To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Melissa Scandlyn Smith entitled "Attitudes of Resident Assistants Toward Homosexuality and Gay and Lesbian Students: A Study at a Southeastern Research University." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in College Student Personnel.

E. Grady Bogue
Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

P. Gary Klukken

Olga Welch

Accepted for the Council:

Anne Mayhew
Vice Chancellor and
Dean of Graduate Studies

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

ATTITUDES OF RESIDENT ASSISTANTS TOWARD HOMOSEXUALITY AND GAY AND LESBIAN STUDENTS: A STUDY AT A SOUTHEASTERN RESEARCH UNIVERSITY

A Thesis
Presented for the
Master of Science
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Melissa Scandlyn Smith
December 2004

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of the people at the University of Tennessee who helped me to complete this thesis project. I would first like to offer a special thank you to Dr. Grady Bogue for serving as my advisor for this thesis. Without your patience and guidance, I would have neither attempted nor completed this project. My thanks also go out to Dr. Gary Klukken and Dr. Olga Welch for agreeing to serve on my committee and become a part of this endeavor. Your time and advice have been invaluable.

I would also like to thank the friends and family who have supported me throughout this process. First, to Kristin Gourley and Stephanie Weathers, my classmates and friends, thanks for the endless hours spent listening to me grumble and acting as my cheerleaders – I would still be staring at a blank computer screen without you. Second, I want to thank my mother, Mary Scandlyn, for believing in me even when I didn't believe in myself and for being the best mother and strongest woman I know. If I am someday half the mother to my own children that you have been to me, I will be a success. Last, but certainly far from least, thanks to my husband Greg. For two years you have supported my decision to return to school and put us in debt in a thousand ways: you have encouraged me always, chided me when it was necessary, and spent countless nights and weekends alone while I studied. Thank you for those things, as well as for the endless loads of laundry done and meals cooked and the hundreds of other mundane tasks that fell on your shoulders while I was caught up in books, papers, and deadlines. Thanks for believing in me – I love you.

ABSTRACT

This purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes of resident assistants at a large southeastern research university towards homosexuality and gay and lesbian students, as well as about the training they received on dealing with the issues that these students face. Attitudes in this descriptive census study were collected from 133 respondents by the distribution of a quantitative survey that utilized a Likert scale. In addition to their attitudes, the resident assistants were also asked to provide their gender, the amount of prior experience they had with lesbians or gay males, and the number of years they had been a resident assistant.

Chi square analysis was performed to determine if there were any statistically significant relationships between the RAs attitudes and the demographic categories. Though two of the three variables included had been significant in other studies, there was little relation here between attitudes and gender, prior interactions with lesbians or gay males, or years of experience as an RA.

The mean scores indicated that as a whole, the sample was neutral to somewhat positive towards lesbians and gay males, but when the mean scores were used in conjunction with the demographic variable chi squares, there were many participants who felt strongly negative about homosexuality.

In addition to the discussion of attitudes, recommendations for improvements to the resident assistant training program, provided by both the participants and the researcher, and suggestions for further research are included.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER I – INTRODUCTION
Introduction....1
Need for the Study....3
Statement of the Problem....3
Purpose of the Study....4
Objectives and Questions....4
Objectives....4
Research Questions....5
Assumptions....5
Delimitations....5
Limitations....6
Definitions....6
Summary....7
CHAPTER II – REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Introduction....8
Resident Assistants....9
Current Theoretical Perspective....11
Responsibilities of Resident Assistants....11
Challenges to Lesbian and Gay Male College Students....12
Resident Assistant Attitudes Toward Lesbian and Gay Male Students....12
Attitudes of Lesbian and Gay Male Students....13
Related Literature....16
Homophobic Attitudes and Their Causes....16
Manifestations of Homophobic Attitudes....21
Results of Homophobic Attitudes on Homosexuals....22
Interventions....24
Conclusions....26
Summary....27
CHAPTER III – METHODOLOGY
Introduction....28
Summary of Methods....28
Selection of the Population....28
Sampling and Procedure....29
Instrumentation....30
Procedures....35
Data Collection....35
Data Analysis....37
Summary....38

CHAPTER IV – RESULTS OF THE STUDY
Introduction....39
Results....40
Research Question 1....40
Research Question 2....46
Research Question 3....56
Summary....65
CHAPTER V – DISCUSSION
Introduction....67
Results and Conclusions....68
Research Question 1....68
Research Question 2....70
Research Question 3....73
Limitations....77
Recommendations for Further Research....77
Summary....79
REFERENCES....81
APPENDICES....86
Appendix A: Instrument....87
Appendix B: Tables....93
VITA....104

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Mean Scores for Sample Population 41
2. Mean Scores by Gender 42
3. Mean Scores by Prior Interactions with Lesbians and Gay Males 43
4. Mean Scores by Previous RA Experience 45
5. χ^2 Values by Question and Demographic Variables 47
6. Gender and Question #12 Cross-tabulation 48
7. Previous Interaction and Question #2 Cross-tabulation 50
8. Previous Interaction and Question #4 Cross-tabulation 51
9. Previous Interaction and Question #6 Cross-tabulation 52
10. Previous Interaction and Question #11 Cross-tabulation 54
11. Previous Interaction and Question #14 Cross-tabulation 55
12. RA Experience and Question #14 Cross-tabulation 57
13. RA Question #1 and Lesbian Subscale Mean Scores Cross-tabulation 59
14. RA Question #1 and Gay Male Subscale Mean Scores Cross-tabulation 60
15. RA Question #1 and Total Scale Mean Scores Cross-tabulation 61

B1. Frequency Distribution for Question #1 94
B2. Frequency Distribution for Question #2 94
B3. Frequency Distribution for Question #3 95
B4. Frequency Distribution for Question #4 95
B5. Frequency Distribution for Question #5 96
B6. Frequency Distribution for Question #6 96
B7. Frequency Distribution for Question #7 97
B8. Frequency Distribution for Question #8 97
B9. Frequency Distribution for Question #9 98
B10. Frequency Distribution for Question #10 98
B11. Frequency Distribution for Question #11 99
B12. Frequency Distribution for Question #12 99
B13. Frequency Distribution for Question #13 100
B14. Frequency Distribution for Question #14 100
B15. Frequency Distribution for Question #15 101
B16. Frequency Distribution for Question #16 101
B17. Frequency Distribution for Question #17 102
B18. Frequency Distribution for Question #18 102
B19. Frequency Distribution for Question #19 103
B20. Frequency Distribution for Question #20 103

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

There is no way to assess the number of Americans who are lesbian or gay. Unfortunately, many people try to guess peoples' sexual orientation by external characteristics. People with heterosexist attitudes use both fact and fiction as a basis to discriminate or use violence or threats against lesbians and gay males. Anti-homosexual messages and attitudes are not new. In both the Old and New Testaments of the Bible, there are references that denounce homosexuality. Teachings such as these have colored the perceptions of people towards homosexuals for centuries, continuing to the present day. Hatred and violence toward homosexuals in the United States is still strong, as evidenced by the murder of Matthew Shepard in 1998 (*Matthew Shepard Resource*, n.d.), even though society as a whole has become more accepting in the last three decades.

Homophobia is no less present on college and university campuses than it is in the larger American society. In the last two decades, researchers have begun to explore the reasons that heterosexuals hate, fear, and discriminate against homosexuals, including the members of college and university communities, and how these attitudes affect homosexuals. Studies by D'Augelli (1989a, 1989b, 1992) explored the discriminations against homosexual students from their perspectives as well as the attitudes of potential resident assistants toward members of the homosexual community. He found that many homosexuals are on the receiving end of mean-spirited or violent attacks, but that they do not often report these incidents for fear of further retribution. He also found that potential

resident assistants were aware of these attacks and themselves often harbored homophobic attitudes.

What researchers have found in recent studies is that there are characteristics that can be an indicator of how members of certain populations will feel about homosexuality. Investigators such as D'Augelli and Rose (1990), Engstrom and Sedlacek (1997), Hensley (1995), Kite (1984), Nelson and Krieger (1997), Reinhardt (1997), Rey and Gibson (1997), Simoni (1996), Waldo (1998), and Whitney (2002) have linked a variety of personal traits to feelings of homophobia. Gender-roles and gender, self-esteem, education level, race/ethnicity, religiosity, geographical area of residence, political preference, income level, and exposure to homosexuals can influence people's feelings about homosexuals. Overall, women are more accepting of homosexuality than men, as are people who have high self-esteem; a higher level of education; higher income; more exposure to homosexuals; who are less active in organized religion; who identify as being politically moderate or liberal; who are not of an ethnic minority; and who live in less conservative areas of the country and/or in more urban settings.

Both student affairs professionals and paraprofessionals, like resident assistants, are in a position to influence in a positive way the views of others toward homosexuals through their actions and the programs they offer to the campus community. The research of Engstrom and Sedlacek (1997), Guth, Hewitt-Gervais, Smith, and Fisher (2000), Nelson and Krieger (1997), and Malaney, Williams, and Geller (1997) indicates that certain programs can be beneficial in supporting homosexual students and in changing homophobic attitudes.

Need for the Study

There is a need for studies concerning the attitudes of resident assistants toward lesbian and gay male college students. Studies of this kind can help identify the level of tolerance that exists within the residence halls on college and university campuses. This is important because the resident assistants help direct the attitude toward diversity that is present in their residence halls. At the selected research university, the study is relevant for determining the attitudes of the resident assistants so that additional or improved diversity education can be implemented in the training program. This training will benefit the university, the resident assistants, and the members of the residence hall community. The university will be promoting diversity and community on its campus. The resident assistants will develop more positive attitudes about diversity; those attitudes will benefit them beyond just their college years. Members of the residence hall community will benefit by being members of an accepting environment and through this will develop more positive attitudes toward diversity.

Statement of the Problem

Millions of Americans are lesbian or gay, yet attitudes toward these groups are often negative. Colleges and universities are home to both heterosexuals and homosexuals, and the attitudes toward lesbians and gay males on campuses tend to reflect the views of the larger society. Resident assistants' attitudes, in turn, reflect the variety of perspectives of the larger campus community. The problem addressed in this study was the scarcity of existing research related to college students', particularly resident assistants', attitudes toward lesbians and gay males. The results of this survey indicated the resident assistants' attitudes only; the results were not representative of the attitudes

of the larger campus community. The attitudes of the particular group of resident assistants involved in this study have not been tested previously. The information gathered in this study is important for understanding the current perspective of the university's resident assistant community toward lesbian and gay male students, as well as for suggesting the information and training that is necessary for resident assistants to help provide a safe and accepting environment for all students.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes of resident assistants at a large research university in the southeast toward lesbians and gay male students. Through the distribution of a descriptive survey instrument, which included demographic information and questions related to the resident assistant training program, the researcher collected data from all resident assistants employed on the campus of the selected research university during the 2003-2004 academic year.

Objectives and Questions

Objectives

1. The first objective of this study was to assess the attitudes toward lesbian and gay male students of the resident assistants at this large southeastern research university.
2. The second objective of this study was to examine any relationships that exist between the resident assistants' attitudes and certain self-identified demographic variables.
3. The third objective of this study was to use the survey results, along with the training-related questions, to examine the resident assistant training program

at this university and suggest ways to improve the component of this program that deals with homosexual students and their needs.

Research Questions

1. What are the attitudes of resident assistants at this large southeastern research university toward lesbian and gay male students?
2. Are the attitudes of resident assistants related to any of three self-identified demographic variables: gender, previous contact/relationship with lesbians or gay males, and resident assistant experience?
3. How well do the resident assistants feel that they have been prepared for their role in dealing with the issues of their lesbian and gay male residents, and what do they see as important factors in preparing resident assistants to deal with these issues?

Assumptions

1. The resident assistants cooperated in the completion of the survey.
2. The resident assistants responded truthfully and thoughtfully to the survey questions.
3. The survey was a valid and reliable instrument for measuring the resident assistant attitudes toward lesbian and gay male students.

Delimitations

1. The study was delimited to measure only the attitudes of the resident assistants toward lesbian and gay male students rather than measuring the attitudes of the larger student population.

2. This study was delimited to include only the resident assistants at one large southeastern research university.
3. The study was delimited by its size; the study will not include resident assistants other than those on staff during the 2003-2004 academic year.

Limitations

1. This study was limited by its generalizability. The results of the study were not generalizable to resident assistants at colleges or universities other than the one studied.
2. This study was limited by the nature of the data and its analysis. Since the data is nominal and ordinal by nature, nonparametric data analysis techniques in the form of chi squares were used.
3. This study was limited by the nature of its self-reporting format.
4. This study was limited by the exclusion of bisexuals and transgendered persons from the subject area addressed. Although bisexual and transgendered students may have similar issues and experiences to those of lesbians and gay males, there is no proof that that is true. Therefore, they were not included as a topic of this study.

Definitions

There are several terms used in the study that require definition. Those terms are as follows:

1. Homosexuality was defined as one of two sexual orientations other than heterosexuality: lesbianism (females) and gay (males).

2. Homosexual was defined as one who defines himself or herself as a lesbian or a gay male.
3. "Coming out" was defined as the ongoing process of revealing one's sexual orientation to others, including family, friends, and members of the larger community.
4. Homophobia was defined as the fear, disapproval, or hatred of homosexuality and homosexual men and lesbians by heterosexuals.
5. Heterosexism was defined as discrimination by heterosexuals against lesbians and gay males.
6. Resident assistant was defined as an undergraduate student selected to work in a residence hall, build community, and offer programming opportunities to help students develop intellectually and socially.

Summary

There is a need to assess the attitudes of resident assistants toward lesbians and gays males. Resident assistants help create culture and are a major link between the university and many of its students. This study analyzed the attitudes of one group of resident assistants and explored the characteristics that relate to their attitudes. The results of the study could be used to reassess the resident assistant training program to encourage more knowledge of issues that homosexuals face. This will encourage acceptance and support of people who are lesbian or gay, as well as promote sexual diversity to heterosexual residential students.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

"You shall not lie with a male as with a woman; it is an abomination" (Lev. 18:22, The New Oxford Annotated Bible). "Do you not know that wrongdoers will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived! Fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, male prostitutes, sodomites, thieves, the greedy, drunkards, revilers, robbers – none of these will inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Cor. 6:9-10, The New Oxford Annotated Bible). These biblical passages demonstrate a disapproval of homosexuality dating from the earliest times. For those who follow the Bible's teachings in a most literal sense, there is little question about the appropriate attitude toward homosexuality. Even though there is no indication that homosexuals are to be cast out of society or denigrated, many followers of the Judeo-Christian tradition have used passages like these as justification for prejudice against lesbians and gay males.

