Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group for bill Group against bill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs About Gay Rights Bill, Attitudes (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude 12</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>50.72</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief 13</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude 13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>.0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude 14</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs About Gay Rights Bill x Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>-4.62</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>.0195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>-6.75</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>-5.88</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>26.95</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>35.63</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>35.17</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>-2.29</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>-8.66</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>28.39</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>-11.51</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>41.77</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>-2.46</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>.0065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT(pe)</td>
<td>84.21</td>
<td>54.46</td>
<td>-10.64</td>
<td>72.56</td>
<td>72.04</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Attitude</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>92.42</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Towards Bill</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>104.55</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Intention</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>149.69</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from those who did not on all the items of the IAH as well as on total IAH score, suggesting that anxiety experienced in the presence of homosexuals is associated with behavior counter to gay rights. Group means were particularly discrepant on several of the IAH items. The greatest difference occurred on item 24 which read, "I would feel uncomfortable knowing that my son's male teacher was a homosexual." The second most significant difference occurred on the item, "I would feel comfortable if I learned that my daughter's teacher was a lesbian." The third largest difference was in response to the item, "I would feel that I had failed as a parent if I learned that my child was gay."

In terms of motivation to comply with normative groups, persons against gay rights were significantly less likely to comply with gay acquaintances or groups but more likely to comply with the church and teachers. No other significant differences were found in responses to this scale. However, significant differences were found for all items in the scales assessing expectations of reference others. In all cases, those who voted against the bill felt that the reference others were less likely to want them to vote for the bill than did persons in favor of the bill. Differences were particularly large with the variables lover or spouse, best friend, and friends. Likewise, with the exception of the psychologist/psychiatrist item, group differences were significant for all the motivation to com-
ply x expectation variables, with means being lower in each case for those who opposed the bill. In addition to highly significant differences for the lover/spouse, best friend, and friends variables, the minister variable obtained large mean differences between groups. Finally, whereas the total score for the normative groups was positive for those voting for the bill (2.65), it was highly negative for those who voted against the bill (-27.43). This difference was highly statistically significant.

Subjects who voted for the bill differed significantly from those who voted against it on nine of the belief items pertaining to the bill. They regarded passage of the bill as being more likely to uphold the American Constitution, help society move in a humane direction, and alleviate the stigmatism and ostracism of gay people. They felt that it was less likely that the bill would have as a consequence of passage a violation of religious teachings, forcing people to work and live near homosexual people, denying employers personal choice in hiring, open homosexual behavior in public, the exposure of young children to homosexuals, and the granting of rights to a minority to the detriment of the majority.

Subjects in both groups had similar attitudes toward upholding the American Constitution and depriving employers of the right to exercise discretion in hiring but differed significantly in their attitudes on all other potential
consequences of the bill listed. As was expected, the attitude items were rated significantly worse by those who opposed the bill, particularly in the instance of giving people greater freedom in expressing their sexuality, the exposure of young children to homosexuals, alleviating the stigmatism and ostracism of homosexuals, and the notion that homosexuals are human and should be treated like everybody else.

The belief x attitude products differentiated significantly the vote-positive from the vote-negative groups on all but the variable dealing with the discretion of employers in hiring. Again, the group means for those who voted for the bill were significantly higher on all variables. The most significant difference occurred on the item involving the exposure of young children to open homosexuals, being followed in magnitude by differences on the items giving people greater freedom in expressing their sexuality and open homosexual behavior in public. As was expected, the means on the total score for the PT(pe) term differed significantly for the two groups.

Likewise, the summation of the PT(pe) and PT(nb mc) terms differentiated the groups at a highly significant level. Persons who voted against the bill expressed significantly lower attitudes towards voting for it, as was expected. Likewise, the behavioral intentions for those subjects were significantly lower than were those of the subjects who eventually voted for the bill.
Correlations Between Demographic Variables, IAH, Attitudes Towards the Gay Rights Bill, Behavioral Intention, and Behavior

Since subjects who voted for the bill did not differ on demographic variables (with the exception of church attendance) from those who voted against the bill, it was not surprising that no correlations significant at the .01 level were obtained between these variables and voting behavior. Correlations between attitude towards the Gay Rights Bill and behavioral intention with voting were likewise statistically insignificant. Church attendance, on the other hand, had small but significant correlations with attitude, intention and behavior ($r = -.21$, $p = .009$; $r = -.21$, $p = .01$; $r = -.24$, $p = .005$). Thus, the greater the church attendance of a subject, the less likely was that subject to be in favor of the bill, express an intention to vote for it, and in fact vote for it.

Experience with homosexuals was expected to correlate with attitude, intention and behavior. One explanation for the failure to find significant relationships was that whereas experience may influence attitude toward homosexuals, behavior towards homosexuals is determined by a variety of other more salient factors, as this research has shown. Supportive of this argument is the fact that four of the five experience variables correlated with the total IAH score. These included having known a homosexual or having had per-
sonal contact ($r = -0.267, \ p = 0.001$), having a homosexual friend ($r = -0.309, \ p < 0.0001$), having been propositioned by a homosexual ($r = -0.23, \ p = 0.005$), and having had a homosexual experience ($r = -0.28, \ p = 0.0005$). Thus, contact with homosexuals was associated with less homophobic scores on the IAH but not with the model terms.

Reliability of the IAH and Attitude Towards Gay Rights Scales

Alpha coefficients were computed to assess the reliability of the IAH and Attitude Toward Gay Rights scales. Alpha for the IAH was found to be 0.934, and that for the Attitude Toward Gay Rights Scale was 0.875. The factorial validity of the scales was assessed by computing correlations for each item in each scale with the total of all other items in the respective scale. Corrected item-total correlations are presented in Table XVI.

Only two of the IAH item-total correlations were less than 0.40, these being, "I would feel uncomfortable knowing that my clergyman was homosexual," and "I would feel uncomfortable kissing a close friend of my sex in public." The average corrected item-total correlation for the IAH Scale was 0.687. Of note was the finding that the new and previously untested items (12, 18, 20 and 21) used in this research had high and significant correlations of 0.764, 0.667, 0.616 and 0.571 respectively.
Table XVI

Corrected Item-Total Correlations for Items in the IAH and Attitude Towards Gay Rights Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IAH Item</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Attitude Item</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the fourteen items in the Attitude Towards Gay Rights Scale, three had corrected item-total correlations below .40 but none below .30. The three were those pertaining to violation of religious teachings ($r = .307$), depriving employers of personal discretion in hiring ($r = .351$), and giving rights to a minority to the detriment of the majority ($r = .339$). The mean correlation for all items was .544. Thus, the attitude scale had excellent factorial validity, with none of the items making less than a moderate contribution to the assessment of attitude towards the Gay Rights Bill.

