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ABSTRACT

The present study explores several predictors of antigay aggression: right-wing authoritarianism, sexual prejudice, and the three dimensions of male role norms, status, toughness and anti-femininity. Status-oriented and anti-feminine men engage in authoritarian thinking (Wilkinson, 2004), and use prejudice and aggression to express group norms (Herek, 1986). Results showed a significant indirect effect of status ($B=0.09$, $SE=0.04$, $p=0.02$) and anti-femininity ($B=0.08$, $SE=0.04$, $p=0.04$) on aggression via authoritarianism. An exploratory model with authoritarianism moderating the effect of prejudice on aggression showed that prejudice significantly influences aggression for low levels of right-wing authoritarianism. These findings indicate that authoritarians will aggress regardless of their sexual prejudice. This is consistent with the characterization of authoritarians as “equal opportunity bigots” (Altemeyer, 2006, p. 24)” that will aggress toward any out-group.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Antigay violence is a serious social problem in the United States. FBI hate-crime statistics (2006, 2007, 2008) show that violent crimes committed against homosexuals have increased annually for the past three years: in 2008 there were 1,706 reported victims, up 15.9% from 2006. In 2007 and 2008 the number of reported deaths due to antigay violence exceeded reported deaths motivated by race, religion, and national origin combined. These data, however, do not express the full extent of the problem because many states do not report hate crime statistics for sexual orientation. The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs (2009) reported 2,424 victims of antigay violence in 2008, an increase of about 26% since 2006, and a 28% increase in the number of antigay murders since 2007. All violence is aggression according to the General Aggression Model (Anderson & Bushman, 2003), which defines violence as an extreme form of aggression intended to cause severe harm. To prevent antigay violence, therefore, we must understand antigay aggression.

Three prominent theories that explain the motivation for antigay aggression are models of peer dynamics, thrill seeking, and sexual prejudice (Franklin, 2000; Parrott & Peterson, 2008). The peer dynamics model posits that antigay aggression is used to demonstrate masculinity and heterosexuality to friends, the thrill seeking model suggests that men attack homosexuals for entertainment, and the sexual prejudice model describes antigay aggression as a product of negative attitudes about homosexuals (Franklin, 2000). Of the three models, sexual prejudice has received the most empirical support and has demonstrated the highest predictive validity (Parrott & Peterson, 2008) and is therefore the most fruitful to explore with further research.

The present study investigates two predictors in the framework of the sexual prejudice model of antigay aggression: male role norms and right-wing authoritarianism.
1.1 Male role norms

One of the most consistent findings in aggression and sexual prejudice research is that men are generally more aggressive than women (Bettencourt & Miller, 1996; Hyde, 1984) and that men tend to hold more highly negative attitudes towards homosexuals than women (LaMar & Kite, 1998). Although some scholars have historically explained gender differences in aggression as rooted in biology, difficulty in establishing a clear physiological link between gender and aggression has led others to examine the social differences between genders in terms of male role norms (Jakupcak, Lisak, & Roemer, 2002). A meta-analysis of 42 studies with a total of 9629 participants shows that male role norms account for about 23% of the variance in sexual prejudice (Whitley Jr, 2001), making it one of the strongest and most consistent predictors of sexual prejudice.

Male role norms are sets of culturally specific gender-role expectations for men. The set of norms that predicts sexual prejudice and antigay aggression is one that values status, toughness and anti-femininity (Parrott, 2009). Male role norms are often treated as a unitary construct in research, but scholarship on the specific aspects of male role norms (status, toughness and anti-femininity) has shown that they differentially predict other variables of interest, such as right-wing authoritarianism and sexual prejudice (Parrott, 2009; Wilkinson, 2004). Treating male role norms as a multi-faceted construct allows for a more nuanced look at the relationships between the masculine gender role, sexual prejudice and antigay aggression (Wilkinson, 2004).

Anti-femininity reflects the norm that men must eschew feminine traits and behaviors (i.e. a man shouldn’t cook, sew or attend the ballet), status reflects the belief that men must be respected and admired (i.e., a man deserves the respect of his family), and toughness reflects the idea that men must be physically tough and willing to become aggressive (i.e., a man should be
ready to use his fists) (Thompson, Pleck, & Ferrera, 1992). The relationship between male role norms and sexual prejudice is due to the belief that gay men are more feminine than straight men (Kite & Deaux, 1987). Men who subscribe to a traditional set of male role norms, therefore, perceive gay men as deviating from the norms for acceptably masculine behavior. The perception of gay men as deviant and wrong facilitates the acceptance of prejudicial views, and these views find expression in the form of antigay aggression.

Men who subscribe to the anti-femininity male role norm are theorized to accept prejudicial views toward homosexuals because they think that nonheterosexual male behavior is an extreme violation of the masculine gender role (Herek, 1988). A survey-based study of 206 (102 male and 104 female) undergraduate students showed that people generally perceive homosexual males as having more feminine characteristics than heterosexual males (Kite & Deaux, 1987), and anti-feminine men therefore adopt negative views toward gay men because they believe that gay men are more effeminate, and therefore deviate from the anti-feminine norm for appropriate masculine behavior. Anti-feminine men therefore aggress against homosexuals to express their values and to reify the boundary between men and women (Herek, 2000; LaMar & Kite, 1998). This theory is supported by experimental and survey-based research with a diverse undergraduate sample (Parrott, 2009; Parrott, Peterson, Vincent, & Bakeman, 2008) that has demonstrated a relationship between anti-femininity and antigay aggression mediated by sexual prejudice.

The male role norm of status is theorized to relate to sexual prejudice and aggression for a different reason than anti-femininity. Men who subscribe to the status component of male role norms believe that men must be dominant and respected, and therefore see themselves in a power hierarchy relative to others. The denigration of out-groups allows men to feel more powerful relative to the members of the out-group, which is reinforcing for men who subscribe to the
status male role norm. The tendency for hierarchical "hegemonic thinking" is represented in the construct of right-wing authoritarianism (Wilkinson, 2004), and authoritarianism is therefore the mechanism through which the status male role norm is expressed as sexual prejudice and antigay aggression. A survey-based study of 157 majority-Caucasian undergraduate students demonstrated that the status male role norm ceased to significantly predict sexual prejudice after controlling for right-wing authoritarianism, and that there was a significant path between status and right-wing authoritarianism, and between right-wing authoritarianism and sexual prejudice. This implied full mediation of status on prejudice by authoritarianism, but the indirect relationship between male role norms and sexual prejudice via right-wing authoritarianism was non-significant.