Hundreds of years have passed since the words of Leviticus and 1 Corinthians were written, but in many ways, little has changed in societal attitudes toward homosexuality. Disapproval of a homosexual lifestyle is still evident in 21st century American society. A well known, albeit extreme, example of the kind of hatred that many homosexuals face is the 1998 murder of Matthew Shepard, an event that was instigated because the victim was gay (*Matthew Shepard Resource*, n.d.). Few homosexuals are tortured or murdered just for their homosexuality, but the fact that it happens at all shines light on the problem of hatred, discrimination, and violence against those with alternative sexual orientations.

When lesbians and gay males in American society face discrimination, it should come as no surprise that the same is true for those homosexuals who are part of college campuses around the nation. When a gay college student like Matthew Shepard is murdered solely for his sexual orientation, it shows why many lesbian and gay male college students keep their homosexuality a secret from the people around them.

By this action, lesbian and gay male students maintain the status of an "invisible" minority on college and university campuses around the country. They cannot be identified by the color of their skin or any other physical characteristics. If they choose to keep their sexual orientation a secret, the fact that they are a part of a minority group is unknown. This has implications beyond their own feelings or personal discomfort. If college and university administrators do not see a presence of homosexual students, they cannot address their needs. Hence, the needs of this group generally go unmet in the scheme of services that colleges and universities provide to the student body. This is unfortunate as lesbian and gay male students have special developmental needs that college student professionals and paraprofessionals can address. The particular group addressed in this study, resident assistants, is part of the paraprofessional staff of a college or university housing department. These students have the opportunity to see the issues that homosexual students face first-hand, as well as the opportunity to address those needs through programs, one-on-one interactions, and acting as role models for other students.

Resident Assistants

Resident assistants are considered paraprofessionals in college and university structures. Resident assistants are undergraduate students who live in residence halls

alongside other undergraduates. The staff of the housing department selects resident assistants to manage the day-to-day activities in the campus's residence halls. The residential assistant staff is responsible for handling the needs of individual students and maintaining order in the building. They handle issues between residents, conduct programming activities for their residents, and serve as the first line of assistance to the students in their care. Resident assistants generally work under the supervision of a hall director or area coordinator, who in turn reports to the director of housing. The position that resident assistants have in the structural design of the university makes them peripheral members of the university staff. Therefore, their attitudes and beliefs are in many ways a reflection, or a perceived reflection, of the attitudes and beliefs of the institution. As this is the case, it is vital for resident assistants to project a supportive attitude toward all students, but particularly those who face additional challenges.

Residence halls are filled with students from a variety of backgrounds. In any given hall are students of diverse racial, ethnic, political, religious, and family backgrounds. The diversity that is part of the residence hall environment can provide challenges to both resident assistants and to the other members of the hall community. Resident assistants are trained in dealing with diversity among their students and promoting the acceptance, inclusion, and respect of students of all minorities. Unfortunately, members of the lesbian and gay male minority are often forgotten because they are unseen. This leads to difficulties for lesbian and gay male students who live in residence halls. They have special needs, just as other minority students do, but those needs go unfilled because they are not seen as members of a minority.

Unfortunately, there has been little research done that has specifically addressed the attitudes of resident assistants toward lesbian and gay male students. The one study that has addressed this issue directly is discussed, along with exploratory qualitative studies measuring the perceptions of lesbians and gays males about resident assistants and residence hall life. Information from studies that have addressed the attitudes of college students in general toward lesbian and gay male students follows that discussion.

Current Theoretical Perspective

Responsibilities of Resident Assistants

Resident assistants have responsibilities for creating the community in which they live. As the institution's representative in the residence halls, they are influential in creating positive climates that facilitate student development (Evans, Reason, & Broido, 2001). Their goal should be to create a positive climate where all students who reside in the building feel safe, comfortable, and at ease in their surroundings.

Resident assistants undergo a training process before they take responsibility for the management of any living environments. To create a positive student environment, resident assistants must be educated about the issues that face all types of students during this training. All minority groups have particular issues that are unique to their group. Lesbian and gay male students are no different, and resident assistants must be aware of these issues and supportive of the students who struggle with them (Evans, Reason, & Broido, 2001). Far too often, resident assistants are either uninformed about the issues that homosexual students face or they themselves have negative attitudes about homosexuality, which undermines their ability to maintain a positive environment for their lesbian and gay male students (Evans et al.).

Challenges to Lesbian and Gay Male College Students

Lesbian and gay male students face the same stages of growth and emotional development as other college students; in addition, however, they struggle with decisions about their sexual orientation, whether or not to divulge that orientation, and what will happen if they do "come out" (D'Augelli, 1989b). The stress that comes from the decision to be open about one's sexual orientation is compounded by fears of retribution from others, ranging from verbal insults to physical violence (D'Augelli, 1989a). Resident assistants operate in this context when dealing with lesbian and gay male students.

Resident Assistant Attitudes Toward Lesbian and Gay Male Students

D'Augelli (1989a) conducted a study on the views of students who had applied to become resident assistants toward lesbians and gay males. He stated, "the attitudes of this group toward lesbians and gay males are of central importance because they are the most proximal representatives of the university in students' lives" (D'Augelli, 1989a, p.547). The participants in this study were enrolled in a course designed for training resident assistants; the sample included 103 total students (55 female students and 48 male students). The participants completed the Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men scale (ATLGM), which was scored using a Likert scale. In addition, each participant provided demographic information and answered seven questions not originally part of the ATLGM survey (D'Augelli, 1989a).

After analyzing the data, D'Augelli (1989a) found the following in relation to attitudes toward lesbians and gay males. Male students were significantly more negative toward gay males than were female students, although their attitudes toward lesbians

were the same as those of the female students. On average, the male students' overall scores on the survey showed higher levels of homophobia than the female students' scores (D'Augelli, 1989a).

In relation to their personal knowledge of lesbians and gay males, all participants knew more gay males than they did lesbians, and the numbers of gay males and lesbians known was similar for both male and female subjects. D'Augelli (1989a) found there was a significant correlation between homophobia in the subjects and their knowledge of lesbians or gay males; the more lesbians and gay males they knew, the less homophobia their survey scores indicated.

In relation to their views concerning the harassment of lesbians and gay males, more male students than female students had made antigay/antilesbian comments, but female students thought the likelihood of harassment of lesbian and gay males was greater than did male students (D'Augelli, 1989a). The potential resident assistants were supportive in their attitudes toward protection for gays and lesbians, female students more so than male students. Female students were also more positive about receiving course material about lesbians and gays in the course than were male students.

Through this study, D'Augelli (1989a) found homophobia more pronounced in the male students in his sample than in the female students, and results indicated that increased exposure to lesbians and gay males would likely cause a decrease in homophobic attitudes in both groups.

Attitudes of Lesbian and Gay Male Students

In a qualitative research study in 2001, Evans, Reason, and Broido explored the perceptions of lesbian and gay male students related to resident assistants. This study

produced three themes related to the way that resident assistants and their responsibilities are defined by non-heterosexual residents. The first theme to emerge was expectations. Non-heterosexual respondents expected that resident assistants would be open and accepting of others' orientation, that they would be knowledgeable and personally accepting of these orientations, and that they would work to create a positive climate for all residents (Evans et al.). The second theme to emerge was the importance of having lesbian and gay male resident assistants. Respondents viewed homosexual resident assistants, whether lesbians or gay males, as confidants who would assist in connecting students and creating a positive impression of residence life (Evans et al.). The third theme to emerge was resident assistant training. Study participants believed resident assistants should be knowledgeable about homosexual issues, have exposure to homosexual persons, undergo experiential training, and undergo continued education in this area (Evans et al.).

Evans and Broido conducted a qualitative study in 1999 concerning the experiences of lesbian and gay male students who chose to disclose their sexual orientation while living in college residence halls. The interviewers questioned students on their perspectives of the climate in the residence halls, their experiences with other students in the residence halls, the actions of the resident assistants, and any suggestions they had for changes in the residence hall system relating to lesbian and gay male issues (Evans & Broido). The interviews produced ten themes from the participants, two of which directly related to residence halls. First, respondents said that the residence hall environment had a strong influence on whether or not a person divulged their orientation and the extent to which they chose to do so (Evans & Broido). The authors reported that

students were willing to divulge their orientation if supportive people surrounded them, if they perceived the climate as supportive, and if there were lesbian and gay male role models in the environment. Second, the respondents said that environmental circumstances motivated them to divulge their orientation as much or more than internal pressures (Evans & Broido). The authors' analysis revealed that homosexual students living with or near other lesbians and gay males who were more out than they were motivated them to divulge their sexual orientation.

To meet the needs of lesbians and gay males living in residence halls, Evans and Broido advocated that resident assistants and other residence hall staff ensure that the environment is safe for those who wish to divulge their sexual orientation. They also advocated education on issues related to homosexuals as well as intervention when necessary to protect and support lesbian and gay male students who are in the process of revealing their orientation (Evans & Broido, 1999).

Herbst and Malaney (1999) conducted a qualitative study of a special interest residential program for lesbian and gay male students implemented at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. The program was implemented to give lesbian and gay male students a safe community where they could live with other students who faced the same life issues (Herbst & Malaney). Interviews with residents on the "2-in-20 floor," as the designated hall was named, gave written feedback about their feelings related to living in the special interest residential program. Overall, the homosexual students living on the program's floor responded positively. Residents of this floor were happy being able to live with other people who shared their concerns and issues (Herbst & Malaney). In particular, the respondents commented on the support from the floor's resident assistant

and the building's resident director (both of whom were gay) and the pleasure they felt in having two role models in leadership positions in their residence hall (Herbst & Malaney).

These studies showed that lesbian and gay male students living in residence halls had special needs and required specific kinds of support from the residence hall staffs. Unfortunately, as evidenced in D'Augelli's study (1989a) of prospective resident assistant attitudes, those responsible for providing the support for lesbian and gay male students were often not prepared to do that due to their own biases and unfamiliarity with the needs of the homosexual community.

Related Literature

A number of studies addressing the attitudes of college students toward lesbians and gay males have been conducted by researchers investigating the bases for attitudes that college students have towards homosexuals. The results of these studies overwhelmingly have found that women are less homophobic than are men; that exposure to lesbians and gay males decreases feelings of homophobia; and that certain other variables, including age, race/ethnicity, political preference, religiosity, and level of education, can predict attitudes of homophobia. In addition, research has documented the ways that homophobic attitudes in college students surface in discrimination and violence against homosexuals.

Homophobic Attitudes and Their Causes

Homophobic attitudes were present in every conceivable subgroup of the general population. There are many reasons that people develop negative feelings towards homosexuals. Research studies suggested that there were several variables that correlated

to the presence of homophobic attitudes. Among those variables were gender-roles and gender, self-esteem, education level, race/ethnicity, religiosity, geographical area of residence, political preference, income level, and exposure to homosexuals. There exists conflicting opinions on the level of impact that these variables have on attitudes toward homosexuality, but most researchers believe that some or all play a role in the formation of negative or positive attitudes.

The possible correlation between gender, and the accompanying expectations called gender-roles, and homophobic attitudes was a frequently cited variable affecting homophobia. Three studies in particular addressed this relationship. In 2002, Whitley examined the influence of gender-roles (specific expected male and female roles in society) on attitudes toward homosexuality. His research consisted of two small studies, a meta-analysis, and a follow-up study. Results from the meta-analysis indicated that there was a close link between beliefs about the existence of traditionally defined gender-roles and attitudes toward homosexuality. The relationship proved to be similar in attitudes towards lesbians and attitudes toward gay males; this indicated that homophobic attitudes related to traditional gender-role norms and occurred because homosexuality violates these norms (Whitley). Whitley also established the existence of a correlate between attitudes toward homosexuality and traditional sexism. People who held traditional ideas about the prescribed roles of men and women were more likely to be homophobic. Finally, in the meta-analysis, Whitley found that hypermasculinity, the "extreme involvement in and acceptance of the traditional male gender role" (2002, p. 693), was strongly correlated to homophobic attitudes. Men who were highly invested in traditional male gender-norms were more likely to exhibit homophobia. In the follow-up study,

Whitley supported two of the assertions made in the meta-analysis and added a third correlate. He found that two major predictors of homophobia were indeed the belief of traditional male and female gender-role norms and the endorsement of those roles for others through the notions of traditional sexism, as well as benevolent sexism (attitudes about prescribed gender-role norms expressed in a passive rather than an active way).

A second meta-analysis study, this one conducted by Kite in 1984, focused on the differences in attitudes toward homosexuals between males and females. She found that there was a small difference in attitudes towards homosexuals between men and women (men having the stronger negative attitudes toward homosexuality), but that difference may be attributable to sample size, year of publication, and the sex of the target. She also identified a tendency to focus on males and male targets in research related to homosexuality (Kite).

Finally, a study by Basow and Johnson in 2000 focused entirely on the particular predictors of homophobic attitudes that occur in women. Significant in relation to homophobia were gender-role attitudes in females that were strongly in favor of traditional gender norms. They found that the degree of importance of feminine attributes in women was correlated to homophobia against lesbians while feelings of inadequacy, self-esteem, and self-discrepancy resulting from conflicting with traditional gender norms were not correlated to negative attitudes toward homosexuals in general (Basow & Johnson). In other words, heterosexual women who saw traditionally feminine traits as important characteristics for a woman to have were more likely to view lesbians negatively, as they were not perceived as having those feminine traits; but those

heterosexual women who did not themselves possess traditionally feminine traits did not have negative self-images.

A person's gender was frequently cited as a factor that was correlated to homophobia. Overwhelmingly, researchers suggested that females are more accepting of lesbians and gay males than men are (D'Augelli & Rose, 1990; Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1997; Hensley, 1995; Hill et al., 2002; Nelson & Krieger, 1997; Reinhardt, 1997; Rey & Gibson, 1997; Simoni, 1996; Waldo, 1998). These studies indicated that females were much more likely to have positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay males, or at least less negative ones.

Researchers cited several other characteristics and demographic variables as they related to attitudes toward lesbians and gay males. The most prevalent characteristics are self-esteem, education level, race/ethnicity, religiosity, geographical area of residence, political preference, family income, and exposure to lesbians and gay males.