**Subject Mortality**

Seventeen of the 151 subjects in this study failed to return their ballots to the State Capital. To assess whether or not these subjects were comparable to the remainder of the sample, F-statistics were computed for differences between groups on each variable assessed in the study. The groups did not differ significantly on any variable at the .01 level. Means for the responders and no responders on the scale assessing attitudes towards voting in favor of the bill were 4.68 and 4.35 respectively and 4.63 and 4.00 for the measure of behavioral intention. Thus, subjects who did not return ballots were slightly but not significantly less in favor of the bill and more neutral in their expressed intention to vote for it. In sum, it appeared unlikely that subject mortality in this study, which may have been due to losses in the mail, influenced the findings of the research.
DATA VALIDITY AND GENERALITY

There were two primary threats to the validity of the subjects' responses—the sensitive nature of the research topic and the anonymous conditions under which data were collected.

A stance supportive of gay rights is in many segments of society viewed negatively, and it was felt that some subjects might have felt hesitant to express support for this reason. One finding of this research was that subjects as a group felt it slightly unlikely that reference others would want them to vote for the bill. An even more sensitive portion of the research was that in which experience with homosexuals was assessed. The anonymity of all data collection was stressed in all phases of the research to insure candid responses. No subject at any time during the research questioned its anonymity. The fact that the majority of subjects tended to be in favor of the bill (63%), voted for it (66%), stated that they knew or had had contact with homosexuals (65%), and responded in a non-homophobic fashion on the IAH (82%) suggests that the subjects were not deterred from expressing positive attitudes and intentions by more prevailing negative attitudes in their society at large.

That subjects felt their responses to be anonymous
created a potential for random and careless responding. Examination of the research results clearly demonstrated that such was not the case. The high alpha coefficients for the IAH and Attitude Towards Gay Rights Scale revealed consistent and thus non-random responses by the subjects, as did the high correlations between BI and B and between predicted intention and actual intention. The perceived expectations of others were as anticipated—gay people and organizations were seen as being highly in favor of voting for the bill, teachers and mental health professionals as being slightly in favor, and ministers, the church, parents, and lovers or spouses as being against voting for the bill. Thus, responding in general appeared careful and accurate.

A related potential threat to validity was a failure to understand directions. The highly significant results of the study again suggest that responses were in accordance with the written instructions on the questionnaire. The section of the questionnaire deemed most confusing was the Attitude Towards Gay Rights Scale. Subjects had to rate probabilities of certain consequences and then evaluate the consequences independently of their probability. Had subjects evaluated the probability that a given consequence would occur rather than the consequence itself, then the high correlations between PT(pe) and both behavioral intention and behavior would not have been obtained.
The subjects in this study were college students, and though the test of the Ajzen and Fishbein model was not influenced by this lack of generality, the other findings of the study were probably not representative of the general population. Aside from the obvious age differences, the subjects had more education, came from more professional families, and attended church less frequently than do members of society at large. However, insofar as college students represent the future leaders of the community, findings for this subject population are important in their own right.

The question may be raised as to whether or not the students in the survey were comparable to those used in other research studies in this area. Less than 20% of the sample was Caucasian, but ethnic differences were not associated with any of the major variables assessed in this research. However, the great ethnic variability in Hawaii may to some extent have had the effect of increasing tolerance for differences from subjects' own values and norms. Transsexuality was accepted by the autochthonous peoples in ancient Hawaii. This factor, as well as the possibility that mainland Americans who move to Hawaii are in general more liberal than those who do not, may have created a more liberal sample than would have been obtained at a mainland university with respect to this issue.

The subjects in all three surveys were told prior to participation the exact nature of the research and its re-
quirements. Those who volunteered may not have been representative of the general college population, as was suggested by the fact that female volunteers outnumbered males by more than two to one. The failure to find sex differences in this study may have been related to the possibility that those males who participated were more willing to disclose personal information than are males in general. Likewise, the subjects as a group, who participated knowing the nature of the research, may have been more willing to express their feelings about personal and controversial issues than would have been the case had the nature of the research not been specified.

The Ajzen and Fishbein Model

The six predictions derived from the Ajzen and Fishbein model presented earlier were all verified by the results of the study. Correlations between PT(pe) and Aact, predicted BI and actual BI, and BI and B were .839, .838, and .730 respectively. A possibility in this research was that subjects' affective responses to homosexuals would better predict their voting than would their attitudes towards the Gay Rights Bill. As was predicted by the model, beliefs about the act were more predictive of B than was the measure of affective responses utilized. Also in accordance with prediction was the fact that BI was the best overall predictor of behavior. Finally, the addition of demographic variables
to the regression equation predicting behavior from the PT(pe) and PT(nb.mc) terms did not significantly increase the variance accounted for by the model.

There are several aspects of this research which account for the high correlations obtained. First, care was made to specify all four elements of the BI entity and to insure exact correspondence between the BI and B entities. Thus, subjects were told the nature of the behavior (voting in a legislative poll on the gay rights issue), its target (homosexuals), the time of the poll (one week in the future), and the setting in which it was to occur (the subject's residence).

Second, the time interval between the assessment of BI and B was short. There were no historical events during this interval which were likely to have influenced attitudes toward the Gay Rights Bill, subject maturation was minimal during so short a period, and attitude change attributable to this factor was likewise minimal.

Third, in accordance with the suggestions of Schuman and Johnson (1976) and Tittle and Hill (1967), the behavior selected was common and well within the behavioral repertoires of all subjects. Also, this behavior was deemed far from trivial, since the responses were examined by the Chairperson of the Committee on Public Employment. The fact that a number of subjects enclosed written comments with their ballots suggests that they regarded the poll as meaningful.
Another explanation for the highly significant findings was the fact that the measures used were constructed on the basis of data provided by the population from which subjects were drawn. Issues and normative groups presented as items in the survey were those deemed relevant by this population. The high reliability and factorial validity of the attitude scale may be attributed to this selection procedure.

