

**Examining Minority Groups' Perspectives:
Upward Contempt and Stereotypes about Dominant Outgroups**

by

Jessica L. Matsick

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Psychology and Women's Studies)
in the University of Michigan
2016

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Terri Conley, Chair
Professor Lilia Cortina
Professor Denise Sekaquaptewa
Assistant Professor Robert Wyrod, University of Colorado

© Jessica L. Matsick 2016

DEDICATION

I dedicate this research to my participants for their willingness to share their attitudes and experiences.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I knew I wanted to work with Terri Conley since I was a sophomore in college and, nearly a decade later, I am still her biggest fan. Terri has taught me to have confidence in asking the tough questions and to treat obstacles as challenges. I appreciate Terri's mentorship and friendship, and I am grateful to have Terri as my mentor for years to come. Thank you to the other members of my dissertation committee: Lilia Cortina, Denise Sekaquaptewa, and Robert Wyrod. Each committee member has guided my growth as a researcher. Lilia is an incredibly supportive mentor— she is a great person to have in one's corner and I am thankful to feel that she is in mine. Denise is a fantastic research advisor— she has taught me to think about my work in terms of advancing theory and contributing to broader areas of social psychological research. Robert and his Feminist Research Methods course have impacted how I think about the research process and my ability to transcend disciplinary boundaries. I am truly grateful to have encountered these people so early in my career. Thank you to my graduate colleagues who were part of the brainstorming process involved with this project (Amy, Ali, Jen, Dawn, and Brandon). I also wish to acknowledge the hard work of my research assistants. Jane Spann, Mary Kruk, Rachel Cultice, Abby Dolan, Kiri Alvarado, Morgan Perry, and Erica Meehan assisted with the design, recruitment and compensation, and organization involved with these data. They are resourceful, efficient, and ambitious student researchers. I cannot thank them enough for caring about the work as much as I do. Finally, thank you to Brit Wardecker for encouraging me to work as hard as you do.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	vi
ABSTRACT.....	viii
CHAPTER 1: General Introduction.....	1
CHAPTER 2: (Study 1) A Measure of Upward Contempt.....	10
Methods.....	19
Results.....	25
Discussion.....	31
CHAPTER 3: (Study 2) Stereotypes about Heterosexuals and LGBTQ People’s Well-Being.....	37
Methods.....	39
Results.....	44
Discussion.....	46
CHAPTER 4: (Study 3) Heterosexual Stereotypes Affect LGBTQ People’s Well-being.....	50
Methods.....	50
Results.....	54
Discussion.....	58
CHAPTER 5: General Discussion.....	62
FOOTNOTES.....	76
APPENDICES.....	83
REFERENCES.....	92

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

1.1. Exploratory Factor Analysis Loading Matrix (three-factor solution; $N = 371$).	77
1.2. Exploratory Factor Analysis Loading Matrix (two-factor solution; $N = 371$).	78
1.3. Intercorrelations Among Upward Contempt and Validity Measures ($N = 371$).	79
2.1. Means (Standard Deviations) by Video Condition ($N = 146$).	80
3.1. Means (Standard Deviations) by Video Condition ($N = 221$).	81
3.2. Correlations Among Upward Contempt and Primary Variables.	82
B.1. Stereotype Content: Heterosexual Video Condition.	86
B.2. Stereotype Content: LGBTQ Video Condition.	87

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Study 1 Measures.	83
Appendix B: Study 2 and 3 Video Materials.	85
Appendix C: Study 2 Measures.	88
Appendix D: Study 3 Measures.	89

ABSTRACT

Social psychological research on the relations between heterosexual people and sexual minorities generally falls within two bodies of literature: 1) research conducted to elucidate heterosexual people's biases and 2) research used to identify predictors of coping and stress among sexual minorities. In contrast, relatively fewer efforts in social psychology seek to understand how minority groups perceive dominant groups. In this dissertation, I address intergroup dynamics from the standpoint of sexual minorities (LGBQ people; lesbian, gay, bisexual and queer) in a scale development study and two experimental studies. In Study 1, I evaluate the psychometric properties of a newly created measure of a construct that has not yet been empirically tested: upward contempt (i.e., a low status group's contempt for and disapproval of a higher status group). Specifically, I examine LGBQ people's upward contempt for heterosexual people. Consistent with my predictions, to the extent that LGBQ participants acknowledge status discrepancies between heterosexual and LGBQ people, they feel upward contempt for heterosexual people. The *Upward Contempt Scale* (16 items; e.g., "Heterosexual people aren't as great as they think they are") can be used as a stand-alone tool or in conjunction with other instruments to investigate minority groups' perceptions of dominant groups. In Studies 2 and 3, I build upon Matsick and Conley (2016a) to examine the function of minority groups' stereotypes about dominant groups. In particular, I test how stereotypes about a dominant outgroup (i.e., heterosexual people) influence sexual minorities' psychological well-being. I find that LGBQ participants who are exposed to stereotypes about heterosexuals feel more positive psychological outcomes related to their identities (e.g., feeling affirmed, proud,

and happy with being LGBTQ) than those not exposed to heterosexual stereotypes. This pattern of results suggests that LGBTQ people's views of heterosexual people affect LGBTQ health and well-being— a predictor of minority stress that remains untested in previous research. Drawing on feminist methodological frameworks (i.e., feminist standpoint theory), I elucidate nuances of studying minority groups' perspectives within social psychological theories and I identify features of minority groups' perspectives that can inform members of dominant groups about strategies to improve intergroup relations.

Keywords: LGBTQ, heterosexual, upward contempt, stereotypes, intergroup relations

CHAPTER 1: General Introduction

A voluminous collection of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination research positions stigmatized group members as “objects” of analysis and majority group members as “subjects” (Amir, 1969, as explained in Shelton, 2000). Beginning with Allport (1954), intergroup relations research has overwhelmingly favored the study of dominant groups’ thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors about and toward people with marginalized identities (e.g., stereotypes about Black Americans, attitudes toward gay and lesbian people). In particular, for nearly three decades, relatively few studies have examined sexual minorities’ perceptions (i.e., thoughts and attitudes) of heterosexual people compared to the large body of work focused on heterosexual people’s perceptions of lesbian women and gay men (cf. Conley, Calhoun, Evett, & Devine, 2001; Conley, Devine, Rabow, & Evett, 2003; Matsick & Conley, 2016a; Vaughn & Teeters, 2015; White & Franzini, 1999). For example, a substantial body of research tests heterosexual people’s thoughts and beliefs about sexual minorities (e.g., Kite & Deaux, 1987) and heterosexual people’s prejudice and discriminatory behaviors toward lesbian women and gay men (e.g., Bailey, Wallace, & Wright, 2013; Haddock, Zanna, & Esses, 1993; Herek, 1989, 2000; Kite & Whitley, 1996; Massey, 2010; Morrison & Morrison, 2002). Much of this work aims to understand predictors of prejudice that reproduce status discrepancies. These areas of inquiry clearly yield important implications for identifying and reducing prejudice between groups; however, given that intergroup relations are a two-way process, the omission of minority groups’ perspectives leaves an incomplete picture of intergroup perceptions.

Feminist methodologists and social-personality psychologists have called on researchers to attend to minority groups' perspectives that are commonly "left out" of research (Fine & Gordon, 1992; Fonow & Cook, 1991; Reinharz, 1992; Stewart, 1998; Stewart & McDermott, 2004). This approach to psychological and sociological research echoes scholarship in feminist critical theory who promote the feminist standpoint as a better means of doing science. At the core of feminist standpoint theory (i.e., a feminist approach to research that allows researchers to account for power and politics in their science) is the belief that knowledge is socially situated and that the limits of knowledge depend on its sources and context (Haraway, 1988; Harding, 1986, 2004). That is, despite science's claims of objectivity, the social locations of both subject and researcher influence the possibilities of knowledge (Collins, 1986).

Scholars of feminist epistemology and philosophy of science argue that dominant frameworks and research practices underserve minority communities by deeming their perspectives as inferior or deviant, by reproducing the dominant standpoint as normative or standard, and by producing knowledge that does not empower minorities or reflect minorities' worldviews and experiences (see Harding, 1986, 2004). Thus, the inclusion of minority groups in science not only diversifies samples and strengthens the validity of theory; but also, their inclusion repositions the angles through which knowledge is acquired. When minority groups' perspectives are incorporated into research, a different picture of the context emerges than what can be gathered from the dominant standpoint. In particular, as feminist standpoint theorists suggest, minority groups are better equipped to identify patterns of behavior that otherwise go undetected by those who are not marginalized (e.g., Haraway, 1988; Hartsock, 1983). Thus, a minority-focused approach to research should hold remarkable value to those who study intergroup relations.

Accordingly, there are characteristics about intergroup dynamics that cannot be uncovered by examining the perspectives of dominant groups; thus, if one seeks to understand the current status between groups, both sides must serve as sources (not only as targets). Social psychologists have similarly encouraged researchers to treat minorities as active agents in the intergroup process. Researchers should consider how minorities' attitudes and behaviors influence intergroup dynamics and their own well-being; specifically, stigma and prejudice researchers argue that minority groups are not merely passive recipients of stigma, but are a functioning part of the intergroup process (Conley, Rabinowitz, & Matsick, 2015; Contrada et al., 2000; Matsick & Conley, 2016a, 2016b; Monteith & Spicer, 2000; Oyserman & Swim, 2001; Shelton, 2000; Shelton, Alegre, & Son, 2010). For example, as Shelton (2000) explains, "In the typical experiment on prejudice, Whites are treated as participants who can provide researchers with information, whereas Blacks are treated as a relatively homogenous and amorphous group in the form of photographs or experimental confederates" (p. 374). Ultimately, Shelton (2000) and other stigma and prejudice researchers propose that there is bias within the study of intergroup biases and that researchers should consider minority groups as "functioning individuals who can influence intergroup dynamics" if they aim to explore the full picture and complexity of intergroup relations (Shelton, 2000; p. 375).

In the current research, I prioritize minority standpoint in the study of intergroup relations. Specifically, I examine lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer, and transgender (LGBTQ) individuals' perceptions of heterosexual people and how perceptions of heterosexual people relate to LGBTQ people's psychological health and well-being. Within each chapter, I review previous research that guides my aims and hypotheses for each study; here, I draw on stigma and prejudice research to address empirical approaches to studying LGBTQ and heterosexual group

dynamics.

Intergroup Dynamics Among LGBQ and Heterosexual People

Although researchers have examined the thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors of heterosexual people toward LGBQ people, less attention is given to the ways in which LGBQ individuals perceive heterosexual people (cf. Conley et al., 2001; Conley et al., 2003; Matsick & Conley, 2016a; Vaughn & Teeters, 2015; White & Franzini, 1999). As previously discussed, a large body of research documents stereotypes that heterosexuals hold about lesbian women and gay men (e.g., Herek, 1991), heterosexual people's anti-gay attitudes (e.g., Herek, 2009), and discriminatory behaviors toward LGBQ people (e.g., Bailey et al., 2013). For example, through these studies we have learned that college students perceive gay and lesbian professors as having stronger political agendas, greater biases, and less competence than heterosexual professors (Anderson & Kanner, 2011), and that heterosexual people's attitudes toward lesbian women and gay men differ as a function of gender, religious ideologies, and previous experiences with sexual minorities (Herek, 1988). These well-established areas of research pursue a critical line of inquiry to test the ways in which people with social and political power (i.e., heterosexual individuals) perceive and interact with those who have relatively less power. Moreover, this body of research evaluates strategies for reducing people's endorsement of anti-gay stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination.