Simoni (1996) cited self-esteem as being negatively correlated to individuals' development of homophobic attitudes. She also associated self-esteem with a negative correlation to heterosexist ideas. As self-esteem increases, homophobic attitudes decrease. In a similar fashion, with a rise in self-esteem comes a decrease in heterosexist ideas and actions.

A person's level of education was also cited as a factor in his/her attitudes toward homosexuality: the lower the level of education, the more likely that the person would have homophobic attitudes (Simoni, 1996). A similar correlate is parents' levels of education. Simoni stated that people whose parents had fewer years of formal education displayed homophobic attitudes more frequently. In a related area, Kim, D'Andrea, Sahu,

and Haughen (1998) found that homophobic attitudes decreased with the amount of time spent in college. Malaney, Williams, and Geller (1997) found that the type and size of the college were related to attitudes; students at small colleges showed more homophobic attitudes than did students at large universities.

Race was cited in three studies as relating to homophobic attitudes but the results were inconsistent with respect to how it affected attitudes. Waldo (1998) and Hensley (1995) found that Whites were more likely to display homophobic attitudes than minorities, while Kim et al. (1998) found that Whites were less likely than minorities to be homophobic.

Four researchers investigated religiosity, all of whom found that people associated with organized religious denominations had higher levels of homophobia than those who did not (Hensley, 1995; Herek, 1988; Reinhardt, 1997; Rey & Gibson, 1997; Waldo, 1998). These same researchers also found that those who attended religious services frequently were more homophobic than those who did not attend religious services on a regular schedule.

The geographical region of residence and the size of the community were important in predicting homophobic attitudes. Those people who lived in more conservative areas of the country were more likely to have homophobic attitudes (Hensley, 1995; Herek, 2002; Hill et al., 2002). Those people who lived in smaller towns and rural areas, even in more liberal areas of the country, were more likely to have negative views about homosexuality.

Political preferences and affiliations were cited as having a correlation with negative attitudes toward homosexuality. Political conservatives or those who identified

themselves as Republicans were more likely than moderates or liberals, including those who identified themselves as members of other political parties, to show homophobic tendencies (Hensley, 1995; Herek, 2002; Kim et al., 1998; Rey & Gibson, 1997).

Herek (2002) found that people with lower family incomes were more likely to be homophobic than those with higher incomes. The relationship of income to attitudes demonstrated the link between education and income; those with more education likely had higher incomes, and those with less education lower incomes.

Finally, previous contact with lesbians and/or gay males was cited by several researchers as important in predicting homophobia. People who had previous knowledge of and association with lesbians and/or gay males were less likely to be homophobic (Bowen & Bourgeois, 2001; D'Augelli & Rose, 1990; Hensley, 1995; Herek, 1988; Nelson & Krieger, 1997; Reinhardt, 1997; Rey & Gibson, 1997). The contact came through having either casual contact with lesbians or gay males or a close friend or family member who was homosexual.

Manifestations of Homophobic Attitudes

Homophobia manifested itself in a number of ways. Manifestations were classified as being either violent or nonviolent in nature. These manifestations were directed at the homosexual in some cases or happened in other cases without the knowledge of the homosexual, meaning that in some cases the person was ridiculed without his/her knowledge.

Rey and Gibson (1997) studied heterosexual students' self-reported homophobic behaviors. Students admitted to engaging in at least one of the following activities: they made jokes and/or sexually explicit comments to or about lesbians and gay males;

verbally harassed or threatened them with violence; chased or followed them; vandalized their property; assaulted them physically or with a weapon; or forced sexual activity on them. The majority of respondents indicated that they participated in anti-gay behavior not out of malicious intent, but because they were bored (Rey & Gibson).

Results of Homophobic Attitudes on Homosexuals

What were the effects of homophobia on lesbians and gay male students? Lesbians and gay males have experienced discrimination and retribution because others do not approve of their sexual orientation. This type of behavior affects their perceptions of heterosexuals and heterosexist environments.

D'Augelli conducted studies in 1989 and 1992 that focused on the discrimination and harassment of lesbian and gay students from their perspectives. In the 1989b study, D'Augelli found that that the 125 lesbians and gay males surveyed had experienced harassment ranging from verbal insults to physical attacks with weapons. Twenty-six percent had been verbally insulted one time, and 50% had been threatened two or more times. Over one quarter (26%) had been threatened with physical violence, and 17% reported having personal property damaged. Objects were thrown at 12%; 22% were chased or followed; and 4% were physically assaulted without a weapon. One person had been attacked with a weapon. The incidence of harassment aimed at lesbians was less than that aimed at gay males. Ninety-four percent of study participants expected victimization to continue, and 91% expected discrimination (D'Augelli, 1989b).

The results from D'Augelli's 1992 study were similar to those from 1989. Out of 121 participants, 77% had been verbally insulted; 27% had been threatened; 13% had property destroyed; and 6 people out of the 121 had been assaulted. Ninety-six percent of

respondents expected discrimination, and lesbians expected to be discriminated against more than gay males, though there is no indication that that is the case (D'Augelli, 1992).

It was discovered in both studies that the majority of incidents were not reported to authorities; in the 1989b study, D'Augelli found that only 6% of victims self-reported incidents and in the 1992 study, he found that the number was 12%. Lesbians and gay males who had been harassed feared further retribution if they reported any crimes against them, and if the crimes were reported that they would be forced to divulge their sexual orientation (D'Augelli, 1989b, 1992). Because of being targeted for attacks, most of the students changed their lives to prevent further incidents. Lesbians and gay males avoided certain locations, distanced themselves from other gays and lesbians who were known to be such, and they hid their sexual orientation and presented themselves to others as heterosexual (D'Augelli, 1989b, 1992). Herek (1993) reported similar statistics for harassment and violence against lesbians and gay males at Yale. Lesbian and gay students at Yale were just as unlikely to report crimes against them as were the respondents in D'Augelli's studies.

Pilkington and D'Augelli (1995) conducted a similar study measuring the victimization of sexual minorities in communities that included school, work, family, and the larger community outside those institutions. They found that lesbians and gay males had experienced harassment in all four of these environments, and they often kept their sexual orientation a secret because of fear (Pilkington & D'Augelli).

Baier, Rosenzweig, and Whipple addressed a specific kind of victimization of homosexuals in 1991. They explored the sexual coercion and victimization of college students, including lesbians and gay males. In responding to the instrument, 11.8% of the

homosexual students reported having been a victim of attempted rape, 17.6% of them reported having been victims of rape, and more than one third of them reported having engaged in sex acts because they were coerced to do so (Baier, Rosenzweig, & Whipple). The numbers of homosexuals who were victimized were as high and in some cases higher than the victimization rates of heterosexual women on campus.

In 1996 Aberson, Swan, and Emerson conducted a study to measure covert discrimination of gay males by college students. They believed that students would not overtly discriminate against gay males because it was not perceived as socially acceptable. Their theory was proved true when students found opportunities to reveal their hidden biases without appearing to be discriminating against gay males. Students showed bias against gay males only when the bias could be attributed to another factor, and were overly positive about gay males when addressing questions that dealt only with sexuality (Aberson et al.).

The perception of campus climate by lesbians and gay male students has been affected by their experiences with discrimination and violence, which are evidenced in these studies. Male homosexual students perceived the university climate to be less supportive, less intellectual, and less tolerant of innovation than did heterosexual males who were matched with them on characteristics other than sexual orientation (Reynolds, 1989).

Interventions

A factor in how homosexuals perceived the campus environment was the attitudes of student affairs professionals toward lesbians and gay males (Marszalek & Goree, 1995). The Marszalek and Goree study found that homosexual college students perceived

that many student affairs professionals attempted to offer them a supportive and fair environment. Hogan and Rentz (1996) found that student affairs professionals were less homophobic than professors were as a group and were more likely to contribute to a positive campus climate for homosexual students.

Student affairs professionals and paraprofessionals, including resident assistants, are responsible for creating and maintaining a positive living and learning environment for all students. The formation of a "Safe Places" program on campus is one way to offer support for lesbians and gay male students (Malaney et al., 1997). These programs designate offices or departments where any student can go for confidential assistance with issues of sexuality.

Some studies suggested interventions and educational opportunities to help rid campuses of homophobic attitudes. Nelson and Krieger (1997) suggested the implementation of a peer panel comprised of lesbians and gay males. Their study found that a panel of homosexual students who spoke to classes about their experiences led to an increase in tolerance toward lesbians and gay male students. Guth, Hewitt-Gervais, Smith, and Fisher's study (2000) showed the effectiveness of inviting an HIV-positive speaker to campus. Students' knowledge was increased and attitudes toward homosexuality and AIDS were improved. Engstrom and Sedlacek (1997) also indicated the benefits of this type of peer panel for overcoming homophobia. They also suggested offering academic courses that focus on the interconnections of all types of discriminatory attitudes.

Hogan and Rentz (1996) suggested moving away from educational programs to action-oriented endeavors to improve attitudes. Mohr and Sedlacek (2000) discussed the

perceived barriers that exist to friendships between heterosexual and homosexual students. They suggested that situations should be created where heterosexual and homosexual students can make positive contact. Malaney et al. (1997) suggested the formation of a campus leadership group made up of homosexual students, heterosexual students, and members of the senior staff of the college.

Student affairs professionals and paraprofessionals, including resident assistants, are responsible for inventing and incorporating programs to address the needs of students on campus. The programs previously mentioned, such as HIV-positive speakers and "Safe Places," are ways that both groups can address the issues of homosexuality and homophobia on college and university campuses. A combination of these types of programs serves to address both existing attitudes in the heterosexual community and the need for support in the homosexual community.

Conclusions

Homophobic attitudes exist on college campuses. These attitudes manifest themselves in many ways and are detrimental to heterosexual and homosexual students alike. Attitudes vary in their severity, and their existence has been attributed to a variety of factors, including gender and gender-roles, self-esteem, education level, race/ethnicity, religiosity, geographical area of residence, political preference, income level, and exposure to homosexuals. Because of homophobic attitudes on college and university campuses, lesbians and gay male students face additional challenges in their day-to-day lives that other students do not.

Resident assistants are the college or university's first line of contact with many of its students. The attitudes that resident assistants hold toward lesbians and gay male

students mirror to some extent the attitudes of the general student population. This study of resident assistants' attitudes toward homosexuals will provide the institution where they work with insight into the situation on its campus. This will allow the administration to look for ways to improve the training and education of its resident assistants, which will translate into an improvement in campus climate for all students who live in residence halls, and hopefully beyond to the general student population. If a positive outcome can be achieved, other colleges and universities may seek to implement a similar study to assess their own environments and improve climates toward lesbian and gay male students.

Summary

Resident assistants have had a responsibility for creating culture and climate in their residence halls and addressing the needs of their residents. This has included addressing the needs of lesbian and gay male students. The attitudes displayed towards lesbian and gay male students were correlated to a variety of demographic variables. When the variables were present, homophobic attitudes tended to appear. Homophobic attitudes manifested themselves in ways ranging from verbal attacks to physical assaults, with many incidents of violence reported to researchers by lesbian and gay male students, but few to campus authorities. The effects of homophobic attitudes were not limited to homosexual students; they affected all students. The key to improving attitudes was to implement educational and experiential activities that created positive interactions between the two groups of students.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter details the methods used in this study. Following a summary of the methodology is a discussion of the population studied, the sampling procedure, the instrumentation, and the data collection and analysis procedures.

Summary of Methods

This census study was based on a quantitative survey design that made use of a Likert scale. The survey measured the self-reported attitudes of the entire staff of resident assistants at a large southeastern research university toward lesbians and gay males. Demographic information was also gathered, as well as answers to six questions (two utilizing a Likert scale and four open-ended) relating to the resident assistants' perceptions of the training they received concerning the issues faced by lesbian and gay male students. Data was collected at residence hall staff meetings; the statistics department of the university analyzed the survey and demographic data and the researcher summarized the answers to the four open-ended questions related to training.

Selection of the Population

The population for this study was the group of resident assistants at a large southeastern research university chosen for convenience. The population for this study was specifically the 155 resident assistants who were working during the 2003-2004 academic year. Because this was a census study, the population and the sample were identical. As the study sought to determine the attitudes of the resident assistants of this university, it was required that each person who participated was a resident assistant.

Sampling and Procedures

Because this study was a census, the sample included the entire population of 155 resident assistants employed by the chosen research institution. The participants in this study could not expect, not were they assured of, anonymity. The fact that they were eligible to participate in the study identified them as a resident assistant, thus making anonymity impossible. Their confidentiality, however, was guarded in three ways. First, the surveys were in no way marked or labeled before they were completed. All resident assistants received identical copies of the survey and they were returned to the researcher at one time. Second, the completed surveys were kept in a locked storage departmental office when not in use by the researcher. No one had access to the completed surveys except the researcher, the committee chair, and the statistician who computed the survey scores. Third, the data was reported in aggregate form in this final analysis and report. No individual responses were discussed, only the responses of the group as a whole or those of subgroups related to the demographic variables. The combination of these three precautions provided the participants with as much protection of their confidentiality as the researcher can reasonably offer.

The method for collecting completed surveys was designed to minimize the threat of coercion on the potential participants. There was less pressure on individuals to participate if the researcher was absent when the surveys are completed, if the surveys were returned in sealed envelopes, and if the researcher provided them ample time complete the surveys, rather than collecting them in a specified period. To protect the privacy of each potential participant in their decision to participate or not to participate,

individual surveys were placed in separate envelopes and sealed before their return, regardless of whether the survey had been completed or not.

Instrumentation

The majority of existing studies cited in this project related to heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay males have relied upon the use of surveys to obtain the desired information. Many of the studies utilized surveys designed by authors for their own particular study. Although those instruments may be valid and reliable for their designers' purposes, none has been used with enough frequency to warrant their use here. To ensure that the information obtained from the participants is suitable for the purposes of this project, the researcher opted to design an original attitude survey which is included in Appendix A.

