

Undergraduate Psychology Research Methods Journal

Volume 1 | Issue 15

Article 6

5-2013

Understanding Sexual Diversity

Nate Maeys
Lindenwood University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/psych_journals



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Maeys, Nate (2013) "Understanding Sexual Diversity," *Undergraduate Psychology Research Methods Journal*: Vol. 1 : Iss. 15 , Article 6.

Available at: https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/psych_journals/vol1/iss15/6

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Psychology, Sociology, and Public Health Department at Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Psychology Research Methods Journal by an authorized editor of Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. For more information, please contact phuffman@lindenwood.edu.

Understanding Sexual Diversity

Nate Maey's⁵

This research assessed comfort levels toward sexual diversity. Sexual diversity encompasses anyone who identifies with a gender or sexual orientation other than one that is socially accepted for his or her gender. This research followed Ceglie and Lyons' (2004) study which assessed people's comfort levels towards cross-dressing men. They showed that comfort levels towards cross-dressing men could be altered. They explained their findings using the mere exposure effect which refers to the tendency that over time, people will develop a preference for something or someone they are repeatedly exposed to (Zajonc, 2001). Participants in the study filled out two surveys that assessed their comfort level towards sexual diversity. There were two groups in this study; an experimental group, which saw a video pertaining to sexual diversity between the two surveys and a control group who saw a filler video between the two surveys. Pre-exposure and post-exposure scores were compared to see if there was a change in the participants' level of acceptance towards sexual diversity. It was found that comfort levels increased across groups within this study. A significant difference between pre-exposure and post-exposure scores was found for the experimental group but not for the control group. These results show that the comfort levels towards sexual diversity can be altered in a relatively short period of time.

In every society there are norms that are expected to be adhered to. Deviations to some norms have seen an increase in acceptability (Tewksbury & Gagne, 1996). In Western society there are expectations regarding sexuality and anatomy. An individual's biological makeup is supposed to be congruent with their gender. Some individuals deviate from this norm and associate with a gender that is not congruent with their biological makeup (Tewksbury & Gagne, 1996).

Western culture assumes that people should be able to make quick judgements based on appearance (Tewksbury & Gagne, 1996). This assumption states that if you are biologically male you should appear male and if you are biologically female you should appear female. There are

⁵ Nate Maey's, Department of Psychology, Lindenwood University
Correspondence regarding this paper should be addressed to Nate Maey's at Lindenwood University, 209 South Kingshighway, St. Charles, MO, 63301.

many people who do not fit this norm. These individuals fall under the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and questioning (LGBTQ) spectrum. Anyone who falls under this spectrum can be seen as deviating from the norm of a one-to-one relationship of anatomical sex and gender.

Anyone falling under the LGBTQ spectrum was classified as a sinner or having an illness up until the twentieth century (Tewksbury & Gagne, 1996). While sexual deviation is no longer classified as a medical illness, LGBTQ individuals still face a large amount of discrimination and often have stigmas placed on them. These stigmas are placed by society and stem from traditional ways that can often be hard to forget. Tewksbury and Gagne (1996) suggest that sexuality cannot be a dichotomous category labeling gender solely on biological makeup. Sexuality is instead a broad spectrum that manifests in many different forms and degrees.

The different forms of sexual diversity pertain to people falling under the LGBTQ spectrum. These individuals are displaying gender variance, an expression of one's gender or behavior that differs from the norm of Western society (Riley, Clemson, Sitharthan, & Diamond, 2013). People who are displaying gender variance are under a much broader category known as transgender. As these individuals are growing up, they may face several difficulties and they may have different needs as they are developing in order to properly cope with their daily difficulties.

One of the main things these transgendered individuals wanted was for those around them to have a better knowledge of gender variance. They felt that those around them in their daily lives did not truly understand what it meant to be transgendered (Riley, et al., 2013). As children these individuals felt anxious and fearful of rejection from those who took care of them. However, those individuals who received support from their caregivers reported that it was not enough to compensate for their daily lives. This need, while important, was not sufficient enough to make them feel safe from bullying and other social pressures (Riley, et al., 2013).