The findings are strengthened by several additional factors. Care was taken to select a behavior for which intentions did not have highly skewed base rates. High attitude-behavior consistency can thus not be attributed to severe restriction of response options. Second, intentions and behavior were measured in different settings, as has been urged by Schuman and Johnson (1976) and Wicker (1969). The likelihood of consistency due to demand effects operating in both settings was thus greatly reduced. The fact that the belief component of the prediction equation was significantly more predictive of BI than was the normative component in the University setting but not in the home environment does suggest the impact of environment upon assessment. Belief items were found in general to support passage of the bill, whereas normative items were slightly in opposition. It is thus not surprising that the majority of inconsistencies between BI and B occurred in cases of subjects expressing intent to vote for the bill who in fact voted against it.

Although the need for unobtrusive measurement of behav-
ior has been stressed, subjects in this research were told the nature of the behavior they were required to perform. This procedure was selected for both practical and theoretical reasons. First, making the behavior a requirement assured high response rates. Second, had the behavior not been specified, then the assessment of BI could have been undertaken with only the action and target elements specified. Third, the reason for unobtrusive measurement is to guarantee that contingencies operative in the assessment of attitudes and intentions do not influence assessment of behavior. Although subjects knew the behavior in advance, great care was taken to insure that contingencies would not be the same. Aside from the anonymity of data collection in both settings and the fact that assessment occurred in experimental and non-experimental conditions, care was taken to make the actual voting response seem unrelated to the research. Subjects were told that the poll was required to insure that previously expressed attitudes were in response to a realistic decision-making situation. For these reasons, it was deemed unlikely that subjects' previously expressed behavioral intentions would have influenced actual voting behavior to any considerable degree.

In summary, this research was designed to provide an assessment of the Ajzen and Fishbein model under conditions in which failure to produce significant findings would have had major impact with respect to the validity of the model.
The practical utility of the model is an issue quite apart from its validity. The fact that subjects' behavior in the Gay Rights Poll was significantly predicted by a measure of behavioral intention is probably one of the lesser findings of this research. Likewise, the predicted intention correlated with actual intention to a significant degree, but a simple attitude scale was as useful in predicting BI as were the weighted sums of PT(pe) and PT(nb·mc) terms which took considerable effort to assess.

A major contribution of the model was its provision of information pertaining to the relative weights of the attitudinal and normative components in the prediction of actual behavior. Each contributed to prediction to an equivalent degree. This information is valuable since had the normative component obtained a greater weight, then it would have been expected that changing beliefs about the bill would be largely unsuccessful in changing behavior.

An inspection of the data revealed that subjects with negative beliefs about the bill also perceived reference others as being against their voting for the bill. Since reference others shape beliefs and are also selected on the basis of belief similarity, this finding was not surprising. However, the high correlation between the two terms did allow for the possibility that one was simply a function of the other—subjects justified their positions by making the expectations of others consistent with their intentions. If
this were the case, then the stepwise regression equations would have revealed no significant increase in prediction following the inclusion of a second variable. Both the attitudinal and normative components when entered second in the equation caused significant increases in prediction, thereby indicating the independence of the terms. Thus, though attitudes and normative influences were highly correlated, there is some basis for predicting change in behavior subsequent to attitude change.

The second contribution of the model was in the data it produced relevant to the concern for which issues were most highly predictive of behavior. The response which was most predictive of behavior, explaining 29% of the variance, concerned the exposure of children to avowed homosexuals. Those who opposed the bill felt this consequence of bill passage to be significantly more probable and evaluated this eventuality significantly more negatively than did those who voted for it. Explaining 24% of the variance was the item dealing with giving people in general more freedom in expressing their sexuality. Both groups felt this to be a probable consequence of the bill, but those who voted for it rated this consequence significantly more positively than did those who did not. The issue of relieving the stigmatism of gay people in our society was the issue found to correlate next most highly with behavior, and it accounted for 21% of the variance. Those in favor of the bill rated
both the probability of this occurrence and its effects significantly more positively than did other subjects. Also accounting for 21% of the variance was the item pertaining to affirmation of equality of treatment. Both groups saw this as being a likely consequence of the bill, but those who opposed the bill rated this outcome significantly less positively than did those who voted for it.

With the exception of one issue, all belief x attitude products significantly differentiated subjects who voted for the bill from those who did not. However, five of the belief items, when considered singly, did not differentiate the subjects. This finding is very important in that it shows, with respect to the gay rights issue, that attempts to change some of one's central beliefs about the consequences of gay rights may be an ineffective means of changing overall attitude and behavior. It is the evaluation of perceived consequences which differentiated subjects' behavior in two of the four central beliefs. Thus, change attempts would in these cases focus on altering evaluations rather than beliefs about certain consequences. In the case of exposure of children to homosexuals, one might best cite research indicating that homosexuals do not appear to influence the sexual orientations of children for whom they serve as role models, that attempts to seduce young children are not a distinguishing characteristic of homosexuals, and the like. Since the model provides this needed information pertaining to atti-
tude composition, it thus has made a further contribution to this area of research.

A major limitation of the findings imposed by the model was the lack of generality. The issues and normative groups selected were pertinent to the population studied, and thus the utility of the scale is indeterminate for other samples. This research differs from others in the area in two fundamental respects which make the generality of findings difficult to assess. It is the only study known to this author in which attitude towards an act was assessed, and also, with the exception of the Simmons (1965) research, the only one in which items were selected on the basis of content analysis from pre-test data generated by the subjects themselves. Still, it is reasonable to assume that though the responses to the survey items by non-student populations would be more conservative, the reference groups and issues selected would remain relevant. The relative weights of the attitude and normative components might alter, as would perhaps the ordering of the issues in terms of their correlations with behavior. Still, it is expected that the current survey with little revision would yield highly accurate predictions of behavior as well as the information relevant to changing attitudes.

Research Findings for Demographic Variables

Given the novel nature of the research, the failure
to find significant associations between demographic variables is difficult to assess. However, findings from other studies will be summarized and related to this research.