This survey included three questions related to demographic variables, requesting that the participants specify their gender, their previous experience with lesbians or gay males, and their experience as a resident assistant, in each case selecting from a list of options. There were several demographic variables discussed earlier that were said to have an influence on attitudes toward lesbians and gay males, only two of which were included in this study. Gender was discussed by D'Augelli and Rose (1990), Engstrom and Sedlacek (1997), Hensley (1995), Hill et al. (2002), Nelson and Krieger (1997), Reinhardt (1997), Rey and Gibson (1997), Simoni (1996), and Waldo (1998) as being influential on attitudes, and this multitude of previous research led to the inclusion of gender as a variable in this survey. Previous exposure to lesbians or gay men was another frequently cited factor, being a part of studies by Bowen and Bourgeois (2001), D'Augelli and Rose (1990), Hensley (1995), Herek (1988), Nelson and Krieger (1997),

Reinhardt (1997), and Rey and Gibson (1997). The consistent results found that related to these two variables called for their inclusion in the survey for this project.

The other demographic variables discussed in the literature review are not included in this survey for a variety of reasons. Gender-roles, self-esteem, religiosity, and political preference would all be difficult to quantify and measure; each would require the administration of a separate instrument with the survey and/or extensive one-on-one interviews with the participants. Income as a variable was not included as the participants in this study are students; it is unlikely that any of them have a significant income of their own or an income that is dramatically different from any of their peers. Each of the participants was a college student; including their level of education as a variable would provide no useful information. It is probable that the participants in this study grew up in a variety of environments; geographical area of residence, therefore, might be applicable, but the number of possible scenarios is so large as to be prohibitive. The answer choices provided by the researcher would have to include small town, large town, city, and metropolitan area, each combined with the state/region of the country where the town or city lay, as well as quantifying definitions of "conservative" and "liberal" as they describe the atmosphere of the identified areas. Finally, race/ethnicity was not included in this survey due to the makeup of the sample. It was comprised of 111 White students, 37 African-American students, 4 biracial students, 1 Hispanic student, 1 Asian student, and 1 Alaskan/Native American Indian student. Some of the potential participants would decline to answer such a question or to complete the survey at all for fear that this information could be used to identify them. Rather than risk compromising the

confidentiality of any of the participants or causing them any discomfort, race/ethnicity was not an identifying demographic variable for this survey.

Following the demographic variables were twenty questions addressing the feelings of the participants on various issues related to lesbians and gay males. These questions made up the attitude scale. The questions were divided into two subscales of ten questions each, one addressing issues related to lesbians and one addressing issues related to gay males. The questions for the two groups were identical, with only the wording changed to reflect the respective group (i.e., gay males substituted for lesbian). Therefore, the scores for the subscales could be compared to each other to assess whether differences exist in how the participants feel about the two groups.

The questions were scored using a 7-point Likert scale, with possible responses ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The score for each of the two subscales ranges from 10 (extremely high heterosexist attitudes) to 70 (extremely low heterosexist attitudes), and the score for the whole scale ranges from 20 to 140. In each of the two subscales, five of the ten questions were phrased positively and five were phrased negatively. The negatively phrased questions were reverse-scored to keep the scale's meaning consistent throughout the survey, thus giving those with little acceptance of lesbians and gay men a low score and those with great acceptance a high score. The difference in phrasing technique was employed in an attempt to assure that participants paid careful attention to the questions being asked rather than blindly circling numbers on the scale. The negative and positive questions were randomly ordered in a second attempt to assure that each question is answered thoughtfully.

The design of this section of the survey was influenced by an attitudinal survey called the Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men (ATLG) scale, designed by Gregory Herek in 1988. The ATLG is also comprised of twenty questions and divided into two subscales in the same manner as this one. The questions are answered using a Likert format, and some of them are phrased negatively and reverse scored, as were some of the questions used in this project. The specific subject matter of several of the questions in this project's survey was inspired by questions written by Herek for the ATLG scale. This survey was designed in lieu of using the ATLG for two reasons. First, the ATLG's subscales are not comprised of questions with identical stems; this prevented the two from being directly compared. Second, the questions on the ATLG did not address all of the cultural issues that are important in 2004. Rather than adapt the ATLG and retest it for reliability and validity in a new form, the researcher chose to build a new instrument.

Following the main body of the instrument were six questions that related to the resident assistants' training. The first two questions were based on the same 7-point scale as the main survey and addressed how well the resident assistants perceived that the issues related to the issues of lesbians and gay men were addressed in their training program and how well they perceived they were able to handle these issues in their residence halls. The scaled format of these two questions allowed for the participants to rate themselves and their preparation. The last four questions were open-ended, allowing the participants to supply their own thoughts. The first question asked for a list and a description of the kind of information they received in their training program related to lesbian and gay male issues. The second question asked for a list and description of the types of activities concerning homosexual issues they experienced during their training

program. The data from these two questions provided a profile of how the Housing Department prepared its resident assistants to identify the issues that lesbian and gay male students face and how to deal with those issues. The third question asked for a list and description of the kind of information they wish they had received in their training program related to lesbian and gay male issues. The fourth question asked for a list and description of the types of activities concerning homosexual issues they wish they had experienced during their training program. The data from these two questions provided some ideas about how the resident assistants perceived that their training in this area could have been improved. The answers to the Likert-scaled questions were not included as part of the survey's total possible score of 140. The data from these six questions are included in the discussion and conclusion section of this report after the attitudes of the resident assistants have been assessed and the characteristics of the existing training program are identified.

To address reliability and validity of this survey, a small-scale pilot test was conducted before the scales were administered to the study participants. The purpose of the pilot test was to find out if the survey questions were clear, if any of them caused distress to the participants, whether the information collected was consistent with the information sought, and to estimate the time required to answer that part of the survey. The participants for the pilot test were members of the researcher's graduate cohort group, that group chosen for convenience. These participants were given the same survey, but they were not asked to supply demographic information related to their experience as resident assistants or to answer the six questions related to resident assistant training. A chi square goodness of fit test was calculated for each of the survey

items to provide a standard of measure for the answers given by the research group; the goodness of fit test provided the expected and observed values for each item. Chi square tests of independence were calculated to provide a similar standard of measure for each of the demographic items.

Procedures

Data Collection

Data for this study was collected by distributing the instrument to each resident assistant on the campus of the selected research institution. This project required the completion of an Institutional Research Board (IRB) Form A, which was reviewed within the Educational Administration and Policy Studies department, as the research is exempt from review by the university's larger IRB panel. The data collection did not take place until this approval had been given. The data collection was accomplished according to the specific procedure outlined here.

After receiving approval to conduct the research from the Assistant Director of Housing, the researcher talked with the Hall Directors and/or Assistant Hall Directors to schedule time for the survey to be distributed during the weekly staff meetings held at each residence hall. At each of these meetings, the researcher introduced herself to the group and explained the general nature of the project without giving so much information as to jeopardize the honesty of the survey responses.

A memo containing the project information and addressing the rights of the potential participants was distributed to each person. The information given to the potential participants in the following five steps was provided in the memo, but was also repeated verbally to the groups. First, the concept of confidentiality was explained as well

as the three ways in which the confidentiality of the members of this group was protected. Second, the concept of informed consent was explained and the potential participants were notified that by completing the survey and returning it, they gave their informed consent to be a part of the study. Third, the researcher explained that everyone had the right to refuse participation in the study without penalty and that they could request to be removed from the study and have their data destroyed, so long as the decision was made before all the data had collected. Fourth, the collection procedure for the surveys was discussed. Fifth, the researcher explained that the participants could telephone the Compliance Office or her at any time with questions and the contact information for both (which was printed in the memo) was given.

The researcher then explained the format of the survey (the number of questions, the answer scale, and the open-ended questions). At this time, blank copies of the survey and unmarked envelopes were distributed. A few minutes were allowed for the potential participants to look at the survey and ask any questions. When there were no further questions, the researcher left additional copies of the survey and the memo, along with some stamped, self-addressed envelopes and a large collection envelope with the Hall Director or Assistant Hall Director and answered any questions they had regarding their role in collecting the surveys. The researcher then left the meeting and returned to the residence hall the following day to retrieve the sealed envelope that contained both the completed and blank surveys.

Each person who chose to participate in the project completed his/her survey, put it into the provided envelope, and sealed the envelope before turning it in to the Hall Director or Assistant Hall Director at the conclusion of the staff meeting. Each person

who chose not to participate put his/her blank survey into the provided envelope and sealed the envelope before turning it in to the Hall Director or Assistant Hall Director at the conclusion of the staff meeting. When the Hall Director and/or Assistant Hall Director had collected all copies of the survey, he or she placed the individual envelopes into a larger collection envelope, sealed it, and kept it for retrieval by the researcher on the following day. Any resident assistant not present at his/her staff meeting was given one of the extra sets of information that the researcher left with the Hall Director or Assistant Hall Director, along with a stamped envelope pre-addressed to the researcher and could return his/her survey by mail.

After all 155 resident assistants had the opportunity to participate in the study, the researcher numbered the completed surveys (*N*=133). Each of the four pages of an individual's survey were coded with an identical number to guard against the possibility of interchanging any one person's responses for another's. As discussed previously, the completed surveys were stored in a locked cabinet in the departmental office when not in use to guard the participants' confidentiality.

Data Analysis

The raw data was delivered to the statistics department at the university to be analyzed. The statistician used Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 12.0 to analyze the data. First, a mean score for each Likert-scaled question was determined, as well as mean scores for the scale and its two subscales. Second, a mean score for each of the demographic subgroups was determined (one each for the two genders, the three categories of prior association with lesbians or gay males, and the three categories of resident assistant experience) for each question and for the scale and its

subscales. The existence of relationships between the demographic variables and the scale and subscale scores were assessed using chi square analysis by looking for significant differences in the expected and observed responses to the survey items. Finally, the researcher addressed the questions related to training. A summary was compiled of the answers given by the resident assistants to the four open-ended questions. The statistician also performed chi square analysis for the two questions related to training that were Likert-scaled.

Summary

This study concerned the attitudes of 133 resident assistants at a large southeastern research university. The census survey was administered to the participants in small groups comprised of all the resident assistants who worked in the individual residence halls. The instrument was a Likert-scaled assessment that measured attitudes toward lesbians and gay males. Information related to demographic variables was also collected to assess possible relationships to the data resulting from the survey analysis. The information obtained from the open-ended questions was summarized to provide insight into the training that the resident assistants experienced regarding the issues of lesbian and gay male students and what training they wished they had received. The data resulting from the answers to all of the research questions was used to assess the attitudes of resident assistants toward lesbians and gay males, to suggest some possible reasons for those attitudes, and to offer suggestions for improvements to the sexual diversity aspect of the resident assistant training program, both from the perspective of the current resident assistant and the researcher.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The research survey was distributed at a weekly resident assistant staff meeting to 155 resident assistants according to the procedures outlined in Chapter II. Of those surveys, 133 were returned completed by the participants yielding a return rate of 85.8%. There were 75 male resident assistants (48.4%) and 80 female resident assistants (51.6%) as reported by the Housing Department. Based on the self-reported gender variable on the survey, 14 males and 8 females declined to participate in the study. The 61 males who did participate made up 45.9% of the total (*N*=133) and the 72 females who participated made up 54.1% of the total. This is a slight variance from the original makeup of the staff, but small enough that its impact on the study should not be significant.

The results of the survey are presented here in the order of the research questions that were presented in Chapter I:

1. What are the attitudes of resident assistants at this large southeastern research university toward lesbian and gay male students?
2. Are the attitudes of resident assistants related to any of three self-identified demographic variables: gender, previous contact/relationship with lesbians or gay males, and resident assistant experience?
3. How well do the resident assistants feel that they have been prepared for their role in dealing with the issues of their lesbian and gay male residents, and what do they see as important factors in preparing resident assistants to deal with these issues?

Results

The attitudes of the resident assistants toward lesbian women and gay men were measured by the administration of the survey designed by the researcher. Twenty questions were answered by the participants, with a score of 1 on the questions indicating extremely negative attitudes towards lesbians and gay males and a score of 7 indicating extremely positive attitudes towards lesbians and gay males. Questions 1, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 15, 16, 17, and 19 were reverse scored in calculating the results of the survey; these questions were originally phrased so that a score of 1 indicated an extremely positive attitude and a score of 7 indicated an extremely negative attitude. The scores have been reversed so that a the meaning of the scale remains consistent, with the highest number indicating positive attitudes and the lowest number indicating negative attitudes. All scores for these ten questions discussed in this chapter refer to the reversed score.

Research Question 1

Each question on the survey was answered on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from a low of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The determination of the mean scores for the scale and its subscales for the sample as a whole, as well as for the subgroups based on the demographic variables, was the how the attitudes sought in Research Question 1 were investigated.

First, the mean scores on the scale and its subscales for the group as a whole were addressed. The mean score per question for the lesbian subscale was 4.9457 (*SD*=1.47088). Thus, the resident assistants as a group had attitudes that were somewhat positive towards lesbians. The mean score per question for the gay male subscale was 4.8711 (*SD*=1.50014). While still indicating attitudes that were somewhat positive

towards gay males, the attitudes towards gay males were slightly lower than towards lesbians. The mean score per question for the scale as a whole was 4.9081 (*SD*=1.47089). The overall mean score was, again, somewhat positive towards lesbians and gay males as a group. These data can be seen in Table 1.

The mean scores were then computed as they related to the demographic variables. The first demographic variable addressed was gender (Table 2). The mean score for male participants (*n*=61) was 4.7603 (*SD*=1.56080) on the lesbian subscale, 4.5762 (*SD*=1.61079) on the gay male subscale, and 4.6675 (*SD*=1.57560) on the whole scale. The mean score for female participants (*n*=72) was 5.1028 (*SD*=1.38167) on the lesbian subscale, 5.1210 (*SD*=1.36133) on the gay male subscale, and 5.1119 (*SD*=1.35373) on the whole scale. Male participants were slightly more positive towards lesbians than towards gay males, although the mean scores for both groups, as well as the mean score for the groups combined, were closer to the positive end of the scoring scale. Female participants were more positive towards gay males than towards lesbians,

Table 1

Mean Scores for Sample Population

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
lesbian	133	1.70	7.00	4.9457	1.47088
gaymale	133	1.40	7.00	4.8711	1.50014
total	133	1.70	7.00	4.9081	1.47089
Valid N (listwise)	133				

Table 2

Mean Scores by Gender

DV1		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1*	lesbian	61	1.70	7.00	4.7603	1.56080
	gaymale	61	1.40	7.00	4.5762	1.61079
	total	61	1.70	7.00	4.6675	1.57560
	Valid N (listwise)	61				
2**	lesbian	72	2.50	7.00	5.1028	1.38167
	gaymale	72	2.50	7.00	5.1210	1.36133
	total	72	2.50	7.00	5.1119	1.35373
	Valid N (listwise)	72				

*1= male; **2=female

though slightly. The female participants as a group were more positive towards both groups than were the male participants.