A second area of research in LGBQ psychology departs from the traditional model of prejudice research by using LGBQ individuals as *participants* in research (rather than as *targets* of person-perception paradigms). Researchers working within this framework aim to uncover the ways in which anti-gay stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination affect sexual minorities; specifically, these researchers are interested in how LGBQ respond to prejudice and how they

cope with stigma. Much of this work is explained by social stress theory.

Social stress theory posits that social contexts (e.g., prejudice, stigma, experiences with other groups) generate stress that adversely affects health outcomes among those with socially stigmatized identities (Crocker, Major, & Steele, 1998). As an extension of social stress theory, researchers define LGBTQ people's identity-related stress as "minority stress," or the chronic stress experienced by LGBTQ people that results from managing a stigmatized identity. Minority stress develops through a variety of experiences common among LGBTQ people: disclosing or "coming out" to others, internalizing negative messages about same-sex sexuality, encountering social rejection, and enduring anti-gay prejudice and discrimination (Meyer, 2003, 2007). Further, the fact that LGBTQ people experience greater stressors than their heterosexual counterparts can help to explain a host of mental and physical health disparities between LGBTQ and heterosexual individuals. For example, in a large sample of LGB- and heterosexual-identified participants, Meyer, Schwartz, and Frost (2008) found that sexual minorities experienced greater acute stressors and prejudice-related stressors than their heterosexual peers. Moreover, in an examination of stress and physical health outcomes, Frost, Lehavot, and Meyer (2015) found that LGB-identified people who experienced a *prejudice-specific* stressor within the past year were more likely to report a physical health issue at a follow-up one year later compared to those who did not experience a prejudice-specific stressor. Drawing on these findings, researchers conclude that stressors related to prejudice, as opposed to general life stressors, uniquely impact mental and physical health outcomes among those with LGBTQ identities (Frost et al., 2015).

Another shared feature of social stress theory and the minority stress model is a focus on factors that disrupt the relationship between stress and health outcomes. Stigma researchers

share a long-standing goal of detecting moderators that buffer the negative psychological effects of stigmatization (e.g., affirming the group or instilling a sense of group belonging can alleviate stigma-related stress; Crocker & Major, 1989; Dovidio, Major, & Crocker, 2000; Major, Mendes, & Dovidio, 2013; Major & O'Brien, 2005; C. T. Miller & Major, 2000; Walton & Cohen, 2011). Similarly, the minority stress model tests the roles of social support, coping strategies, and community affiliation as buffers to stress (see Meyer, 2003 for further discussion). Thus, not only do theories of social stress and minority stress test associations between stigma, stress, and health; but also, both theories identify strategies to preserve psychological well-being among members of stigmatized groups even when they are faced with prejudice.

To review, within research on LGBQ and heterosexual relations, there are two main camps: 1) researchers who elucidate heterosexual people's intergroup biases and 2) researchers who examine predictors of LGBQ people's health via theories of social stress. In both areas, researchers seek to improve the lives of LGBQ people and offer well-established frameworks for explaining LGBQ people's psychological adjustment. However, to my knowledge, neither body of research accounts for LGBQ people's perceptions of other groups. That is, very little research addresses LGBQ people's perceptions of heterosexuals in the stereotyping and prejudice literature, and LGBQ people's perceptions of heterosexuals are noticeably absent from the minority stress literature (with the exception of the minority stress model's evaluation of internalized homophobia which, to some extent, addresses sexual minorities' perceptions of heterosexuality through one's internalized prejudice toward same-sex sexuality). Although it is premature to claim how and why perceptions of heterosexuals are a meaningful feature of LGBQ people's lives, it is worth testing the potential role that perceptions of heterosexuals may play in the psychology of LGBQ people. Accordingly, researchers may have to reach across their

subdisciplinary boundaries to create the scaffolding required to explain minority groups' perceptions of dominant groups. Take, for example, Cox, Abramson, Devine, and Hollon (2012) who propose a model of "deprejudice"— a term used to convey the comorbidity of prejudice and depression among targets of prejudice. At the most basic level, a deprejudice framework integrates the work of social psychologists fighting prejudice with that of clinical psychologists fighting depression. In particular, Cox et al. (2012) encourage researchers to move beyond their subdisciplinary homes to provide a more complex and comprehensive account of prejudice and psychological health. Similarly, I argue that research questions once thought to be housed in intergroup relations research should merge with those related to minority stress. An examination of minority groups' perceptions of dominant outgroups provides researchers with the opportunity to uncover another predictor of minorities' psychological health (an important concern among minority stress researchers) and to better understanding intergroup processes (a driving force behind research on intergroup biases).

Given that members of minority groups are not merely passive recipients of stigma (as suggested by Contrada et al., 2000; Oyserman & Swim, 2001; Shelton, 2000; Shelton et al., 2010; Shelton & Richeson, 2006a, 2006b), we can expect that minorities have had ample opportunities to observe dominant groups' behaviors to formulate their own stereotypes about and attitudes toward members of dominant groups. For example, Matsick and Conley (2016a) examined cultural stereotypes and personal beliefs about heterosexual people held among LGBTQ people and found that LGBTQ people reported highly gendered and negative perceptions of heterosexual target groups (e.g., participants stereotyped heterosexual women as being overly vain and inauthentically flirtatious with other women). Moreover, Conley et al. (2001) assessed how sexual minorities' interpret heterosexual people's actions to investigate mistakes that

heterosexual people make when trying to appear non-prejudiced. The results of Matsick and Conley (2016a) and Conley et al. (2001) suggest that dominant group members' *intentions* in intergroup interactions can greatly differ from the *impact* of their behaviors on sexual minorities. That is, even well-meaning heterosexual people may unknowingly offend sexual minorities and, if dominant groups gain better insight into how minorities perceive them, they can better avoid acting in ignorance. For example, a heterosexual man may offer to connect his lesbian co-worker with another lesbian woman who he knows in hopes of setting them up to date. Although his intentions in playing match-maker may seem harmless, his behavior can be interpreted by his lesbian colleague as stereotypically lumping all gay people together (i.e., assumptions of outgroup homogeneity; Brewer, Dull, & Lui, 1981) or implying that all gay women are attracted to one another (i.e., heterosexual men's eroticization of lesbianism; Whitley, Wiederman, & Wryobeck, 1999). Similarly, a heterosexual woman might enthusiastically ask a gay man to take her to a gay bar. Although the woman's intentions may appear to be a sign of allyship and her comfort with being around gay men and lesbians, the gay man may interpret this act as appropriating his lifestyle and access to safe public spaces into a heterosexual woman's adventure.

Such examples illustrate how LGBTQ people can identify ways in which heterosexual people hamper rather than enhance intergroup interactions. Heterosexual people are likely unaware of how the LGBTQ people in their lives perceive them; yet, this knowledge could help to improve relations between these groups, especially among heterosexual people who are motivated to reduce their prejudice. Knowing how LGBTQ people perceive heterosexuals can also strengthen our understanding of how LGBTQ people's perceptions of others relate to their own health: is there a link between psychological well-being and the ways in which LGBTQ

people perceive heterosexuals? As I will discuss more thoroughly in Study 2, previous research on intergroup behavior suggests that intergroup perceptions relate to various aspects of psychological health for ingroup members (e.g., self-esteem, feelings of pride, ingroup solidarity); thus, it is reasonable to expect that perceptions of heterosexual people are associated with LGBTQ well-being.

The Current Research

In a series of studies, I examine intergroup perceptions from the minority standpoint (i.e., from the perspective of LGBTQ people). In Study 1, I evaluate the psychometric properties of a newly created measure of a construct that has not yet been empirically tested: upward contempt. Upward contempt, defined as minority groups' contempt for and disapproval of dominant groups, is an unexplored dimension of intergroup perceptions that provides insight into how minority groups' perceive dominant groups. In Study 1, I evaluate sexual minorities' feelings of upward contempt for heterosexual people. In Studies 2 and 3, I extend the results of Matsick and Conley (2016a) to examine the function of minority groups' stereotypes about dominant groups. In particular, I test how stereotypes about a dominant outgroup (i.e., heterosexual people) can influence sexual minorities' psychological well-being. Within each study, I discuss future research directions and implications for understanding the psychological health of sexual minorities.

CHAPTER 2: (Study 1) A Measure of Upward Contempt

Group-based emotions are emotions that influence intergroup attitudes and depend on how individuals categorize themselves and others into groups (Esses, Haddock, & Zanna, 1993; Goldenberg, Halperin, van Zomeren, & Gross, 2016; Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002; Iyer & Leach, 2008; Smith, 1993). Contempt is one group-based emotion of particular relevance to the study of intergroup biases. Feelings of contempt convey people's moral disapproval and perceived superiority over others (Izard, 1977); thus, contempt offers great insight into the relationship between groups that differ in societal status by marking some groups as superior and others as inferior. Because contempt involves ranking individuals and groups on dimensions of superiority, contempt has political and social significance in understanding the socially constructed positions of various groups. In this study, I critically examine contempt as a group-based emotion and introduce the concept of "upward contempt" to psychology as another way to frame minority groups' feelings about dominant groups.

Contempt as an Intergroup and Prejudicial Emotion

Basic definitions of *contempt* include feelings of scorn, derision, disrespect, disapproval of, and loathing toward an individual target or group of people. Though contempt appears to encompass a host of features related other emotions, some scholars define contempt as a unique emotional response and distinguish it from other commonly-held emotions, such as disgust, hate, and pity (Ekman, 2003; Gottman & Levenson, 1999; Izard, 1977; Solomon, 1993). At the most basic level, when a person feels contempt for an individual or group, s/he evaluates the target as

being inferior and beneath a set of societal standards. In contrast, disgust and hatred toward an individual/group suggest that the target is indeed displeasing and worthy of aversion, but not necessarily inferior (Ben-Ze'ev, 2001). Although pity accounts for the perceived inferiority that is absent from feelings of disgust and hate, pity is short-lived and associated with feelings of compassion, whereas contempt is relatively more long-term and operates without compassion (W. I. Miller, personal communication, June 19, 2014; Solomon, 1993). Moreover, because issues of equality and perceived inferiority fuel feelings of contempt, contempt can be relatively stable if status discrepancies and inferiority are maintained (Izard, 1977; W. I. Miller, 1995, 1997; Solomon, 1993).

Feelings of contempt often satisfy a person's desire to make oneself appear more superior, powerful, and noble in comparison to the target, suggesting that the target in question is morally offensive and inferior to the perceiver (Solomon, 1993). In order to feel contempt for a target, a person must have a strong sense of how the target fails to meet societal standards and expectations. Relatedly, the notion that "familiarity breeds contempt" stems from the idea that a target's flaws become more recognizable and salient to others over time (Ben-Ze'ev, 2001). Thus, it may be difficult to hold contempt for a novel stimulus, but easier to feel contempt toward a target whose attributes are effortlessly recalled. Given that minority groups are more familiar with the characteristics and behaviors of the dominant group than vice versa (Fiske, 1993), it seems likely that minorities have acquired sufficient familiarity with dominant group members to feel contempt for them. Importantly, contempt does not deem a target as globally inferior; instead, contempt occurs in reference to specific characteristics of a target that are perceived as inferior (Ben-Ze'ev, 2001; W. I. Miller, 1995, 1997). For example, a person can hold contempt for a target based on physical appearance, but s/he can recognize that the target

may be adequate, or even superior, in ways that are not related to appearance (e.g., the target can be intellectually superior despite being physically inferior to the perceiver). Thus, a person can hold contempt for a target along some specific dimensions of character but not along others.

