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Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) people in the United States continue to be marginalized, oppressed, and harassed throughout mainstream society, and college campuses are no exception. Campus administrators at many institutions of higher education have begun to address concerns of safety and inclusion for LGBT students, faculty, and staff through a variety of programs and services. Over 140 campuses are using Safe Zone programs as part of their efforts to create safe, welcoming environments for LGBT students. However, little empirical study has been conducted to assess the impact or effectiveness of these programs. The purpose of this study was to explore the impact of a Safe Zone program on non-LGBT students. An on-line survey was conducted in which 324 non-LGBT undergraduate students at a large Midwestern research university were asked about their awareness of the Safe Zone program and their attitudes toward lesbian, gay, and bisexual people. Findings indicated that students who were aware of the program demonstrated more positive attitudes toward LGB people. This study adds to the existing literature providing justification for the implementation and continuation of Safe Zone programs. As part of a broad movement toward creating a more positive environment for LGBT people, a Safe Zone program seems to be able to positively impact the attitudes of non-LGBT students. Additionally, this study indicates that broader exposure to the program would likely have the most impact on the campus climate. This implication provides rationale for opting for a Safe Zone model that maximizes participation in the program by minimizing the commitment level and training requirements for participants.
CHAPTER 1. OVERVIEW

For more than 10 years, college and university campuses have used “Safe Zone” programs as a way to provide support for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) students. These programs are designed to help LGBT students identify individual offices, faculty, and staff members who are willing to be advocates or allies for LGBT people (Sanlo, Rankin, & Schoenberg, 2002). This goal is often accomplished by asking participants to display on their office door a sticker or sign that incorporates a symbol commonly associated with LGBT communities, such as a pink triangle or rainbow. The earliest known program began at Ball State University in 1992 (Poynter & Barnett, 2003). Since then, the number of programs has grown to over 140 (Tubbs & Barnett, 2004). Safe Zone programs have taken many forms, and each program is unique to the campus it serves. Some programs incorporate orientation or training sessions to assist in developing allies while others focus on increasing participation by requiring less initial involvement from program participants.

While the number of Safe Zone programs has increased, widespread hostility and negative attitudes toward LGBT students on campuses across the nation have continued (D’Augelli & Rose, 1990; Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1997; Evans & D’Augelli, 1996; Rankin, 2003). The impact of Safe Zone programs on LGBT students’ ability to find safe places within campus communities and on program participants’ attitudes have been examined (Evans, 2002), but the impact of these programs on the remainder of the campus community has gone unstudied.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to explore the impact of a Safe Zone program on non-LGBT students. Specifically, this study examined the relationship between non-LGBT
students' awareness of an LGBT Safe Zone program and the students' attitudes toward LGB people. Demographic details such as gender, ethnicity, age, size of home community, and religious affiliation also were collected to determine if any relationships exist between these demographic variables and changes in students' attitudes. Undergraduate students at a large Midwestern research university were invited to complete an on-line survey that assessed their awareness of the Safe Zone program and their attitudes toward LGB people, as well as collected demographic information.

**Research Questions and Hypothesis**

This study attempted to answer these questions:

1. To what extent are non-LGBT students aware of the Safe Zone project?
2. What are non-LGBT students' attitudes toward LGB people?
3. Is there a relationship between non-LGBT students' awareness of the Safe Zone project and their attitudes toward LGB people?
4. What impact do demographic differences, such as gender, race/ethnicity, religiosity, year in school, and hometown size, have on the relationship between non-LGBT students' awareness of the Safe Zone project and their attitudes toward LGB people?

The null hypothesis tested was that there is no relationship between non-LGBT students' awareness of the Safe Zone project and their attitudes toward LGBT people.

**Rationale**

While Safe Zone programs have increased in number, little empirical study has been conducted to assess the impact of such initiatives. Usually the rationale for developing Safe Zone programs has been based primarily on anecdotal evidence. To date, only one published study (Evans, 2002) has attempted to assess the impact—and thus the
value—of a Safe Zone program on a general campus population. That study focused specifically on the impact the program had on LGBT students and the faculty and staff participants in the program but not on the impact the program had on non-LGBT students. As members of the dominant culture, non-LGBT students play a major role in shaping the climate of a campus. To examine further how a Safe Zone program impacts campus climate, the program's impact on non-LGBT students also must be examined.

**Significance of the Study**

While other research has shown that a Safe Zone program can positively affect attitudes of the program participants, this study is the first to attempt to quantify the impact of a Safe Zone program on non-LGBT students outside of the program. By determining whether a relationship exists between awareness of the Safe Zone program and attitudes toward LGB people within the majority culture, which in turn impact the campus climate for LGB students, the findings from this study can inform practitioners about the value of implementing such a program.

**Theoretical Perspective**

Much of the research in the area of majority group attitudes toward stigmatized minority groups has been guided by the contact theory described originally by Allport (1954). In this theory, Allport asserted that positive contact between majority and minority groups reduces many forms of prejudice regarding the minority group that exist within the majority group. Several previous studies have suggested that positive attitudes of heterosexuals toward lesbians and gay men are correlated with positive intergroup contact (Herek, 1994; Herek & Capitanio, 1996) and with exposure to information about LGBT issues and the experiences of LGBT people (Peel, 2002; Riggle, Ellis, & Crawford, 1996; Waterman, Reid, Garfield, & Hoy, 2001).
Allport (1954) explained that for prejudice to exist, “there must be an attitude of favor or disfavor; and it must be related to an overgeneralized (and therefore erroneous) belief” (p. 13). Because the attitudes and beliefs are related, interventions that cause individuals in the majority population to question their previously held beliefs can lead to a change in the associated attitudes and result in a reduction of prejudice. The interventions studied previously have included personal contact with members of the stigmatized group (Herek & Capitanio, 1996), awareness training (Peel, 2002), and media contact through the viewing of a documentary film (Riggle et al., 1996). This study attempts to extend the contact theory to indirect contact through passive exposure to the Safe Zone program.