As children, these individuals were very confused about how other people saw them. They saw themselves as associating with the gender opposite to their biological make-up. It was very confusing to them because they did not understand why others did not see them as they saw themselves (Riley, et al., 2013). This shows that early on in their lives, LGBTQ individuals notice they are different from what is expected of them.

These needs changed and developed over time as acceptance and understanding grew. The early needs focused on having the ability to express their gender. As they got older their needs changed to focus on receiving support from parents, school members, and others (Riley, et al., 2013). Having support in school is very important to any child. Much of a person's life as a child and adolescent is spent in school where support can lead to success and development.

Oftentimes support is lacking for LGBTQ individuals causing many problems (Mufios-Plaza, Quinn, & Rounds, 2002). There is a general consensus in the literature that LGBTQ individuals lack adequate support in school. This lack of support may contribute to higher rates of suicide among LGBTQ youth than their non LGBTQ counterparts and they sustain higher rates of physical and verbal abuse which can lead to higher levels of substance abuse. At many high schools there is limited information available for LGBTQ teens. The lack of information and pressure from peers can lead to a feeling of isolation (Mufios-Plaza et al., 2002).

When schools implement support groups for LGBTQ students, they still may not fully benefit from them. Transgendered students are at a greater risk of discrimination than the other categories under the LGBTQ spectrum. This is because many policies placed to protect lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) students do not incorporate gender identity expression (McGuire et al., 2010). Often times, transgendered teens are considered gay by their peers. Some of the

transgender students buy into it and hope to avoid any further confusion that could cause additional harassment (McGuire et al., 2010).

LGBTQ students sometimes experience harassment that is not from their peers. Sometimes school faculty get involved or they do not try to stop harassment they witness. Faculty harassment is less common than peer harassment, but it does occur in forms such as gestures and comments. Teachers who were approached by students for help sometimes turned them away or met them with ignorance about the harassment of their peers. It has been shown that LGB students feel safer at school when a faculty member is willing to provide support (McGuire et al., 2010).

McGuire et al. (2010) found that many LGBTQ students were aware of school policies that protected their safety and the ones that did not. However, they were able to come up with potential ideas to help improve these policies and better their lives at school. Incorporating their ideas could provide a higher feeling of belonging and safety (McGuire et al., 2010). Harassment can continue in college and can have the same impact as in high school aged LGBTQ students. College campuses have become more diverse in the last few decades and LGBTQ individuals make up a portion of the diversity (McKinney, 2005). As the diversity grows, a larger number of people have been identifying somewhere within the LGBTQ spectrum. These issues have become more apparent and some college campuses have taken measures to address the growing number of LGBTQ students on college campuses. Trans-inclusive residential policies and physical facilities are a few things that some campuses have incorporated, although many remain unaware or non responsive to transgender issues (McKinney, 2005).

Undergraduate and graduate students report that there is a lack of knowledge on transgender issues within their school, and that there is a lack of transgender resources at their

disposal (McKinney, 2005). These students would like to see things such as gender neutral bathrooms and well funded LGBTQ centers. Incorporating these aspects would give a more welcoming environment to schools. Students who sought counseling were often met with insufficient results, and many of these students were turned away or sent to professionals who were unsupportive or who lacked knowledge to assist them (McKinney, 2005).

Attitudes and opinions are formed throughout one's life; being shaped based on the amount of exposure to different stimuli. There is a phenomenon known as the mere exposure effect that can be used to shape opinions and attitudes. Research has shown that people show a greater preference for stimuli they have been repeatedly exposed to (Zajonc, 2001). This effect can be seen cross-culturally and is not limited to certain societies. For this to take place there does not need to be any interaction. The individual being repeatedly exposed to a stimulus will eventually show a preference for it without interacting with it in any way. This has been shown to work for a variety of different stimuli and in a variety of contexts; working without any positive or negative feedback. Over time the mere exposure effect can cause a preference of similar stimuli to take place, altering previously learned attitudes (Zajonc, 2001).

Attitudes can be altered through exposure to new objects, changing perceptions through mere exposure. Ceglian and Lyons (2004) sought to achieve a change in comfort levels to cross-dressing individuals. At birth, children in Western society are exposed to the idea that anatomy and gender go hand-in-hand. Children observe the world through a gender schema which allows them to make sense of how males and females should act in their respective society. The researchers wanted to find out if this preconceived notion held true with undergraduate college students and if their attitudes could be altered.