With respect to sex, males were found to be more negative in various measures of responsivity to homosexuals in research by Turnbull and Brown (1977), Glassner and Owen (1976), and Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier (1974) but not in Levitt and Klassen (1974), Henley and Pincus (1978), and Weinberger and Millham (1978). Data indicating that same-sexed homosexuals are more negatively evaluated than opposite-sexed was collected by Millham and Weinberger (1977) and Millham, San Miguel, and Kellogg (1976). The failure to find significant sex differences in this research is consistent with the Hudson and Ricketts (1979) research, in which no sex differences were found on the IAH.

As was proposed previously, the failure to find sex differences may have been due to subject self-selection, with more liberal males being more likely to enter the study.

That younger and better educated subjects respond more favorably to homosexuals on attitude scales was reported by Jenkins (1976) and Nyberg and Alston (1976). No age or educational effect was found by Levitt and Klassen. Hudson and Ricketts reported significant negative correlations between age and years of school completed and homophobia. In the current research, the correlation between IAH and age and years in school were $-0.206 (p = 0.011)$ and $-0.118 (p = 0.156)$,
thus indicating a small effect for age on this variable. That older subjects tended to have lower scores on the IAH was initially surprising since the younger generation has experienced rapid changes in social values during its formative years. The fact that IAH scores for the group were by-in-large non-homophbic and the fact that the majority of respondents voted for the bill does suggest that younger individuals are more liberal on this issue than is the general American public. It also appears the case that within the younger generation increased age and thus maturity and experience is associated with decreased homonegativism to a small extent. The failure to find significant differences with respect to behavior was most likely due to the very restricted range in age and education in the subject population.

Ethnic background was assessed in the Millham et al. (1976) and Hudson and Ricketts (1979) research. Whereas no differences were found in the former, Caucasians were found to be significantly less homophobic on the IAH than Orientals and Filipinos. This effect was not found in this research and may have been due to differences in subject recruitment between the studies.

Socio-economic status was assessed in this study by use of the occupational scale from the Hollingshead Two-Factor Index. Neither the level of the father's occupation nor mother's occupation correlated with the IAH or model terms.
In previous research, higher SES was related to preference for greater personal distance to homosexuals in the Glassner and Owen (1976) study and had no effect in the Levitt and Klassen (1974) research. No relationship was found between IAH and total family income in the Hudson and Ricketts (1979) research. A likely explanation for the current findings is that college samples represent neither the full range of socio-economic classes nor the average members of the lower classes. Most of the students in this research came from professional families, and those who did not were perhaps atypical of lower middle and working class backgrounds. Thus, even if these latter classes are more opposed to gay rights legislation, this effect would not have been demonstrated here.

Religious affiliation was also assessed in this research but did not differentiate subjects on any of the variables assessed. These findings were consistent with those of Millham et al. (1976) and Smith (1971). However, greater church attendance was associated with significantly more negative beliefs about the Gay Rights Bill, the expectations of others, general attitudes toward the bill, and expressed intention to vote or actually vote for the bill. Greater church involvement was also a characteristic of the more homophobic responders in the Turnbull and Brown (1977) research. Since the Christian doctrine asserts that homosexual behavior is sinful and unnatural, it is not surprising that those who most subscribe to doctrine are likewise more un-
comfortable in the presence of homosexuals and opposed to rights for these individuals.

Two other variables assessed in this research included family size and environment in which raised. Family size was unrelated to homophobia in both this research and that of Hudson and Ricketts (1979), but few subjects came from families with more than seven members. That population density was unrelated to research variables is consistent with the findings of Turnbull and Brown (1977) and Millham et al. (1976).

The effect of previous experience with homosexuals has been assessed by a variety of researchers. In the San Miguel and Millham (1976) research described previously, whereas a positive interaction with a homosexual in the experimental situation led to attenuated aggression in subjects with neutral attitudes, highly homophobic subjects were uninfluenced by the nature of previous interaction. In the Millham et al. (1976) research, previous experience with homosexuals of either sex led to a less negative characterization of both male and female homosexuals. Likewise, Glassner and Owen (1976) found that females, who reported knowing more homosexuals, obtained lower social distance scores on four of eight social distance measures. In the Levitt and Klassen (1976) research, homophobics were found to have had significantly less homosexual experience. These findings led to the prediction that subjects who reported having homosexual
friends, family members and experiences would also indicate more positive attitudes toward homosexuals and the Gay Rights Bill. That such was not the case may have been due to inaccurate responding by the subjects on these sensitive items, although base rates were generally consistent with other research findings in this area. A more likely explanation is that homophobic individuals tend to respond to homosexuals on the basis of their sexual orientation (the label) rather than their personal characteristics, whereas non-homophobic people respond to individual homosexuals on the basis of their attributes. This contention is supported by the research of both Karr (1978) and San Miguel and Millham (1976) and clearly suggests that whereas the response to interaction with homosexuals may be predicted from initial attitudes, the quantity of experience with homosexuals should not a priori be predictive of attitudes. A factor of some consequence is the fact that the most obviously identifiable homosexuals are frequently those who most conform to stereotypes. Those whose opinions of homosexuals are neutral or positive prior to interaction should not automatically be expected to improve or maintain approval subsequent to personal contact. It is further relevant to point out that although attitudes towards homosexuals correlated highly with measures of BI and B, they accounted for only 48% and 28% of their variance respectively. Attitudes toward the Gay Rights Bill were significantly better predictors of both terms, and less than
40% of the variance in these attitudes was accounted for by the measure of attitudes toward homosexuals.

In summary, the only demographic variable which was significantly correlated with model terms was church attendance. Differences between current findings and previous ones were attributed to differences in the criterion variable, subject recruitment, and limited variation in the sample on some of the variables assessed.

Other Research Findings

A further contribution of this research derived from the information it provided pertaining to the modified IAH Scale. All new items had high and significant corrected item-total correlations, thereby demonstrating the factorial validity of the scale. Also of importance was the finding that IAH scores correlated significantly with behavior, thereby providing evidence for the construct validity of the scale. Although the IAH was not expected to be as good a predictor as were the model terms, it was anticipated that those who obtained high scores on this scale would be less likely to vote for the bill.