1.2 Right-Wing Authoritarianism

Right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) is an individual-level personality variable characterized by high levels of submission to authorities, conventionalism, and authoritarian aggression (Altemeyer, 1981). Right-wing authoritarians tend to defer to authorities that they perceive as legitimate (i.e. police, military, clergy), cling to traditional values, and express aggression toward groups that established authorities oppose (Altemeyer, 1981; Whitley Jr, 1999). People high in RWA tend to prefer members of their in-group and to express their preference through prejudice towards out-groups (Altemeyer, 1996). They also tend to aggress against those who defy traditional values (Hunsberger, 1996). Due to the prevalence of sexual stigma (cultural values that devalue homosexuals) the tendency of authoritarians to accept traditional values means that they tend to view homosexuality as deviant and wrong, and they aggress toward homosexuals to express this prejudice. Authoritarians also recognize homosexuals as an out-group that is opposed by traditional authorities (religious and political), and will aggress toward gay people independent of sexual prejudice. Nonheterosexuals are a
minority out-group that defies traditional conceptions of gender and sexuality, and are therefore particularly good targets for authoritarian aggression because they offend both the in-group bias and traditional sensibilities of people high in RWA.

Right-wing authoritarianism consistently correlates highly with sexual prejudice, as demonstrated in a survey-study of 491 parents (247 mothers and 244 fathers) of undergraduate students at the University of Manitoba, Canada (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). Right-wing authoritarianism also predicted sexual prejudice and gay and lesbian-rejecting behaviors (including antigay aggression) in a majority Caucasian sample of 255 college students (130 women, 125 men), with the relationship between authoritarianism and gay and lesbian rejecting behaviors partially mediated by sexual prejudice (Goodman & Moradi, 2008). The correlation between right-wing authoritarianism and sexual prejudice demonstrates the tendency of authoritarians to express their in-group bias as prejudice toward out-groups. The mediation of gay and lesbian rejecting behaviors by sexual prejudice supports the claim that violence, harassment and discrimination are behavioral expressions of sexual prejudice (Herek, 2000), and implies that the relationship between authoritarianism and antigay aggression is partially due to the tendency of authoritarians to be prejudiced toward nonheterosexuals.

1.3 Sexual Prejudice

Sexual prejudice is defined as “all negative attitudes based on sexual orientation” (Herek, 2000), and includes all forms of bias against and opposition to nonheterosexual behavior. According to Herek’s (2009) conceptual framework, sexual prejudice is an attitudinal construct that represents the internalization of sexual stigma, a societal level construct that is defined as “the negative regard, inferior status, and relative powerlessness that society collectively accords to any nonheterosexual behavior, identity, relationship, or community.” Sexual prejudice was
proposed by Herek as an alternative to the concept of homophobia, which portrays prejudice as an individual pathology rather than the internalization of societal-level stigma.

Herek (2000) suggests that sexual prejudice develops for a number of potential reasons: sexual prejudice can be motivated by discomfort with gender non-conformity, group norms that are hostile to nonheterosexuals, and the perception that gay people are threatening to one’s personal value system. Discomfort with gender non-conformity is related to the construct of male-role norms (particularly the anti-femininity component), and the perception that homosexuals are threatening to traditional norms relates to both the status aspect of male role norms and the construct of right-wing authoritarianism. The expression of sexual prejudice can therefore serve a psychological function for authoritarians and men who subscribe to traditional male role norms by expressing their values and alleviating their anxiety, discomfort and fear. Furthermore, sexual prejudice can serve the psychological function of reifying group boundaries (Herek, 1986; Parrott & Peterson, 2008), and can therefore be used by authoritarians and men who subscribe to traditional male role norms to define themselves and bolster their identity by creating a boundary between themselves and homosexuals.

Survey research has consistently demonstrated a significant relationship between sexual prejudice and antigay aggression. A recent study with a majority Caucasian sample of 255 male and female undergraduates showed a positive relationship between sexual prejudice and gay and lesbian rejecting behaviors, which included antigay aggression as a component (Goodman & Moradi, 2008). A relationship between sexual prejudice and antigay aggression was also found using structured interviews with a diverse sample of 135 heterosexual men (Parrott & Peterson, 2008). Experimental studies support the relationship between sexual prejudice and antigay aggression; Parrott & Zeichner (2005) measured aggressive responses directed towards an opponent in a reaction time task in a majority Caucasian sample of 165 heterosexual male
undergraduate students. By manipulating the sexual orientation of the opponent, the experimenters showed that sexual prejudice positively predicted the frequency and intensity of shocks administered to homosexuals but not to heterosexuals.

1.4 Omitted Variables

Several other predictors that correspond to these functions of and motivations for sexual prejudice have been theoretically and empirically linked to prejudice and antigay aggression. These include: religious fundamentalism, social dominance orientation and masculine gender role stress. Right-wing authoritarianism and male role norms were selected for further exploration in the present study, whereas religious fundamentalism, social dominance orientation and masculine gender role stress were excluded.

Religious fundamentalism was omitted from the present study because it has been shown to correlate highly with right-wing authoritarianism (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004), and has been described as a religious manifestation of authoritarianism (Altemeyer, 1996; Wilkinson, 2004). The inclusion of both variables in a single model was therefore deemed unnecessary as they tap the same underlying construct, and right-wing authoritarianism was chosen due to its higher correlation with sexual prejudice (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992).

Although social dominance orientation predicts generalized prejudice, right-wing authoritarianism is a stronger predictor of sexual prejudice (Ekehammar, Akrami, Gylje, & Zakrisson, 2004; Whitley Jr, 1999). A meta-analysis of research on the effects of right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation on antigay prejudice demonstrated a stronger effect of right-wing authoritarianism (Whitley Jr & Lee, 2000), and the scientific literature identifies right-wing authoritarianism as a variable of interest for sexual prejudice and aggression more frequently than social dominance orientation (Parrott, 2008). Therefore, given the limited number of variables that could be included given the size of the sample, right-wing
authoritarianism was selected for inclusion in the present study over social dominance orientation.

Masculine gender role stress represents men’s tendency to experience stress in situations that they perceive as violating their gender role norms. Gender role stress and male role norms have been demonstrated to predict antigay aggression and to mediate the effect of male role norms on aggression in a laboratory-based study of 150 male undergraduates (Parrott, 2009), but masculine gender role stress is not theorized to directly predict sexual prejudice. Men who experience stress in response to gender discordant behavior may aggress to alleviate their stress, but they do not necessarily develop prejudicial views in response to stress. As the present study seeks to test the sexual prejudice model of antigay aggression, masculine gender role stress was deemed unnecessary for inclusion.