They initially assessed comfort levels the undergraduate students had towards cross-dressing men. This was done by giving them the Hudson and Ricketts' Index of Homophobia survey (Ceglian & Lyons, 2004). They chose to assess comfort levels towards men because cross-dressing men are ridiculed more than cross-dressing women in Western culture. Two men from Tri-Ess, a national organization for cross-dressing men, came to speak to the students one week after the initial comfort level assessment. When they spoke to the students they were wearing female clothing. The two men spoke about various topics including cross-dressing behaviors, discrimination, and family life (Ceglian & Lyons, 2004).

When the two men were done speaking and answering questions, the students were given a second assessment of their comfort levels towards cross-dressing men. Ceglian and Lyons (2004) hypothesized that exposure to the cross-dressing men would increase comfort levels. They were hoping that the mere exposure effect would take place. What they discovered was that all of the second scores showed an increase in comfort levels (Ceglian & Lyons, 2004). The mere exposure effect had taken place but it could also be the case that the students comfort levels increased because of the small time gap between the exposure and the survey. It would be important to see if repeated exposure had a lasting effect rather than a single experience.

The current study has been designed to expand upon Ceglian and Lyons (2004) research. It was expected that a measurable difference in comfort level would be shown in the experimental group from pre-exposure and post-exposure. It was expected that the control group would show no measurable difference in comfort level between pre-exposure and post-exposure. In the previously stated experiment, two cross-dressing men were utilized as the stimuli to try and elicit a change in comfort levels. In the current study a 6 min 55 s video on sexual diversity

was used as the stimuli for the experimental group and a 6 min 54 s video on movie effects was used as the stimuli for the control group.

Ceglian and Lyons' (2004) research had a week gap between the initial assessment of comfort levels and the stimuli. The current study had a pre-exposure survey followed by an immediate exposure to the sexual diversity video followed by a second survey. It was expected that the mere exposure to the two surveys and video would allow for the mere exposure effect to take place in a short amount of time.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited through the Lindenwood Participant Pool (LPP). The LPP provides an ethical means of recruiting participants. Introductory courses in the social sciences, athletic training, and exercise sciences were eligible to take part in the LPP recruitment. Professors within these disciplines were given the chance to allow their students to be part of the LPP. Students who chose to participate were compensated with bonus points in their eligible course. There were 48 participants; of which 19 were male and 29 were female with a mean age of $M = 20.25$ ($SD = 2.488$).

Participants were asked if they had any previous education on sexual diversity, any friends/family who fell under sexual diversity, and if they have had a coworker who falls under sexual diversity; 11 said yes, 34 said no, and 3 were unsure about the education; 16 said yes and 32 said no to the friends/family; 19 said yes, 28 said no, and 1 was unsure about the coworker.

Materials and Procedure

Participants signed up for the study via the LPP bulletin board located on the fourth floor of Young Hall at Lindenwood University. There was a description sheet posted on the bulletin board briefly describing the experiment (see Appendix A). This was used to give the participants

a quick overview of the study. Below the description sheet there were sign-up sheets. The sign-up sheets were provided by the LPP and were designed to allow participants to sign up for specific time slots on specific days.

The rooms were obtained through the LPP and were located on the first floor of Young Hall. Each room, provided by the LPP, had a table or desk for the participants to sit at. When the participants arrived, they were given an informed consent form to fill out (see Appendix B). The consent form was used to inform the participants of the nature of the study and the expected amount of time it would take to complete. The informed consent stated it would take approximately 15 min to complete the study. In the informed consent it was stated that participants were free to skip any questions they were uncomfortable answering or terminate the experiment at any time with no repercussions.

After filling out the consent form, participants were asked to fill out the first of two questionnaires (see Appendices C and D). These questionnaires were derived from the LGBTQA-Q Resource Center's Index of Homophobia (n.d; Hudson & Ricketts, 1980). The original survey had 25 questions on it which was broken down into two different surveys, arbitrarily omitting one question. It was necessary to omit one question to make the two surveys in the current study equal in length. The original survey used the word queer to indicate the differences in sexuality. The word queer was omitted and changed to phrases such as cross-dresser, gay, bisexual, transgender, and lesbian to encompass a broader spectrum of sexual diversity. The two resulting surveys were similar in structure and each one consisted of 12 questions.