Social psychologists typically discuss contempt in terms of *downward* social comparisons (i.e., the contempt people feel toward individuals or groups who are "beneath" them; Caprariello, Cuddy, & Fiske, 2009; Fiske, 2010, 2011). Specifically, prejudice researchers find that people's feelings of contempt for an outgroup largely depend on the ways in which they perceive the outgroup in terms of status and competition (e.g., Caprariello et al., 2009; Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2008; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002). To the extent that people perceive a low-status outgroup as competitive, they feel contempt for the outgroup (compared to feeling pity for a low status/uncompetitive outgroup, envy for a high status/competitive outgroup, and admiration for a high status/uncompetitive outgroup). Furthermore, groups that are stereotyped as incompetent and cold (e.g., homeless people, welfare recipients) can elicit feelings of contempt from others (Fiske et al., 2002). The groups at the receiving end of *contemptuous prejudice* (i.e., negative attitudes associated with contempt) are often deemed as being immoral, violating societal standards, and hindering the ingroup's goals and plans (Cuddy et al., 2008; Rozin, Lowery, Imada, & Haidt, 1999). Overall, high status groups elicit envy and admiration, whereas low status groups elicit pity and contempt.

However, our knowledge of how emotions operate at the group-level mostly develops from samples of dominant group members (i.e., white, heterosexual, middle-class, and educated) in terms of how they feel about outgroups (e.g., non-whites, non-heterosexuals, people of lower socioeconomic status). Given that a primary ingredient of contempt is people's perceptions of a target as inferior, can people feel contempt toward those above them in social ranking?

Upward Contempt: Minorities' Feelings of Contempt

Scholars in political theory and philosophy argue that contempt occurs in an upward direction; that is, contempt can be held for higher status targets. *Upward contempt* describes the contempt that members of low status groups feel for people who are of higher social status (e.g., the contempt that teenagers have for adults, blue-collared workers for white-collared employees, ethnic minorities for whites; W. I. Miller, 1995, 1997). As suggested by Pelzer (2005), upward contempt likely emerges from the ample opportunities that low status people have had to closely observe the lifestyles and characteristics of high status people.

Miller (1995, 1997) argues that upward contempt occurs when someone of low status perceives a high status target as inferior. Specifically, upward contempt occurs when a low status person believes that the higher status target is below the level of which the higher status target claims itself to be. Put simply, upward contempt characterizes a person's beliefs that the high status target is simply not as great as it believes it is and is, in some ways, inferior to the low status perceiver. Therefore, upward contempt allows a person of lower status to claim superiority to the higher status group, at least along one attribute. To exemplify this tenet of upward contempt, Miller (1997) uses the example of "moral menials." Lawyers and politicians are generally perceived as high status group members; they have achieved financial success and likely hold powerful positions in society. However, people may feel that lawyers and politicians are morally bankrupt and are indeed inferior to others when it comes to morality and nobility. Thus, while recognizing that lawyers and politicians hold great status in society, other people may claim superiority over these individuals on some dimensions of character.

In addition to allowing a person of lower status to perceive superiority over a high status target, upward contempt occurs when a low status person perceives high status people's values

and social institutions as “silly” or “a cause for general mirth” (W. I. Miller, 1997; p. 222). As a result, the attributes and values in which high status people may be superior are perceived to be inessential and deserving of ridicule. For example, an atheist (a low status person in the United States) may find the strong religious convictions and institutions of those with higher status as unnecessary for living a full life. Further, an atheist might find religious people’s unquestioning loyalty to pious institutions and texts as ridiculous and nonsensical. Thus, by evaluating the characteristics and values of high status people, a low status person is able to claim superiority and discredit the significance of high status people’s qualities that they use to defend their dominance over others. This tendency to devalue dimensions on which one’s own group fares poorly is consistent with previous research that examines how members of disadvantaged groups protect their psychological sense of self (Crocker & Major, 1989).

Miller (1997) suggests that upward contempt emerges in response to being a common target of downward contempt. Accordingly, upward contempt can be considered as a form of rebellion, or a way to cope with habitual humiliation and defeat as a low status person. Because low status individuals assert superiority through feelings of upward contempt, it may be an enjoyable emotion to experience. Nevertheless, upward contempt does not distort one’s perceptions of the status discrepancies in society. That is, a low status person holding upward contempt understands that s/he is still of low status and beneath those who are targets of upward contempt. Further, high status people are likely unaware that people beneath them hold this form of contempt and nuanced sense of superiority. High status people may even feel that they are globally admired, respected, and envied by low status group members (W. I. Miller, 1997; Pelzer, 2005); thus, upward contempt is truly a low status, or minority, issue— it is established, recognized, and held among members of minority groups.

Despite upward contempt's implications for understanding low status groups' thoughts, feelings, and behaviors in relation to high status groups, the concept of upward contempt is practically non-existent in psychology (cf. research on contempt in organizations in Pelzer, 2005). Within the large body of psychological research on the dynamics between low status and high status groups, the lack of attention given to upward contempt is unfortunate because this prejudicial emotion may help to explain how members of minority groups perceive members of dominant groups. Because there is a dearth of research on upward contempt, I turn to how scholars have observed instances of upward contempt in popular culture and among LGBTQ participants in qualitative studies.

Preliminary Evidence: Cultural and Empirical Observations of Upward Contempt

In order to express contempt for people of high status, members of minority groups require safe and sequestered spaces to critique dominant groups. If openly and earnestly conveyed, feelings of upward contempt or disapproval of the dominant group could endanger members of minority groups for challenging a dominant group's status; thus, shared critiques among insubordinates often occur in hidden circles or are masked in humor or performance (Scott, 1990). Importantly, it may be easier (and safer) for low status groups to play openly with power dynamics in relatively benign arenas of power than threatening the deservingness of high status groups to more consequential forms of power (e.g., economic and political power). For example, Hart (2004) explains the inversion of power dynamics between LGBTQ and heterosexual people through the former hit reality television series *Queer Eye for the Straight Guy*. The show features a team of five gay men whose purpose is to reform a heterosexual guy into a culturally sensitive, stylish, nurturing, and well-mannered man. In each episode, a team of gay men transform a new "project"—a heterosexual man in need of a make-over from his gay

counterparts. The show depicts gay men's attributes and skills as superior to those of heterosexual men and the team is known for ridiculing their heterosexual projects for failing to possess the refined qualities of gay men. Ultimately, the series exemplifies that it is "just as easy for gay men to make fun of heterosexuals as it has been for heterosexuals to make fun, for decades on television, of gay men" (Hart, 2004; p. 247). As previously discussed, upward contempt involves the perceived superiority of low status groups to high status groups; thus, the inversion of power dynamics, even in trivial domains, demonstrate minority groups' potential to reclaim superiority.

As another source of evidence for upward contempt, Matsick and Conley (2016a) found that LGBQ people perceive heterosexual people as leading boring lives, having mediocre sexual experiences, adhering to more rigid gender roles, and being more closed-minded and judgmental than LGBQ people. Describing stereotypes about heterosexual women, one lesbian participant commented: "I'll never get how straight girls can have sex with guys and even live with them! It's kind of sad but funny because they really don't know what they're missing b/c [sic] men don't know women's bodies like other women do." This participant's response suggests that better sexual and relational experiences are afforded to women who have relationships with other women. Similarly, some participants reported that LGBQ people are intellectually and morally superior to heterosexuals (e.g., open-minded). For example, one participant suggested that gay and lesbian people are more socially conscientious than heterosexual people:

Being queer, I'm afraid of dealing with hate every day from straights [...] I wish there was a way to get straights to understand what this is like. Or even, how it would feel to have the tables turned, to having being "straight" as the minority, and being "gay" as the norm. They have a lot of good things going for them but they'd never think of any of this on their own until they could walk in our shoes. That's why it is easier to be around gay people who like talking about these things and are more sensitive about how their actions and words effect [sic] other people...

In addition to commenting on the perceived ways in which heterosexual people fall short when compared to LGBTQ people, participants also reported that heterosexual people are unaware of privileges they gain based on their sexual orientation. Moreover, participants suggested that heterosexuals flaunt their access to dominant culture and mainstream institutions (in this case, marriage). As a gay male participant explained:

Most of the time, I think I feel annoyed by heteros. If I had a nickel for every time I heard a straight girl talk about her HUSBAND or HUBBY, I'd be rich! It's like they are incapable of talking about anything else and will always find a way to bring up their husband. We get it. You're married. You have no idea that I've been in a relationship for 16 years and still cannot call my partner my 'husband.' It hurts... I guess it's just easier for me to think she's an idiot than dwell on it. Ha!¹

Not only does this participant's response address heterosexual privilege; but also, the participant clearly takes issue with heterosexual people who do not recognize sexual privilege and existing inequality. Specifically, the participant explains that it is "just easier" to focus on a heterosexual woman's ignorance regarding her privilege than dwell on issues of injustice. This type of response suggests that feelings of upward contempt, or derogating members of the dominant group, may have some protective psychological qualities for minorities especially when minorities feel threatened or hurt by the dominant group or status quo. Relatedly, one participant expressed her frustration with dominant groups being in a superior position to "accept" her:

We still hear comments from otherwise smart (heterosexual) people that go something like this: I accept them/you. Accept? I want to wipe my brow and say: Thank you very much!! And, I accept your alcoholism, philandering, gambling, and unwavering loyalty to the Catholic Church and masses on Sundays.

This participant's response supports Miller's (1995) argument that upward contempt is connected to institutions and values (e.g., the Catholic Church) that some may perceive as frivolous and; moreover, minority group members call the admirable status of heterosexual

people into question. Importantly, those who feel upward contempt continue to acknowledge the allocated social locations and difference in status between the perceiver (minority group) and target (dominant group)— that is, despite the negative aspects of heterosexuality that participants identify, participants recognize that heterosexuals are high status and minority groups are low status. Ultimately, participants echoed Miller’s assertion that though upward contempt may build group cohesion among members of low status groups by derogating the high status group, “the truth is that they would switch places with the dominant group in a heartbeat” (W. I. Miller, personal communication, June 19, 2014).

Taken together, cultural examples and qualitative data support the idea that contempt is held by sexual minorities toward heterosexual people. Other prejudicial emotions that occur in an upward direction (e.g., jealousy, envy, anger, and hatred) may be used to describe LGBTQ people’s emotions; however, I argue that “upward contempt” is a more fitting label for LGBTQ people’s attitudes and affect toward heterosexual people. In the current research, I test how upward contempt relates to other emotions that are typically used to describe feelings toward heterosexual people and I develop a new tool for measuring minority groups’ attitudes toward dominant groups.

The Current Research

In Study 1, I evaluate the psychometric properties of a newly created measure of a construct that has not yet been empirically tested: upward contempt. Upward contempt, defined as minority groups’ contempt for or disapproval of dominant groups, is an unexplored dimension of intergroup perceptions. Although there is no shortage of psychological measures to assess intergroup processes, as Clark and Watson (1995) state, “human psychology is sufficiently complex that there is no limit to the number of psychological constructs that can be

operationalized as scales” (p. 310). Accordingly, although upward contempt may have similarities to extant psychological measures, this new instrument will provide additional insight into the complexity of minority groups’ perspectives. Further, the new scale emphasizes the standpoint of minorities— by creating new measures to assess minority groups’ processes, researchers can avoid overgeneralizing measures developed from dominant group perspectives by applying them to minority groups. The upward contempt measure can be considered as one of many factors that characterize minority groups’ perceptions of dominant groups.

The purpose of Study 1 is to develop a psychological tool to evaluate upward contempt. Scale development is achieved through a standard set of practices. The American Psychological Association, as summarized by Hinkin (1998), recommends that new measures demonstrate content validity, criterion-related validity, and internal consistency. To satisfy these criteria, I generated a set of items that cover the definition of upward contempt, collected data from a large sample of LGBTQ-identified participants, refined the survey items and factor structures, established correlations with theoretically similar and different measures, and tested how upward contempt varies as a function of participants’ demographics (e.g., age, gender). Overall, this study offers a nuanced way of understanding minority groups’ perceptions and yields new empirical territory in intergroup perceptions and LGBTQ people’s experiences.