Tentative Presuppositions

Prior studies referenced here often addressed only lesbian and gay male individuals due to lack of understanding of the terms and misinformation regarding bisexual and transgender persons (Pope & Reynolds, 1991). Since attitudes regarding bisexual and transgender individuals tend to be even more negative than those regarding lesbians and gay men (Carter, 2000; Pope & Reynolds), the researcher assumed that results from other studies indicating negative attitudes toward lesbians and gay men likely indicate negative attitudes toward bisexual and transgender individuals as well.

Definitions

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender. In the following definitions, the term sex refers to biological sex, or more simply, which sex organs are present, while the term gender refers to the personal identification with culturally-defined masculinity or femininity and the expression of gendered behavior. Lesbian and gay individuals are women and men, respectively, whose primary sexual and/or affectional attractions are
toward persons of the same sex. Bisexual individuals are persons whose primary sexual and/or affectional attractions are toward persons of either, both, or multiple sexes or genders or for whom sex or gender plays no role in determining their attractions for another individual. Transgender individuals are persons who transgress traditional gender norms, roles, or stereotypes. This population may include individuals who feel that their gender does not match their biological sex who either do or do not elect to pursue gender reassignment treatment as well as individuals who do not identify with either male or female genders.

Safe Zone Program. Safe Zone programs on college campuses are designed to increase visibility, support, and awareness of LGBT people and issues. Typically some form of recognizable emblem such as a pink triangle or rainbow on a sticker, magnet, mug, etc. is used to visibly identify participants in the program (Sanlo et al., 2002). These programs work from the premise that when these emblems are seen by LGBT people they will be given an indication that those displaying the emblem are willing to provide them a safe space to discuss LGBT issues. On some campuses, these programs are coupled with training on LGBT issues or how to be an ally for LGBT people (Sanlo et al.).
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The focus of this study is on non-LGBT students’ attitudes toward LGB people and the impact of a specific initiative on those attitudes. In this chapter, the existing literature is reviewed in two main areas. First is an examination of literature relating to existing attitudes, specifically how attitudes toward LGB people have been conceptualized and measured and what factors contribute to these attitudes. Second is an exploration of literature dealing with interventions that have attempted to change attitudes toward LGB people. Due to the scarcity of research relating to attitudes regarding bisexual and, especially, transgender people, the scope of this review is limited primarily to attitudes regarding lesbians and gay men. Attitudes toward bisexual and transgender people are included only when they were addressed by the research discussed.

Attitudes Toward LGB People

In recent decades, considerable research has examined heterosexuals’ attitudes toward lesbians and gay men and, to a lesser extent, their attitudes toward bisexuals. A variety of scales have been developed to measure heterosexuals’ attitudes, and a number of studies have examined potential correlates and predictors of negative attitudes.

Conceptualizing and Measuring Attitudes

Among the most widely used scales is the Index of Homophobia (IHP; Hudson & Ricketts, 1980). The IHP conceptualizes homophobia as “responses of fear, disgust, anger, discomfort, and aversion that individuals experience in dealing with gay people” (p. 385).

Herek (1988) developed the Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men (ATLG) scale from a series of factor-analytic studies in which Herek (1984) determined that a single factor, condemnation or tolerance for homosexuality, best accounted for the variance among heterosexuals’ attitudes regarding lesbians and gay men. This
Condemnation-Tolerance factor included items that “characterize homosexuality as unnatural, disgusting, perverse, and sinful; as a danger to society and requiring negative social sanctions; and as a source of personal anxiety to the individual respondent” (p. 48) and provided the foundation for the creation of the ATLG scale.

The Modern Homophobia Scale (Raja & Stokes, 1998) was an attempt to update older scales to reflect more recent attitudes regarding LGB individuals. In developing the scale, three factors emerged: personal discomfort with homosexuals, support for institutional homophobia, and the belief that homosexuality is deviant and changeable.

Mohr and Rochlen (1999) looked specifically at attitudes toward bisexuals and developed the Attitudes Regarding Bisexuality Scale (ARBS). The ARBS measures heterosexuals’ attitudes toward bisexuality along two dimensions: stability and tolerance. Stability refers to the stability and legitimacy of bisexuality as a sexual orientation as well as the stability of bisexual relationships. Tolerance refers to the degree to which bisexuality is viewed as a moral, tolerable sexual orientation.

Worthington, Dillon, and Becker-Schutte (2005) developed the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Knowledge and Attitudes Scale for Heterosexuals (LGB-KASH) that conceptualized heterosexual attitudes toward LGB individuals as multidimensional, challenging the prior research and theory that conceptualized heterosexual attitudes along a single continuum from condemnation to tolerance (e.g., Herek, 1984). Although other scales separate attitudes based on the sex of the target (i.e., attitudes toward lesbians versus attitudes toward gay men), partly because of evidence that participants think of gay men when reading items about gay people when gender is not specified (Herek, 1994), the LGB-KASH scale measures attitudes toward lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals.
collectively. The fact that the items specifically mention LGB people addresses the concern about non-gender-specific language.

**Attitudes and Their Correlates**

Herek (1994) summarized his research using the ATLG scale and reported that heterosexuals' attitudes were influenced by demographic factors such as gender and education as well as social psychological variables including attitudes about gender and family roles, religiosity, political ideology, and interpersonal contact with lesbians and gay men. Over the course of ten years, Herek conducted six studies in which he consistently found that more negative attitudes are predicted by heterosexuals' acceptance of traditional gender roles, high religiosity, political conservatism, and lack of positive interpersonal contact with lesbians and gay men. Additionally, Herek found that men routinely held more negative attitudes than women and that heterosexuals tended to have more negative attitudes about homosexuals of their same gender. Several other studies (D'Augelli & Rose, 1990; Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1997; Kite, 1984; Simoni, 1996) also have found connections between attitudes and gender, while others (Cotten-Huston & Waite, 2000) have concluded that there is no such relationship.

Whitley and Árgeisdóttir (2000) corroborated the relationship between heterosexuals' attitudes and gender role beliefs and found support for a connection between negative attitudes toward lesbians and gay men and a general conservative belief system reflected in a high social dominance orientation and high authoritarianism. Social dominance orientation is "the extent to which one desires that one's in-group dominate and be superior to outgroups" (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994, as cited in Whitley & Árgeisdóttir). Authoritarianism is demonstrated by deference to established authority in terms of shared values and aggression toward outgroups. Whitley and
Aðgísdottrír surveyed 253 students at a predominantly White, public Midwestern university. Their findings indicated that, similar to other prejudices, authoritarianism and social dominance orientation are complementary constructs that jointly support prejudice against lesbians and gay men. Whitley and Aðgísdottrír pointed out that, although authoritarianism and social dominance orientation are connected, either or both may influence an individual’s attitudes toward lesbians and gay men.