On each survey, there were non-reverse score questions and reverse score questions. Non-reverse score questions were scored equally to the number the participant chose from the Likert scale. If they chose 5 then that question was scored as a 5. Reverse score questions were

scored opposite of the number the participant chose from the Likert scale. If the participant chose 5 then the score for that question was 1. The two surveys were sub-labeled A and B. Some of the participants received Survey A as their pre-exposure assessment and others received Survey B as their pre-exposure assessment. This was done randomly for both groups in order to counterbalance the surveys and reduce biases.

After filling out the first questionnaire, participants used either a Toshiba laptop or an iPad to view one of two videos. Each video was a TED talk; one was titled *Fifty shades of gay* by artist iO Tillett Wright (2012); which was cut down in time: start 8:45 end 15:40 (6 min and 55 s). The other was titled *A cinematic journey through visual effects* by Don Levy (2012); which was played in its entirety (6 min and 54 s). These videos were taken from the TED talk website and put into Windows Movie Maker to ensure no outside material was viewed by the participants. There were comments and other suggested material on the website that could have led to biases.

When the participants were finished viewing their respective video, they filled out a second questionnaire. The second survey each participant took depended on if they took Survey A first or Survey B first. If the participant received Survey A for their pre-exposure survey, Survey B was used as the post-exposure survey. The second survey, A or B, was used to assess their post viewing comfort level towards sexual diversity. The questionnaires were counterbalanced to avoid biases.

Participants were then given a demographic survey that was designed by the primary investigator (see Appendix E). The demographic survey consisted of five questions: what is the participant's gender (male, female, or other); what is the participant's age; has the participant had any previous sexual diversity education such as in high school; does the participant have a close

family member or friend who falls under sexual diversity; has the participant ever worked with someone who falls under sexual diversity?

Once the participants were finished with the demographic survey they were debriefed and given a feedback letter (see Appendix F). The feedback letter provided the hypothesis and nature of the study. The web links to both videos used in the experiment were provided in the feedback letter. There were also three web links provided within the feedback letter for participants if they were interested in learning more about transgendered people. At this time participants were given an LPP receipt that they used to redeem for bonus points in their class. This was their compensation for taking part in the study. The LPP receipt was their documentation of participating in my study and allowed them to earn bonus points toward their class.

Results

The current study was designed to analyze pre-exposure and post-exposure comfort levels toward sexual diversity. This was done using a 2(group) X 2(exposure) Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). It was discovered that there was a significant main effect of test, $F(1,46) = 10, p = 0.002$ showing a significant difference between the pre-exposure scores and post-exposure scores across both groups. There was a significant main effect of group, $F(1,46) = 7.475, p = 0.009$. The ANOVA also showed results approaching significance for an interaction of test by group ($F(1,46) = 4.014, p = 0.051$), which required post hoc tests to determine the location of this interaction.

Separate independent t-tests were conducted for the pre-test and the post-test. The pre-test resulted in a significant difference, $t(46) = -2.097, p = 0.042$; $M = 34.042, SD = 9.693$, among the participants which did not support the original hypothesis. The post-test resulted in a

significant difference, $t(46) = 3.152, p = 0.003$; $M = 31.625, SD = 10.392$, which supported the original hypothesis.

A paired t-test was run for both the experimental group and the control group to determine if there was a significant difference between pre-scores and post-scores within each group. The experimental group t-test showed a significant difference between pre-scores and post-scores, $t(23) = 3.317, p = 0.00$,) with a pre-score ($M = 31.208, SD = 11.132$) and a post-score ($M = 27.292, SD = 12.139$). The control group t-test showed no significant difference between pre-scores and post-scores, $t(23) = 0.996, p = 0.33$, with a pre-score ($M = 36.875, SD = 7.164$) and a post-score ($M = 35.958, SD = 5.842$).