The second demographic variable addressed was the participants' reported prior interactions with lesbians or gay men (Table 3). One participant declined to report an answer to this demographic. The mean score for those who reported having no previous interactions with lesbians or gay males (*n*=6) was 4.3000 (*SD*=1.57099) on the lesbian subscale, 4.0333 (*SD*=1.79963) on the gay male subscale, and 4.1667 (*SD*=1.57560) on the whole scale. The mean score for those who reported having casual interactions with lesbians or gay males (*n*=67) was 4.6493 (*SD*=1.42748) on the lesbian subscale, 4.5515 (*SD*=1.44796) on the gay male subscale, and 4.6007 (*SD*=1.42831) on the whole scale. The mean score for those who reported having a close friend or family member who is a lesbian or gay male (*n*=59) was 5.3454 (*SD*=1.44385) for the lesbian subscale, 5.3205

Table 3

Mean Scores by Prior Interactions with Lesbians and Gay Males

DV2		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
0*	lesbian	1	5.10	5.10	5.1000	.
	gaymale	1	4.80	4.80	4.8000	.
	total	1	4.95	4.95	4.9500	.
	Valid N (listwise)	1				
1**	lesbian	6	2.80	7.00	4.3000	1.57099
	gaymale	6	2.20	7.00	4.0333	1.79963
	total	6	2.50	7.00	4.1667	1.68008
	Valid N (listwise)	6				
2***	lesbian	67	1.70	7.00	4.6493	1.42748
	gaymale	67	1.40	7.00	4.5515	1.44796
	total	67	1.70	7.00	4.6007	1.42831
	Valid N (listwise)	67				
3****	lesbian	59	2.50	7.00	5.3454	1.44385
	gaymale	59	2.50	7.00	5.3205	1.43546
	total	59	2.50	7.00	5.3318	1.41788
	Valid N (listwise)	59				

*0=declined to indicate; **1=no prior interaction; ***2=casual prior interactions; ****3=close friend or family member is lesbian/gay male

(*SD*=1.43546) on the gay male subscale, and 5.3318 (*SD*=1.41788) on the whole scale. Although all of the scores were at or above the middle point of the Likert scale, the scores increased in direct proportion to the level of prior interaction that the participants reported to have with lesbians or gay males.

The third demographic variable addressed was the participants' reported years of experience as a resident assistant (Table 4). The mean score for those who reported that they were in their first year as a resident assistant (*n*=77) was 4.9530 (*SD*=1.48634) on the lesbian subscale, 4.8578 (*SD*=1.53882) on the gay male subscale, and 4.9048 (*SD*=1.50149) on the whole scale. The mean score for those who reported that they were in their second year as a resident assistant (*n*=46) was 4.8413 (*SD*=1.49333) on the lesbian subscale, 4.7959 (*SD*=1.48852) on the gay male subscale, and 4.8186 (*SD*=1.46873) on the whole scale. The mean score for those who reported that they were in their third or more year as a resident assistant (*n*=10) was 5.3700 (*SD*=1.29190) on the lesbian subscale, 5.3200 (*SD*=1.29512) on the gay male subscale, and 5.3450 (*SD*=1.28657) on the whole scale. Although those reporting to be in their third or more year as a resident assistant did have the highest mean score, those in their first year as part of the staff reported a higher score than did those in their second year. Based on the pattern of the previous demographic variable (as interaction increases, attitudes become more positive), one would expect that as experience in the job increased, so would have feelings of acceptance towards lesbians and gay males; this variable did not follow this previous pattern in exactly the same way. The mean scores for the sample and all of its demographic subgroups served to give a scaled notion of where the attitudes of the resident assistants lie.

Table 4

Mean Scores by Previous RA Experience

DV3		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1*	lesbian	77	2.20	7.00	4.9530	1.48634
	gaymale	77	1.40	7.00	4.8578	1.53882
	total	77	1.80	7.00	4.9048	1.50149
	Valid N (listwise)	77				
2**	lesbian	46	1.70	7.00	4.8413	1.49333
	gaymale	46	1.70	7.00	4.7959	1.48852
	total	46	1.70	7.00	4.8186	1.46873
	Valid N (listwise)	46				
3***	lesbian	10	3.50	7.00	5.3700	1.29190
	gaymale	10	3.40	7.00	5.3200	1.29512
	total	10	3.45	7.00	5.3450	1.28657
	Valid N (listwise)	10				

*1=1st year as an RA; **2=2nd year as an RA; ***3=3rd or more year as an RA

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 sought to determine whether the self-reported demographic variables were in any way related to the attitudes investigated in this study. Three demographic variables were chosen to be assessed: gender, prior interactions of the participants with lesbians or gay males, and the years of experience they had as a resident assistant. Chi square tests of independence were performed to see if the answers to the survey questions were independent of the various demographic variables. All chi square independence values are presented in Table 5.

The chi square independence values indicated that for 19 of the 20 questions, the survey responses were independent of gender. The distribution of answers to these questions could be attributed to chance and were not significantly related to gender. Question #12, however, did have a significant result. The significant χ^2 value for this question was 15.590 (df=6) P = less than .05 (Table 6). For this question pertaining to whether or not homosexual men should be treated the same as other men, the females' responses were more positive than were the men's more frequently than could be attributed to chance alone.

When gender was compared to the frequency distribution of the answers for the total scale, the lesbian subscale, and the gay male subscale the distributions of answers to the questions in these areas were within the expected range. Therefore, gender did not have a significant effect on how the participants answered the questions.

The chi square independence values indicated that for 15 of the 20 questions, the survey answers were independent of the prior interaction with lesbians or gay males

Table 5

χ^2 Values by Question and Demographic Variables

		Demographic Variables		
		Gender	Previous Interaction	RA Experience
Survey Questions	Q1	3.765	13.652	12.664
	Q2	9.823	22.199*	13.503
	Q3	5.145	11.698	15.478
	Q4	12.456	36.076*	15.081
	Q5	6.641	20.852	12.317
	Q6	11.192	22.214*	8.690
	Q7	5.663	12.148	8.645
	Q8	9.744	11.736	13.797
	Q9	3.226	17.349	7.345
	Q10	11.363	14.788	10.759
	Q11	6.927	21.008*	6.342
	Q12	15.590*	20.475	19.618
	Q13	9.946	14.467	10.093
	Q14	10.651	26.288*	21.923*
	Q15	5.649	12.351	11.601
	Q16	7.056	20.506	14.471
	Q17	5.601	20.065	14.651
	Q18	9.588	14.254	15.449
	Q19	2.279	16.035	8.204
	Q20	3.641	20.009	14.533

*statistically significant value

Table 6

Gender and Question #12 Cross-tabulation

			Q12							Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
DV1	1*	Observed	4	2	5	5	5	7	33	61
		Expected	1.8	.9	2.3	4.6	4.1	9.2	38.1	61.0
	2**	Observed	0	0	0	5	4	13	50	72
		Expected	2.2	1.1	2.7	5.4	4.9	10.8	44.9	72.0
Total		Observed	4	2	5	10	9	20	83	133
		Expected	4.0	2.0	5.0	10.0	9.0	20.0	83.0	133.0

*1=male; **2=female

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.590[a]	6	.016
Likelihood Ratio	19.784	6	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.712	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	133		

[a] 9 cells (64.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .92.

demographic. The distribution of answers could be attributed to chance and were not related in any significant way to the type of prior interactions the participants reported that they had. Chi square tests on questions #2, #4, #6, #11, and #14 did produce significant results.

The significant χ^2 value for Question #2 was 22.199 (*df*=12) *P* = .05 (Table 7). For this question about treating lesbians the same as other women, those who reported that they had a close friend or family member who was a lesbian or gay male answered positively more often than did those who had had only casual prior interactions with lesbians or gay males or than those who had had no prior interactions at all. The distribution of the answers was dependent on the prior interactions of the participants.

The significant χ^2 value for Question #4 was 36.076 (*df*=12) *P* = less than .001 (Table 8). For this question, those who reported having a close friend or family member who was a lesbian or gay male were more positive about accepting lesbians in positions of authority than members of the other two subgroups of this variable; the distribution frequency of the answers could not be attributed to chance alone. With a value significant at less than the .001 level, this relationship is very strong.

The significant χ^2 value for Question #6 was 22.214 (*df*=12) *P* = .05 (Table 9). This question addressed how the respondents would feel if they found out that their sister was a lesbian. Again, those with the most frequent prior interactions with lesbians or gay males were far more likely to be accepting of a lesbian sister than those who had had no prior interactions or merely casual interactions with lesbians or gay males.

Table 7

Previous Interaction and Question #2 Cross-tabulation

			Q2							Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
DV2	1*	Observed	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	6
		Expected	.0	.0	.2	.5	.6	.8	3.8	6.0
	2**	Observed	1	1	2	6	7	12	38	67
		Expected	.5	.5	2.5	5.1	6.6	9.1	42.6	67.0
	3***	Observed	0	0	1	3	6	6	43	59
		Expected	.4	.4	2.2	4.5	5.8	8.0	37.5	59.0
Total		Observed	1	1	5	10	13	18	84	132
		Expected	1.0	1.0	5.0	10.0	13.0	18.0	84.0	132.0

*1=no prior interactions; **2=casual prior interactions; ***3=close friend or family member is lesbian/gay male

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.199[a]	12	.035
Likelihood Ratio	15.747	12	.203
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.765	1	.009
N of Valid Cases	132		

[a] 14 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .05.

Table 8

Previous Interaction and Question #4 Cross-tabulation

			Q4							Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
DV2	1*	Observed	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	6
		Expected	.0	.1	.2	.7	.6	.9	3.5	6.0
	2**	Observed	0	1	3	9	8	9	37	67
		Expected	.5	1.0	2.0	8.1	7.1	9.6	38.6	67.0
	3***	Observed	0	0	1	7	6	8	37	59
		Expected	.4	.9	1.8	7.2	6.3	8.5	34.0	59.0
Total		Observed	1	2	4	16	14	19	76	132
		Expected	1.0	2.0	4.0	16.0	14.0	19.0	76.0	132.0

*1=no prior interactions; **2=casual prior interactions; ***3= close friend or family member is lesbian/gay male

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36.076[a]	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	17.280	12	.139
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.379	1	.036
N of Valid Cases	132		

[a] 13 cells (61.9%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .05.

Table 9

Previous Interaction and Question #6 Cross-tabulation

			Q6							Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
DV2	1*	Observed	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	6
		Expected	1.5	.5	.6	.5	.3	.4	2.1	6.0
	2**	Observed	21	8	8	7	5	2	16	67
		Expected	16.9	6.1	7.2	5.1	3.6	4.6	23.5	67.0
	3***	Observed	10	3	6	2	1	7	29	58
		Expected	14.6	5.3	6.2	4.4	3.1	4.0	20.4	58.0
Total		Observed	33	12	14	10	7	9	46	131
		Expected	33.0	12.0	14.0	10.0	7.0	9.0	46.0	131.0

*1=no prior interactions; **2=casual prior interactions; ***3=close friend or family member is lesbian/gay male

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.214[a]	12	.035
Likelihood Ratio	23.460	12	.024
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.655	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	131		

[a] 12 cells (57.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .32.

The significant χ^2 value for Question #11 was 14.788 (*df*=12) *P* = .05 (Table 10). This question asked whether the participants felt that male homosexuality was a natural expression of human sexuality. Those in the subgroup who had a close friend or family member who was a lesbian or gay male were the most positive about male homosexuality. Chance alone could not account for the differences in distribution of the answers.

The significant χ^2 value for Question #14 was 26.288 (*df*=12) *P* = .01 (Table 11). Question #14 addresses the acceptance of male homosexuals in positions of authority. As the level of prior interactions with lesbians or gay males increased, so did the positive attitudes towards male homosexuals in authority. With the level at .01, the relationship between the variable and the answer distribution is very significant.

When prior interactions with lesbians or gay men were compared to the frequency distribution of the answers for the total scale, the lesbian subscale, and the gay male subscale the distributions of answers to the questions in these areas were within the expected range. Therefore, prior interactions did not have a significant effect on how the participants answered the questions.

The chi square independence values indicated that for 19 of the 20 questions, the survey answers were independent of the demographic variable for years of resident assistant experience. The distribution of answers could be attributed to chance and were not related in any significant way to the number of years' experience that the participants reported. A chi square test of independence for Question #14 did produce a significant result.

Table 10

Previous Interaction and Question #11 Cross-tabulation

			Q11							Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
DV2	1*	Observed	3	0	1	1	0	0	1	6
		Expected	1.6	.7	.5	.9	.2	.6	1.5	6.0
	2**	Observed	21	9	9	9	2	9	8	67
		Expected	18.3	7.6	5.6	9.6	2.5	7.1	16.2	67.0
	3***	Observed	12	6	1	9	3	5	23	59
		Expected	16.1	6.7	4.9	8.5	2.2	6.3	14.3	59.0
Total		Observed	36	15	11	19	5	14	32	132
		Expected	36.0	15.0	11.0	19.0	5.0	14.0	32.0	132.0

*1=no prior interactions; **2=casual prior interactions; ***3=close friend or family member is lesbian/gay male

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.008[a]	12	.050
Likelihood Ratio	23.601	12	.023
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.329	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	132		

[a] 10 cells (47.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .23.

Table 11

Previous Interaction and Question #14 Cross-tabulation

			Q14							Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
DV2	1*	Observed	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	6
		Expected	.1	.1	.2	1.0	.6	.7	3.4	6.0
	2**	Observed	1	1	3	11	7	10	34	67
		Expected	1.0	1.0	2.0	10.7	6.6	7.6	38.1	67.0
	3***	Observed	0	0	1	10	5	4	39	59
		Expected	.9	.9	1.8	9.4	5.8	6.7	33.5	59.0
Total		Observed	2	2	4	21	13	15	75	132
		Expected	2.0	2.0	4.0	21.0	13.0	15.0	75.0	132.0

*1= no prior interactions; **2=casual prior interactions; ***3=close friend or family member is lesbian/gay male

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.288[a]	12	.010
Likelihood Ratio	17.121	12	.145
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.487	1	.019
N of Valid Cases	132		

[a] 13 cells (61.9%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .09.