Whitley (2001) also demonstrated a link between sexism and attitudes toward homosexuality. In a study of 394 students enrolled in an introductory psychology course at a medium-sized Midwestern public university, traditional sexist beliefs, endorsement of traditional male role norms, and benevolent sexism were found to be predictors of attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. Whitley concluded that the results support the theory that heterosexuals’ negative attitudes toward lesbians and gay men are motivated, in part, by a desire to maintain traditional gender roles.

Some research has yielded predictors of positive attitudes toward LGB people. In a survey of 109 students living in residence halls on a Midwestern campus, Bowen and Bourgeois (2001) confirmed previous research (D’Augelli & Rose, 1990; Herek, 1994; Herek & Capitanio, 1996; Simoni, 1996) that found a correlation between prior contact with and knowledge about LGB people and students’ attitudes toward LGB people.

**Changing Students’ Attitudes Toward LGB People**

In light of the continuing hostile climate for LGB students, student affairs professionals and other educators increasingly are called upon to address issues of homophobia and heterosexism on college campuses (Schreier, 1995). Often programming designed to address these issues has the goal of changing non-LGB students’ attitudes
toward LGB people. Various initiatives, including Safe Zone programs, have been implemented and, to an extent, evaluated on college campuses.

Educational Initiatives to Change Attitudes

One frequently used educational program for changing students' attitudes toward LGB people is a speakers' panel. Such presentations typically involve several LGBT and possibly heterosexual ally individuals who speak about their personal experiences and respond to questions from the audience. In a review of existing research relating to the impact of speakers' panels, Croteau and Kusek (1992) found reasonable empirical evidence that such panels reduce non-LGB students' negative attitudes. However, certain methodological concerns in several of the studies reviewed call their findings into question. Some of the studies reviewed did not separate out the speaker's panel from other educational activities that also were evaluated. Others did not have strong experimental designs with control and treatment groups and pre- and post-test measures.

Several classroom initiatives have been evaluated as well. Riggle et al. (1996) studied the impact of the screening of an LGB-related documentary film on students' attitudes. All 82 participants responded to a pre-test using the Attitudes Toward Homosexuality Scale (ATHS; Herek, 1984). Three weeks later, the participants were divided into three groups for a viewing of the documentary film *The Times of Harvey Milk*, which chronicles the life and death of Harvey Milk, one of the first openly gay elected officials in the U.S. Two of the groups (experimental) completed the ATHS again after viewing the film while the third group (control) completed the ATHS again prior to viewing the film. The results indicated that the film had a significant impact on the students' attitudes toward gay men. Students who responded to the ATHS after viewing
the film demonstrated more positive attitudes than did their counterparts who responded to the ATHS prior to viewing the film.

Waterman et al. (2001) analyzed data from 71 students enrolled in a Psychology of Homosexuality course at a private Midwestern university. The students completed pre- and post-course questionnaires including multiple attitude scales. The students reported significantly increased positive attitudes toward homosexuality after completion of the course. Serdahely and Ziemba (1984) studied the impact on homophobic attitudes of a unit on homosexuality within a course on human sexuality. They found that for students who scored above the group median on a modified version of the IHP scale (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980), homophobic attitudes decreased significantly for students enrolled in the human sexuality course compared with students in a control group who were enrolled in a drug education course with no material on homosexuality. For students with IHP scores below the median (i.e., students who already had less homophobic attitudes), there was not a significant change in attitudes.

Safe Zone Programs

Although Safe Zone programs increasingly are being implemented on college campuses, there is little literature regarding the programs. What is available tends to focus on the history and development of Safe Zone programs (e.g., Poynter & Barnett, 2003; Sanlo et al., 2002; Tubbs & Barnett, 2004), with little attention to the impact of such initiatives. An extensive search of available literature found only two studies that specifically addressed the impact of Safe Zone programs in a college setting.

One such study (Finkel, Storaasli, Bandele, & Schaefer, 2003) focused specifically on psychologists and graduate students in a school of professional psychology. Sixty-six graduate students and two administrative staff members participated in a Safe Zone
training program comprised of two 2-hour sessions. Participants self-rated their attitudes toward LGBT individuals during each session, and the results suggested more positive attitudes after the second session.

Evans (2002) conducted a critical ethnographic evaluation to examine the impact of an LGBT Safe Zone program on a college campus. The research team interviewed 42 individuals at a large Midwest research university who were involved in the development of the program, were participants in the program, or were LGBT students, faculty, or staff at the institution. The research team also attended meetings and discussions about the program, canvassed the campus to record the locations of Safe Zone emblems in campus buildings, and reviewed documents and other artifacts from the program. While few participants reported increased interactions between LGBT students and individuals displaying a Safe Zone sticker, participants felt that the program had increased the visibility of and support for LGBT people and issues on campus. LGBT students, faculty, and staff reported feeling safer and more affirmed on campus.

**Summary**

Considerable research has examined heterosexuals' attitudes toward LGB people using a variety of scales and measures. Several factors that consistently have been found to be correlated with attitudes toward LGB people include attitudes regarding gender and family roles, religiosity, political ideology, interpersonal contact with LGB people, and knowledge about LGB people. A number of educational initiatives, focusing primarily on increasing students' contact with and knowledge about LGB people, have been shown to impact non-LGB students' attitudes positively. This study attempted to advance the existing research by examining the impact of a particular educational initiative, the Safe Zone project, on non-LGBT students' attitudes.
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

In this chapter the methodology that was used in this study is discussed. First the methodological and philosophical foundations are described. The specific design of the study including participants, data collection procedures, instrumentation, and data analysis methods are then addressed. The chapter concludes with design concerns.