1.4 The Present Study

The male role norms of status and anti-femininity consistently predict antigay aggression, mediated by sexual prejudice, in experimental research with ethnically diverse undergraduate samples (Parrott, 2009; Parrott, et al., 2008). Right-wing authoritarianism predicts sexual prejudice and antigay aggression in survey-based research with a majority Caucasian undergraduate sample (Goodman & Moradi, 2008). I have found no studies, however, that have considered right-wing authoritarianism and the three dimensions of male role norms mediated by sexual prejudice in their effect on antigay aggression. Only one study (Wilkinson, 2004) has looked at the mediating effect of right-wing authoritarianism on the relationship between the status and anti-femininity male role norms and sexual prejudice. This research, however, did not look at the indirect effect of male role norms on aggression through authoritarianism and prejudice.
If the male role norm of status results in hegemonic thinking (represented by the construct of right-wing authoritarianism) and hegemonic thinking facilitates the denigration of a nonheterosexual out-group through the acceptance of sexual prejudice and its expression as antigay aggression, then a significant indirect effect of the status male role norm on antigay aggression via right-wing authoritarianism and sexual prejudice can be hypothesized. If men who subscribe to the male role norm of anti-femininity view homosexuals more negatively due to the perception that homosexuals are more effeminate, and then aggress toward homosexuals to express their view, then an indirect effect of anti-femininity on aggression via sexual prejudice can also be predicted.

The present study seeks to test these hypotheses and replicate past research (Wilkinson, 2004) by first testing a model with right-wing authoritarianism mediating the relationship between the dimensions of male role norms and sexual prejudice (Figure 1.1), and then expanding this model to include antigay aggression as an outcome (Figure 1.2). Testing the relationship between the dimensions of male role norms and sexual prejudice mediated between by right-wing authoritarianism (Figure 1.1) will show whether the findings of Wilkinson (2004) are replicable in an ethnically diverse sample, which is a useful extension of past research as the use of a mostly Caucasian sample was identified by Wilkinson as a limitation of his study.
Figure 1.1 Wilkinson model - predicted
Predicted effect of the three dimensions of male role norms on right-wing authoritarianism and sexual prejudice with right-wing authoritarianism mediating the relationship between male role norms and sexual prejudice. Note: Dotted lines indicate predicted non-significant relationships.

Figure 1.2 Present model - predicted
Predicted relationship between male role norms, right-wing authoritarianism, sexual prejudice and antigay aggression. Note: Dotted lines indicate predicted non-significant relationships.
The addition of antigay aggression as an outcome in the second hypothesized model (Figure 1.2) will test the predicted relationships between the variables in the context of the sexual prejudice model of antigay aggression. This will demonstrate whether, as predicted, right-wing authoritarianism and sexual prejudice are the mechanisms by which the male role norms of status and anti-femininity impact antigay aggression.

The findings of this study may have implications for the prevention of antigay violence: if authoritarian men and men who subscribe to the traditional male role norms of status and anti-femininity aggress toward gay men and lesbians because they are sexually prejudiced, this means that interventions that can successfully alleviate sexually prejudicial views (perhaps through education) will help eliminate the antigay aggression and violence resulting from these views, and thereby eliminate the aggression resulting from the traditional male role and authoritarianism. If, however, sexual prejudice is not the mechanism by which male-role norms and right-wing authoritarianism affect aggression, indicated by a non-significant indirect effect of male role norms or right-wing authoritarianism on antigay aggression through sexual prejudice, this would mean that interventions targeting sexual prejudice can not successfully stop aggression resulting from male role norms or authoritarianism. This would suggest the need for a shift in the focus of interventions, and imply that practitioners should look for ways to treat authoritarian personality and traditional male role norms rather than sexual prejudice.
CHAPTER 2: METHOD

2.1 Participants

One hundred and fifty-two male undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory psychology course at a university in the southeastern United States participated in this research study in exchange for course credit. Participants were recruited through the university’s undergraduate research participant pool.

One hundred and forty-one of the research participants identified as "Straight/Heterosexual," and of the remaining 11 participants, five identified as "Gay/Homosexual," five as "Bisexual/Pansexual," and one as "Asexual." Because this research study was intended to assess the relationship between traditional masculinity, antigay attitudes and aggression, it was not expected to be generalizable beyond heterosexual males. The data from the 11 participants who did not identify as "Straight/Heterosexual" were therefore excluded from the final analyses.

Three participants did not answer any questions beyond the demographic items and three more failed to complete whole measures. The missing data for these participants could therefore not be assumed to be missing completely at random and so these six cases were not used in subsequent analyses.

For the final sample of 135 cases, ages ranged from 17 to 39 years of age, with a mean age of 20.57 (SD = 3.34). Both the median and mode for age was 19 years of age. Seventy-six percent of the sample was between 17 and 21 years of age.

The sample was diverse, with the most highly-represented ethnic group (White/Caucasian) constituting only 36.3% of the sample of 135. Of the final sample, 49 identified as "White/Caucasian," 34 as "Black/African American," 31 as "Asian/Pacific Islander," nine as "Hispanic/Latino/Latina," nine as "Multi-Racial/Bi-Racial," and two as "Arab."
One person answered "Other" and purposefully declined to disclose their ethnicity in the followup clarification question due to a political opposition to questions about race.

2.2 Measures

Demographics form. Participants were asked to report their age, ethnic identity, sexual orientation, and whether or not they are attracted to men or women.

Sexual prejudice. Participants’ degree of sexual prejudice was measured using the Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men Scale (ATLG; Herek, 1988). The ATLG was modified from its original form of a 1-9 Likert-scale to an 8-point Likert-scale (-4 indicating “Strongly disagree” and +4 indicating “Strongly agree”). This was done to avoid participant confusion by making all measures consistent, and also to eliminate a middle value that corresponded to “neither agree or disagree,” thereby making the measure a forced-choice Likert scale.

Forced-choice Likert scales do not have a middle value, and therefore force participants to either agree or disagree. Forced choice scale are arguably less susceptible to response bias than traditional Likert-type scales (Zavala, 1965), but they are also more computationally simple. A response of “neither agree or disagree” is not necessarily equivalent to a mathematical scale midpoint, as this response could also be used by participants to indicate “Not applicable” or “I don’t know.” These responses should be handled as missing data and not as a middle value, and the middle value was therefore removed. Participants were able to indicate that they did not know the answer or did not have an opinion by skipping the question.

Participant scale scores were the overall mean on the twenty items. These could range from 1.00, reflecting extremely positive attitudes towards gay men and lesbians, to 8.00, reflecting extremely negative views towards gay men and lesbians. The measure consists of two ten-item subscales, one assessing attitudes toward gay men and the other regarding attitudes
toward lesbians. The reliability of the ATLG has typically been high, with an alpha of .89 in a study using an undergraduate sample (Herek, 1988), and an alpha of .91 in a more recent study of 563 undergraduate students from a university in the southern United States (Stoever & Morera, 2007). In the present study, the reliability for the complete 20-item scale was .95, and the alphas for the gay men and lesbian subscales were .93 and .92, respectively.

**Right-wing authoritarianism.** Right-wing authoritarianism was measured using the Right-Wing Authoritarianism scale (RWA; Altemeyer, 2006). This version of the RWA scale consists of 30 items on an 8-point Likert-scale (“Very strongly disagree” to “Very strongly agree”). The RWA scale has previously demonstrated high reliability with undergraduate samples (alpha > .85; Altemeyer, 2006; Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Whitley Jr, 1999), and in the present study the measure had a reliability of .93.