Methods

Participants

I recruited online, LGBTQ-identified participants in various cities across the U.S. Prior to analysis, participants were removed from the dataset if they did not meet the survey inclusion criterion (i.e., identifying as non-heterosexual). Twenty-eight participants who identified as heterosexual were removed and three participants were removed because they had

indicated at the end of the survey that they had not provided honest and serious responses when completing the survey.

Recommended sample sizes for scale development vary based on the nature of the study's design. The most common recommendation is to include 200-300 participants if interitem correlations are moderate (Comrey, 1988; Guadagnoli & Velicer, 1988; Hinkin, 1998); however, Clark and Watson (1995) and Tabachnick and Fidell (2012) suggest that at least 300 observations should be included in any factor examination. Another technique to estimate sample adequacy is to rely on an item-to-respondent ratio. Suggested item-to-respondent ratios range from as liberal as 1:4 to as conservative as 1:10 (Rummel, 1970; Schwab, 1980). In the current survey, 28 items were included to develop the new measure; thus, the conservative estimate would recommend that at least 280 participants be surveyed. The final sample size exceeds this recommendation.

Participants were recruited by online advertisements describing a 10-minute study posted on classified advertisement pages (e.g., craigslist.com) and LGBTQ-oriented listservs (e.g., Facebook.com groups). This online method of recruitment has its advantages, one of which is providing access to large samples of LGBTQ-identified individuals (as used in Conley, Rubin, Matsick, Ziegler, & Moors, 2014; Matsick & Conley, 2016a). Further, online sampling techniques provide a greater range of outness among those with LGBTQ identities, age, and regional diversity than found in laboratory-based studies (Frankel & Siang, 1999; Riggle, Rostosky, & Reedy, 2005; Rosser, Oakes, Bockting, & Miner, 2007). The online advertisement included the following information:

We are researchers at the University of Michigan and are interested in the emotions and experiences of LGBTQ-identified individuals. This survey is voluntary and takes most

people 10-15 minutes to complete. If you choose to participate in the survey, you will have the option of providing your name and email address to be entered into a raffle to win a \$25 Amazon.com gift card. If you are at least 18 years old and identify as LGBTQ, please click here to participate: (survey link).

Following conservative sampling size recommendations, 371 LGBTQ-identified participants were included in the sample. Forty-nine percent of the sample was female, 37% male, 9% transgender, and 6% preferred not to answer. Eighty-three participants identified as lesbian, 96 as gay, 156 as bisexual or pansexual (56% female), and 36 as queer (33% female). The average age of the sample was 35 years old (age range 17 to 74 years) and one quarter of participants were currently undergraduate students. Seventy percent of the sample identified as European American/White, 3% as Asian American/Asian, 9% as multiracial, 9% as Latina/o, 6% as African American/Black, 2% identified as Native American, and 2% did not provide their ethnicity. Nearly one-third of participants resided in the Northeast (32%), and 27% were in the Midwest, 20% in the South and Southeast, 12% in the West, 7% in the Southwest, and 3% indicated that they live in another region. All participants who provided personal contact information were entered into a raffle to win \$25 gift cards. Twenty participants were re-contacted with compensation.

Design and Procedure

Qualtrics Survey Software hosted the survey. After providing their consent, participants responded to items assessing upward contempt, status discrepancies, emotions, and social desirability concerns. At the beginning of the survey, participants were instructed to respond to questions based on “how they generally feel toward heterosexual people as a group.” The measures were presented in a counter-balanced pattern in order to avoid order effects; each

participant received all of the measures. Finally, participants completed a demographic questionnaire and volunteered their contact information if they wished to be considered for compensation.

Measures

See Appendix A for a complete list of items and measures used in Study 1.

Upward contempt: Item generation. To build content validity of the proposed measure, I used inductive reasoning to develop items that reflected LGBTQ people's responses in previous research and deductive reasoning to operationalize criteria that constitute upward contempt (conceptualized by W. I. Miller, 1995). Following the recommended practice of over-including items in a deliberate effort to thoroughly cover the construct (Clark & Watson, 1995; Springer, Abell, & Hudson, 2002), 28 initial items were developed to measure feelings of upward contempt. Five researchers with expertise in LGBTQ psychology and intergroup relations were given background information on upward contempt and then asked to review the set of 28 items prior to data collection. Based on the reviewers' feedback, minor adjustments were made to clarify and refine the intended content of the items to best operationalize upward contempt. The response format included seven scale points to allow for subtle distinctions between the scale points, which may be lost when using too many or too few response options (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 7 = *Strongly Agree*). The collection of items included five reverse-scored items to reduce response set bias (Price & Mueller, 1986) and the complete text of the 28 items appears in Table 1.1.

Drawing on the central and descriptive tenets of the construct, I included items that assessed *unwarranted status* (i.e., believing that the high status group is actually below the level in which it claims for itself; 9 items), *minorities' superiority* (i.e., expressing perceived

superiority over the high status group; 10 items), and *devaluing attributes* (i.e., debasing the ways in which the high status group is perceived as superior; 10 items). For example, items were included that challenged the status quo (e.g., “Heterosexuals aren’t as great as they think they are”). When developing a new measure, the items included to address each content area should be proportional to the importance of the area to the larger construct (Loevinger, 1957); thus, equal amounts of items were included per content area to evaluate upward contempt.

Acknowledgement of status discrepancies. At its core, *upward* contempt requires a group to be lower in status than another group and for low status groups to be aware of the status difference between groups (W. I. Miller, 1995). As such, the inclusion of items to evaluate perceived status discrepancies between heterosexual and LGBQ people can assist in testing one avenue of establishing predictive, criterion-related validity: does the new measure (upward contempt) significantly relate to a concept to which it theoretically should relate (perceived status discrepancies)? Five items were included to address participants’ acknowledgement of heterosexual people’s higher status relative to LGBQ people. All items were presented on a seven-point scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 7 = *Strongly Agree*): “Heterosexuals are more often in positions of power in society than LGBQ people,” “It is generally believed that LGBQ people are inferior to heterosexuals,” “Heterosexuals have greater societal status than LGBQ people,” “LGBQ people are treated like second-class citizens in society compared to heterosexual people,” and “LGBQ and heterosexual people hold equal social status” (reverse-scored). These 5 items were combined into the *Acknowledgement of Status Discrepancies Scale* ($\alpha = .74$). Greater numbers reflect greater acknowledgement of status discrepancies between heterosexual and LGBQ people.

Affect. Participants were instructed “to think carefully about their feelings toward

heterosexual people as a group.” Participants indicated the extent to which they felt each emotion toward heterosexual people in general on a seven-point scale (1 = *Definitely Not*, 7 = *Definitely*). The 24 emotions included: *jealous, envious, suspicious, afraid, upset, nervous, hurt, judged, distressed, frustrated, inspired, enthusiastic, angry, resentful, happy, comfortable, pity, fear, hatred, disdain, love, positive, negative, and disgust*. This set of items reflects the positive and negative subscales in the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (Mackinnon et al., 1999), as well as LGBTQ participants’ open-ended responses in previous research (Matsick & Conley, 2016a). Further, many of these emotions have been discussed in reference to upward contempt (e.g., anger, envy, disgust, hate; Ben-Ze’ev, 2001; W. I. Miller, 1995, 1997), but their relationships to upward contempt have not been empirically tested.

Social desirability concerns. A measure of social desirability concerns was included to evaluate participants’ motivation to respond in socially acceptable ways. This type of scale is commonly used in prejudice research (e.g., Morrison, Morrison, Harriman, & Jewell, 2008) to detect the extent to which responses on new measures might be influenced by individuals’ desire to appear in a positive light (i.e., non-prejudiced). Participants completed a 13-item short-form version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Ballard, 1992; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). Participants were given a series of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits and were asked to indicate whether each statement was true or false of their typical behavior ($\alpha = .71$; e.g., “I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own”). Participants earned one point for each item on which they responded in a socially desirable manner. Higher scores on this scale indicate a stronger motivation to appear culturally appropriate (ranging from 0-13). Participants in this sample ranged from 0-12 in their social desirability scores.

Results

The analysis for scale development required several steps. First, I sought to reduce the number of items to retain for a new upward contempt scale in order to yield a scale that is short enough to use in conjunction with other measures in research, has few redundant items, and has moderate interitem correlations. Next, I submitted the remaining items to principal axis factoring (PAF) to assess the latent structure of an upward contempt scale. After identifying factors (subscales) and evaluating internal consistency and distributions within the subscales, I acquired preliminary evidence of predictive, convergent, and discriminant validity. Lastly, I tested for differences in reporting upward contempt as a function of gender, sexual orientation, age, and student status.

Preliminary Analyses: Normality and Interitem Correlations

Consistent with Hinkin's (1998) recommendations, I screened the initial 28 items to identify and eliminate items that had insufficient variance and non-normative distributions. All items had adequate variability in responses and, across all items, the skew index (SI: ranging from 0.00 to |1.15|) and kurtosis index (KI: ranging from 0.00 to |1.27|) deemed the items acceptable to include in further analyses.

Next, I examined the interitem correlations. Interitem correlations should ideally be moderate in magnitude (Clark & Watson, 1995) and, as recommended by Kim and Mueller (1978), I identified variables that did not correlate greater than .40 with at least one other variable. In other words, a variable should correlate at .40 or greater with at least one other variable to be retained and, at the very least, variables that do not correlate with many variables above .30 should be considered for removal. Given their low relationships to other variables, I decided to remove six items from further analyses (see Table 1.1; of note, five of the items

dropped for having low interitem correlations were reverse-scored items). Further, two items were highly correlated and similar in wording [$r(369) = .74, p < .001$]; thus, I removed the item “LGBQ people have better mentalities than heterosexual people” to avoid redundancy with the retained item, “LGBQ people have been attitudes than heterosexual people.” For the remaining analyses, 21 items were used.

Factor-Structure Identification

Prior to extracting factors, I determined that the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test of sampling adequacy was sufficient (.92; a value between .5-1.0 suggests that patterns of correlations are compact and the sampling size is adequate; Kaiser, 1970, 1974) and Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant, $\chi^2(210) = 3853.08, p < .001$, demonstrating that the correlation matrix is significantly different from zero. Multicollinearity was not an issue (R determinant = .000024).

The main goal of this study is to reveal the latent structure of an upward contempt measure and produce a scale that can be used in future research with minority group members. I submitted the 21 items to principal axis factoring (PAF) with oblique (promax) rotation to allow for correlated factors. This rotation follows theoretical expectations that the resultant subscales of an upward contempt measure will be intercorrelated as found in other prejudice scales (e.g., Morrison & Morrison, 2002; Morrison et al., 2008; Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995). That is, it seems reasonable to expect that factors of emotional prejudice (upward contempt) will not be independent from one another.

To determine the number of factors to extract, I assessed the eigenvalues (retaining factors with an eigenvalue greater than 1; Kaiser criterion) and a scree plot of the percentage of variance explained (using the point of inflexion as the cut-off for factor retention; Cattell, 1966).

Kaiser's criterion (eigenvalues) can be considered if the sample is greater than 250 participants and communalities are quite high (on average, at least 0.6), whereas the scree plot provides reliable markers for factor selection if more than 200 participants are used (Stevens, 2002). The average of communalities for the items after extraction was .51, suggesting that Kaiser's criteria may be an inappropriate fit for these data. However, both eigenvalues *and* the scree formation supported a three-factor solution; therefore, regardless of the strength of communalities, a three-factor solution appears to be a fitting structure. The reproduced correlation matrix (i.e., the residuals of the correlations based on the model and observable data) indicates that there are 34 non-redundant residuals (16%) that are greater than .05 (it is suggested that non-redundant residuals should not exceed 50%).