The significant χ^2 value for Question #14 was 21.923 (*df*=12) *P* = less than .05 (Table 12). For this question, those who reported being in their third or more year of being a resident assistant were more positive about accepting gay males in positions of authority than members of the other two subgroups of this variable; the distribution frequency of the answers could not be attributed to chance alone. With a value significant at less than the .05 level, this relationship is strong.

Research Question 3

Research Question 3 asked how well the resident assistants felt they were prepared to deal with the issues of their lesbian and gay male students and what suggestions they had for improving their training. To assess their attitudes about their training they were asked to answer two Likert-scaled questions addressing how well they felt they were prepared to deal with the issues of their lesbian and gay male students and how well they thought they were actually able to deal with these residents. Chi square goodness of fit tests were performed for the two questions to look for any significant relationships between their mean scores for the attitude scale and its two subscales. Due to the inability of SPSS and the computer processor to handle the large volume of information involved, the cells containing the mean scores for the attitude scale and its subscales were collapsed and three points created from the seven on the scale. For the mean scores and the question responses, those whose values were between one and two were assigned a value of one; those whose values were between three, four, and five were assigned a value of two; and those whose values were between six and seven were assigned a value of three.

Table 12

RA Experience and Question #14 Cross-tabulation

			Q14							Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
DV3	1*	Observed	2	2	0	11	8	5	49	77
		Expected	1.2	1.2	2.3	12.2	7.5	8.7	44.0	77.0
	2**	Observed	0	0	4	10	5	7	20	46
		Expected	.7	.7	1.4	7.3	4.5	5.2	26.3	46.0
	3***	Observed	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	10
		Expected	.2	.2	.3	1.6	1.0	1.1	5.7	10.0
Total		Observed	2	2	4	21	13	15	76	133
		Expected	2.0	2.0	4.0	21.0	13.0	15.0	76.0	133.0

*1= 1st year as an RA; **2=2nd year as an RA; ***3=3rd or more year as an RA

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.923[a]	12	.038
Likelihood Ratio	26.099	12	.010
Linear-by-Linear Association	.018	1	.892
N of Valid Cases	133		

[a] 13 cells (61.9%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .15.

When the responses to the question asking how well they felt the issues of their lesbian and gay male students were addressed during their training were compared to the lesbian subscale mean scores, somewhat significant results were found. The significant χ^2 value for this question was 9.447 (*df*=4) *P* = less than .10 (Table 13). The value for significance at the .05 level would be 9.488; the calculated value was so close as to indicate that there is probable significance between the lesbian subscale answers and the responses to the question. The results indicated that the higher their mean score on the lesbian subscale (the more positively they felt about lesbians), the less positive they were about the preparation they received during their training. This indicated that for this comparison, the participants' view of their training decreased as attitudes about lesbians increased.

Similar but more clearly significant results were found for the gay male subscale and the total attitude scale. For the gay male subscale, the significant χ^2 value for this question was 10.168 (*df*=4) *P*=less than .05 (Table 14). Those whose scores were more positive on the gay male subscale were less positive about the efficacy of the preparation they received during training. As positive attitudes about gay males increased, positive feelings about training decreased.

The results for the total scale were very similar to the results for the gay male subscale. The significant χ^2 value for this question was 9.311 (*df*=4) *P* = less than .05 (Table 15). Again, as with the gay male subscale, those participants with positive scores on the attitude scale were less favorable of the preparation they received in the resident assistant training class.

Table 13

RA Question #1 and Lesbian Subscale Mean Scores Cross-tabulation

			Lesbian subscale			Total
			1.00*	2.00**	3.00***	
RAQ1	1.00*	Observed	0	7	12	19
		Expected	.4	11.1	7.4	19.0
	2.00**	Observed	2	36	28	66
		Expected	1.5	38.7	25.8	66.0
	3.00***	Observed	1	35	12	48
		Expected	1.1	28.2	18.8	48.0
Total		Observed	3	78	52	133
		Expected	3.0	78.0	52.0	133.0

*1=score between 1 and 2; **2=score between 3 and 5; ***3=score between 6 and 7

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.447[a]	4	.051
Likelihood Ratio	9.889	4	.042
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.038	1	.005
N of Valid Cases	133		

[a] 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.

Table 14

RA Question #1 and Gay Male Subscale Mean Scores Cross-tabulation

			Gay male subscale			Total
			1.00*	2.00**	3.00***	
RAQ1	1.00*	Observed	0	6	13	19
		Expected	.7	11.0	7.3	19.0
	2.00**	Observed	3	38	25	66
		Expected	2.5	38.2	25.3	66.0
	3.00***	Observed	2	33	13	48
		Expected	1.8	27.8	18.4	48.0
Total		Observed	5	77	51	133
		Expected	5.0	77.0	51.0	133.0

*1=score between 1 and 2; **2=score between 3 and 5; ***3=score between 6 and 7

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.168[a]	4	.038
Likelihood Ratio	10.600	4	.031
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.853	1	.005
N of Valid Cases	133		

[a] 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .71.

Table 15

RA Question #1 and Total Scale Mean Scores Cross-tabulation

			Total scale			Total
			1.00*	2.00**	3.00***	
RAQ1	1.00*	Observed	0	7	12	19
		Expected	.6	11.1	7.3	19.0
	2.00**	Observed	3	36	27	66
		Expected	2.0	38.7	25.3	66.0
	3.00***	Observed	1	35	12	48
		Expected	1.4	28.2	18.4	48.0
Total		Observed	4	78	51	133
		Expected	4.0	78.0	51.0	133.0

*1=score between 1 and 2; **2=score between 3 and 5; ***3=score between 6 and 7

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.016[a]	4	.040
Likelihood Ratio	10.464	4	.033
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.169	1	.007
N of Valid Cases	133		

[a] 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .57.

The second question that pertained to personal resident assistant experience asked how well the participants thought they were able to deal with the issues faced by their lesbian and gay male residents. When the collapsed scores were put into a chi square goodness of fit tests with the collapsed mean scores on the lesbian subscale, the gay male subscale, and the total scale, there were no significant results for any of the tests. Therefore, the distribution of answers to self-reported skills question was attributable to chance alone and was not related to their attitudes on the attitude survey.

The final section of the survey consisted of four questions for which the participants were asked to describe the information they received during resident assistant training, the training experiences they had during this time, what types of information they wished they had received, and the training exercises that they wish had been done during their training. These questions provided a chance to get more detailed information about the resident assistant training program from its students and see where improvements might be made to help RAs be better prepared to deal with the issues of their lesbian and gay male students.

The first open-ended question asked the participants to list and describe the information they had been given in their training regarding lesbians, gay males, and the issues that might arise in residence halls. Approximately 20% of the participants neglected to answer the question at all, which may or may not indicate that they did not feel they received any information. Another 15% could not remember any information having been given to them or felt that they did not receive any pertinent information. One of the most common answers was that the RAs received information about being open

and tolerant of all types of diversity, including sexual diversity. Others mentioned being given information on hate crime statistics, AIDS, discrimination, referrals of homosexual students to the Counseling Center to help them deal with problems, and how to mediate between roommates who are having difficulties because one is homosexual. Some people mentioned that they were told during training to keep their personal feelings, beliefs, and morals to themselves regarding homosexuality. An interesting comment made by a participant was that RA training indicated that homosexuals were "great" and that the housing staff tries to make the RAs "love them more." Some RAs said that they were given information on having programs for their residents about sexual diversity and making communities in their residence halls. A few people were concerned about what they perceived to be a lack of information on the subject; they felt their training was limited to dealing with interactions between residents and did not focus enough on dealing with personal feelings. Most seemed to feel that they had received enough information to be comfortable dealing with situations that might arise in a residence hall.

The second open-ended question asked the participants to list and describe the types of training activities that they participated in during training. Nearly half of the participants neglected to answer the question, said that there were no training activities, or that they could not recall what activities they had experienced. The two most commonly referenced activities were role-playing activities and group discussions. A few participants mentioned a game they played in which they were assigned some grouping trait, such as being homosexual, of a racial or ethnic minority, or having a disability, and then were discriminated against by the others in the class who were not a part of the same

group. This exercise was supposed to give them an idea about how it feels to be on the receiving end of discrimination. A couple of participants indicated that the training exercises were not helpful because they were "not applicable for their residents." A common idea mentioned was that many of the diversity exercises were designed to cover all types of diversity and were not specific to sexual diversity.

The third question asked for the participants to list and describe the information they wished they had received during their training. Nearly two-thirds of the RAs gave no answer at all or said that they did not think any additional information was necessary. Some of those who did respond wanted more open discussion, including practical information about coming out issues, hate crimes, available resources and organizations that offer support for homosexuals, resident programming, mediating between roommates, and how to deal with their own feelings about homosexuality. A useful suggestion made several times was for first-hand information about homosexual issues be provided by a lesbian and/or a gay male. Opinions about whether additional information was even necessary varied; some people said that it was already "harped on too much" while others said that any additional information would be helpful. One or two people suggested that although they would like more information, they did not know what they needed because they had not yet had to deal with any situations or because the best information comes from first-hand experiences. Some of the RAs were negative about the information they had already received; they believed that the way they were told to act was fake and they resented not being allowed to stand up for their personal convictions about homosexuality.

The final question asked for the participants to list and describe what activities they wished they had experienced during their training. Again, nearly two-thirds of the participants neglected to answer the question or wanted no additional training. Some of those who did comment on additional activities had very definite ideas such as more role-playing activities, a panel discussion, and a lesbian or gay male who would talk to the group about their own experiences and how they dealt with being a homosexual on campus and in the residence halls. Others wanted more training about dealing with issues such as coming out, being supportive of homosexuals in the residence halls, and techniques for handling situations, but they did not offer any suggestions for specific activities that would provide that training. A few people said that although anything would be helpful, they had not had to deal with any problems yet and so were unsure about what would help them in real-life situations.

It seemed that the answers to these four questions were, in many instances, not given much thought. That undoubtedly affected the usefulness of the answers, but those participants who did give the topics some thought had some insightful commentary and useful suggestions.

Summary

The three research questions addressed with this survey did provide some useful data about the attitudes of the resident assistants at this university. The mean scores and distribution frequencies indicated how positive and negatives the attitudes were about lesbians and gay males for the resident assistants on this particular campus. The analysis of the scores in relation to the demographic variables was oftentimes not consistently significant, but there were some areas in which there was a significant relationship

between the demographic subgroups and the questions being investigated. The two Likert scale questions pertaining to resident assistant training were more significant in their relationship to the scale and subscale scores. The open-ended questions about information and training activities did not reveal as many useful suggestions as expected, but even the lack of enthusiasm about the topics was telling.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes of resident assistants at a large research university in the southeast toward lesbian and gay male students. A descriptive Likert-scaled survey instrument was distributed to the resident assistants at this university. The survey included three demographic questions, 20 questions related to attitudes, two Likert-scaled questions related to the preparation and competency of the participants, and four open-ended questions to determine what information and training exercises were part of the training program and what the resident assistants wished had been part of the training. The researcher distributed surveys to all 155 resident assistants who were employed on the campus of the selected research university in the 2003-2004 academic year. From the sample of 155 persons, 133 completed surveys were returned.

The demographic variables that participants were asked to report related to gender (male or female); prior interactions with lesbians or gay males (no prior interactions, casual prior interactions, or having a close friend or family member who was a lesbian or gay male); and the number of years of experience that they had as a resident assistant (they were in their first, second, or third or more year as an RA). The 20 questions that constituted the main body of the survey, the total scale, were about various topics related to homosexuality and homosexuals in society. Ten of the questions were related to lesbians and constituted the lesbian subscale; the other ten questions were related to gay males and constituted the gay male subscale.

Results and Conclusions

Research Question 1

To address the first research question, the sample's (*N*=133) mean scores for the survey items were calculated for the scale and the subscales; mean scores were also calculated for the items, the scale, and the subscales considering the demographic categories. This analysis provided insight into the actual attitudes of the resident assistants: how positively or negatively did they view lesbians and gay males? As shown in the Chapter IV discussion on this topic, the mean scores showed that the attitudes of the sample and its subgroups always fell at least slightly above 4 on the scale and most often higher than that, indicating a fairly neutral to positive position. These mean scores did not, however, tell the entire story.

Distribution frequencies for the survey items were tabulated as well for the sample; these frequencies are shown in Tables B1-B20 located in Appendix B. The tabulations indicated that although the mean scores typically were in the neutral to somewhat positive range, the two extreme points on the scale were often selected as being the most descriptive of peoples' attitudes.

Eight of the 20 questions had very high numbers of people selecting the most positive answer choice as describing their feelings. The percentage of participants choosing 7 (strongly agree) as their response to Questions #2-4, #8, #12-14, and #18 ranged from 56.8% to 75%. That indicated extraordinarily high numbers of resident assistants who strongly agreed that both lesbians and gay males should be treated the same as other women and men (Questions #2 and #12); should be protected from personal violence under hate crime laws (Questions #3 and #13); should be accepted in

positions of authority (Questions #4 and #14); and should be protected from job discrimination based on their sexuality (Questions #8 and #18). Participants were positive about these same topics for both the lesbian subscale questions and the gay male subscale questions. The areas covered by these questions are subjects related to basic rights and civilities of American society; the participants as a group felt strongly that both lesbians and gay men should be afforded these things in the same way as heterosexual women and men.

Frequency distributions for 10 of the 20 questions, however, showed that the even though the mean scores for these questions may have fallen at mid-scale, the two most selected answers were 1 (strongly disagree) and 7 (strongly agree). This was true for the ideas of lesbianism or male homosexuality as a natural expression of human sexuality (Questions #1 and #11); disapproval of a sister or brother being a lesbian or gay male (Questions #6 and #16); lesbianism or male homosexuality as a sin (Questions #9 and #19); legal marriage for lesbian or gay male couples (Questions #10 and #20); male homosexuals adopting children (Question #15); and the increase in openness about male homosexuality being an indication of a decline in our society's morals (Question #17). The questions that produced such divergences in opinion were centered more on family and religious/moral issues rather than on basic societal niceties. Obviously, a number of people who indicated that they were in favor of offering basic rights to homosexuals were opposed to homosexuality itself on religious or moral grounds and did not favor homosexuals as positive parts of family units.