Methodological Approach

A quantitative approach was used in this study. This approach allows for testing a hypothesis on the basis of quantifiable measures. Specifically, a cross-sectional survey method using a self-administered on-line questionnaire was used. In a cross-sectional survey, data from a sample are collected at one point in time to make inferences about a larger population at that point in time (Babbie, 1990). A self-administered on-line questionnaire was selected to minimize the costs associated with data collection and to increase the speed of survey return (Fowler, 2002).

Philosophical Assumptions

This approach is based in a postpositivist paradigm. A postpositivist epistemology recognizes that, building on both positivist and rationalist epistemologies, both experience and reason are important in the creation of knowledge, but neither alone can serve as the sole foundation for knowledge (Phillips & Burbules, 2000). Knowledge claims are seen as conjecturable and fallible but must be supported by the strongest warrants available at the time with the understanding that future observations may require existing theories and claims to be adjusted or rejected (Phillips & Burbules). Additionally, observed facts “underdetermine” conclusions; that is, a multitude of conclusions may explain a given set of observations. Therefore, a stronger claim is made by demonstrating that no evidence can be found to disprove a given conclusion rather
than simply stating that evidence has been found supporting that conclusion (Phillips & Burbules).

**Research Approach**

The study used a posttest-only design (Creswell, 2003) with participants surveyed regarding their previous exposure to an ongoing treatment. Participants who indicated awareness of the Safe Zone program were considered the treatment group while those who did not indicate awareness of the program were considered the control group. Because participants were assigned to the treatment or control group on the basis of their self-reported awareness of the Safe Zone program, there was no guarantee that the comparison groups would be equivalent. To minimize the threat of extraneous variables that may affect the outcome of this study, additional demographic variables that have been shown to impact non-LGB students’ attitudes toward LGB people were collected and included in the data analysis (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). This research project was submitted to the Iowa State University Institutional Review Board for approval. The project was approved on September 28, 2005.

**Participants**

A simple random sample of 8,000 undergraduate students out of a total undergraduate population of 22,230 students at a large Midwestern research university were invited to complete the on-line survey. The sample was selected from a list obtained from the Office of the Registrar of names and email addresses of undergraduate students who were enrolled for the semester in which the study was undertaken. The list was randomly sorted by a computer program, and the first 8,000 students were invited to participate in the study.
Data Collection Procedures

Email invitations were sent to the sample with instructions and a URL for the online survey. A follow-up email was sent eight days later reminding participants to complete the survey. The content of each email is given in Appendices A and B, respectively. Students' awareness of the Safe Zone project was measured with a series of questions developed specifically for this study. Students' attitudes toward LGB people were assessed using the LGB-KASH (Worthington et al., 2005). Participants were also asked to disclose their sexual orientation and gender identity. Participants who elected not to disclose or who did not identify as non-LGBT were not included in the data analysis. For the purposes of this study, all students who identified as non-heterosexual or as neither male nor female were considered LGBT students. All other students were considered non-LGBT students. Participants who indicated that they had participated in the Safe Zone project also were excluded from the data analysis.

Instrumentation

Participants were asked to complete the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Knowledge and Attitudes Scale for Heterosexuals (LGB-KASH; Worthington et al., 2005). The LGB-KASH is a 28-item scale that assesses heterosexuals' attitudes toward and knowledge of lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals along five factors: Hate, LGB Knowledge, LGB Civil Rights, Religious Conflict, and Internalized Affirmativeness. The Hate factor reflected "attitudes about avoidance, self-consciousness, hatred, and violence toward LGB individuals" (p. 108). The LGB Knowledge factor reflected "basic knowledge about the history, symbols, and organizations related to the LGB community" (p. 108). The LGB Civil Rights factor addressed "beliefs about the civil rights of LGB individuals with respect to marriage, child rearing, health care, and insurance benefits" (p. 108). The Religious
Conflict factor included “conflictual beliefs and ambivalent homonegativity with respect to LGB individuals, often of a religious nature” (p. 108). The Internalized Affirmativeness factor reflected “a personalized affirmativeness and a willingness to engage in proactive social activism” (p. 108). Worthington et al. reported evidence of internal consistency and stability as well as discriminant, convergent, and construct validity. The values of Cronbach’s alpha for the five subscales ranged from .76 to .87. Test-retest reliability was demonstrated with reliability estimates for the five subscales ranging from .76 to .90.

Bivariate correlations among LGB-KASH, Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men (Herek, 1988), and Attitudes Regarding Bisexuality Scale (Mohr & Rochlen, 1999) scores indicated significant relationships between the LGB-KASH subscales and existing measures of heterosexuals’ attitudes toward LGB individuals. A one-way multivariate analysis of variance indicated that heterosexual and LGB individuals differed on the subscales of the LGB-KASH. LGB individuals had lower scores on the Hate and Religious Conflict subscales and higher scores on the LGB Knowledge, LGB Civil Rights, and Internalized Affirmativeness subscales than heterosexual individuals.

Participants’ awareness of the Safe Zone project was assessed using a series of three questions developed specifically for this study. The first question asked if participants recognized the Safe Zone project by its name. The second question asked where participants have seen the Safe Zone symbol on campus. The third question asked participants to describe what the symbol stands for. Awareness of the project was indicated by a positive response to the first question, listing at least one location where the student has seen the symbol on campus in the second question, or correctly describing the meaning of the symbol in the third question. A fourth question, “Have you ever requested or received a Safe Zone emblem (sticker, key chain, or magnet) for
yourself?" was used to identify participants who have participated in the Safe Zone project for exclusion from the data analysis. Participants also were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire that included age (year of birth), gender, ethnicity, U.S. citizenship status, sexual orientation, grade classification, hometown size, religious affiliation, and strength of religious conviction. The complete survey instrument can be found in Appendix C.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

After participants who did not disclose their gender or sexual orientation, participants who identified as LGBT, and participants who indicated that they had participated in the Safe Zone project were removed from the sample, the remaining participants were divided into control and treatment groups based on their responses to the awareness of the Safe Zone project questions (items 1-3). The size of each of the two groups demonstrates the extent to which non-LGBT students were aware of the Safe Zone project (research question 1). For each participant, a score for each factor of the LGB-KASH was computed by calculating the means of the values of their responses to the LGB-KASH questions (items 5-32) associated with each factor. Descriptive statistics for these scores were used to describe non-LGBT students' attitudes toward LGB people (research question 2). To examine whether a relationship exists between non-LGBT students' awareness of the Safe Zone project and their attitudes toward LGB people (research question 3), the mean LGB-KASH scores for each group on each factor were compared using a two-tailed t-test for equality of means. Multiple analyses of variance with LGB-KASH scores as the independent variable and awareness and the various demographic variables (items 33-43) as factors were used to explore the impact of demographic differences on the relationship between awareness and attitudes (research question 4).
Design Issues

The questionnaire items developed specifically for awareness of the Safe Zone project were not pilot tested prior to their implementation in this study. However, members of my thesis committee who are experts in the areas of LGBT issues and survey research methods reviewed the instrument prior to its use.