Factor loadings greater than .40 and loadings twice as strong on one factor than on any other factor is a meaningful way to organize the items by factors (Ford, MacCallum, & Tait, 1986; Hinkin, 1998). The ranges of loadings in the three-factor solution were as follows: Factor 1 (8 items; .66-.86), Factor 2 (8 items; .60 to .77), and Factor 3 (5 items; .46 to .74).

Factor 3 included fewer items and had the lowest factor loadings. The item loadings of Factor 3 also loaded on Factor 1 and, as predicted, Factor 3 was correlated with Factor 1 [$r(369) = .54, p < .001$] and Factor 2 [$r(369) = .48, p < .001$]. Further, Factor 3 contained two items that had marginal differences between their loadings across all factors. After examining the factor's communalities and the wording of the five items, I decided to remove this set of items from further analysis and test a two-factor solution. Of note, the content of Factor 3 namely addressed the devaluing aspect of upward contempt (e.g., "Some of heterosexuals' moral values are ridiculous")— I will return to the removal of this factor in the discussion.

To review, using the original 28 items used in the survey, items were eliminated if they

had low correlations with other items or were highly correlated with at least one another item, or if they did not load highly on any factor (loading < .40) or loaded too similarly on more than one factor. The final scale contains 16 items (8 items per factor). The 16 retained items were resubmitted to principal axis factoring (PAF) with oblique (promax) rotation to determine final loadings and variance. The items had moderate-to-high communalities (greater than .41) and the two-factor solution accounted for 58% of the variance. The two-factor solution was supported by both eigenvalue and scree plot criteria and is used in all subsequent analyses. See Table 1.2 for the factor loadings of the two-factor solution.

Subscales. The first factor (eigenvalue = 6.25) included 8 items that ranged from .65 to .83 in their factor loadings. I labeled this factor *minorities' superiority*. The second factor (eigenvalue = 3.09) included 8 items with factor loadings ranging from .61 to .77 and I labeled this factor *unwarranted status*. The two subscales were correlated [$r(369) = .35, p < .001$], but not enough to suggest that the subscales should be abandoned in favor of a singular measure (note: given the interrelationships between factors, the oblique rotation was an appropriate choice for these data). Moreover, the interitem correlations *within* each subscale (*minorities' superiority*, average interitem correlation = .53; *unwarranted status*, average interitem correlation = .50) were stronger than the correlations between subscales (average interitem correlation = .20), providing support for keeping two subscales as part of the larger construct (Clark & Watson, 1995). The *unwarranted status subscale* contained 8 items ($\alpha = .89$) and the *minorities' superiority subscale* contained 8 items ($\alpha = .90$).² Taken together, the 16 items comprised of the *Upward Contempt Scale* show high reliability ($\alpha = .89$) and no skewness or kurtosis emerged in the final scale (SI = 0.25; KI = 0.52).

Establishing Criterion-Related Validity

One step of the scale development process is to establish a “nomological network,” or a set of relationships between the newly developed scale and other psychological measures. Here, I test predictive, convergent, and discriminant validity using the *Acknowledgement of Status Discrepancies Scale*, positive and negative emotions, social desirability concerns, and the newly formed *Upward Contempt Scale*. In Table 1.3, I report coefficient alphas, means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among the measures used in establishing validity.

Predictive validity. Perceptions of status discrepancies and upward contempt should theoretically be related given that upward contempt is rooted in identifying differences between groups in a social hierarchy. Participants’ acknowledgement of status discrepancies was significantly related to their feelings of upward contempt toward heterosexual people, $r(369) = .39, p < .001$. That is, the extent to which people perceive differences in societal status between LGBQ and heterosexual people is positively related to their reported feelings of upward contempt.

Convergent and discriminant validity. In a preliminary investigation of convergent and discriminant validity, I examined correlations between other common emotions and the *Upward Contempt Scale*, with high and low correlations serving as evidence of convergent and discriminant validity, respectively.

First, using the 24 emotion items, I organized the emotions into positive and negative scales (as commonly used in previous research; e.g., Conley & Rabinowitz, 2004; Mackinnon et al., 1999). The *Positive Emotion Scale* was comprised of six items ($\alpha = .86$; *inspired, enthusiastic, happy, comfortable, love, and positive*). Eighteen items created the *Negative Emotion Scale* ($\alpha = .95$; *jealous, envious, suspicious, afraid, upset, nervous, hurt, judged, distressed, frustrated, angry, resentful, pity, fear, hatred, disdain, negative, and disgust*). As

presented in Table 1.3, upward contempt was *negatively* associated with positive emotions and positively associated with negative emotions. Next, I examined the relationships between the 24 emotion items and upward contempt; the magnitude of significant correlations ranged from .11 (*envious*) to .43 (*suspicious*) for the negative items and from -.15 (*enthusiastic*) to -.24 (*love*) for the positive items. Given the size of the correlations, for both the total positive and negative scales and their individual items, it appears that there is a stronger link between upward contempt and negative affect than with positive affect. Future studies with the *Upward Contempt Scale* should continue to examine relationships between upward contempt and extant measures that are theoretically similar and different from the construct.

Finally, I tested the relationship between the new *Upward Contempt Scale* and a measure of social desirability. The relationship between upward contempt and the social desirability measure was not significant. In other words, self-reported feelings of upward contempt are not significantly influenced by people's desire to behave in a culturally appropriate manner (i.e., to appear non-prejudiced); however, there was a significant relationship between social desirability and the subscale of *unwarranted status*, $r(369) = -.16, p < .001$. People who provide socially desirable responses tend to provide lower ratings on the *unwarranted status subscale*, which assesses participants' beliefs that heterosexual people's social standing is unwarranted. However, the *Upward Contempt Scale*, as a whole, does not appear to be vulnerable to social desirability bias.

Subsample Differences

I tested if participants differed in their feelings of upward contempt as a function of gender, sexual orientation (lesbian, gay, bisexual), age, and student status. For clarity, I conducted separate tests to compare means of upward contempt based on demographic groups.

Given the low subsample size, I excluded the 23 trans-identified participants from the gender analysis and only compared those who identified as men ($n = 137$) to people who identified as women ($n = 181$). No gender differences emerged in participants' feelings of upward contempt, $t(316) = 0.40, p = .69$. Next, I conducted a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to test for differences as a function of sexual orientation (lesbian, gay, and bisexual) and there was no effect of sexual orientation on upward contempt, $F(2, 332) = .88, p = .41$.

Lastly, given that people have unique experiences with heterosexual people and different sources of stress associated with their LGBQ identities across the lifespan (e.g., D'Augelli & Grossman, 2001; Dyson et al., 2003), it is expected that there might be age differences in feelings of upward contempt toward heterosexual people. Although age was not significantly related to upward contempt [$r(369) = -.03, p = .622$], participants who were currently undergraduate students reported greater upward contempt ($M = 4.58; SD = 0.97$) than those who were not currently students ($M = 4.23; SD = 0.99$), $t(369) = 2.92, p = .004$. This pattern of students reporting greater upward contempt than non-students was found on both the *unwarranted status subscale* [$t(369) = 2.20, p = .029$] and the *minorities' superiority subscale* [$t(369) = 2.57, p = .011$].

In sum, there were no differences in upward contempt in terms of gender, sexual orientation, and age; however, students did hold more upward contempt toward heterosexual people than non-students.

Discussion

The current study accomplished the main goal of establishing a set of items to measure upward contempt. The items used to evaluate upward contempt were inspired by empirical and cultural observations of intergroup processes from LGBQ people's perspectives, as well as from

theoretical discussions of upward contempt (Ben-Ze'ev, 2001; W. I. Miller, 1995, 1997). A three-factor solution initially emerged to organize the latent structure of the upward contempt measure; however, upon further scrutiny, the third factor was dropped in favor a two-factor framework that will provide greater external validity and include fewer items to reduce participant fatigue. Although the third factor was meaningful and covers one of the many aspects of upward contempt as discussed in the literature, its content may be more susceptible to changing social norms and contains ambiguous meaning (e.g., the item “Heterosexuals’ values are inessential” does not specify the ways in which these values might be inessential). Moreover, with the nation-wide legalization of same-sex marriage in the United States in 2015, same-sex couples have greater access to adopt the values that were once associated with heterosexual people (i.e., marriage, family, children). It is unclear how LGBTQ participants would respond to these items with a changing social landscape in which certain values and traditions are no longer exclusively heterosexual. According to queer theorists, the legalization of same-sex marriage renders LGBTQ people to the same norms and standards of heterosexuals (see Barker, 2013; Moon, 2010; Warner, 1999), thus, the lines between heterosexual values and queer values may blur as LGBTQ people assimilate. Furthermore, the third factor was very specific to the dynamics between LGBTQ people and heterosexual people. If the *Upward Contempt Scale* is adapted to be used in research with other low and high status groups, the third factor might have little relevance. One possible solution would be to develop various versions of a third factor of the *Upward Contempt Scale* that applies to more than one social group (i.e., addressing values related to sexual orientation, race, social class within separate subscales); thus, researchers would be able to incorporate a third subscale based on the fit for their participants.

The final two-factor solution (*Upward Contempt Scale*; 16 items) yielded eight items per

subscale: *minorities' superiority* (beliefs that the low status group is superior to the high status group in various ways) and *unwarranted status* (beliefs that the high status group's status is unjustified). Participants' acknowledgement of status discrepancies between heterosexual and LGBTQ people predicted their feelings of upward contempt, and the *Upward Contempt Scale* and negative affect were correlated to a greater extent than upward contempt related to positive affect. Importantly, people's reported feelings of upward contempt did not fall prey to social desirability bias. There were no differences in feelings of upward contempt as a function of gender, sexual orientation, or age; however, students were more likely to hold upward contempt toward heterosexual people than non-students. There were too few queer- and trans-identified people in the sample to include them in the subsample comparisons of sexual orientation and gender. Given that *queer*-identities are known as the "liberal left" of the lesbian and gay community (Ward, 2015), people who identify as queer and, presumably critique heterosexuality to a greater extent than lesbian- and gay-identified people, may hold stronger feelings of upward contempt toward heterosexual people than those who identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual.

Limitations and Future Directions

The next step for developing the *Upward Contempt Scale* is to perform a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Given the current sample size, I chose not to perform the confirmatory factor analysis with these data. With a larger sample size, a sample can be split randomly in half and the two samples can then be used to conduct parallel analyses with PAF and CFA (Krzystofiak, Cardy, & Newman, 1988). Hoelter (1983) and Weston and Gore (2006) recommend having minimum sample sizes of 200 for submitting items to PAF and CFA. After excluding participants who did not fit the survey criteria, this study's final sample included 371 participants, which yields two sample sizes of 185. Although CFA is possible with these data, it

is highly recommended that replication studies use independent samples to perform CFA to avoid producing sample-specific factors (as suggested by Krzystofiak et al., 1988). Therefore, another study will provide me with the opportunity to confirm the factor solution and to test additional validity variables for upward contempt.

As with all new measures, ongoing psychometric testing is necessary. This study provides insight into upward contempt's relationship to a large range of emotions. Because there were no strong correlations between the upward contempt measure and the 24 emotions included, we can conclude that, though it is related to other emotions, it is not identical to LGBTQ people's other feelings toward heterosexual people. Additional measures are needed to formulate a more comprehensive nomological network for upward contempt that continues to test convergent and discriminant validity, as well as concurrent validity. Specifically, concurrent validity of the measure will help to establish that upward contempt is a low status group process. That is, high status group members should score differently than low status group members on this measure; thus, the scale should be powerful enough to differentiate high status and low status group members who complete the measure.