The question related to lesbians adopting children (Question #5) did not have as many strongly negative answers as the like question about gay males; the categories with

the most answers were either neutral or strongly positive towards lesbians adopting children. The same occurred on the question pertaining to openness about lesbianism indicating a decline in our social morals (Question #7). Again, the participants were more often neutral on the subject or felt that the two things were unrelated. This seemed to indicate that fewer people saw lesbians and/or lesbianism as producing as much of a threat as they felt male homosexuals and/or male homosexuality did.

At the time that this survey was distributed, a very public national debate was ongoing about legalizing gay marriages. The amount of exposure that the participants would likely have had to this subject could have affected the results for the two questions related to this topic (Questions #10 and #20). There is no way to know that if the exposure did indeed affect responses whether it caused people to be more in favor of the idea or less so. Regardless, the fact that it may have affected the outcome should be noted.

These frequency distributions, in conjunction with the mean scores discussed earlier, provided a more accurate picture of the situation. The mean scores often gave the appearance that attitudes were always neutral to somewhat positive; in reality, half the time that neutral mean score came from a balance between two extremes rather than from a true neutral feeling from the sample as a whole.

Research Question 2

To address the second research question, chi square tests of independence were performed to see if the answers to the survey questions were independent of the various demographic variables. Tests were performed for each question, the scale, and the subscales for each of the three demographic variables.

Previous studies had indicated that several demographic factors influenced how positively people viewed lesbians and gay males. The three demographic variables addressed in this study were gender, prior interactions with lesbians or gay males, and years of resident assistant experience.

Studies by D'Augelli and Rose (1990), Engstrom and Sedlacek (1997), Hensley (1995), Hill et al. (2002), Nelson and Krieger (1997), Reinhardt (1997), Rey and Gibson (1997), Simoni (1996), and Waldo (1998) indicated that females were much more likely to have positive attitudes toward lesbians and gay males than were males. In this study, this trend was found to be true in any statistically significant way for just 1 of the 20 survey items. Only on the survey question addressing whether gay males should be treated the same as other men did the chi square indicate that females were significantly more positive than males. Chi square tests for the other 19 questions and the mean scores on the scale and its subscales produced no statistically significant results based on gender.

This outcome was very surprising in light of previous research on the subject. With females reported as being more positive toward homosexuals than males in so many studies, there was an expectancy that the same would hold true in this study. There are, then, two possibilities. Either there is no relationship between gender and homophobic attitudes, or some other factors were at work in this study. As so many studies have found a link between gender and attitudes, the former seems unlikely. Therefore, it was more likely a result of the latter. The university in this study is located in the southeastern part of the United States, a fairly religious area of the country and both politically and socially conservative. Geographical location, religiosity, and political preference have all been cited as influencing homophobic attitudes. It is possible, then, that these factors were

more powerful influences than gender within this sample group and contributed to the departure from previous studies concerning gender and attitudes.

Prior interactions with lesbians and gay males have also been shown to influence attitudes towards homosexuals; this was the second demographic variable measured. Bowen and Bourgeois (2001), D'Augelli and Rose (1990), Hensley (1995), Herek (1988), Nelson and Krieger (1997), Reinhardt (1997), and Rey and Gibson (1997) all found that the more contact people had with lesbians and gay males the more positive they were about homosexuality and homosexual issues. Prior interaction was the most statistically significant demographic variable in this study. Although there was no significant relationship between prior experience and the scale or subscales, 5 of the 20 individual survey items did show a relationship. These five items questioned whether lesbians should be treated the same as other women, whether lesbians should be accepted in positions of authority, whether the participants would disapprove of their sister if they found out she was a lesbian, whether male homosexuality was a natural expression of human sexuality, and whether gay males should be accepted in positions of authority. The chi square tests for these questions found that the attitudes of the participants increased as their level of prior interaction increased. Those with no prior interactions with lesbians or gay males were less positive than those with casual prior interactions; those with casual prior interactions were less positive than those with a close friend or family member who was a lesbian or gay male. The results for those with no prior interactions should be viewed, however, with reserve as the size of the group (n=6) was quite small. That said, it was surprising that even six people stated that they had had no previous interactions with lesbians or gay males. In a time when more and more

homosexuals are open about their lifestyle, it seemed unlikely that anyone could say that they had never interacted with a gay person. More likely than not, even these six persons had had interactions with homosexuals, but in situations where they were unaware of the other person's sexual orientation.

The third demographic variable addressed in this study was previous resident assistant experience. This variable had not been cited in any prior studies reviewed in this project. The chi square for only one question (pertaining to accepting gay males in positions of authority) showed any statistically significant relationship between attitudes and the number of years of experience. Those resident assistants in their third or more years were extremely positive about gay males in positions of authority. The next most positive group was those in their first year rather than those in their second year. This finding is contrary to what would be expected; if, in fact, years of experience is related to this attitude, one would expect that positive feelings would increase in direct proportion to years of experience rather than decreasing from year one to year two and then increasing for year three to a level higher than year one. Further study might be conducted to investigate this area more closely; no reason for this trend can be provided based on the parameters of this study.

Research Question 3

To address the third research question, chi square goodness of fit tests were performed for the scale, the two subscales, and the individual questions to determine if the participants' attitudes about their training and their competency in dealing with homosexual issues in their residence halls were related to their scores. In addition, summaries of the participants' responses to the open-ended questions were presented to

assess more deeply their views of the training they received and their suggestions for improving training in the future.

For the first question, addressing how well they felt they were prepared to deal with issues related to homosexuality in their residence halls, statistically significant relationships were found for the gay male subscale and the total scale. The chi square for the lesbian subscale showed borderline significance. These tests demonstrated that the more positive participants were about homosexuality the less confidence they had in the training that was offered to them to deal with issues related to homosexuality. Those who felt negatively about homosexuality were either confident that they had been well prepared or merely wanted no more training than what they had already been given.

For the second question, addressing how well the resident assistants felt they were able to deal with the issues faced by their lesbian and gay male residents, there were no statistically significant results for any of the chi square calculations. How well the participants felt they were able to deal with the issues was not related to their attitudes about lesbians or gay males.

The responses to the open-ended questions were summarized and any trends, if present, were addressed. It was disappointing to find that many participants did not answer these questions, possibly because they were not interested in the topic, did not want to spend the time necessary to answer, or they found the questions difficult to understand. However, it is also possible that they did not answer because they were uncomfortable doing so.

Homosexuality is a sensitive subject and difficult for many people to discuss. It is easy, however, to circle an answer that indicates that you feel that homosexuals should be

protected from violence or job discrimination, or even that they would be accepted within your family. There is no emotional investment in indicating that one believes objectively that homosexuals should be given equity in society. There would, however, be an emotional investment in discussing it on a deeper level. The short-answer questions asked that the participants think beyond hypothetical situations to their own reality; what did they learn about homosexuality and what else did they want to be taught? Examining the subject in this way brings it to a personal level, which is much more threatening to the individual. The problem that arises is this: how can RAs carry out their duties if they do not want to know about a group, if they want to avoid the subject entirely, regardless of how positively they say that they feel about it? Part of a resident assistant's job is to facilitate education outside the classroom, to be a role model to their residents, and to be a catalyst for positive campus change. If RAs are not armed with enough information to educate their residents or do not want that information, how can they be effective leaders? Certainly all students have different beliefs and RAs cannot be expected to come to their jobs with no personal convictions, but if they are unable to discuss topics like homosexuality because they are uncomfortable with them, perhaps they are not really well suited for the job.

Whether or not it is desired, more training and information is necessary to ensure that resident assistants are prepared to support their gay residents and are comfortable discussing the subject of homosexuality with all their residents, even if they are personally opposed to homosexuality. How can the training program be adapted to produce better results? The suggestion given by some participants was to include lesbians or gay males directly in the training program; that is, indeed, one possibility, but not

necessarily a practical one. The possibility of finding a homosexual person or persons who would be willing to get up in front of a group and discuss their own experiences seems remote. Experiences that put RAs in direct contact with gay men and women would be ideal, but any other opportunities to expose resident assistants to homosexual issues must be created to supplement what has been offered in the past.

The responsibility for creating more useful training tools falls on the shoulders of those in charge of the program. The training program must include information and activities that make the RAs more comfortable with the subject of homosexuality, but to be effective it has to be conducted in a non-threatening way. The role-playing activities and case studies that are now part of the program are useful, but they cannot stand alone. They must be supplemented with other activities that go deeper than play-acting.

There is no perfect formula for conducting training on delicate subjects such as homosexuality; to be effective, it must be comprehensive, sensitive, and creative. The program designers need to consider first what their goals are for the training experience. The program they design around these goals should be sensitive enough not to alienate the participants, but challenging enough to get their attention and make them think about the topic. The more exposure that RAs have to homosexuality the more comfortable they will become with the subject and therefore the more effectively they will be able to deal with it in their residence halls. Changing people's personal prejudices about homosexuality through training would be ideal, but that is probably an unrealistic expectation. The Housing Department can strive, though, to have a training program that provides as much information as possible and that challenges the RAs to think about their

beliefs. If the subject is avoided or treated with superficiality by the training staff, it will receive no greater consideration from those the staff seeks to educate.

Limitations

The usefulness of this study was limited by four factors. First, the results were not generalizable to the rest of the student body at this institution, nor were they generalizable to resident assistants at any other institutions. Second, the self-report format of the questions was limiting. It was obvious which answers were most socially acceptable and may have led some participants to choose the "right" answer rather than the one that reflected their true feelings. Third, the kind of analysis used in the study limited the inferences that were drawn. Chi square analysis is a non-parametric test; it does not have the same power as a parametric test might have. Fourth, the exclusion of bisexual and transgendered persons limited the study. The results cannot be generalized to include these groups; if attitudes towards bisexual and/or transgendered persons were measured, they would not necessarily be the same as the results reported in this study for lesbians and gay males. Although none of these limitations was a threat to this study as it was designed and performed, it would be beneficial to do similar studies that would also address these issues.

Recommendations for Further Research

Additional research on this and many other related topics is sorely needed. The recommendations given here for further research fall into two categories: both follow-up and new research projects to be conducted at this particular institution and research projects to be done outside of this university or in conjunction with other institutions.

At the institution addressed here, a number of other studies would be useful. An in-depth assessment of the training program by the housing department staff would be beneficial to see where improvements might be made that would produce the most accepting and open RA staff possible. A training program assessment, used in conjunction with a long-term version of this study, would be beneficial in determining the efficacy of any changes made because of the program assessment. A pretest and posttest given during the training period would help identify what information and activities are not working so they can be adapted. The duplication of this study on a much larger scale to include the general student body would provide the university with an idea about the campus-wide climate for lesbians and gay males. Finally, a duplication of this study with the addition of bisexual and transgendered persons to the subject matter would provide a more comprehensive view of how resident assistants feel about and deal with all types of sexual diversity.

Outside of just the institution in this study, a study that included participants from similar and/or different types of colleges and universities would be useful for comparing the staff at this school to those at other schools. All institutions of higher learning that have residence life programs could benefit from performing a study that measures the attitudes of their resident assistants towards homosexuals. A qualitative component to the study could delve more deeply into the feelings and actions of individual resident assistants; this type of study would bring another layer of meaning to the results. Any studies that draw attention to the issue of sexual diversity on college campuses would be beneficial for the schools and for both their heterosexual and homosexual populations.

Summary

The problem addressed in this study was the scarcity of existing research related to resident assistants' attitudes toward lesbians and gay males. The sample studied consisted of the entire resident assistant staff at the selected university. The purpose of this study was to identify the attitudes of the resident assistants on this particular campus, see how three self-reported demographic variables related to their attitudes, and seek their impressions of their training as well as to ask for their input to improve it. Demographic variables, identified from related studies, were selected to be tested for significant relationships with attitudes. Gender, prior interactions with lesbians or gay males, and years of resident assistant experience were all studied. The instrument used to assess attitudes was designed for this study and was based on a self-reported Likert scale basis. Chi square analysis was used to look for relationships between the demographic variables and the attitudes of the resident assistants.

The analysis did not produce as many statistically significant results as were expected. Gender, though cited in other studies as being related to attitudes, did not have a widespread impact on the attitudes of this sample. Prior interactions with lesbians or gay males, also cited in other studies as a significant factor in attitudes, had a more significant impact on the attitudes of the sample, but still somewhat limited. Finally, years of resident assistant experience had a very limited impact on any of the attitudes measured.

The results of this study, or the execution of other studies, could be used to benefit the residence life program at the selected university. Certainly further study is warranted to determine how resident assistant training is affecting the climate

surrounding sexual diversity in the residence halls, as well as to make improvements in that training that would benefit both the RAs and their residents.

REFERENCES

Aberson, C. L. , Swan, D. J., & Emerson, E. P. (1999). Covert discrimination against gay men by U.S. college students. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 139,* 323-334.

Basow, S. A., & Johnson, K. (2000). Predictors of homophobia in female college students. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 42,* 391-404.

Baier, J. L, Rosenzweig, M. G., & Whipple, E. G. (1991). Patterns of sexual behavior, coercion, and victimization of university students. *Journal of College Student Development, 32,* 310-322.

Bowen, A. M., & Bourgeois, M. J. (2001). Attitudes toward lesbian, gay, and bisexual college students: The contribution of pluralistic ignorance, dynamic social impact, and contact theories. *Journal of American College Health, 50*(2), 91-96.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1989a). Homophobia in a university community: Views of prospective resident assistants. *Journal of College Student Development, 30,* 546-552.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1989b). Lesbians' and gay men's experiences of discrimination and harassment in a university community. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 17,* 317-321.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1992). Lesbian and gay male undergraduates' experiences of harassment and fear on campus. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7,* 383-395.

D'Augelli, A. R., & Rose, M. L. (1990). Homophobia in a university community: Attitudes and experiences of heterosexual freshmen. *Journal of College Student Development, 31,* 484-491.

Engstrom, C. M., & Sedlacek, W. (1997). Attitudes of heterosexuals toward their gay male and lesbian peers. *Journal of College Student Development, 38,* 565-576.

Evans, N. J., & Broido, E. M. (1999). Coming out in college residence halls: Negotiation, meaning making, challenges, supports. *Journal of College Student Development, 40,* 658-668.

Evans, N. J., Reason, R. D., & Broido, E. M. (2001). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual students' perceptions of resident assistants: Implications for resident assistant selection and training. *College Student Affairs Journal, 21*(1), 82-91.