A chi-square test was run to determine if exposure to a family member or friend contributed to the significant difference in pre-exposure scores among groups. The chi square test showed there was a significant difference in the number of people who had exposure to a family member or friend who identifies within sexual diversity between the experimental and control group, $\chi^2(1) = 6, p = 0.0143$. An independent t-test was run to determine if there was a difference in pre-exposure scores for those who answered yes to the family or friend question and those who answered no. The t-test showed no significant difference in scores, $t(46) = 1.662, p = 0.103$; those who answered yes had a $M = 30.813, SD = 10.528$, and those who answered no had a $M = 35.656, SD = 8.986$.

There were a larger proportion of men in the control group than there was in the experimental group. An independent t-test was run to determine if there was a sex difference that could potentially explain the pre-score differences between the groups. The t-test resulted in a significant difference of pre-exposure score based on sex ($t(46) = -2.512, p = 0.016$), men scored

$M = 38.157$, $SD = 9.627$ and women scored $M = 31.34$, $SD = 8.89$. This showed that women had higher pre-exposure comfort levels towards sexual diversity than men.

Discussion

The initial ANOVA showed a main effect of test and a main effect of group. It was necessary to run post hoc tests to determine where the significant difference occurred. The original hypothesis stated there would be a measurable difference between the pre-exposure and post-exposure scores for the experimental group but no measurable difference from pre-exposure to post-exposure for the control group. The null hypothesis was rejected after the post hoc test, which showed a significant difference from pre to post-exposure in the experimental group but not in the control group.

However, it was also expected that the pre-exposure scores would show no significant difference between the experimental group and control group. The t-test addressing this issue showed there was a significant difference between the groups regarding the pre-exposure scores. This portion of the null hypothesis was failed to be rejected. It could be the case that the uneven sex distribution among groups had an effect on these results. It was found that men lower comfort levels towards sexual diversity on average than women. The uneven distribution of men in the control group could have skewed the data for pre-exposure scores.

This experiment was similar to Cyglian and Lyons' (2004) research in that post-exposure comfort levels on average rose for the experimental group. The difference was this experiment had a control group to compare the results of the experimental group with. Cyglian and Lyons (2004) found that men had the lowest pre-exposure comfort level scores. These findings were replicated in this experiment which showed men scored, on average, lower pre-exposure comfort levels towards sexual diversity than women.

One of the limitations with this study was the time constraint. The mere exposure effect, as stated before, takes time to occur. If this study could have been conducted over several trials, with the same individuals being repeatedly exposed to the treatment stimuli it could have shown different/stronger results. The time constraint also limited the sample size of this study. A larger sample size could have reduced some biases and allowed for different results. Each group only had one video which could have led to biases as well.

For future research it would be a good idea to lengthen the amount of time given to the study. This would allow more participants to be included in the sample size which could help eliminate biases, allowing for a possible interaction of group and test to occur. It could be useful to have multiple trials in which the same participants receive treatment over time, giving the mere exposure effect more time to take place. Having multiple videos available to each group could reduce biases as well. For future research it would be a good idea to use two or three videos for each group, counterbalancing the sexual diversity videos within the experimental group and the filler videos in the control group, to ensure that the videos being used are a fair stimulus.

The surveys participants received were titled Transgender Survey with the sub-labels of A and B. It would be beneficial to eliminate the title of Transgender Survey and simply label them Survey A and Survey B. There may have been some confusion as to what was meant by Transgender. As it was stated earlier Transgender is one of the sexual diversity categories addressed in the LGBTQ. Labeling the surveys as Transgender Surveys was an unfair title because the study was addressing a broad spectrum of sexual diversity. Eliminating the misleading title could help reduce any confusion that may have been present during the survey process. Similarly, the demographic survey should be altered to address the term sexual diversity

rather than transgender. There was some confusion as to what was meant by the term transgender on the demographic survey. Again using the term transgender was not appropriate because the study was looking at a broad spectrum of sexual diversity.

Addressing the issue of sex would be an important step for future research. If this experiment were replicated it would be beneficial to assign an even number of men and women in the experimental group and control group. This could help address the issue discovered regarding the pre-exposure difference among men and women.