There are also concerns related specifically to conducting on-line surveys. The validity of the data collected and the privacy and confidentiality of participants are paramount. However, guaranteeing security in a networked environment like the Internet is not possible (Smith & Leigh, 1997). There is always the possibility, however slight, that data stored on-line may be compromised. To minimize the risk of data disruption, modification, or loss and to provide the highest possible level of privacy for participants, an on-line survey provider with a strong reputation and comprehensive security safeguards was selected to host the survey instrument (see Survey Monkey, n.d.). To reduce the risk of multiple responses from the same participant, responses were screened for similar submissions originating from the same IP address (Schmidt, 1997).

Additionally, conducting on-line research limits the pool of potential participants to individuals with sufficient computer skills and comfort with sharing personal information electronically. This possible limitation is less of a concern for this particular study because of the location and desired participants. The students attending the university that served as the site for this study were assumed to be sufficiently savvy technologically, and the reputation of the university as a science and technology school contributes to the expectation that students have the necessary computer skills and experience to communicate effectively on-line.
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

In this chapter, the results of the data analysis are relayed. First, a further description of the sample is provided. The data that were collected and analyzed to address each of the four research questions presented earlier are then described.

Description of the Sample

Completed questionnaires were submitted by 434 participants. Fourteen were excluded for identifying as homosexual or bisexual or not disclosing a sexual orientation. Three were excluded for identifying as transgender. Ninety-three were excluded for indicating they had participated in the Safe Zone program by requesting or displaying a Safe Zone emblem. Of the 324 participants included in the data analysis, 165 (50.9%) identified as male, and 159 (49.1%) as female. Of the fall 2004 undergraduate student population, 56.1% were male and 43.9% were female (Iowa State University Office of Institutional Research, n.d.). Over 90% of the sample identified as White (n = 296) compared to 88.1% of the university undergraduate population (Iowa State University Office of Institutional Research). Respondents ranged in age from 18 to 43. Participants were 63 (19.4%) freshman, 72 (22.2%) sophomores, 75 (23.1%) juniors, and 114 (35.2%) seniors. The percentages for the fall 2004 undergraduate student population were 22.7%, 20.5%, 23.2%, and 33.6%, respectively (Iowa State University Office of Institutional Research). Table 1 provides additional demographic details of the sample.

Data Analysis

In this section, each of the four research questions will be addressed. The results of the analysis of the data corresponding to each question are described.
Table 1. Demographics of study sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African/Caribbean/African American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina/Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/American Indian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native/Hawaiian Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian/European American</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiethnic: White and Black/African/Caribbean/African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiethnic: White and Latina/Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiethnic: White and Middle Eastern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Classification</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total number and percentage values for this category are less than 324 and 100, respectively, due to non-response.

Awareness of the Safe Zone Project

Over 50% of the participants indicated awareness of the Safe Zone project \( (n = 166) \). Most of these respondents \( (n = 117) \) recognized the project only after being presented with an image of the Safe Zone emblem and being asked to list places on campus where they had seen the emblem; they did not indicate awareness based solely on the name of the project. None of the respondents who did not recognize the project on the basis of either name or symbol correctly described the meaning of the symbol.
Of the respondents who were aware of the program, over 60% reported seeing the symbol in more than one location \((n = 106)\). The most frequently reported locations were residence halls \((72.3\%)\), faculty or academic department offices \((59.0\%)\), and staff or non-academic department offices \((37.3\%)\). A summary of locations reported is given in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence hall</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity / sorority house</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member or academic department office</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff member or non-academic department office</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On someone’s backpack, key chain, etc.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other location</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage values are out of the total number of participants who indicated awareness of the Safe Zone program \((n = 166)\).*

Attitudes Toward LGB People

Using the LGB-KASH scale, participants’ attitudes were conceptualized along five dimensions: Hate, LGB Knowledge, LGB Civil Rights, Religious Conflict, and Internalized Affirmativeness. Values of Cronbach’s alpha for each of the five subscales were .81, .77, .90, .71, and .78, respectively. For each participant, a score for each factor of the LGB-KASH was computed by calculating the means of the values of their responses to questions within each subscale. The means and standard deviations for each subscale are listed in Table 3. Similar to other studies using this scale (Worthington et al., 2005), non-
LGB respondents demonstrated the lowest mean scores on the Hate subscale and the highest mean scores on the LGB Civil Rights subscale.

**Relationship Between Awareness and Attitudes**

For each of the five LGB-KASH subscales, the mean scores for the control and treatment groups (aware vs. unaware) were compared using a two-tailed t-test for equality of means. The mean scores for the two groups on each subscale are presented in Table 4. Significant differences were found on four of the five subscales: Hate ($t = 2.94, p < .01$), LGB Knowledge ($t = -2.30, p < .05$), LGB Civil Rights ($t = -3.32, p < .001$), and Internalized Affirmativeness ($t = -3.31, p < .001$). The mean score for Religious Conflict did not vary significantly between the two groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Group statistics for LGB-KASH subscale scores by awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGB Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGB Civil Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalized Affirmativeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* For all subscales, Unaware: $n = 158$, Aware: $n = 166$.