Guth, L. J., Hewitt-Gervais, C., Smith, S., & Fisher, M. S. (2000). Student attitudes toward AIDS and homosexuality: The effects of a speaker with HIV. *Journal of College Student Development, 41,* 503-512.

Hensley, C. L. (1995). Social reactance towards homosexuality: An analysis of college students' attitudes. *Masters Abstracts International, 34*(01), 175A. (UMI No. 1376063.

Herbst, S., & Malaney, G. D. (1999). Perceived value of a special interest residential program for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender students. *NASPA Journal, 36*(2), 106-119.

Herek, G. M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences. *The Journal of Sex Research, 25*(4), 451-477.

Herek, G. M. (1993). Documenting prejudice against lesbians and gay men on campus: The Yale sexual orientation survey. *Journal of Homosexuality, 25*(4), 15-28.

Herek, G. M. (2002). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward bisexual men and women in the United States. *The Journal of Sex Research, 39,* 264-275.

Hill, R. J., Childers, J., Childs, A. P., Cowie, G., Hatton, A., Lewis, J. B. et al. (2002). *In the shadow of the arch: Safety and acceptance of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer students at the University of Georgia*. Athens: University of Georgia, UGA Campus Climate Research Group.

Hogan, T. L., & Rentz, A. L. (1996). Homophobia in the academy. *Journal of College Student Development, 37,* 309-314.

Kim, B. S. K., D'Andrea, M. J., Sahu, P. K., & Haughen, K. J. S. (1998). A multicultural study of university students' knowledge of and attitudes toward homosexuality. *Journal of Humanistic Education and Development, 36,* 171-182.

Kite, M. E. (1984). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexuals: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Homosexuality, 10,* 69-81.

Malaney, G. D., Williams, E. A., & Geller, W. W. (1997). Assessing campus climate for gays, lesbians, and bisexuals at two institutions. *Journal of College Student Development, 38,* 365-375.

Marszalek, J. F. III, & Goree, C. T. (1995). Practicing what we preach? Gay students' perceptions of student affairs. *College Student Affairs Journal, 15,* 80-86.

Matthew Shepard resource: An online human rights resource and permanent web memorial. (n.d.) Retrieved September 10, 2003, from http://stophate.us/shepard/

Mohr, J. J., & Sedlacek, W. E. (2000). Perceived barriers to friendship with lesbians and gay men among university students. *Journal of College Student Development, 41,* 70-80.

Nelson, E. S., & Krieger, S. L. (1997). Changes in attitudes toward homosexuality in college students: Implementation of a gay men and lesbian peer panel. *Journal of Homosexuality, 33*(2), 63-81.

Pilkington, N. W., & D'Augelli, A. R. (1995). Victimization of lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth in community settings. *Journal of Community Psychology, 23,* 34-56.

Reinhardt, B. (1997, August). *Examining correlates of homophobia in heterosexual college students*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.

Rey, A. M., & Gibson, P. R. (1997). Beyond High School: Heterosexuals' self-reported anti-gay/lesbian behaviors and attitudes. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 7*(4), 65-84.

Reynolds, A. J. (1989). Social environment conceptions of male homosexual behavior: A university climate analysis. *Journal of College Student Development, 30,* 62-69.

Simoni, J. M. (1996). Pathways to prejudice: Predicting student's heterosexist attitudes with demographics, self-esteem, and contact with lesbians and gay men. *Journal of College Student Development, 37,* 68-78.

Waldo, C. R. (1998). Out on campus: Sexual orientation and academic climate in a university context. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 26,* 745-774.

Whitley, B. E. Jr. (2002). Gender-role variables and attitudes toward homosexuality. *Sex Roles, 45,* 691-721.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENT

Please answer the following questions about yourself:

1) Gender: _____ Male _____ Female

2) Previous interactions with lesbians or gay males:

_____ I have had no interaction with lesbians or gay males.

_____ I have had casual interaction with lesbians or gay males.

_____ I have a close friend or family member who is a lesbian or gay male.

3) Previous experience as a resident assistant:

_____ This is my first year as a resident assistant.

_____ This is my second year as a resident assistant.

_____ This is my third or more year as a resident assistant.

Please indicate your feelings about the following statements by circling the number that corresponds with your answer. Read each question carefully. The answers range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Strongly Disagree **Strongly Agree**

Lesbianism is an unnatural expression of human sexuality.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I think lesbians should be treated the same as other women.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Lesbians should be protected from personal violence under hate crime laws.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Lesbians should be accepted in positions of authority.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Lesbians should not be allowed to adopt children.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

If I had a sister, I would disapprove if I found out that she was a lesbian.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

The increase in openness about lesbianism indicates a decline in the moral values of our society.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Lesbians should be legally protected from job discrimination related to their sexuality.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Lesbianism is a sin.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Lesbian couples should be legally allowed to marry.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly Disagree **Strongly Agree**

Male homosexuality is an unnatural expression of human sexuality.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I think gay males should be treated the same as other males.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Gay males should be protected from personal violence under hate crime laws.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Gay males should be accepted in positions of authority.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Gay males should not be allowed to adopt children.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

If I had a brother, I would disapprove if I found out that he was gay.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

The increase in openness about male homosexuality indicates a decline in the moral values of our society.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Gay males should be legally protected from job discrimination related to their sexuality.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Male homosexuality is a sin.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Gay male couples should be legally allowed to marry.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strongly Disagree **Strongly Agree**

I feel that issues related to lesbians and gay males were adequately addressed during my resident assistant training program.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I think I am able to deal with the issues that my lesbian and gay male residents face.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

List and describe the information you received in your training regarding lesbians and gay males and the related issues that may arise in residence halls.

List and describe the kinds of training activities you experienced that dealt with the issues of lesbians and gay males in residence halls.

List and describe the information you wish you had received in your training regarding lesbians and gay males and the related issues that may arise in residence halls.

List and describe the kinds of training experiences you wish you had experienced that deal with the issues of lesbians and gay males in residence halls.

APPENDIX B

TABLES

Table B1

Frequency Distribution for Question #1*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	29	21.8	21.8	21.8
	2	15	11.3	11.3	33.1
	3	14	10.5	10.5	43.6
	4	18	13.5	13.5	57.1
	5	10	7.5	7.5	64.7
	6	13	9.8	9.8	74.4
	7	34	25.6	25.6	100.0
	Total	133	100.0	100.0	

*the table shows the reversed scores for this question

Table B2

Distribution Frequency for Question #2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	.8	.8	.8
	2	1	.8	.8	1.5
	3	5	3.8	3.8	5.3
	4	10	7.5	7.5	12.8
	5	13	9.8	9.8	22.6
	6	18	13.5	13.5	36.1
	7	85	63.9	63.9	100.0
	Total	133	100.0	100.0	

Table B3

Distribution Frequency for Question #3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	1.5	1.5	1.5
	2	1	.8	.8	2.3
	3	2	1.5	1.5	3.8
	4	8	6.0	6.1	9.8
	5	11	8.3	8.3	18.2
	6	12	9.0	9.1	27.3
	7	96	72.2	72.7	100.0
		132	99.2	100.0	
Missing	0	1	.8		
Total		133	100.0		

Table B4

Distribution Frequency for Question #4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	.8	.8	.8
	2	2	1.5	1.5	2.3
	3	4	3.0	3.0	5.3
	4	16	12.0	12.0	17.3
	5	14	10.5	10.5	27.8
	6	19	14.3	14.3	42.1
	7	77	57.9	57.9	100.0
	Total	133	100.0	100.0	

Table B5

Distribution Frequency for Question #5*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	19	14.3	14.3	14.3
	2	10	7.5	7.5	21.8
	3	11	8.3	8.3	30.1
	4	26	19.5	19.5	49.6
	5	12	9.0	9.0	58.6
	6	16	12.0	12.0	70.7
	7	39	29.3	29.3	100.0
	Total	133	100.0	100.0	

*the table shows the reversed scores for this question

Table B6

Distribution Frequency for Question #6*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	33	24.8	25.0	25.0
	2	12	9.0	9.1	34.1
	3	14	10.5	10.6	44.7
	4	10	7.5	7.6	52.3
	5	7	5.3	5.3	57.6
	6	10	7.5	7.6	65.2
	7	46	34.6	34.8	100.0
	Total	132	99.2	100.0	
Missing	0	1	.8		
Total		133	100.0		

*the table shows the reversed scores for this question

Table B7

Distribution Frequency for Question #7*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	22	16.5	16.7	16.7
	2	9	6.8	6.8	23.5
	3	19	14.3	14.4	37.9
	4	25	18.8	18.9	56.8
	5	4	3.0	3.0	59.8
	6	15	11.3	11.4	71.2
	7	38	28.6	28.8	100.0
	Total	132	99.2	100.0	
Missing	0	1	.8		
Total		133	100.0		

*the table shows the reversed scores for this question

Table B8

Distribution Frequency for Question #8

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	2.3	2.3	2.3
	2	3	2.3	2.3	4.5
	3	4	3.0	3.0	7.6
	4	9	6.8	6.8	14.4
	5	15	11.3	11.4	25.8
	6	23	17.3	17.4	43.2
	7	75	56.4	56.8	100.0
	Total	132	99.2	100.0	
Missing	0	1	.8		
Total		133	100.0		

Table B9

Distribution Frequency for Question #9*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	46	34.6	34.6	34.6
	2	17	12.8	12.8	47.4
	3	5	3.8	3.8	51.1
	4	10	7.5	7.5	58.6
	5	8	6.0	6.0	64.7
	6	11	8.3	8.3	72.9
	7	36	27.1	27.1	100.0
	Total	133	100.0	100.0	

*the table shows the reversed scores for this question

Table B10

Distribution Frequency for Question #10

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	35	26.3	26.3	26.3
	2	14	10.5	10.5	36.8
	3	12	9.0	9.0	45.9
	4	16	12.0	12.0	57.9
	5	9	6.8	6.8	64.7
	6	14	10.5	10.5	75.2
	7	33	24.8	24.8	100.0
	Total	133	100.0	100.0	

Table B11

Distribution Frequency for Question #11*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	36	27.1	27.1	27.1
	2	15	11.3	11.3	38.3
	3	11	8.3	8.3	46.6
	4	19	14.3	14.3	60.9
	5	6	4.5	4.5	65.4
	6	14	10.5	10.5	75.9
	7	32	24.1	24.1	100.0
	Total	133	100.0	100.0	

*the table shows the reversed scores for this question

Table B12

Distribution Frequency for Question #12

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	4	3.0	3.0	3.0
	2	2	1.5	1.5	4.5
	3	5	3.8	3.8	8.3
	4	10	7.5	7.5	15.8
	5	9	6.8	6.8	22.6
	6	20	15.0	15.0	37.6
	7	83	62.4	62.4	100.0
	Total	133	100.0	100.0	

Table B13

Distribution Frequency for Question #13

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	.8	.8	.8
	2	1	.8	.8	1.5
	3	2	1.5	1.5	3.0
	4	9	6.8	6.8	9.8
	5	10	7.5	7.6	17.4
	6	10	7.5	7.6	25.0
	7	99	74.4	75.0	100.0
	Total	132	99.2	100.0	
Missing	0	1	.8		
Total		133	100.0		

Table B14

Distribution Frequency for Question #14

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	1.5	1.5	1.5
	2	2	1.5	1.5	3.0
	3	4	3.0	3.0	6.0
	4	21	15.8	15.8	21.8
	5	13	9.8	9.8	31.6
	6	15	11.3	11.3	42.9
	7	76	57.1	57.1	100.0
	Total	133	100.0	100.0	

Table B15

Distribution Frequency for Question #15*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	28	21.1	21.1	21.1
	2	14	10.5	10.5	31.6
	3	11	8.3	8.3	39.8
	4	19	14.3	14.3	54.1
	5	12	9.0	9.0	63.2
	6	18	13.5	13.5	76.7
	7	31	23.3	23.3	100.0
	Total	133	100.0	100.0	

*the table shows the reversed scores for this question

Table B16

Distribution Frequency for Question #16*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	34	25.6	25.6	25.6
	2	13	9.8	9.8	35.3
	3	14	10.5	10.5	45.9
	4	11	8.3	8.3	54.1
	5	8	6.0	6.0	60.2
	6	6	4.5	4.5	64.7
	7	47	35.3	35.3	100.0
	Total	133	100.0	100.0	

*the table shows the reversed scores for this question

Table B17

Distribution Frequency for Question #17*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	24	18.0	18.2	18.2
	2	13	9.8	9.8	28.0
	3	12	9.0	9.1	37.1
	4	22	16.5	16.7	53.8
	5	8	6.0	6.1	59.8
	6	14	10.5	10.6	70.5
	7	39	29.3	29.5	100.0
	Total	132	99.2	100.0	
Missing	0	1	.8		
Total		133	100.0		

*the table shows the reversed scores for this question

Table B18

Distribution Frequency for Question #18

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	.8	.8	.8
	2	2	1.5	1.5	2.3
	3	3	2.3	2.3	4.5
	4	12	9.0	9.1	13.6
	5	15	11.3	11.4	25.0
	6	18	13.5	13.6	38.6
	7	81	60.9	61.4	100.0
	Total	132	99.2	100.0	
Missing	0	1	.8		
Total		133	100.0		

Table B19

Distribution Frequency for Question #19*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	47	35.3	35.3	35.3
	2	14	10.5	10.5	45.9
	3	5	3.8	3.8	49.6
	4	15	11.3	11.3	60.9
	5	6	4.5	4.5	65.4
	6	10	7.5	7.5	72.9
	7	36	27.1	27.1	100.0
	Total	133	100.0	100.0	

*the table shows the reversed scores for this question

Table B20

Distribution Frequency for Question #20

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	33	24.8	24.8	24.8
	2	14	10.5	10.5	35.3
	3	12	9.0	9.0	44.4
	4	19	14.3	14.3	58.6
	5	10	7.5	7.5	66.2
	6	12	9.0	9.0	75.2
	7	33	24.8	24.8	100.0
	Total	133	100.0	100.0	

VITA

Melissa Kathleen Scandlyn Smith was born in 1973 in Knoxville, Tennessee. She was raised in Harriman, Tennessee, where she attended elementary and middle schools and received an Honors diploma with distinction from Harriman High School in 1991. She attended Rhodes College in Memphis, Tennessee, where she received a Bachelor of Arts degree in History in 1995. Melissa received her Master of Science degree in College Student Personnel from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville in December 2004.