References

A cinematic journey through visual effects. (2013). Retrieved from

http://www.ted.com/talks/don_levy_a_cinematic_journey_through_visual_effects.html

Ceglian, C. M., & Lyons, N. N. (2004). Gender type and comfort with cross-dressers. *Sex Roles, 50*(7), 539-546.

Fifty shades of gay. (2013). Retrieved from

http://www.ted.com/talks/io_tillett_wright_fifty_shades_of_gay.html

Hudson, W. W., & Ricketts, W. A. (1980). A strategy for the measurement of homophobia.

Journal of Homosexuality, 5(4). Retrieved from

<http://www.bgsu.edu/downloads/sa/file14259.pdf/>

McGuire, J. K., Anderson, C. R., Toomey, R. B., & Russell, S. T. (2010). School climate for transgender youth: A mixed method investigation of student experiences and school responses. *Journal of Youth Adolescence, 39*, 1175-1188.

McKinney, J. S. (2008). On the margins: A study of the experiences of transgender college students. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education, 3*(1), 63-76.

- Mufioz-Plaza, C., Quinn, S. C., & Rounds, K. A. (2002). Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender students: Perceived social support in the high school environment. *The High School Journal*, 84(4), 52-63.
- Riley, E. A., Clemson, L., Sitharthan, G., & Diamond, M. (2013). Surviving a gender-variant childhood: The views of transgender adults on the needs of gender-variant children and their parents. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 39, 1-23.
- Tewksbury, R., & Gagne, P. (1996). Transgenderists: Products of non-normative intersections of sex, gender, and sexuality. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 5(2), 105-127.
- Zajonc, R. B. (2001). Mere exposure: A gateway to the subliminal. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 10(6), 224-228.

Appendix A

EXPERIMENT DESCRIPTION

Project #: _____

Experimenter's name(s): Nate Maeys

Experimenter's contact information: njm489@lionmail.lindenwood.edu

Approximate amount of time experiment will take: 10 minutes

Type of experiment (survey, interactive, etc.): Surveys and watching a video

Experiment name: Understanding Transgender

Description of the experiment: You will answer two questionnaires regarding the topic of transgendered individuals and a demographic survey. Transgendered individuals are people who identify with a gender different than their biological one. The first questionnaire will be given before viewing a brief video clip. The second questionnaire will be given after viewing the video clip. You will then answer a short demographic survey.

Appendix B

Informed Consent Form

I, _____ (print name), understand that I will be taking part in a research project that requires me to complete two surveys regarding the topic of transgendered people and a short demographic survey. I understand that I will also be viewing one of two short videos during this study. I understand that I will take one of the transgender surveys before viewing the video and another one after viewing the video. I understand that I should be able to complete this project within 15 minutes. I am aware that I am free to skip any questions in the unlikely event that I feel uncomfortable answering any of the items on either the demographic survey or the transgender surveys. I am also aware that my participation in this study is strictly voluntary and that I may choose to withdraw from the study at any time without any penalty or prejudice. I should not incur any penalty or prejudice because I cannot complete the study. I understand that the information obtained from my responses will be analyzed only as part of aggregate data and that all identifying information will be absent from the data in order to ensure anonymity. I am also aware that my responses will be kept confidential and that data obtained from this study will only be available for research and educational purposes. I understand that any questions I may have regarding this study shall be answered by the researcher(s) involved to my satisfaction. Finally, I verify that I am at least 18 years of age and am legally able to give consent or that I am under the age of 18 but have on file with the LPP office, a completed parental consent form that allows me to give consent as a minor.

_____ Date: _____
 (Signature of participant)

_____ Date: _____
 (Signature of researcher obtaining consent)

Nate Maey's

Phone: 573-705-2108

Email: njm489@lionmail.lindenwood.edu

Supervisor:

Dr. Michiko Nohara-LeClair

Course Instructor

(636)-949-4371 mnohara-leclair@lindenwood.edu

Appendix C

Subject # _____

Transgender Survey^(A)

This questionnaire is designed to measure your comfort level associated with transgendered individuals. This is not a test, so there are no wrong answers. Answer each item as carefully and accurately as you can by placing a number beside each one as follows:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