**Demographic Differences**

For each LGB-KASH subscale, univariate analyses of variance were conducted to determine which demographic variables, if any, influenced LGB-KASH scores. Gender ($p < .001$) and semesters previously enrolled ($p < .01$) each independently significantly predicted scores on the Hate subscale. For the LGB Knowledge subscale, gender ($p < .05$), religious importance ($p < .001$), and race (collapsed to white or person of color, $p < .001$)
were significant predictors. Gender ($p < .001$) and religious importance ($p < .001$) also
were significant predictors for the LGB Civil Rights subscale. Although awareness was not
found to predict scores on the Religious Conflict subscale significantly, birth year ($p <
.01$), semesters previously enrolled ($p < .001$), and religious importance ($p < .001$) were
significant. For the Internalized Affirmativeness subscale, gender ($p < .001$), grade
classification (freshmen versus seniors only, $p < .01$), religious importance ($p < .001$), and
race (collapsed to white or person of color, $p < .05$) were significant predictors. Significant
differences in LGB-KASH scores were not found based on participants' U.S. citizen status
for any subscale.

**Summary**

Several key findings stand out from the data analysis. With regard to research
question 1, which examined the extent to which non-LGBT students were aware of the
Safe Zone project, I found that over 50% of the 324 participants indicated awareness of
the project. Research question 2 explored the attitudes of non-LGBT students toward LGB
people. I found that students demonstrated low levels of Hate and LGB Knowledge,
moderate levels of Internalized Affirmativeness and Religious Conflict, and more positive
than negative views about LGB Civil Rights. My findings related to research question 3,
regarding the relationship between awareness of the Safe Zone project and attitudes
toward LGB people, indicated significant differences in mean scores between the
participants who were aware of the program and those who were unaware on four of the
five LGB-KASH subscales: Hate, LGB Knowledge, LGB Civil Rights, and Internalized
Affirmativeness. Demographic differences were investigated in research question 4. No
one demographic variable studied had an impact across all five subscales. These findings
are discussed in further detail in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION

In this final chapter, the findings are discussed further and possible implications of the study are elaborated. The chapter closes with some possible limitations and suggestions for further research.

Findings

More than half of the respondents were aware of the Safe Zone program. This finding is one indication of the program’s success at raising awareness. One common goal of Safe Zone programs is raising awareness of LGBT people and issues on campus (Poynter & Tubbs, in press). A frequently used rationale for this goal is the theory that positive exposure to LGBT people and ideas tends to be associated with more positive attitudes toward LGBT people (Bowen & Bourgeois, 2001; Herek, 1994; Herek & Capitanio, 1996; Simoni, 1996).

This study also found support for the relationship between exposure and attitudes. The participants who were aware of the Safe Zone program demonstrated significantly more positive attitudes regarding LGB individuals along four of the LGB-KASH subscales than did participants who were unaware of the program. Participants who were aware of the program were more likely to have lower scores on the Hate subscale and higher scores on the LGB Knowledge, LGB Civil Rights, and Internalized Affirmativeness subscales than students who were unaware. This finding suggests that the extension of Allport’s (1954) contact theory to indirect contact through exposure to the Safe Zone program may be valid. The existence of the Safe Zone program increases the visibility of LGBT people and issues. The broad visibility of the Safe Zone emblem throughout campus also sends a message about the culture of the institution, which may in turn impact students’ attitudes. Greater visibility challenges previous misconceptions students may hold regarding LGBT
people. The more students are exposed to positive responses toward LGBT people, the more normative positive responses become. Additionally, greater visibility also challenges the notion that LGBT people only constitute a small population that can easily be ignored or marginalized.

The lack of a significant relationship between awareness and students' scores on the Religious Conflict subscale would indicate that while exposure to the program may impact students' knowledge and personal attitudes, it has little impact on resolving any conflicts between their religious beliefs and their attitudes toward LGB people. It may be either that students whose attitudes changed also modified their religious beliefs to correspond to their new attitudes toward LGB people or that students whose religious beliefs are incompatible with positive attitudes were less likely to change their attitudes.

No one demographic variable studied had a consistent impact across the LGB-KASH subscales. Consistent with prior research regarding gender and LGB-related attitudes (D'Augelli & Rose, 1990; Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1997; Herek, 1994; Kite, 1984; Simoni, 1996), gender played a role in predicting scores on four of the five subscales. Participants who identified as female tended to have lower Hate scores and higher LGB Knowledge, LGB Civil Rights, and Internalized Affirmativeness scores than did participants who identified as male. Herek (1988) hypothesized that gender differences in attitudes toward lesbians and gay men can be understood best in the context of cultural constructions of gender. In contemporary American society heterosexuality is strongly emphasized within the construct of masculinity. For this reason, Herek (1988) suggested that for males, negative attitudes toward lesbians and, particularly, toward gay men may serve a defensive function to assert or confirm their masculinity. For females, the cultural definition of femininity has become less and less constraining, largely due to the influence
of feminism and the feminist movement. Negative attitudes towards lesbians and gay men likely serve less of a function in demonstrating femininity for women as similar attitudes do in demonstrating masculinity for men.

Religious importance was also a significant predictor on four of the five subscales, which is also consistent with prior research (Herek, 1994). Participants who indicated a higher importance of religion in their lives tended to score lower on the LGB Knowledge, LGB Civil Rights, and Internalized Affirmativeness subscales and higher on the Religious Conflict subscale than did participants who indicated a lesser importance of religion. Because many conservative religions continue to condemn homosexuality, this finding is not surprising. Parks (1986) described a model of faith development for young adults in which individuals move from a dualistic perspective that is dependent upon an external authority, such as organized religion, for answers to faith-related questions to a more multiplistic or relativistic approach where meaning is made interdependently with external authorities. It is likely that students who indicated a higher importance of religion rely heavily on the teachings of organized religion in making moral and ethical decisions and in shaping their attitudes regarding LGBT people.

**Implications**

This study adds to the existing literature providing justification for the implementation and continuation of Safe Zone programs. In addition to the positive impact of such programs on LGBT students, campus environments, and the individuals who participate in the programs that has been documented by other research (Evans, 2002), this study provides evidence of a relationship between awareness of the program and attitudes of non-LGB students toward LGB students. As part of a broad movement toward creating a more positive environment for LGBT people, a Safe Zone program like
this one appears to be able to impact positively the portion of the campus population that is most likely to have negative attitudes about LGBT people (D’Augelli & Rose, 1990; Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1997; Rankin, 2003). This is not to say that a Safe Zone program by itself is likely to have a significant impact on non-LGB students’ attitudes. The program studied is situated on a campus among a multitude of simultaneous, complementary efforts designed to foster a positive environment. This study does not suggest that a stand-alone Safe Zone program without additional programs and services would be equally effective.