The mean total IAH score of 58.5 obtained in this study was comparable to that obtained by the authors of the scale (53.0). Few subjects in both were classified as high-grade non-homophobic, but almost 20% were classified high-grade homophobic in this research as compared to less than 5% in
the previous one. These differences may be a result of the fact that the latter utilized a sample of which almost 20% was non-student. Some of the non-students were faculty members who would be expected to have less homophobic scores.

The findings on the IAH indicated that subjects did not experience being ill at ease at the prospect of interacting socially with, working with, or living near a homosexual. However, there was a trend for increasingly close interactions to be rated more and more negatively. Being propositioned by a homosexual and finding one's family members to be homosexual were the most negatively rated items. However, on only one item (I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my spouse or partner was attracted to members of his or her sex) did subjects express clear agreement that they would feel uncomfortable. There are a variety of non-homophobic reasons why people would feel uncomfortable to learn of homosexual impulses in their spouses and family members, and thus the higher means for these items were hardly surprising. In general, the subjects as a group did not indicate that they would be uncomfortable in interactions with homosexuals, provided that physical intimacy was not involved. They clearly did not feel comfortable with the prospect of having homosexual children or spouses.

These findings were similar to those of Glassner and Owen (1976) who found that although 80% of their subjects would work with a homosexual, only 20% would not be upset if
a family member were homosexual. The findings of the Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier (1974) study, though consistent with the trend presented above, were considerably more conservative. Whereas more than half of the men in their research claimed that they would not allow a male homosexual to sit next to them in class or talk to them on a first-name basis, the majority of subjects in this study did not claim that they would be uncomfortable talking to a homosexual at a party, working with one, or finding that their best friend were homosexual. As was previously discussed, there is reason to believe that the subject population composed of students at the University of Hawaii would be more tolerant of homosexuals than would students from the mid-Western university from which the sample utilized by Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier was drawn. The subjects in this latter study were not self-selected, and this may also have contributed to the differences in findings obtained.

As was the case with responses on the IAH, subjects as a group responded in a liberal fashion on the other variables assessed in this research. In general, the consequences of the bill deemed most probable were evaluated positively, and the consequences deemed negative were rated so with less strength than were positive consequences. Thus, the overall attitude towards the bill was favorable, as were expressed intentions to vote and actual behavior.

Care was taken in the second survey, from which scale
items were derived, to insure that subjects gave their considerations about voting for the Gay Rights Bill as opposed to homosexuals per se. The scales thus did not assess the swish, sick and danger stereotypes which were so frequently endorsed in the research cited previously. The current findings indicated that subjects rated most highly judging homosexuals on the basis of their abilities, legislation promulgating humane values, and the upholding of the American Constitution. These findings were not incompatible, however, with the simultaneous belief in the validity of these stereotypes. That the issue which most correlated with behavior was that of the exposure of children to homosexuals suggests that any one or all of these stereotypes may have been held by many of the subjects. Also rated negatively was the consequence of open homosexual behavior in public, a fact which further implies that whereas students felt that homosexuals should be treated equally and that they should have freedom in choosing the expression of their sexuality, they still neither considered homosexual behavior normal nor the gay lifestyle as an acceptable alternative. It is of note that few subjects expressed clear agreement with the item stating that the bill would give rights to a minority to the detriment of the majority. Since subjects who felt that homosexuals would corrupt co-workers and could cause the downfall of society, as did so many respondents in the Levitt and Klassen research, would have certainly indicated a high
probability that the granting of homosexual rights would be detrimental to the majority, it appears unlikely that the danger stereotype was widely accepted in the sample.
CHAPTER VIII.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The goal of this research was to investigate the relationships between beliefs, attitudes, intentions and a specific behavior, this being the support of gay rights legislation. The Ajzen and Fishbein model of attitude-behavior consistency was used to relate these terms, and the research was designed as a test of the model.

Approximately 250 students at the University of Hawaii participated in one of the three phases of this research. The purpose of the first was to select a criterion behavior, and that of the second was to design scales assessing attitudes toward gay rights legislation and beliefs about the expectation of and motivation to comply with relevant normative others. In the third phase, relationships between survey variables and actual behavior in a legislative poll on gay rights were assessed. These variables included the previously mentioned scales as well as demographic information, the IAH Scale, a one-item scale assessing attitude towards gay rights, and a scale assessing behavioral intention.

Results indicated that all predictions derived from the Ajzen and Fishbein model were supported by the data. Correlations between predicted attitudes and actual attitudes, predicted intention and actual intention, and intention and
behavior were high and statistically significant. It was also found that whereas the attitudinal component of the model was a better predictor of intention than was the normative component, both terms contributed significantly and equally to the prediction of behavior.

Subjects as a group had positive attitudes about the Gay Rights Bill and voted for it. They likewise expressed relative comfort on the IAH items pertaining to a variety of social encounters with homosexuals. It was none-the-less clear that sexual advances from homosexuals, open homosexual behavior in public, and the exposure of young children to homosexuals were unacceptable to the subjects in the sample. Whereas IAH scores, virtually all belief x evaluation of belief products, the reference beliefs x motivation to comply items, predicted intention, attitude towards the Gay Rights Bill, and actual intention significantly differentiated subjects on voting behavior, none of the demographic variables except church attendance did so at the .01 level of significance.

That the Ajzen and Fishbein model successfully accounted for behavior was deemed to be of theoretical but little practical import. The major contribution of the model was in its specification of the relative contributions of attitudinal and normative influences in determining behavior, which issues were most salient in determining attitudes with respect to the gay rights issue, and the need to consider
both beliefs and their evaluations in any future attempts
to alter attitudes towards the bill.

Finally, the reliability of a modified version of the
IAH Scale was assessed in this research and found to be high. The high correlation obtained between total scores on this scale and behavior contributed support for the construct validity of the scale.