**Male role norms.** Male role norms were measured using the Male Role Norms Scale (MRNS; Thompson & Pleck, 1986). This measure originally consisted of 26 7-point Likert-scale items, but was converted to an 8-point Likert scale for consistency and to force response of either agree or disagree. Responses ranged from -4, “Very strongly disagree” to +4, “Very strongly agree”, with higher scores indicating acceptance of the three traditional masculine role norms: Status, Toughness and Anti-femininity.

These three factors are based on the four dimensions of the male role norm suggested by Brannon (1976), and subsequent research has supported this three factor model (Thompson & Pleck, 1986; Thompson, et al., 1992). The reliability of the three subscales has ranged between .70 and .85 in previous studies using undergraduate samples (Parrott, et al., 2008; Thompson & Pleck, 1986). In this study the reliability for the full measure was .88, and reliability was .83, .74 and .81 for the Status, Toughness and Anti-femininity subscales, respectively. The average responses for items in each sub-scale were used for analyses; scale scores could therefore range
from 1.00, indicating strong opposition to the male role norm, to 8.00, indicating strong adherence to the traditional norm.

**Anti-gay aggression.** The Self-Report of Behavior Scale - Revised (SBS-R; Roderick, McCammon, Long, & Allred, 1998) consists of 20-items that assess both aggressive and avoidant behaviors directed towards gay men and lesbians. For the purposes of this study, only the eight items that specifically addressed aggressive behavior were used. Responses indicate the frequency of participants’ past perpetration of aggressive acts towards homosexuals on a five point Likert scale (1 indicating “Never” and 5 indicating ”Always”). As per the scale instructions, the scale score for each participant was computed as the sum of participant responses to the eight questions. Scores therefore ranged from a minimum of 8.00, indicating no past aggressive acts toward homosexuals, to 40.00, indicating constant perpetration.

The complete scale has previously demonstrated high reliability with samples of undergraduate students, ranging from .86 to .95, and the eight-item scale consisting of only questions about aggression has demonstrated a reliability of .70 in a sample of 135 undergraduate men (Parrott & Peterson, 2008). In the present study, the eight-item measure demonstrated a reliability of .82.

**2.3 Procedure**

Undergraduate students in the research pool who were interested in participating received an informed consent form by clicking the link associated with the study. They confirmed their consent to participate by entering their name and clicking a link at the bottom of the consent form. This redirected participants to the SurveyMonkey web site, where they received the battery of measures in the following order: demographics form, male role norms scale, right-wing authoritarianism scale, attitudes toward gay men scale, and self-report of behavior scale. Upon completing these measures, participants received a debriefing form with a full explanation of the
goals of the study and contact information for the experimenter. Participants then received a message thanking them and were awarded course credit for their participation.
3.1 Preliminary Analyses

Eighty-six participants (63.7%) had no missing data. Of the remaining cases, 27 had only one missing item, and 22 had between two and five. Scatterplots of missing value patterns indicated that these data did not appear to be missing systematically, and Little’s MCAR (missing completely at random) test confirmed this, $\chi^2 (5178) = 989.85, p = 1.00$. The non-significant chi-square result confirmed that the data could be treated as missing completely at random, and therefore met the criteria for imputation using Expectation Maximization (EM) estimation.

Missing values for the 49 cases that had between one and five missing items across all measures were estimated using EM in SPSS 18. The amount of missing data was small (<5%) and the improvement in estimation from multiple imputations would be minimal, and so a single imputation using EM estimation was conducted. All subsequent analyses used a dataset with EM estimates in place of missing values.

3.2 Descriptive Statistics

Initial tests of normality showed that all scales were within acceptable limits of skewness and kurtosis with the exception of the SBS-R antigay aggression measure, which was positively skewed. A Box-Cox transformation ($\lambda = -1$) was conducted, and the newly transformed data was within the acceptable limits of skewness and kurtosis. Histogram plots indicated that all measures were reasonably normally distributed.

Correlations, standard deviations and means for all variables are presented in Table 3.1. All variables were significantly correlated with one another ($\alpha = .05$), but multicolinearity was not implied as no variables demonstrated a correlation above .80. The highest correlation ($r = .78$) was between right-wing authoritarianism and sexual prejudice. The range for the male role
norm of status included the maximum possible score (8.00), indicating a possible ceiling effect, and the ranges for anti-femininity and sexual prejudice included the lowest possible score (1.00), indicating a floor effect.

3.3 Hypothesis Testing

A series of path analyses with ML estimation were conducted using Mplus version 6.1 (Muthen & Muthen, 2010) to observe the relationships between the three dimensions of male role norms (MRN), right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), sexual prejudice (SP), and antigay aggression (AGA). Five models were tested in total: four hypothesized models (See Figures 1.1-1.2, 3.1-3.2) and a fifth exploratory model.

The first path model regressed sexual prejudice on the three dimensions of MRN (status, toughness, and anti-femininity). This model showed that, as predicted, status and anti-femininity significantly predict sexual prejudice. Toughness, also as predicted, did not significantly predict SP (See Figure 3.3). A second model with RWA regressed on the three dimensions of male role norms showed the same effect, with status and anti-femininity but not toughness significantly predicting RWA (See Figure 3.4). These models were just-identified, making them mathematically equivalent to regression models and meaning that goodness-of-fit tests could not be performed. As these models were only intended for confirmation of the previously established relationships between the variables they were considered to be sufficient evidence to continue to the next model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status MRN</th>
<th>Tough MRN</th>
<th>AF MRN</th>
<th>RWA</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>AGA'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toughness male role norm</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-femininity male role norm</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-wing authoritarianism</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual prejudice</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.78*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigay aggression (transformed; λ=-1)</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>1.98-8.00</td>
<td>2.13-7.88</td>
<td>1.00-7.57</td>
<td>1.40-6.47</td>
<td>1.00-7.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level; ' = λ=-1 transformation.*
Figure 3.1 Sexual prejudice model - predicted
Predicted effect of the dimensions of male role norms on sexual prejudice. 
Note: Dotted lines indicate predicted non-significant relationships.

Figure 3.2 Right-wing authoritarianism model - predicted
Predicted effect of male role norms on right-wing authoritarianism. 
Note: Dotted lines indicate predicted non-significant relationships.
Figure 3.3 Sexual prejudice model - observed
Estimated effect of the dimensions of male role norms on sexual prejudice. 
*Note: SE in parentheses; dotted lines indicate non-significant relationships; reported parameter estimates are unstandardized.*

Figure 3.4 Right-wing authoritarianism model - observed
Estimated effect of male role norms on right-wing authoritarianism. 
*Note: SE in parentheses; dotted lines indicate non-significant relationships; reported parameter estimates are unstandardized.*
A third model that included both SP and RWA with the three dimensions of MRN, based on Wilkinson’s model (2004) of Connell’s theory (1995) was tested. In this model, RWA was predicted to mediate the relationship between MRN and SP. As predicted, RWA demonstrated a significant effect on SP, and the male role norm of anti-femininity significantly predicted sexual prejudice and right-wing authoritarianism. The status male role norm significantly predicted only right-wing authoritarianism (See Figure 3.5). Tests of the indirect effects of male role norms showed that RWA fully mediated the relationship between status and SP and partially mediated the effect of anti-femininity on SP (See Table 3.2). This model was also just-identified, meaning that chi-square goodness of fit tests could not be obtained, but given that this model was intended to test a previously tested model, respecification was not an option.