One argument that is sometimes used against Safe Zone programs is a concern that non-LGBT students will respond negatively to the program, either out of feeling marginalized as a population that is not addressed explicitly by the program or feeling threatened by the additional attention paid to LGBT populations (Poynter & Tubbs, in press). While the present study does not explicitly address this particular concern, the findings do show a positive correlation between awareness of this program and non-LGBT students’ attitudes rather than a negative correlation. There is no indication that exposure to the program resulted in any negative response from non-LGBT students.

Participants in this study indicated a wide range of campus and off-campus locations where they had seen the Safe Zone emblem. To maximize the impact of the program, administrators should attempt to maximize students’ exposure to the program. This can be achieved, in part, by encouraging broad participation in the program throughout the campus. When designing and planning for a Safe Zone program, administrators should consider opting for a less extensive training requirement for potential participants to increase the number of participants. While some researchers and practitioners have argued for the necessity of a comprehensive training requirement
(Poynter & Tubbs, in press), this study indicates that a program with no training requirement reaching a broad audience can be effective in achieving the goal of increasing positive attitudes.

Safe Zone programs are designed to increase visibility, support, and awareness of LGBT people and issues. This study, along with previous research and evaluations (Evans, 2002; Poynter & Tubbs, in press), further demonstrates the effectiveness of these programs in creating positive change on college campuses. Campuses where a commitment exists to create more inclusive and supportive environments for LGBT people should consider the implementation of a Safe Zone program as part of a broad strategy of visibility, awareness, and education.

**Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research**

While this study did find a correlation between students' awareness of the Safe Zone program and their attitudes toward LGB people, this finding does not necessarily indicate that the attitude change was caused by exposure to the program. Participants' attitudes may have been impacted by a multitude of factors that may not have been addressed by this study, and students likely had differing attitudes prior to their exposure or non-exposure to the Safe Zone program. Additionally, there may be a relationship between students' attitudes toward LGB people upon entering the university and the likelihood of their noticing the program. Without a pretest to measure attitudes prior to exposure, this possibility cannot be discounted.

A potential threat to the validity of this study is non-response. There were a large number of invited participants who began but did not complete the survey. Several students contacted the researcher to voice confusion regarding the wording of some of the items on the Religious Conflict subscale. It is possible that the students who did not
respond to the survey may have provided very different responses from the students who did participate. There is also the possibility that students who were aware of the program were more likely to complete the survey than were students who were unaware.

Additionally, because this study was conducted at only one institution, the findings of this study may not be applicable to other institutions, particularly institutions where the Safe Zone model varies significantly from the model used at this institution. Further research would be necessary to validate this study's generalizability.

One additional area of further research could be a comparison of the various models of Safe Zone programs that are currently in existence. As more and more campuses are developing and evaluating programs independently, it may be helpful to compile and compare the results across campuses. Poynter and Tubbs (in press) have begun this process by reporting on the anecdotal evidence they have collected from various campuses as well as sharing some results of evaluations undertaken on two campuses. Both of the programs evaluated, however, included training components. It may be useful to compare programs that do and do not require training for program participants.
APPENDIX A: INITIAL INVITATION EMAIL

SUBJECT: Your voice matters, please participate in our survey

You have been randomly selected to participate in a research study about your awareness of a particular program on the Iowa State campus. Your participation in the study should take no more than 15 to 30 minutes of your time and will be greatly appreciated. All you need to do is click on the link below and complete a brief survey. Even if you are not familiar with the program mentioned in the survey, your responses will be very helpful. For more information about this study or to begin the survey, please click the link below or enter this address in your web browser:

[survey link]

Thank you!

Jeremy P. Hayes, Master’s student
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Iowa State University
APPENDIX B: FOLLOW-UP REMINDER EMAIL

SUBJECT: Reminder: Your voice matters, please participate in our survey

Approximately 8 days ago you received an email invitation to participate in a research study about your awareness of a particular program on the Iowa State campus. This email is a simple reminder of that invitation. If you have not yet had time to complete the survey, please consider doing so soon. Your participation in this study is essential for us to make an accurate assessment of the program. We greatly appreciate your time, and your participation in the study should take no more than 15 to 30 minutes. All you need to do is click on the link below and complete a brief survey. Even if you are not familiar with the program mentioned in the survey, your responses will be very helpful. For more information about this study or to begin the survey, please click the link below or enter this address in your web browser:

[survey link]

Thank you!

Jeremy P. Hayes, Master's student

Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

Iowa State University
APPENDIX C: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Note: The text below was presented to potential participants when they logged in to the online survey system. Participants were asked to acknowledge that they had read the text before they could proceed to the survey questions.

Title of Study: The Impact of the Safe Zone Project at Iowa State University

Investigators: Jeremy P. Hayes, B.S.

Nancy J. Evans, B.A., M.Ed., M.F.A., Ph.D.

This is a research study. Please take your time in deciding if you would like to participate. Please read the following information about this study before you proceed to the survey.

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to learn more about the impact of the Safe Zone Project on students at Iowa State University. You are being invited to participate in this study because you are an undergraduate student at Iowa State University. You do not need to have experience with or knowledge about the Safe Zone Project to participate.

Description of Procedures

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a survey about the Safe Zone Project and your attitudes towards lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) people. You may skip any question that you do not wish to answer or that makes you feel uncomfortable. It is expected that it will take between 15 and 30 minutes for you to complete the survey.

Risks

There are no foreseeable risks at this time from participating in this study.
Benefits

If you decide to participate in this study there will be no direct benefit to you. It is hoped that the information gained in this study will enhance our understanding of student’s attitudes and the effectiveness of campus programs.

Costs and Compensation

You will not have any costs from participating in this study, and you will not be compensated for participating in this study. If you are accessing this survey from an off-campus site, you may be responsible for any standard Internet connection fees that are charged by your Internet service provider. For your convenience, several free computer labs are available on the Iowa State campus for student use.