Although there is a dearth of research on minority groups' attitudes toward dominant groups, testing upward contempt's relationship to the following will strengthen convergent and discriminant validity: measures of ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation (i.e., the extent to which people favor the ingroup and denigrate the outgroup, respectively; Allport, 1954; Brewer, 1999, 2007), the *Attitudes toward Heterosexuals Scale* (e.g., "I prefer to be friends with straight people;" Vaughn & Teeters, 2015), a measure of internalized homophobia (e.g., "Social situations with gay/lesbian people make me feel uncomfortable;" Ross & Rosser, 1996), stigma consciousness (e.g., "Most heterosexuals have a lot more homophobic thoughts than they

actually express;" Pinel, 1999), and system justification (e.g., "All in all, the world is a balanced place;" Kay & Jost, 2003). Feelings of upward contempt should be similar to favoring the ingroup, holding negative attitudes toward heterosexuals, and experiencing less internalized homophobia, greater stigma consciousness, and greater resistance to the social hierarchy.

Another avenue for future research is to consider how upward contempt might operate with other minority groups. Miller discussed the upward contempt that people of lower socioeconomic status' hold toward wealthy individuals (e.g., blue-collared workers' attitudes toward middle-upper class people; W. I. Miller, 1995). One promising future direction is to test upward contempt within dynamics based on socioeconomic status. In addition, upward contempt may be held by Black Americans toward white Americans, employees toward employers (see Pelzer, 2005), and people of various religious and political orientations toward their dominant counterparts. The possible contexts in which upward contempt may function are abundant.

Future research with the *Upward Contempt Scale* should investigate the role that upward contempt plays in intergroup relations and in LGBTQ health. Specifically, more research is needed to identify individual differences in upward contempt, contextual factors that play a role in upward contempt, and the theoretical and applied implications of upward contempt. For example, predictors such as education, activism, and engagement in non-assimilationist queer politics might differently predict people's feelings of upward contempt. In terms of contextual and situational factors, upward contempt might emerge as a psychological response to anti-gay contexts rather than identity-affirming contexts. In general, the *Upward Contempt Scale* will offer new ways of thinking about LGBTQ perspectives and experiences. Lastly, research should examine how upward contempt fits into pre-existing frameworks of LGBTQ identity and health (e.g., the minority stress model; Meyer, 2003)— feelings of upward contempt may be related to

minority stress, which is negatively associated with psychological and physical health outcomes (Duncan & Hatzenbuehler, 2014; Frost, 2011; Hatzenbuehler, 2009; Huebner & Davis, 2007; Major et al., 2013).

Conclusion

The upward contempt scale and its two dimensions contain strong reliability, normal distributions, and preliminary evidence of construct validity. Future research should confirm the two-factor solution and continue to validate the scale. Once validated, the measure can be used as a stand-alone tool or in conjunction with other psychological instruments. In particular, the *Upward Contempt Scale* has implications for intergroup relations research that seeks to examine minority groups' perspectives and for research on LGBQ people's identities, stress, attitudes, and experiences.

CHAPTER 3: (Study 2) Stereotypes about Heterosexuals and LGBQ People's Well-Being

Similar to Study 1, I focus on *minority* groups' perceptions of dominant groups in Study 2. I investigate one area of intergroup relations from the minority perspective: stereotypes. Building on results from Matsick and Conley (2016), I test how stereotypes about heterosexuals affect LGBQ people's psychological well-being. Although Matsick and Conley (2016) established that stereotypes about heterosexual people are known and held by LGBQ people, it is unclear how LGBQ people experience stereotypes about heterosexuals. Put simply, we know that stereotypes about heterosexual people exist, but we know little about what stereotypes do for LGBQ people beyond serving basic cognitive purposes (e.g., saving cognitive resources by processing information quickly at the group-level rather than individual-level; Allport, 1954; Diehl & Jonas, 1991; Fiske & Neuberg, 1990; D. T. Gilbert & Hixon, 1991). Stereotype functionality has long been of interest to social psychologists (see Stangor & Schaller, 1996); however, our knowledge about stereotype functionality is largely developed from observing the behaviors of dominant groups or intergroup dynamics among randomly assigned groups in controlled laboratory experiments. Answering Cox et al.'s (2012) call for researchers to explore new functions of stereotyping (e.g., using outgroup derogation to increase self-esteem; Fein & Spencer, 1997), this study aims to address the purpose of stereotypes from the minority standpoint.

Groups have a basic instinct to engage in self-categorization, that is, to perceive themselves and others in terms of group membership (e.g., Brewer, 1991, 2007; Turner, 1987;

Turner & Oakes, 1989). The categorization of people into an ingroup and outgroup allows ingroup members to differentiate from the outgroup and unite over shared values and identities with other ingroup members (as explained by social identity theory; see Tajfel & Turner, 2004). Queer history, in particular, is filled with ways in which LGBTQ people willingly differentiate themselves from heterosexual people. For example, atypical gender performance, celebrations of queer pride, political resistance, and non-assimilation perspectives within LGBTQ communities are some of the many ways in which LGBTQ differentiate their ingroup from the dominant outgroup (e.g., Butler, 1990; Halperin & Traub, 2010; G. Rubin, 1984; Warner, 1999). Although not many social psychological theories to my knowledge have been used to explain queer history and LGBTQ people's experiences, it is highly likely that LGBTQ people indeed engage in self-categorization and group differentiation; these intergroup processes have even been documented within minimal group paradigms (e.g., among groups with minimal or arbitrary differences; Brewer, 1979; Cadinu & Rothbart, 1996; Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971).

When group differentiation occurs, people tend to favor their ingroup and, sometimes, this form of ingroup bias is accomplished through outgroup derogation, especially when the ingroup perceives the outgroup as threatening or as a hindrance to an ingroup's goals (Branscombe, Wann, Noel, & Coleman, 1993; Brewer, 1999; Fein & Spencer, 1997; Voci, 2006). Outgroup stereotypes provide ingroups with the opportunity to positively differentiate themselves from outgroup stereotypes (Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel & Forgas, 1981). Thus, stereotypes about dominant outgroups can be thought of as a proxy for ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation among minority ingroups— outgroup stereotypes reinforce group differentiation, and, given that stereotypes about heterosexuals position heterosexual people in a negative light and LGBTQ people in a positive light (Matsick & Conley, 2016a), outgroup stereotypes perpetuate

ingroup favoritism among LGBTQ people. That is, outgroup stereotypes can be used to differentiate groups while bolstering the ingroup. Moreover, there are psychological rewards for engaging in ingroup favoritism. As a result of favoring the ingroup and derogating the outgroup, ingroup members experience more positive psychological outcomes related to their group membership (e.g., greater self-esteem and pride about group membership; Fein & Spencer, 1997; Lemyre & Smith, 1985; M. Rubin & Hewstone, 1998) and are perceived more positively by other ingroup members (Castelli & Carraro, 2010). Thus, not only do outgroup stereotypes provide a way to differentiate groups, but also it yields psychological benefits.

In this study, I examine LGBTQ-identified participants' psychological well-being after they are presented with stereotypes about a dominant outgroup (heterosexual people). Drawing on theories of intergroup behavior, I predict that individuals who are exposed to heterosexual stereotypes will experience more positive psychological outcomes than those in the control group. Testing the effect of outgroup stereotypes on an ingroup's well-being is an especially important research aim with LGBTQ people given the psychological burden and stress that members of LGBTQ communities endure based on their group membership.

Methods

Participants

I recruited participants using the same recruitment procedures outlined in Study 1. Participants were recruited into an online survey entitled, "Online Research Study: The Social Attitudes and Reactions of LGBTQ People." Participants confirmed that they had access to sound on their computers before they were directed into the study. All participants who provided contact information were entered into a raffle to win \$25 Amazon.com gift cards, and twenty participants were re-contacted to receive compensation.

The sample ($N = 146$) consisted of 32 lesbian women, 23 gay men, 74 bisexual individuals (69% female), and 17 queer individuals (76% female). Ninety-five participants identified as women, 37 as men, and 14 identified as genderqueer, genderless, or transgender. The average age was 25 years old (ages ranging from 17 to 66 years); 52% of participants were undergraduate students. Seventy-three percent of the sample identified as European American/White, 8% as multiracial, 6% as Asian American, 5% as Latina/o, 5% as African American/Black, 3% as Native American, and 1% of participants did not report their ethnicity. Forty-four percent resided in the Midwestern part of the United States, 32% in the Northeast, 11% in the West, 6% in the Southwest, 3% in the Southeast, and 4% currently lived in Canada.

Design and Procedure

After agreeing to participate in the study, participants were randomly assigned to watch one of two videos in order to evaluate the videos for quality. In one video, actors provided stereotypes about heterosexual people and the actors in the other video conveyed stereotypes about LGBTQ people. The same actors participated in both videos and presented the stereotypes in the same light— in both videos, the actors exaggerated the stereotypes and included some degree of humor in their delivery. Participants completed the survey measures and the demographics questionnaire that was used in Study 1. The study, including time spent watching the video, took most participants 12-15 minutes to complete. All materials were presented through Qualtrics Survey Software, including the embedded videos.

Experimental Manipulation

Media, community conversations, satire, and humor are some of the ways in which minority groups can safely express their thoughts about and attitudes toward the dominant group (Hart, 2004; Scott, 1990). Over the past five years, members of marginalized groups have

created videos with other ingroup members to recapture their daily realities; for example, numerous videos exist to expose microaggressions that people face and how minority groups are treated by dominant groups. The videos have become widely popular with over millions of views on the Internet (e.g., “Stuff White People Say to Black Girls,” “If Black People Said the Stuff that White People Say,” “Stuff that Straight Girls Say”). In general, these videos exaggerate the thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors of the outgroup, but nonetheless, are effective in poking fun at the dominant group through the eyes of minority group members.

To operationalize stereotypes about heterosexuals, I created similar videos for the purpose of this study. First, I turned to previous research to identify commonly-held stereotypes about each of the following groups: heterosexual men, heterosexual women, gay men, and lesbian women (see Fingerhut & Peplau, 2006; Geiger, Harwood, & Hummert, 2006; Madon, 1997; Matsick & Conley, 2016a). I created a list of stereotypes that reflected what participants had said in previous studies. Nine researchers (seven of whom were members of the LGBTQ community) reviewed these stereotypes and selected 24 stereotypes about heterosexual people that were easily translated into statements and were highly gendered (a component of heterosexual stereotypes identified by Matsick & Conley, 2016a). Next, the research team and I selected 24 stereotypes about lesbian and gay people that were perceived as the most commonly-heard within the LGBTQ community and, importantly, would not be seen as overly offensive to members of the LGBTQ community (e.g., lesbian women are good at fixing things should be a relatively benign stereotype compared to stereotypes about perversion). In other words, we attempted to select stereotypes that were relatively harmless in comparison to some of the more critical stereotypes about LGBTQ people. The goal was to design two group-level videos that were somewhat humorous and light-hearted, even though they contained stereotypes.

I recruited three women and two men to act in the video as lesbian- and gay-identified individuals. In the video entitled “Stuff that Straight People Say... (According to LGBTQ Folks),” the actresses delivered 12 statements regarding heterosexual women and the actors read 12 statements regarding heterosexual men. In the video entitled “Stuff that Gay and Queer People Say... (According to LGBTQ Folks),” the actresses and actors each performed 12 statements regarding lesbian women and gay men, respectively. Both videos incorporated ingroup humor based on sexual orientation. The order of actors presented and the lengths of video were controlled across both conditions; see Appendix B for the full list of statements used in both video conditions.