The fourth hypothesized model included RWA and SP as mediators, with status indirectly predicting AGA via RWA and anti-femininity predicting AGA directly and indirectly via both RWA and SP (See Figure 3.2). The model demonstrated good fit with the data, \( \chi^2(4) = 2.93, p = .57, \) RMSEA = .00, CFI = 1.00. The predicted relationships between MRN, RWA and SP were significant, with status positively predicting RWA and anti-femininity positively predicting both RWA and SP. Anti-femininity and right-wing authoritarianism, as predicted, had significant direct effects on the outcome variable, AGA. The predicted path between SP and AGA, however, was not significant (See Figure 3.6). Tests of the indirect effects showed that status and anti-femininity positively predicted AGA via RWA, but not via SP as was predicted (See Table 3.3).
Figure 3.5 Wilkinson model - observed

Observed effect of male role norms on right-wing authoritarianism and sexual prejudice mediated by right-wing authoritarianism. 

Note: SE in parentheses; dotted lines indicate non-significant relationships; reported parameter estimates are unstandardized.
Figure 3.6 Present model - observed

Observed relationship between male role norms, right-wing authoritarianism, sexual prejudice and antigay aggression.

*Note: SE in parentheses; dotted lines indicate non-significant relationships; reported parameter estimates are unstandardized.*
### Table 3.2 Indirect effects for Wilkinson model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>CI^{95%}</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Femininity Indirect via RWA</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.23-.53</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02-.27</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Femininity Total Effect</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.35-.76</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Total Indirect via RWA</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.20-.57</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Effect</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.25-.13</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Total Effect</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02-.55</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughness Indirect via RWA</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.41-.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Effect</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.14-.30</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughness Total Effect</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.41-.24</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Confidence intervals are bias-corrected; obtained from bootstrapping in MPLUS v. 6.1 with 5000 iterations.

### Table 3.3 Indirect effects for present model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>CI^{95%}</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Femininity Total Indirect</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03-.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via RWA</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02-.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via ATLG</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04-.05</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via RWA and ATLG</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06-.06</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06-.32</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Femininity Total Effect</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17-.40</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Total Indirect</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03-.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via RWA</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01-.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via RWA and ATLG</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09-.06</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughness Total Indirect</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.12-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via RWA</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.15-.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via RWA and ATLG</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04-.03</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWA Indirect Via ATLG</td>
<td>&lt;.01*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.16-.16</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04-.45</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWA Total Effect</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10-.39</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Confidence intervals are bias-corrected; obtained from bootstrapping in MPLUS v. 6.1 with 5000 iterations.
To explain the non-significant relationship between SP and AGA, a fifth exploratory model was tested. A potential cause of the null effect of SP on AGA could be that the effect of SP on AGA is dependent upon the level of RWA, so a product term for the interaction between SP and RWA was added to the model. The fifth model was equivalent to model four with the single addition of the interaction term. This model also demonstrated good fit with the data, $\chi^2(4) = 3.22, p = .52$, RMSEA = .00, CFI = 1.00. The SP by RWA interaction was significant, indicating a negative effect of RWA on the relationship between SP and AGA. SP and RWA both positively predict AGA in this model, but the interaction term indicates that as RWA increases the impact of SP on AGA decreases. Sexual prejudice, therefore, only predicts AGA at low levels of RWA (See Figure 3.7). Tests of the indirect effects are included in Table 3.4.

### Table 3.4 Indirect effects for exploratory model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>CI95%</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anti-Femininity Total Indirect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via RWA</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18-.84</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via ATLG</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08-.36</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via RWA and ATLG</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03-.27</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05-.35</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Femininity Total Effect</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.37-1.05</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status Total Indirect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via RWA</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15-.69</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via RWA and ATLG</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05-.36</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toughness Total Indirect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via RWA</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.52-.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via RWA and ATLG</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.29-.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RWA Indirect Via ATLG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.13-.94</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWA Total Effect</td>
<td>1.05*</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.44-1.69</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Confidence intervals are bias-corrected; obtained from bootstrapping in MPLUS v. 6.1 with 5000 iterations.
Figure 3.7 Exploratory model observed
The observed moderated relationship between MRN, RWA, SP and AGA.
CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION

This research study examined whether right-wing authoritarianism plays a role in the effect of traditional male role norms on sexual prejudice, as was predicted by Wilkinson (2004) and Connell (1995), and also to test whether the previously observed relationships between male role norms, sexual prejudice and antigay aggression (Parrott, 2009) could be replicated in a model that controls for right-wing authoritarianism.

The results indicated that male role norms influence sexual prejudice directly, as previously demonstrated by Wilkinson (2004). Norms were also shown to effect prejudice indirectly via right-wing authoritarianism (see Table 3.2), which was predicted by Connell (1995) but not found by Wilkinson. The finding that male role norms indirectly predict sexual prejudice via authoritarianism implies that men who subscribe to traditional masculine role norms tend to be more authoritarian than non-traditionally masculine men, and that their authoritarian personality leads them to internalize cultural sexual stigma more than their non-authoritarian counterparts. Herek (2007) described institutionalized sexual stigma as heterosexism, and it could be the communication of this heterosexist bias via authority figures, such as politicians and clergy, that results in higher degrees of sexual prejudice for authoritarians.

As in Wilkinson’s (2004) and Parrott’s (2009) studies, the present study did not treat male role norms as a unitary construct, but observed the unique effects of the different dimensions of male role norms on sexual prejudice and aggression. The findings of this research differed from what was previously demonstrated by Wilkinson (2004); anti-femininity was found to positively predict right-wing authoritarianism (see Figure 3.5), whereas Wilkinson demonstrated a non-significant effect of the “Fear of Appearing Feminine” on right-wing authoritarianism. Additionally, Wilkinson did not demonstrate an indirect effect of either status
or anti-femininity on sexual prejudice via authoritarianism, both of which were demonstrated in this study. These differences could be due to the inclusion of different variables and the operationalization of the variables in the two studies. Wilkinson measured the “Fear of Appearing Feminine” using some items from the anti-femininity subscale of the male role norms scale, but also included items from other measures based on a factor analysis. Wilkinson also excluded the toughness component of male role norms, which may have contributed to the different observed effects. The incongruence could also be due to cultural differences, as Wilkinson’s study was performed in the Midwestern United States with a mostly Caucasian sample, whereas this study was conducted in the Southeastern United States with a more ethnically diverse sample. Further research is needed to determine the specific relationships between the dimensions of male role norms, right-wing authoritarianism and sexual prejudice, but apart from this difference the results of this research study are compatible with Wilkinson’s findings. Both studies demonstrated a significant direct effect of anti-femininity on sexual prejudice, an effect of status on right-wing authoritarianism, and of authoritarianism on sexual prejudice.