A major limitation of the research was the homogeneous and unrepresentative subject population utilized. The failure to find effects due to demographic characteristics was for some variables attributed to this factor. It was hypothesized that although non-student populations would differ on their responses to the survey, the issues and normative groups selected for the research would none-the-less be relevant for non-student populations. However, the saliency of normative group expectations and belief items would undoubtedly be influenced by changes in the norms and values of the population sampled. Thus, strategems designed on the basis of this research to change behavior with respect to the gay rights issue would be most likely to succeed with student populations.
I. Sample Items From the Attitudes Toward Homosexuality Scale*

4. I believe that all homosexuals should be confined and not released until cured.

5. I would not be too upset if I found that my son or daughter were homosexual.

7. Homosexuality is a sin.

10. Homosexuals are sick.

11. The thought of homosexuality is repulsive to me.

15. I find it hard to believe that homosexuals can really love each other.

18. A homosexual relationship can be as fulfilling as a heterosexual relationship.

19. Homosexuals should never be allowed to teach school or supervise children.

21. Because of its perverse nature, sex between homosexuals can only be animalistic pleasure.

22. I would not wish for homosexuals to live near me.

23. Homosexuality is just a different kind of lifestyle and, therefore, should not be condemned.

24. Homosexuals are very unhappy people who wish they could be heterosexual.

27. Homosexuality is a perversion which should be erased for the good of society.

II. Items of the Anti-H Scale*

1. Homosexuality is a rotten perversion and ought to be suppressed.

2. Homosexuals constitute a minority group and as such they are being denied certain of their basic civil rights.

3. I would never be seen in public with a known homosexual.

4. Homosexuals should be allowed to operate clubs and/or bars as meeting places.

5. Vice-squad tactics of entrapment are justified in the case of homosexuals.

6. Homosexuals should be barred from entering the country by Immigration Laws.

7. I would invite known homosexuals to a party in my home.

8. Homosexuals should be allowed in the armed forces.

9. If I found out that my friend was a homosexual, I would end our friendship.

10. Homosexual "marriages" should be officially recognized.

11. Homosexuals are no better than criminals.

12. Homosexuality is unnatural.

13. If I discovered that my son was a homosexual and he then refused psychiatric help, I would expel him from my home.

14. A homosexual's partner should have the same legal status as does a heterosexual's partner.

III. Items from the
Attitudes Toward Homosexuality Scale*

1. The idea of two men having sex together is disgusting.
2. Sex between men is abnormal.
3. If two boys want to have sex together, it's all right so long as they both want to do it.
4. I do not believe that homosexuals should be legally punished.
5. Homosexuality is wrong under all circumstances.
6. If two men love one another, then sex between them is OK.
7. Sex between two consenting male adults is all right.
8. Sexual activities that society is opposed to are immoral.
9. Two boys having sex is something that I would consider abnormal or unnatural.
10. I would not vote for a candidate who I knew to be a homosexual.
11. Homosexuality should be seen as an emotional disturbance.
12. I could have a close friendship with a homosexual.
13. It's all right that we have laws against homosexuality.
14. There is no sex act that I would think of as being abnormal, so long as the people involved want to do it.
15. If I had children and any of them turned out to be homosexual, I would be very upset.
16. It's immoral for two persons of the same sex to have sex with each other.

* Items are reproduced from Sobel (1976), p. 447-448.
IV. Items from the Homophobia Scale*

1. Homosexuals should be locked up to protect society.

2. It would be upsetting for me to find out I was alone with a homosexual.

3. Homosexuals should be allowed to hold government positions.

4. I would not want to be a member of an organization which had any homosexuals in it membership.

5. I find the thought of homosexual acts disgusting.

6. If laws against homosexuals were eliminated, the proportion of homosexuals in the population would probably remain about the same.

7. A homosexual could be a good president of the United States.

8. I would be afraid for a child of mine to have a teacher who was homosexual.

9. If a homosexual sat next to me on a bus, I would get nervous.

* Items achieving statistical significance in the Lumby study include 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8. Other items achieving significance are listed below.

I won't associate with known homosexuals if I can help it.

Heterosexuals have weaker sex drives than homosexuals. Homosexuals are high security risks in government jobs.

Homosexuality is a sickness.
V. Homosexuality Attitude Scale

(Male Target)

1. The growing number of male homosexuals indicates a decline in American morals.

2. Male homosexuals should be allowed to hold high government positions.

3. Most male homosexuals dislike women.

4. Laws regulating male homosexual behavior should be loosened.

5. Male homosexuals are more revolting than female homosexuals (lesbians).

6. If I walked into an all-male gay bar, I would become quite anxious.

7. Male homosexuals are sick.

8. If I were propositioned by a male homosexual, I would not be offended.

9. Male homosexuals are more creative than heterosexuals.

10. Homosexual behavior between two men is just plain wrong.

11. Male homosexuals are more likely to commit crimes (non-sexual) than are heterosexuals.

12. It would be very easy for me to have a conversation with someone I knew to me a male homosexual.

13. Most male homosexuals have some identifiable feminine characteristics.

14. Male homosexuals should be required to undergo psychotherapy.

15. Male homosexuality is a sin.

16. I would rather have a homosexual brother than a lesbian sister.

17. Just as in other species, male homosexuality is a natural expression of sexuality in humans.

18. A male homosexual's mother is probably very domineering.
V. (Continued) Homosexuality Attitude Scale

(Male Target)

19. I would like to have male homosexual friends.
20. Most male homosexuals have a life-style of one-night stands.
21. It is usually easy to identify a male homosexual.
22. I would not like to have male homosexual friends.
23. Most male homosexuals like to dress in women's clothing.
24. I think male homosexuals are disgusting.
25. Male homosexuals prefer to take roles (passive or aggressive) in their sexual behavior.
26. Male homosexuals use physical injury as a usual part of their sexual behavior.
27. Male homosexuality is a choice of lifestyles.
28. If a male homosexual approached me in a public restroom, I would be disgusted.
29. I would rather have a lesbian sister than a homosexual brother.
30. Male homosexuals should be made to take examinations for VD regularly.
31. Bars that cater solely to male homosexuals should be placed in one specific and known part of town.
32. Male homosexuality is just as natural as heterosexuality.
33. If my brother (best male friend if no brother) told me he was homosexual, it would distress me greatly.
34. Male homosexuals should be required to register with the police department where they live.
35. Lesbians are more revolting than male homosexuals.
36. Male homosexuals are more likely to seduce young people than are heterosexuals.
37. Male homosexuality is a perversion.
38. Male homosexuals should be allowed to teach young children.
VI. Items in the Hudson-Ricketts Index of Attitudes Towards Homosexuals*