Participants were randomly assigned to view one of two videos (hosted on YouTube.com). Seventy-four participants viewed the stereotypes about the LGBTQ community video (control) and 72 participants viewed the stereotypes about heterosexual people video (outgroup stereotypes). Immediately following the video, participants rated the video on pre-testing items; they indicated on five-point scales how *funny*, *entertaining*, *attractive*, *likeable*, *interesting*, *amusing*, and *appealing* they found the videos and the people in the videos. There were no significant differences between perceptions of the videos on these pre-testing items ($t(144) \leq |1.29|$, all p -values $> .20$).

Participants also responded to the item, “How do LGBTQ people look for making this video?” on a scale of 1 (*Not Very Good*) to 5 (*Very Good*); there were no differences between the responses of those in the control condition ($M = 4.88$; $SD = 1.09$) and those in the heterosexual stereotypes video condition ($M = 4.63$; $SD = 1.35$), $t(144) = 0.70$, $p = .483$. However, participants perceived the heterosexual stereotypes video as more accurate ($M = 3.22$; $SD = 1.09$) than the control video ($M = 2.67$; $SD = 1.17$), $t(144) = -2.99$, $p = .003$. Participants also

perceived the heterosexual stereotypes video as less offensive to the LGBTQ community ($M = 2.53$; $SD = 1.19$) than the control video ($M = 3.03$; $SD = 1.13$), $t(144) = 2.60$, $p = .01$. However, given the low means on the five-point scale, participants did not appear to perceive either video as highly offensive.

Measures

After viewing the video and responding to items regarding the quality of the video, participants completed the psychological measures of well-being and group esteem. See Appendix C for a complete list of items used in this study.

Psychological well-being. To measure participants' psychological well-being after exposure to stereotypes, I created a set of 11 items on six-point semantic differential scales: *ashamed/proud*, *inferior/equal*, *discouraged/encouraged*, *disrespected/respected*, *afraid/unafraid*, *unsafe/safe*, *rejected/accepted*, *threatened/affirmed*, *stigmatized/supported*, *alone/close to others*, and *strong/vulnerable* (reverse-scored). Using the aforementioned scales, participants were asked to indicate how they felt "right now, at this very moment." Greater numbers indicate greater psychological well-being.

I conducted a principal axis factor analysis with orthogonal (varimax) rotation on the 11 items. Prior to extracting factors, I determined that the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test of sampling adequacy was sufficient (.92; a value between .5-1.0 suggests that patterns of correlations are compact and the sampling size is adequate; Kaiser, 1970, 1974) and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant, $\chi^2(55) = 839.06$, $p < .001$. Multicollinearity was not an issue (R determinant = .003). The procedure extracted a one-factor solution, with an eigenvalue greater of 5.84 (the scree plot's point of inflexion also supported the decision to retain only one factor). Factor loadings ranged from .41-.86 and the factor accounted for 53% of the variance.

The 11 items were averaged to create a scale with high internal consistency ($\alpha = .91$) in which greater numbers reflect positive psychological well-being.

Collective self-esteem. Nine items measured participants' group-based self-esteem, or the extent to which a participant perceived her/his sexual identity to be a positive aspect of the self (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). I adapted the original 9 items of the Collective Self-Esteem Scale to address LGBQ community membership on six-point scales (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 6 = *Strongly Agree*; $\alpha = .82$). Example items included: "I make a positive contribution to the LGBQ community" and "I'm glad I belong to the LGBQ community." The instructions asked participants to indicate their agreement with the items in terms of their feelings "right now, at this very moment."

Happiness. Lastly, I assessed general feelings of happiness with being LGBQ. The survey instructed participants to consider how they felt "right now, at this very moment" while completing the survey. Participants responded on a ten-point sliding scale (1 = *Not at All*, 10 = *Extremely*) to the single-item measure, "I feel happy to be LGBQ."

Results

I conducted an independent-samples t-test to test the effect of heterosexual stereotypes on LGBQ people's psychological outcomes. Next, I tested whether participants' responses varied as a function gender, sexual orientation, and student status.

Effect of Video Condition on Psychological Outcomes

As predicted, stereotypes about heterosexuals affected LGBQ people's well-being. Participants in the heterosexual stereotypes condition felt greater well-being ($M = 4.41$; $SD = 0.96$) than participants in the LGBQ stereotypes (control) condition ($M = 3.93$; $SD = 0.96$), $t(144) = -2.97, p = .004$. Participants who watched the heterosexual stereotypes video also

reported greater happiness (i.e., “I feel happy to be LGBTQ;” $M = 9.09$; $SD = 1.23$) than those who watched the LGBTQ stereotypes video ($M = 8.26$; $SD = 1.85$), $t(125.55) = -3.16$, $p = .002$. Taken together, the effect of video condition on participants’ psychological well-being and happiness confirm that stereotypes about heterosexual people influence the psychological outcomes of LGBTQ people.

In contrast, there was no effect of video condition on participants’ collective self-esteem, $t(144) = -0.75$, $p = .452$. Participants in both conditions reported high collective self-esteem (heterosexual stereotypes video: $M = 4.44$, $SD = 0.72$; LGBTQ stereotypes video: $M = 4.35$, $SD = 0.81$). It is possible that the content of the collective self-esteem measure covers stable, trait-like qualities than more flexible, state-like outcomes that are susceptible to context; that is, it is unlikely that participants would vary their responses to items from mere exposure to a video (e.g., “I make a positive contribution to the LGBTQ community”). See Table 2.1 for means and standard deviations for all outcomes tested in Study 2.

Subsample Differences

I aimed to test whether participants’ gender (women, men), sexual orientation (lesbian, gay, bisexual), and student status (student, non-student) affected their well-being and happiness and whether the video condition effect varied by these demographic factors.

There were too few men per cell to test gender differences (there were less than 20 men per condition). However, the sample sizes permitted me to conduct a 2 (condition) x 2 (sexual orientation) factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) to test for sexual orientation differences on psychological well-being and happiness and to test whether the video condition effect varied as a function of sexual orientation. I excluded queer-identified participants from this analysis and, due to the low sample size of gay men, I combined lesbian women and gay men to compare their

responses to those of bisexual participants (i.e., those with an orientation exclusively directed toward members of the same-sex versus those with orientations that recognize attraction to different-sex people; lesbian and gay, $n = 121$; bisexual, $n = 69$). The results confirmed there was no effect of sexual orientation on participants' reported well-being [$F(1, 125) = .04, p = .901$] or happiness [$F(1, 123) = 1.90, p = .171$] and there were no significant interactions between condition and sexual orientation on well-being [$F(1, 125) = 1.00, p = .759$] or happiness [$F(1, 123) = 0.48, p = .492$].

For ease of interpretation, a separate factorial ANOVA [2 (condition) x 2 (student)] tested whether there was a main effect of student status on psychological well-being and happiness, given that students differed from non-students in Study 1. In Study 2, student status was not a significant predictor of well-being [$F(1, 141) = .43, p = .513$] and happiness [$F(1, 139) = .05, p = .83$] and there was no significant interaction between video condition and student status on well-being [$F(1, 141) = .50, p = .481$] or happiness [$F(1, 139) = .31, p = .582$].

Overall, there is no evidence to suggest that the effect of video condition varies by participant gender, sexual orientation, or student status; however, due to the low representation of gay and bisexual men in the sample, these results should be interpreted with caution.

Discussion

In the current study, I tested how LGBQ people respond to stereotypes about heterosexual people. Until recently, the content of heterosexual stereotypes and its influence on LGBQ people were uncharted areas of inquiry. The current study provides insight into how dominant group (heterosexual) stereotypes affect minority group members (LGBQ people). After exposure to a video that reflected sexual minorities' stereotypes about heterosexual people, LGBQ participants felt greater feelings of happiness and well-being (e.g., pride, respect,

affirmation) than those who were exposed to another set of stereotypes (i.e., stereotypes about LGBQ people). Across conditions, participants were generally happy and had positive self-esteem about their identities. Recall that participants perceived the videos that delivered the sets of stereotypes as equally amusing, likeable, and entertaining; therefore, the effect of the condition is not because participants merely liked the heterosexual stereotypes more than the LGBQ stereotypes (control). Contrary to my hypothesis, outgroup stereotypes did not affect participants' collective self-esteem.

Taken together, greater psychological well-being and happiness with being LGBQ after exposure to heterosexual stereotypes suggest that stereotypes about dominant outgroups yield *positive* psychological outcomes among minority ingroups. Given the effect on happiness and well-being with one's LGBQ identity, it is possible that minorities can use dominant group stereotypes to relieve minority stress (i.e., the stress of having LGBTQ people's values, experiences, and identities devalued in society; Meyer, 2003). In this vein, we might be quick to conclude that stereotypes are good for people, but this is a premature conclusion. Stereotypes about dominant groups might not be a suggested, healthy strategy to reduce stress— in the same way that we would not promote alcohol or smoking to relieve stress— however, minorities might draw on stereotypes about dominant groups when they need to protect or preserve their ingroup. That is, if stereotyping the dominant outgroup boosts solidarity and well-being among a minority ingroup, minority group members might be inclined to use dominant group stereotypes for their own psychological benefit. As such, stereotypes about heterosexuals might not be fair, accurate, or healthy for building positive intergroup relations, but they may be part of an adaptive strategy used to resist threats to the ingroup (e.g., heterosexism, anti-gay prejudice, stigma, and minority stress).

Limitations and Future Directions

The current study is limited by the use of the collective self-esteem scale. The collective self-esteem scale is more often used as a predictor (e.g., Crocker, Luhtanen, Blaine, & Broadmax, 1994; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) than as an outcome (cf. Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Jetten, Spears, & Manstead, 1997). In other words, people's scores on the scale might be relatively stable, which explains why there was little variability on this measure between conditions. In fact, Crocker and Luhtanen (1990) conclude that collective self-esteem is an individual difference factor that moderates people's desire to present the ingroup in a favorable light. Future research could address this limitation by including a more thorough social identity measure that is better equipped to address contextual changes to group-esteem (e.g., "Right now, I have little respect for my group;" Ellemers, Kortekaas, & Ouwerkerk, 1999).

Another limitation to this research is that the control group (i.e., people who watched the LGBQ stereotypes video) might differ from people's baseline wellness and happiness; therefore, they may not be a true control group. The motivation behind including the LGBQ stereotypes video, as opposed to having no video in the control condition, was that I wanted the control to be as similar to the experimental condition as possible. In other words, I did not want any potential effect to be due to the experience of watching a video that incorporates group-based humor. Further, as noted by participants in the comments section of the survey, the stereotypes in the control condition (LGBQ stereotypes) focused on lesbian women and gay men. Those with non-lesbian and non-gay identities may have felt that the control group video was actually conveying outgroup stereotypes (the outgroup, in this case, being lesbian- and gay-identified people). The inclusion of another condition that does not incorporate any group's stereotypes will help to confirm the findings from this study.

Finally, future research should investigate factors that moderate or mediate the effect of dominant outgroup stereotypes on minority group's psychological well-being. For example, ingroup favoritism may moderate the relationship—that is, stereotypes about dominant outgroups may cause minority groups to feel positively about themselves among those who have a stronger inclination to favor and preserve their own group. Furthermore, research should examine the relationship between dominant group stereotypes and feelings of upward contempt (i.e., contempt for and disapproval of dominant groups). It is plausible that feelings of upward contempt mediate the relationship between stereotypes of dominant groups and minority groups' well-being, such that heterosexual stereotypes predict LGBTQ people's well-being because heterosexual stereotypes elicit upward contempt among LGBTQ people. This hypothesis follows the logic posed by W. I. Miller (1995) that upward contempt is experienced as a positive emotion because it allows minorities to reclaim superiority; thus, I would expect that upward contempt is related to positive outcomes for minorities. Understanding how upward contempt relates to minority groups' stereotypes and attitudes toward dominant groups will help to further define upward contempt for researchers to use in the study of intergroup relations.