____ 1.) I would enjoy attending social functions at which cross-dressing people were present.

____ 2.) I would feel comfortable knowing that my clergy person was also bisexual.

____ 3.) If I saw two men holding hands in public, I would feel disgusted.

____ 4.) I would feel uncomfortable if a member of my sex made an advance towards me.

____ 5.) I would feel disappointed if I learned that my child was cross-dressing

____ 6.) If a member of my gender made an advance towards me, I would be offended.

____ 7.) I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my spouse or partner was cross-dressing.

____ 8.) I would feel at ease talking with a gay person at a party.

____ 9.) I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my boss was gay.

____ 10.) It would disturb me to find out that my doctor was cross-dressing.

____ 11.) I would feel uncomfortable knowing that my son or daughter's teacher was bisexual.

____ 12.) I would feel comfortable working closely with a cross-dresser.

Adapted from:
LGBTQ-Q Resource Center index of homophobia

Appendix D

Subject # _____

Transgender Survey_(B)

This questionnaire is designed to measure your comfort level associated with transgendered individuals. This is not a test, so there are no wrong answers. Answer each item as carefully and accurately as you can by placing a number beside each one as follows:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

- ____ 1.) I would feel comfortable working closely with a gay man.
- ____ 2.) If a member of my sex made a sexual advance towards me, I would feel angry.
- ____ 3.) I would feel uncomfortable if I learned that my neighbor was a cross-dresser.
- ____ 4.) I would feel comfortable knowing I was attractive to members of my gender.
- ____ 5.) I would feel uncomfortable being seen in a gay bar.
- ____ 6.) I would feel nervous being in a group of cross-dressers.
- ____ 7.) I would be upset if I learned that my sibling was bisexual.
- ____ 8.) I would feel comfortable if I learned that my child's teacher was a cross-dresser.
- ____ 9.) I would feel that I had failed as a parent if I learned that my child enjoyed cross-dressing.
- ____ 10.) It would not bother me to walk through a predominantly gay section of town.
- ____ 11.) If a member of my gender made an advance towards me, I would feel flattered.
- ____ 12.) I would feel comfortable if I learned that my best friend of my gender was bisexual.

Adapted from:
LGBTQ-Q Resource Center index of homophobia

Appendix E

Subject # _____

Demographic Survey

1. Are you male, female, or other?
2. How old are you?
3. Did your high school provide any transgender education? (ie; in a sex education class)
4. Do you have a family member or close friend who is transgender?
5. Have you ever worked with a transgender individual?

Appendix F

Feedback Letter

Thank you for participating in my study. The purpose of this study was to find out if viewing a short video portraying an inside look to transgendered life would elicit an increase in comfort level versus viewing a video unrelated to transgender life. My hypothesis is that people viewing the inside look into transgendered life will have a better understanding of what it means to be transgendered and will therefore score higher on levels of comfort post viewing. I believe high schools should incorporate transgendered sections into courses such as sex education. These courses could be the foundation for a better understanding of transgendered individuals and lead to a lasting higher comfort level. Discrimination towards transgendered people is prevalent in schools, work places, and in general day to day life. I think it is derived from a lack of understanding which causes people to be uneasy. I hope to raise comfort levels towards transgendered people through a means that would be applicable in a common classroom setting. Videos and slide shows can be utilized in classroom settings easier than searching for transgendered people to speak to a class. If you did not view the transgender video and would like get information about what it means for these people, or if you did view the video and are interested in learning more please visit the following links.

<http://www.freepatentsonline.com/article/College-Student-Journal/96619966.html>

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0092623X.2011.628439>

http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J367v03n01_07

Please note that I am not interested in your individual results; rather, I am only interested in the results of a large group of consumers, of which you are now a part of. No identifying information about you will be associated with any of the findings.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding any portion of this study, please do not hesitate to bring them up now or in the future. My contact information is found at the bottom of this letter. If you are interested in obtaining a summary of the findings of this study at a later date, please contact me and I will make it available to you at the completion of this project which is expected to be in May of 2013.

Thank you again for your valuable contribution to this study.

Sincerely,

Principal Investigator:

Nate Maey's: Phone: 573-705-2108 (njm489@lionmail.lindenwood.edu)

Supervisor:

Dr. Michiko Nohara-LeClair 636-949-4371 (mnohara-leclair@lindenwood.edu)