After testing the relationships predicted by Wilkinson and Connell (see Figure 3.5), I attempted to integrate the model tested by Parrott (Parrott, 2009) with Connell’s theory of male role norms predicting sexual prejudice via right-wing authoritarianism. Parrott had previously demonstrated that the anti-femininity norm is central to men’s expression of masculinity as antigay aggression, and that sexual prejudice is integral to this relationship, and this finding was replicated in the present study. Parrott’s study also demonstrated an effect of the status male role norm on physical antigay aggression mediated by sexual prejudice. Wilkinson’s study, however, showed a non-significant direct effect of status on sexual prejudice in a model that included right-wing authoritarianism. I predicted, therefore, that the relationship between the status male
role norm and sexual prejudice would be mediated by right-wing authoritarianism, and the indirect effect of status on aggression would be via both authoritarianism and prejudice. The prediction that status would be mediated by right-wing authoritarianism was demonstrated in the integrated model (see Table 3.3), implying that men who subscribe to the status male role norm tend to be more authoritarian, and it is their authoritarian tendencies that predict sexual prejudice and aggression.

The observed non-significant effect of sexual prejudice on antigay aggression in the integrated model (see Figure 3.5) was not predicted, however. Although this model showed that, as predicted, the male role norms of status and anti-femininity influenced antigay aggression via right-wing authoritarianism, the expected mediating effect of sexual prejudice was not apparent. This conflicts with a similar survey-based study of 255 undergraduate men and women (Goodman & Moradi, 2008), which found a significant indirect effect of male role norms and right-wing authoritarianism on gay and lesbian rejecting behaviors (of which antigay aggression is a component) via sexual prejudice. This difference is most simply explained by the different operationalization of the outcome variables that, while related, seems to have distinct predictive properties.

Although the integration of Wilkinson and Parrott’s models did operate as expected, the inclusion of a moderation effect of right-wing authoritarianism on sexual prejudice resulted in excellent model fit. This was possibly the most surprising finding of the present study: the significant moderating effect of right-wing authoritarianism on the relationship between sexual prejudice and antigay aggression. This negative interaction means that there is no significant relationship between sexual prejudice and aggression for authoritarian men. Although this may appear counterintuitive, the finding makes theoretical sense when you consider Altemeyer’s claim that, "authoritarians are equal opportunity bigots." (Altemeyer, 2006, p. 24) The
The moderating effect of authoritarianism might mean, therefore, that authoritarians will aggress towards any out-group. The relationship between sexual prejudice is less strong for authoritarians because they will aggress toward anyone, but sexual prejudice is a predictor of antigay aggression for non-authoritarians. This does not imply that authoritarian men tend to be less sexually prejudiced than non-authoritarians; quite the opposite is true. The strongest observed effect in the present study was between right-wing authoritarianism and sexual prejudice, meaning that authoritarian men tend to be considerably more prejudiced than their non-authoritarian counterparts. The moderating effect of RWA only implies that it is their authoritarianism, and not their prejudice, that compels them to aggress toward homosexuals.

As other studies have also demonstrated (Parrott, 2009), the male role norm of anti-femininity has a stronger influence on aggression than either status or toughness. This illustrates the importance of considering status, anti-femininity and toughness separately; this finding would have been overlooked if male role norms were treated as a unitary construct. This also means that the relationships observed in other studies between a unitary construct of male role norms and aggression (Goodman & Moradi, 2008) may have truly been an effect of anti-femininity only. The relationship between anti-femininity and prejudice makes theoretical sense when you consider Herek's claim that one of the motivations for sexual prejudice is to "express in-group norms that are hostile to homosexual and bisexual people" (Herek, 2000, p. 21). Gay men are commonly believed to have more feminine characteristics than heterosexual men (Kite & Deaux, 1987), and men who subscribe to the male role norm of anti-femininity believe that feminine behavior is unacceptable for men to perform (Thompson & Pleck, 1986), and so they may adopt prejudicial views as a result. This theory could be further tested experimentally by manipulating the effeminacy and sexuality of an opponent in a reaction time task to see whether it is sexuality or effeminacy that elicits an aggressive response in anti-feminine men.
The present study replicated the findings of previous research on the relationships between male role norms, right-wing authoritarianism, sexual prejudice and antigay aggression. It also extended prior research by looking at the differential effects of the three dimensions of male role norms (status, anti-femininity and toughness) in a model together with right-wing authoritarianism, sexual prejudice and aggression. Although the effect of these dimensions on sexual prejudice and antigay aggression had formerly been considered, the mediating and moderating effect of right-wing authoritarianism had never been established in a model with antigay aggression. These results confirm theories posited by Herek (2000) and Franklin (2000) on the underlying motivations for sexual prejudice, and by Connell (1995) on the mechanisms by which male role norms influence prejudice. The findings of the present study also have implications for practice: they imply that interventions seeking to eliminate antigay aggression should focus on the anti-femininity aspect of the traditional masculine gender role. Anti-femininity predicts anti-gay aggression, sexual prejudice and right-wing authoritarianism, and has the strongest direct and indirect effect on prejudice and aggression of any of the three dimensions of male role norms. It is therefore the most likely candidate for interventions aimed at curbing sexual prejudice and antigay aggression. Interventions that present alternative models of masculinity that are not defined as oppositional to femininity could alter masculine norms and thereby alleviate sexual prejudice and antigay aggression.

4.1 Limitations

The present study does not include ethnicity as a variable. As male role norms are culturally specific it would be useful to look at ethnicity as a predictor and see if the findings of this study are the same across ethnic groups. A larger sample size would be needed to test for ethnic group differences as the current sample of 135 provided insufficient power to make such group comparisons.
Another limitation of this study was the convenience sample of college students. Although the findings are intended to be generalizable to the general population, all participants in this study were college students at a large urban university in the southeast United States. This sample differs significantly from the overall population in terms of age, social-economic status, family educational history, etc., and may therefore not be generalizable to non-student populations or populations elsewhere in the world. Future research should attempt to replicate the present findings in diverse populations to see if the variables explored operate similarly in varying cultural and social contexts.

Thirdly, the present study omitted important variables that have been identified in the literature as predicting right-wing authoritarianism, sexual prejudice and antigay aggression. Notably, masculine gender role stress and antigay anger have been shown to relate to the traditional masculine gender role and to predict antigay aggression, and should be included in future models to avoid a specification error. Much recent scholarship in the area of masculinity and aggression research has begun to look at the impact of peers and social settings, and an important next step would be to integrate an analysis of peer influence into this study design.