Participant Rights

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may refuse to participate or leave the study at any time. If you decide to not participate in the study or leave the study early, it will not result in any penalty. None of your responses to survey questions will be submitted until you click the Submit Survey link at the conclusion of the survey.

Confidentiality

To ensure confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, your personal information (i.e., name and email address) will not be associated with your survey responses and have not been shared with Survey Monkey.com, the third-party survey provider hosting this survey. Any lists of research participants that include participants’ names or email addresses will be stored by the primary investigator in a secure location separately from the survey data and will be destroyed within one year of the completion of this study (no later than December 1, 2006). Your responses to this survey are completely anonymous.
Records identifying participants will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by applicable laws and regulations and will not be made publicly available. However, federal government regulatory agencies and the Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves human subject research studies) may inspect and/or copy your records for quality assurance and data analysis. These records will contain only the information you provide as responses to the survey questions.

Questions or Problems

You are encouraged to ask questions at any time during this study. For further information about the study, please contact Jeremy P. Hayes, jphayes@iastate.edu, or Nancy J. Evans, nevans@iastate.edu. If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects, please contact the Human Subjects Research Office, 1137 Pearson Hall, (515) 294-4566, austingr@iastate.edu, or the Research Compliance Officer, Office of Research Compliance, 1138 Pearson Hall, (515) 294-3115, dament@iastate.edu.

By clicking the Next link below, you are confirming that you have read the above information and that you voluntarily agree to participate in this research study. Please do not continue if you are not an undergraduate student at Iowa State University or if you are under the age of 18.
APPENDIX D: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Note: The questions below are not formatted as they appeared in the online instrument. Rather, the response options are defined (in brackets) for each question. In the actual instrument, the responses appeared as HTML form elements.

Safe Zone Project

1. Are you familiar with the Safe Zone Project at Iowa State? select one [yes, no]

2. [display Safe Zone logo] Where have you seen this symbol on campus? select all that apply [residence hall, fraternity/sorority house, faculty member or academic department office, staff member or non-academic department office, on someone’s backpack/keychain/etc., other, I have not seen this symbol on campus]

3. Are you aware of what this symbol stands for? If yes, briefly describe what this symbol stands for as it is used on the Iowa State campus. If no, please leave this question blank and go on to the next question. [open response]

4. Have you ever requested or received a Safe Zone emblem (sticker, key chain, or magnet) for yourself? select one [yes, no]

LGB Knowledge and Attitudes Scale

The following items relate to your knowledge of and attitudes toward lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals and issues. The acronym LGB will be used throughout to stand for lesbian, gay, and bisexual. For each item, please indicate the extent to which the sentence is characteristic of you or your views. [7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = very uncharacteristic of me or my views to 7 = very characteristic of me or my views with an eighth option for unsure/chose not to respond]
5. I try not to let my negative beliefs about homosexuality harm my relationships with LGB people.

6. I feel qualified to educate others about how to be affirmative regarding LGB issues.

7. I have conflicting attitudes or beliefs about LGB people.

8. I can accept LGB people even though I condemn their behavior.

9. It is important for me to avoid LGB individuals.

10. LGB people deserve the hatred they receive.

11. I could educate others about the history and symbolism behind the pink triangle.

12. I have close friends who are LGB.

13. I have difficulty reconciling my religious views with my interest in being accepting of LGB people.

14. I would be unsure what to do or say if I met someone who is openly lesbian, gay, or bisexual.

15. Hearing about a hate crime against an LGB person would not bother me.

16. I am knowledgeable about the significance of the Stonewall Riot to the Gay Liberation Movement.

17. I think marriage should be legal for same-sex couples.

18. I keep my religious views to myself in order to accept LGB people.

19. I conceal my negative views toward LGB people when I am with someone who doesn't share my views.

20. I sometimes think about being violent toward LGB people.

21. Feeling attracted to another person of the same sex would not make me uncomfortable.

22. I am familiar with the work of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.
23. I would display a symbol of gay pride (pink triangle, rainbow, etc.) to show my support of the LGB community.

24. It is important to teach children positive attitudes toward LGB people.

25. I conceal my positive attitudes toward LGB people when I am with someone who is homophobic.

26. I would feel self-conscious greeting a known LGB person in a public place.

27. I have had sexual fantasies about members of my same sex.

28. I am knowledgeable about the history and mission of the PFLAG organization.

29. I would attend a demonstration to promote LGB civil rights.

30. It is wrong for courts to make child custody decisions based on a parent's sexual orientation.

31. Hospitals should acknowledge same-sex partners equally to any other next of kin.

32. Health benefits should be available equally to same-sex partners as to any other couple.

Demographic Information

33. Year of birth: [open response]

34. Sex/Gender Identity: select one [male, female, intersex, transgender, transsexual, other]

35. Race/ethnicity: select all that apply [Black/African/Caribbean/African American, Latina/Latino/Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, Middle Eastern, Native American/American Indian, Alaskan Native/Hawaiian Native, White/Caucasian/European American]

36. Are you a U.S. citizen or permanent resident? select one [yes, no]

37. Sexual orientation: select one [heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual, other]
38. Grade classification: select one [freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, other]

39. During how many semesters (prior to the current semester) have you been enrolled as a student at Iowa State? select one [values 1-20, more than 20]

40. In what size community have you spent the majority of your life? select one [urban (50,000+), suburban (5,000-49,999), small town (1,000-4,999), rural (less than 1,000)]

41. Within which religious/spiritual background(s) did you grow up? select all that apply [Baha'i, Buddhism, Christian—Evangelical, Christian—mainstream Protestant, Christian—Catholic, Christian—Other, Hindu, Judaism, Muslim, Sikh, Unitarian Universalism, Wiccan, no affiliation, other]

42. With which religious/spiritual background(s) do you currently identify? select all that apply [Baha'i, Buddhism, Christian—Evangelical, Christian—mainstream Protestant, Christian—Catholic, Christian—Other, Hindu, Judaism, Muslim, Sikh, Unitarian Universalism, Wiccan, no affiliation, other]

43. How important is religion in your life today? [5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = not important in my life to 5 = very important in my life with an sixth option for unsure/chose not to respond]
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