1. I would feel comfortable working closely with a homosexual.

2. I would enjoy attending social functions at which homosexuals were present.

3. I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my neighbor were homosexual.

4. If a member of my sex made a sexual advance toward me I would feel angry.

5. I would feel comfortable knowing that I was attractive to members of my sex.

6. I would feel uncomfortable being seen in a gay bar.

7. I would feel comfortable if a member of my sex made an advance toward me.

8. I would be comfortable if I found myself attracted to a member of my sex.

9. I would feel disappointed if I learned that my child was homosexual.

10. I would feel nervous being in a group of homosexuals.

11. I would deny to members of my peer group that I had friends who were homosexual.

12. I would feel comfortable knowing that my clergyman was homosexual.

13. I would feel that I had failed as a parent if I learned that my child was gay.

14. If I saw two men holding hands in public I would feel disgusted.

15. If a member of my sex made an advance toward me I would feel disgusted.

16. I would feel comfortable if I learned that my daughter's teacher was a lesbian.
VI. (Continued) Items in the Hudson-Ricketts Index of Attitudes Towards Homosexuals*

17. I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my spouse or partner was attracted to members of his or her sex.

18. I would like to have my parents to know that I had gay friends.

19. I would feel uncomfortable kissing a close friend of my sex in public.

20. I would like to have friends of my sex who were homosexual.

21. If a member of my sex made an advance toward me I would wonder if I were homosexual.

22. I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my best friend of my sex was homosexual.

23. If a member of my sex made an advance toward me I would feel flattered.

24. I would feel uncomfortable knowing that my son's male teacher was homosexual.

25. I would feel comfortable working closely with a female homosexual.

VII. Attitude Towards Gay Rights Scale

From Survey III

Instructions

In the space below a number of possible consequences of endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill are listed. If you were to vote for the bill, how likely is it that the consequences listed would occur? Under each statement, circle the number which corresponds to your judgement of the probability that each consequence would occur.

Following each probability rating, you will be asked to indicate on a good-bad scale your attitude concerning the previous consequence. Thus, if the item read, "Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would lead to a great increase in homosexuality.\," your task would first be to indicate how probable it is that homosexuality would increase as a result of endorsement of the bill. You then should give your attitude towards the increased occurrence of homosexuality. It is important that you give your true opinion of the consequences, regardless of whether or not you feel that endorsement of the Bill is likely to lead to that consequence. Thus you may have a negative feeling about the possibility of increased homosexuality in society but also feel that passage of the Bill would have no bearing on the incidence of homosexuality. Please ask the monitor of the experiment if you have any questions at this point.

1. Endorsement of the gay rights bill would give recognition and encouragement to the gay lifestyle.

   improbable  probable
   \[\begin{array}{cccccc}
   -3 & -2 & -1 & 0 & +1 & +2 & +3
   \end{array}\]

   Giving recognition and encouragement to the gay lifestyle.

   bad  good
   \[\begin{array}{cccccc}
   -3 & -2 & -1 & 0 & +1 & +2 & +3
   \end{array}\]

2. Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would uphold the American Constitution.

   improbable  probable
   \[\begin{array}{cccccc}
   -3 & -2 & -1 & 0 & +1 & +2 & +3
   \end{array}\]

   Upholding the American Constitution

   bad  good
   \[\begin{array}{cccccc}
   -3 & -2 & -1 & 0 & +1 & +2 & +3
   \end{array}\]
VII. (Continued) Attitude Towards Gay Rights Scale From Survey III

3. Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would be a violation of religious teachings.
   improbable $\begin{array}{ccccccc} -3 & -2 & -1 & 0 & +1 & +2 & +3 \\ \end{array}$ probable
   Behavior which violates religious teachings:
   bad $\begin{array}{ccccccc} -3 & -2 & -1 & 0 & +1 & +2 & +3 \\ \end{array}$ good

4. Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would help society move towards more humane values.
   improbable $\begin{array}{ccccccc} -3 & -2 & -1 & 0 & +1 & +2 & +3 \\ \end{array}$ probable
   Helping society move towards more humane values:
   bad $\begin{array}{ccccccc} -3 & -2 & -1 & 0 & +1 & +2 & +3 \\ \end{array}$ good

5. Endorsement of the Bill would result in people being forced to work with and live near homosexual people.
   improbable $\begin{array}{ccccccc} -3 & -2 & -1 & 0 & +1 & +2 & +3 \\ \end{array}$ probable
   People being forced to work with and live near homosexuals.
   bad $\begin{array}{ccccccc} -3 & -2 & -1 & 0 & +1 & +2 & +3 \\ \end{array}$ good

6. Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would help to alleviate the stigmatism and social ostracism of gay people in our society.
   improbable $\begin{array}{ccccccc} -3 & -2 & -1 & 0 & +1 & +2 & +3 \\ \end{array}$ probable
   Alleviating the stigmatism and social ostracism of gay people in our society.
   bad $\begin{array}{ccccccc} -3 & -2 & -1 & 0 & +1 & +2 & +3 \\ \end{array}$ good
VII. (Continued) Attitude Towards Gay Rights Scale From Survey III

7. Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would deprive employers and businesses the right to exercise personal choice and discretion in hiring employees.

improbable ___________________________ probable
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

Depriving employers and businesses the right to exercise personal choice and discretion in hiring employees:

bad _________________________________ good
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

8. Endorsement of the bill would affirm the notion that gay people are human and should be treated like everybody else.

improbable ___________________________ probable
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

The notion that gay people are human and should be treated like everybody else.

bad _________________________________ good
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3


improbable ___________________________ probable
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

Open homosexual behavior in public:

bad _________________________________ good
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

10. Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would help to insure that homosexuals would be judged according to their talents and capabilities and not on the basis of their sexual orientation.

improbable ___________________________ probable
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

Judging homosexuals on the basis of their talents and capabilities instead of their sexual orientation.

bad _________________________________ good
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3
VII. (Continued) Attitude Towards Gay Rights Scale From Survey III

11. Endorsement of the bill would lead to the exposure of young children to open homosexuals.

improbable ________________ probable
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

The exposure of young children to open homosexuals:
bad ________________ good
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

12. Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would give people in general greater freedom in choosing how they wish to express their sexuality.

improbable ________________ probable
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

Giving people in general greater freedom in choosing how they wish to express their sexuality:
bad ________________ good
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

13. Endorsement of the Gay Rights Bill would result in giving rights to a minority to the detriment of the majority.

improbable ________________ probable
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