Lastly, the measurement of aggression through self-report has a number of disadvantages, one of which is the susceptibility to response bias. This bias has direct implications for the findings of this study, as non-traditionally masculine men with low antigay bias might underreport their past aggression to align their reported behavior with their attitudes. Conversely, traditionally masculine men may choose to express their antigay attitudes through their self-report of aggression and exaggerate past aggressive behavior accordingly. A more direct measure of aggression, such as a task or observation, should be used in subsequent research to avoid this bias. The self-report of behavior scale was selected because it is simple and convenient to administer, but it may not tap the construct of antigay aggression as well as a physiological test,
observation or lab-based experimental task (electric shock, ice-water submersion, etc.). Even these methods of measuring aggression are flawed, however, since laboratory settings or computer-based surveys can lack external validity. Antigay aggression, as it occurs in natural settings, cannot be tested in the laboratory for ethical reasons. Antigay aggression can only be measured by using proxy variables that represent some point on the spectrum of aggression and violence. Although experimental measures of aggression are dissimilar to people’s experiences outside of the laboratory, they still teach us something about human behavior and confer the benefit of allowing the experimenter to control for extraneous variables (Mook, 1983). They are therefore preferable to self-report measures.

4.2 Future Directions

Future research should focus on the role of right-wing authoritarianism in the relationship between masculinity and sexual prejudice. This research study has shown that the inclusion of authoritarianism in a model of sexual prejudice and aggression changes the picture of how these constructs relate to one another, and suggests that authoritarianism plays a larger role than was previously expected. Although right-wing authoritarianism was included as a mediator in the present study to replicate a previous study (Wilkinson, 2004), it was originally conceptualized as a personality variable (Altemeyer, 1981, 2006) and should likely be modeled as exogenous, as personality variables should occur first in the causal order. Theoretically, it is reasonable to think that the traditionalism of authoritarians would lead them to accept the traditional roles for men. This relationship could provide an equally good-fitting model to the one presented here, but is more theoretically justifiable.

Future studies should also include the effects of masculine gender role stress and peer influence, which have demonstrated effects on antigay aggression, to see how they relate to authoritarianism. Lastly, future research needs to look at the influence of culture and ethnicity on
male role norms and aggression; male role norms are culturally specific, and there is therefore reason to believe that the norms and their effects may differ between cultures.

In order to combat antigay violence and aggression we need culturally sensitive interventions that target the strongest predictors of antigay aggression, and the findings of this study and other research in the field of masculinity and aggression will hopefully facilitate the development of more effective interventions by elucidating the relationships between masculinity, authoritarianism, prejudice and aggression. Although there is need for more research, this constitutes a step in the right direction.
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APPENDIX

MRNS

This questionnaire is designed to assess your beliefs with regards to the role of men in society. You will probably find that you agree with some of the statements, and disagree with others, to varying extents. Please indicate your reaction to each of the statements by choosing a number according to the following scale:

-4 if you very strongly disagree with the statement  
-3 if you strongly disagree with the statement  
-2 if you moderately disagree with the statement  
-1 if you slightly disagree with the statement  
+1 if you slightly agree with the statement  
+2 if you moderately agree with the statement  
+3 if you strongly agree with the statement  
+4 if you very strongly agree with the statement

You may find that you sometimes have different reactions to different parts of a statement. For example, you might very strongly disagree (“-4”) with one idea in a statement, but slightly agree (“+1”) with another idea in the same item. When this happens, please combine your reactions, and write down how you feel “on balance” (that is, a “-3” in this example).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Success in his work has to be a man’s central goal in this life.</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The best way for a young man to get respect of other people is to get a job, take it seriously, and do it well.</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When a man is feeling a little pain he should try not to let it show very much.</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It bothers me when a man does something that I consider ‘feminine.’</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A man owes it to his family to work at the best-paying job he can get.</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nobody respects a man very much who frequently talks about his worries, fears, and problems.</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A man whose hobbies are cooking, sewing, and going to the ballet probably wouldn’t appeal to me.</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A man should generally work overtime to make more money whenever he has the chance.</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A good motto for a man would be “When the going gets tough, the tough get going.”</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It is a bit embarrassing for a man to have a job that is usually filled by a woman.</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. A man always deserves the respect of his wife and children.</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I think that a young man should try to become physically tough, even if he’s not big.</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Unless he is really desperate, I would probably advise a man to keep looking rather than accept a job as a secretary.</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. It is essential for a man to always have the respect and admiration of everyone who knows him.

15. Fists are sometimes the only way to get out of a bad situation.

16. If I heard about a man who was a hairdresser and a gourmet cook, I might wonder how masculine he was.

17. A real man enjoys a bit of danger now and then.

18. A man should never back down in the face of trouble.

19. I always like a man who’s totally sure of himself.

20. In some kinds of situations a man should be ready to use his fists, even if his wife or his girlfriend would object.

21. I think it’s extremely good for a boy to be taught to cook, sew, clean the house, and take care of younger children.

22. A man should always refuse to get into a fight, even if there seems to be no way to avoid it.

23. A man should always think everything out coolly and logically, and have rational reasons for everything he does.

24. A man should always try to project an air of confidence even if he really doesn’t feel confident inside.

25. I might find it a little silly or embarrassing if a male friend of mine cried over a sad love scene in a movie.

26. A man must stand on his own two feet and never depend on other people to help him do things.
RWA

This questionnaire is part of an investigation of general public opinion concerning a variety of social issues. You will probably find that you agree with some of the statements, and disagree with others, to varying extents. Please indicate your reaction to each of the statements by choosing a number according to the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>you very strongly disagree with the statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>you strongly disagree with the statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>you moderately disagree with the statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>you slightly disagree with the statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>you slightly agree with the statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>you moderately agree with the statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>you strongly agree with the statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>you very strongly agree with the statement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you feel exactly and precisely neutral about a statement, choose the number 0.

You may find that you sometimes have different reactions to different parts of a statement. For example, you might very strongly disagree (“-4”) with one idea in a statement, but slightly agree (“+1”) with another idea in the same item. When this happens, please combine your reactions, and write down how you feel “on balance” (that is, a “-3” in this example).

1. Our country desperately needs a mighty leader who will do what has to be done to destroy the radical new ways and sinfulness that are ruining us. 
   -4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4

2. Gays and lesbians are just as healthy and moral as anybody else. 
   -4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4

3. It is always better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities in government and religion than to listen to the noisy rabblerousers in our society who are trying to create doubt in people’s minds. 
   -4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4

4. Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt every bit as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly. 
   -4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4

5. The only way our country can get through the crisis ahead is to get back to our traditional values, put some tough leaders in power, and silence the troublemakers spreading bad ideas. 
   -4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4

6. There is absolutely nothing wrong with nudist camps. 
   -4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4

7. Our country needs free thinkers who will have the courage to defy traditional ways, even if this upsets many people. 
   -4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4

8. Our country will be destroyed someday if we do not smash the perversions eating away at our moral fiber and traditional beliefs. 
   -4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4

9. Everyone should have their own life-style, religious beliefs, and sexual preferences, even if it makes them 
   -4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4
different from everyone else.

10. The “old-fashioned ways” and “old-fashioned values” still show the best way to life.

11. You have to admire those you challenged the law and the majority’s view by protesting for abortion rights, for animal rights, or to abolish school prayer.

12. What our country really needs is a strong, determined leader who will crush evil, and take us back to our true path.

13. Some of the best people in our country are those who are challenging our government, criticizing religion, and ignoring the “normal way things are supposed to be done.”

14. God’s laws about abortion, pornography, and marriage must be strictly followed before it is too late, and those who break them must be strongly punished.

15. There are many radical, immoral people in our country today, who are trying to ruin it for their own godless purposes, whom the authorities should put out of action.

16. A “woman’s place” should be wherever she wants to be. The days when women are submissive to their husbands and social conventions belong strictly in the past.

17. Our country will be great if we honor the ways of our forefathers, do what the authorities tell us to do, and get rid of the “rotten apples” who are ruining everything.

18. There is no “ONE right way” to live life; everybody has to create their own way.

19. Homosexuals and feminists should be praised for being brave enough to defy “traditional family values.”

20. This country would work a lot better if certain groups of troublemakers would just shut up and accept their group’s traditional place in society.

21. It would be best for everyone if the proper authorities censored magazines so that people could not get their hands on trashy and disgusting material.

22. There is nothing wrong with premarital sexual intercourse.

23. People should pay less attention to the Bible and the other old forms of religion, and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral.

24. What our country needs most is discipline, with everyone
following our leaders in unity.

25. A lot of our rules regarding modesty and sexual behavior are just customs that are not necessarily any better or holier than those which other people follow.

26. The facts on crime, sexual immorality, and the recent public disorders all show we have to crack down harder on deviant groups and troublemakers if we are going to save our moral standards and preserve law and order.

27. It’s better to have trashy magazines and radical pamphlets in our communities than to let the government have the power to censor them.

28. The situation in our country is getting so serious, the strongest methods would be justified if they eliminated the troublemakers and got us back on our true path.

29. It is wonderful that young people today have greater freedom to protest against things they don’t like, and to make their own “rules” to govern their behavior.

30. Once the government leaders give us the “go-ahead,” it will be the duty of every patriotic citizen to help stomp out the rot that is poisoning our country from within.
This questionnaire is designed to measure your thoughts with regards to homosexuality. You will probably find that you agree with some of the statements, and disagree with others, to varying extents. Please indicate your reaction to each of the statements by choosing a number according to the following scale:

-4 if you very strongly disagree with the statement  
-3 if you strongly disagree with the statement  
-2 if you moderately disagree with the statement  
-1 if you slightly disagree with the statement  
+1 if you slightly agree with the statement  
+2 if you moderately agree with the statement  
+3 if you strongly agree with the statement  
+4 if you very strongly agree with the statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Male homosexual couples should be allowed to adopt children the same as heterosexual couples</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I think male homosexuals are disgusting</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Male homosexuals should not be allowed to teach school</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Male homosexuality is a perversion</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Just as in other species, male homosexuality is a natural expression of sexuality in human men</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>If a man has homosexual feelings, he should do everything he can to overcome them</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I would not be too upset if I learned that my son were a homosexual</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Homosexual behavior between two men is just plain wrong</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>The idea of male homosexual marriages seems ridiculous to me</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Male homosexuality is merely a different kind of lifestyle that should not be condemned</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Lesbians just can’t fit into our society</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>A woman’s homosexuality should not be a cause for job discrimination in any situation</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Female homosexuality is detrimental to society because it breaks down the natural divisions between the sexes</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>State laws regulating private, consenting lesbian behavior should be loosened</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Female homosexuality is a sin</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>The growing number of lesbians indicates a decline in American morals</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Female homosexuality is itself not a problem, but what society makes of it can be a problem</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Female homosexuality is a threat to many of our basic social institutions</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Female homosexuality is an inferior form of sexuality</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Lesbians are sick</td>
<td>-4 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 +4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This questionnaire is designed to examine which of the following statements most closely describes your behavior during past encounters with people you thought were homosexuals. Rate each of the following self-statements as honestly as possible by selecting the response that best describes your behavior.

1. I have spread negative talk about someone because I suspected that he or she was gay.
   - Never
   - Rarely
   - Occasionally
   - Frequently
   - Always

2. I have participated in playing jokes on someone because I suspected that he or she was gay.
   - Never
   - Rarely
   - Occasionally
   - Frequently
   - Always

3. I have changed roommates and/or rooms because I suspected my roommate to be gay.
   - Never
   - Rarely
   - Occasionally
   - Frequently
   - Always

4. I have warned people whom I thought were gay and who were a little too friendly with me to keep away from me.
   - Never
   - Rarely
   - Occasionally
   - Frequently
   - Always

5. I have attended anti-gay protests.
   - Never
   - Rarely
   - Occasionally
   - Frequently
   - Always

6. I have been rude to someone because I thought that he or she was gay.
   - Never
   - Rarely
   - Occasionally
   - Frequently
   - Always

7. I have changed seat locations because I suspected the person sitting next to me to be gay.
   - Never
   - Rarely
   - Occasionally
   - Frequently
   - Always

8. I have had to force myself to stop from hitting someone because he or she was gay and very near me.
   - Never
   - Rarely
   - Occasionally
   - Frequently
   - Always

9. When someone I thought to be gay has walked towards me as if to start a conversation, I have deliberately changed directions and walked away to avoid him or her.
   - Never
   - Rarely
   - Occasionally
   - Frequently
   - Always

10. I have stared at a gay person in such a manner as to convey to him or her my disapproval of his or her being too close to me.
    - Never
    - Rarely
    - Occasionally
    - Frequently
    - Always

11. I have been with a group in which one (or more) person(s) yelled insulting comments to a gay person or group of gay people.
12. I have changed my normal behavior in a restroom because a person I believed to be gay was in there at the same time.

13. When a gay person has “checked” me out, I have verbally threatened him or her.

14. I have participated in damaging someone’s property because he or she was gay.

15. I have physically hit or pushed someone I thought was gay because he or she brushed his or her body against mine when passing by.

16. Within the past few months, I have told a joke that made fun of gay people.

17. I have gotten into a physical fight with a gay person because I thought he or she had been making moves on me.

18. I have refused to work on school and/or work projects with a partner I thought was gay.

19. I have written graffiti about gay people or homosexuality.

20. When a gay person has been near me, I have moved away to put more distance between us.