Giving rights to a minority to the detriment of the majority:
bad ________________ good
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

14. Failure to endorse the Gay Rights Bill would encourage and sanction discrimination against gay people.

improbable ________________ probable
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

Encouraging and sanctioning discrimination against gay people:
bad ________________ good
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3
VIII. Perceived Expectations of Relevant Others Scale from Survey III

Instructions

For each person or group listed below, circle the number corresponding to the probability that the person or group would want you to vote in a legislative poll in favor of the Gay Rights Bill.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person/Group</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My mother would want me to vote for the bill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improbable</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My father would want me to vote for the bill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improbable</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends would want me to vote for the bill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improbable</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People my own age would want me to vote for the bill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improbable</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My brothers and sisters would want me to vote for the bill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improbable</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay acquaintances would want me to vote for the bill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improbable</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teachers would want me to vote for the bill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improbable</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My church would want me to vote for the bill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improbable</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My best friend would want me to vote for the bill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improbable</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII. (Continued) Perceived Expectations of Relevant Others Scale From Survey III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>improbable</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>probable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My lover or spouse would want me to vote for the bill.</td>
<td>-3  -2  -1 0  +1  +2  +3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay organizations would want me to vote for the bill.</td>
<td>-3  -2  -1 0  +1  +2  +3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My minister would want me to vote for the bill.</td>
<td>-3  -2  -1 0  +1  +2  +3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologists or psychiatrists would want me to vote for the bill.</td>
<td>-3  -2  -1 0  +1  +2  +3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IX. Motivation to Comply with Normative Others Scale from Survey III

Instructions

People's behavior is to some extent determined by their perceptions of the expectations of other people or the groups to which they belong. Listed below are a variety of people and organizations. Please indicate the extent to which you generally try to comply with each by circling the appropriate number on the scale.

I very much want not to | I very much want to
--- | ---
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

I very much want not to | I very much want to
--- | ---
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

do what my mother wants me to do.

I very much want not to | I very much want to
--- | ---
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

do what my father wants me to do.

I very much want not to | I very much want to
--- | ---
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

do what my friends want me to do.

I very much want not to | I very much want to
--- | ---
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

do what people my own age want me to do.

I very much want not to | I very much want to
--- | ---
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

do what my brothers and sisters want me to do.

I very much want not to | I very much want to
--- | ---
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

do what gay acquaintances want me to do.

I very much want not to | I very much want to
--- | ---
-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3

do what my teachers want me to do.
IX. (Continued) Motivation to Comply with Normative Others Scale from Survey III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>I very much want to do what my church wants me to do.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>I very much want to do what my church wants me to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>I very much want to do what my best friend wants me to do.</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>I very much want to do what my best friend wants me to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>I very much want to do what my lover or spouse wants me to do.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>I very much want to do what my lover or spouse wants me to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>I very much want to do what gay organizations want me to do.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I very much want to do what gay organizations want me to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>I very much want to do what my minister wants me to do.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>I very much want to do what my minister wants me to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>I very much want not to do what psychologists or psychiatrists want me to do.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>I very much want not to do what psychologists or psychiatrists want me to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>I very much want not to do what psychologists or psychiatrists want me to do.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>I very much want not to do what psychologists or psychiatrists want me to do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
X. Demographic Information Section of Survey III

Sex: __________

Age: __________

Current year in school: ________

Your father's occupation: __________________________

Your mother's occupation: __________________________

Your father's ethnic background: __________

Your mother's ethnic background: __________

Your religious affiliation: ________________________

Approximately how many times do you attend your church or synagogue monthly? ________

What is your parent's current marital status? (Circle one)
Married  Divorced  Separated  Widowed  Other

What is the total number of persons living with you other than yourself? ________

How many children do your parents have, including yourself? ________

In what kind of environment were you raised?
____ Large city  ____ Suburb of large city
____ Small town  ____ Rural area
A very controversial issue in the last legislative session was that of Gay Rights. A bill was proposed which, if passed, would have forbidden discrimination in housing and employment because of sexual orientation.

As a Representative and Chairperson of the Committee on Public Employment and Government Operations, I would like public input on this issue. If you would indicate either your support or opposition to this bill on the enclosed ballot and return it at your earliest convenience, I would be appreciative.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
A very controversial issue in the last legislative session was that of Gay Rights. A bill was proposed which, if passed, would have forbidden discrimination in housing and employment because of sexual orientation.

As a Representative and Chairperson of the Committee on Public Employment and Government Operations, I would like public input on this issue. If you would indicate either your support or opposition to this bill on the enclosed ballot and return it at your earliest convenience, I would be appreciative.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Stanley
XII. BALLOT FOR GAY RIGHTS LEGISLATION

PLEASE CHECK ONE OF THE BELOW:

________ I am in favor of the Gay Rights Bill and endorse its passage in the Hawaii Legislature.

________ I am opposed to the Gay Rights Bill and do not endorse its passage in the Hawaii Legislature.
I am in favor of the Gay Rights Bill and endorse its passage in the Hawaii Legislature.

I am opposed to the Gay Rights Bill and do not endorse its passage in the Hawaii Legislature.
This study is being conducted to investigate the factors people take into consideration when making decisions about complex social issues. The issue selected for the purpose of the study is the Gay Rights Bill which was introduced in the Hawaii Legislature this year. If passed, the bill would prohibit discrimination in housing and employment because of sexual orientation. We are assisting Kathleen Stanley, Chairperson of the House Committee on Employment and Government Operations, in collecting student input on this bill. As such, students in the experiment will be asked to complete an anonymous one-item survey sent to them from Representative Stanley. Responding to this poll is a requirement of the study because we wish to investigate how people make decisions with respect to realistic situations as opposed to abstract issues. A subsidiary reason for this requirement is that we feel that it is important for University students to take an active interest in the governmental policies which influence their lives.

You will find in this booklet a variety of questions pertaining to your feelings about gay people in general and the Gay Rights Bill in particular. Please read instructions carefully and answer each item as honestly as possible. This questionnaire is anonymous, and as such you should not put your name or social security number on it. This information will be collected on a separate sheet of paper which will be turned in separately. Please ask the monitor at any time if you have any questions about how you are to complete the questionnaire.

Thank you for your cooperation.
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