CHAPTER 4: (Study 3) Heterosexual Stereotypes Affect LGBTQ People's Well-being

The goal of this study is to refine the effect examined in Study 2. While Study 2 provided a test of outgroup stereotypes on well-being, the control task (i.e., a video of LGBTQ stereotypes) may have affected participants' well-being. The inclusion of an additional control group will determine the legitimacy of the effect. Further, the relationship between stereotypes about heterosexuals and LGBTQ people's feelings of upward contempt could not be addressed with the data collected in Study 2; therefore, I included the *Upward Contempt Scale* in this study to contribute to Study 1's goal of understanding upward contempt's psychological properties.

As in Study 2, I hypothesize that (a) stereotypes about heterosexual people will cause LGBTQ people to experience positive psychological outcomes and (b) people who watch the LGBTQ stereotypes video (as used in Study 2) will not significantly differ from a true control group (participants who are not exposed to any stereotypes about any group). Another goal of this study is to explore the relationships between upward contempt, stereotypes about the outgroup, and psychological well-being among members of minority groups.

Methods

Participants

I recruited participants with the same procedures used in Study 1. Participants were recruited into an online survey entitled, "Online Research Study: The Social Attitudes and Reactions of LGBTQ People." Participants confirmed that they had access to sound on their computers before starting the study. All participants who provided contact information at the

end of the study were entered into a raffle to win \$25 Amazon.com gift cards. Twenty participants were re-contacted to receive compensation.

Prior to data analysis, the following participants were excluded: five participants were removed for identifying as heterosexual, five for admitting that they did not watch the video or pay attention to the video used in some of the conditions, and three were removed because they had indicated they did not take the survey seriously. The final sample ($N = 221$) consisted of 65 lesbian women, 55 gay men, 79 bisexual individuals (63% female), 22 queer individuals (36% female). Fifty-five percent of the sample identified as women, 31% as men, and 9% identified as transgender, and 5% identified their gender identity as genderqueer, genderless, or nonbinary. The average age was 33 years old (age ranged from 18 to 69 years); 22% of participants were currently undergraduate students at the time of the survey. Seventy-two percent of the sample identified as European American/White, 9% as multiracial, 6% as Latina/o, 6% as African American/Black, 3% as Native American, 2% as Asian American, and 2% of participants did not report their ethnicity. Thirty-six percent resided in the Northeastern part of the United States, 26% in the Midwest, 15% in the West, 8% in the Southwest, 7% in the Southeast, 4% currently lived in another country (specifically, the United Kingdom or Canada), and 4% did not report their geographic region.

Design and Procedure

After agreeing to participate in the study, participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: LGBTQ stereotypes ($n = 76$), heterosexual stereotypes ($n = 91$), or no stereotypes ($n = 54$).³ All participants completed the survey measures and a demographics questionnaire. The study took most participants 12-15 minutes to complete and all materials were presented through Qualtrics Survey Software.

Experimental Manipulation

In the LGBTQ stereotypes condition, participants watched a video of LGBTQ people presenting stereotypes about LGBTQ people. In the heterosexual stereotypes condition, participants watched a video of LGBTQ people presenting stereotypes about heterosexual people. In the control condition, participants did not watch a video. See Study 2 or Appendix B for more information about the videos.

Those who watched a video responded to six statements about the video. Participants rated the videos as equally entertaining, likeable, and funny (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 5 = *Strongly Agree*; $t(149) \leq |1.06|$, all p -values > .290). Across conditions, participants were also equally likely to agree with the following: “I was offended by the video,” “Other LGBTQ people would enjoy watching the video,” and “I would share this video with my friends who identify as LGBTQ” (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 5 = *Strongly Agree*; $t(149) \leq |0.99|$, all p -values > .324). In sum, though the content and target group of each video was different, there were no significant differences in participants’ general perceptions of the heterosexual stereotypes video and LGBTQ stereotypes video.

Measures

For those in the LGBTQ stereotypes and heterosexual stereotypes conditions, participants responded to all of the measures after the video portion of the survey (recall that those in the “no stereotypes” condition skipped the video segment). The presentation of the measures was counterbalanced to avoid order effects. See Appendix D for the complete list of measures used in Study 3.

Psychological well-being. To measure participants’ psychological well-being, I included the 11 semantic differential items from Study 2: *ashamed/proud*, *inferior/equal*,

discouraged/encouraged, disrespected/respected, afraid/unafraid, unsafe/safe, rejected/accepted, threatened/affirmed, stigmatized/supported, alone/close to others, and strong/vulnerable (reverse-scored). Participants responded to the items on six-point scales based on how they felt “right now, at this very moment” while taking the survey. As in Study 2, a scale comprised of the 11 items had high internal consistency ($\alpha = .92$). On this well-being scale, greater numbers reflect greater psychological well-being.

Happiness. I measured participants’ general feelings of happiness with being LGBTQ. The survey instructed participants to consider how they felt “right now, at this very moment” while completing the survey. Participants responded on a ten-point sliding scale (1 = *Not at All*, 10 = *Extremely*) to the single-item measure, “I feel happy to be LGBTQ.”

Upward contempt. Twenty-eight items measured participants’ feelings of upward contempt toward heterosexual people. Participants were instructed to indicate their agreement with each statement on a seven-point scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 7 = *Strongly Agree*). Consistent with the results of the factor analysis conducted in Study 1, the upward contempt measure hereafter will be discussed as a 16 item measure ($\alpha = .87$) with two subscales. The *minorities’ superiority subscale* ($\alpha = .88$; i.e., expressing perceived superiority over the high status group) and the *unwarranted status subscale* ($\alpha = .88$; i.e., believing that the high status group is actually below the level in which it claims for itself) each included 8 items. Greater numbers on the *Upward Contempt Scale* indicate greater feelings of upward contempt toward heterosexual people.

Acknowledgement of status discrepancies. Given that *upward* contempt requires a group to be lower in status than another group and for low status group members to be aware of the status difference between groups (W. I. Miller, 1995), I included a measure of

acknowledging status discrepancies (as used in Study 1). Five items were included to address participants' acknowledgement of heterosexual people's status relative to LGBTQ people. All items were presented on a seven-point scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 7 = *Strongly Agree*). Example items included: "Heterosexuals are more often in positions of power in society than LGBTQ people" and "LGBTQ and heterosexual people hold equal social status" (reverse-scored). The 5 items were combined into the *Acknowledgement of Status Discrepancies Scale* ($\alpha = .79$). Greater numbers reflect greater acknowledgement of status discrepancies between heterosexual and LGBTQ people.

Affect. As in Study 1, participants indicated the extent to which 24 emotions describe how they feel toward heterosexual people on a seven-point scale (1 = *Definitely Not*, 7 = *Definitely*). Participants were instructed "to think carefully about their feelings toward heterosexual people as a group." I used the 24 emotions to create positive and negative emotion scales (as commonly used in previous research; e.g., Conley & Rabinowitz, 2004; Mackinnon et al., 1999; see Study 1). The *Positive Emotion Scale* was comprised of six items ($\alpha = .83$; *inspired, enthusiastic, happy, comfortable, love, and positive*). Eighteen items created the *Negative Emotion Scale* ($\alpha = .95$; *jealous, envious, suspicious, afraid, upset, nervous, hurt, judged, distressed, frustrated, angry, resentful, pity, fear, hatred, disdain, negative, and disgust*).

Results

First, I aimed to replicate Study 2's results by testing the effect of video condition on psychological well-being and happiness with being LGBTQ. Next, I tested whether exposure to heterosexual stereotypes affects participants' feelings of upward contempt toward heterosexual people. I then assessed subsample differences based on participants' gender, sexual orientation, and student status.

Effect of Video Condition on Psychological Outcomes

Consistent with the results of Study 2, I expected a main effect of the video condition; specifically, LGBQ participants should feel more positive psychological outcomes after watching the heterosexual stereotypes video compared to participants in the control groups. A one-way analysis of variance confirmed this hypothesis (significant comparisons received a Bonferonni adjustment in post-hoc analyses). Participants who watched the heterosexual stereotypes video felt greater well-being [$F(2, 218) = 5.11, p = .007$] and happiness [$F(2, 218) = 4.38, p = .014$] than those who watched the LGBQ stereotypes video or did not watch a video. Importantly, participants' responses in the LGBQ stereotypes condition did not significantly differ from those in the control (no video) condition in terms of well-being or happiness. The replication of the video condition effect validates the original finding that stereotypes about heterosexual people influence LGBQ people's psychological well-being. See Table 3.1 for means and standard deviations.

Analyses Related to Upward Contempt

The video condition had no effect on participants' feelings of upward contempt toward heterosexual people, $F(2, 218) = 1.59, p = .207$. However, when looking at the subscales separately, there was a significant difference between conditions on the unwarranted status subscale [$F(2, 218) = 3.02, p = .05$], but not on the minorities' superiority subscale [$F(2, 218) = 0.40, p = .673$]. Those in the control condition ($M = 5.19; SD = 0.99$) scored significantly higher on the unwarranted status subscale than those in the heterosexual stereotypes condition ($M = 4.71; SD = 1.24$).

The inclusion of the *Upward Contempt Scale*, *Acknowledgement of Status Scale*, and positive and negative affect measures provided the opportunity to reexamine the relationships

between these measures as found in Study 1. The results concerning these variables from Study 1 are replicated in Study 3. Consistent with the results of Study 1, participants' acknowledgement of status discrepancies was significantly related to their feelings of upward contempt toward heterosexual people, $r(219) = .45, p < .001$. As seen in Table 3.2, upward contempt was *negatively* associated with positive emotions [$r(219) = -.26, p < .001$] and positively associated with negative emotions [$r(219) = .36, p < .001$].

Subsample Differences

Given there were no differences between the LGBTQ stereotypes condition and control condition on the outcomes of interest, yet participants in these two conditions were significantly different from those in the heterosexual stereotypes condition, all subsequent analyses will compare the heterosexual stereotypes condition to the no video condition and LGBTQ stereotypes condition combined. Combining those who watched the LGBTQ stereotypes video with those who did not watch a video yields large enough cell sizes to test for subsample differences with sufficient subsample sizes in each condition. The factor of gender included two categories (woman, man) and sexual orientation included three categories (lesbian, gay, bisexual). The tests of subsample differences are conducted separately to include as many cases as possible in each test—for example, if gender and sexual orientation were entered as factors into the same step, queer-identified people would be removed from the entire analysis; in contrast, if gender and sexual orientation are examined separately, queer-identified people's responses may be accounted for in the gender analysis if they identified as women or men.

I conducted a 2 (condition) x 2 (gender) factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) to test for gender differences on psychological well-being and happiness and to test whether the video condition effect varied as a function of gender (women, $n = 121$; men, $n = 69$). There was an

interaction between video condition and gender on well-being, indicating that the effect of stereotypes about heterosexuals is not the same for men and women, $F(1, 186) = 6.66, p = .011$. Men who were exposed to heterosexual stereotypes experienced greater well-being ($M = 4.92$; $SD = 0.69$) than men in the control condition ($M = 4.09$; $SD = 1.02$); however, exposure to outgroup stereotypes appeared to have little effect on women in the heterosexual stereotypes condition ($M = 4.47$; $SD = 0.85$) in comparison to women in the control condition ($M = 4.42$; $SD = 1.07$). In terms of happiness, there was no interaction between stereotype condition and gender; however, there was a significant main effect of gender, such that women ($M = 8.31$; $SD = 2.16$) were happier with being LGBQ than men ($M = 7.33$; $SD = 2.62$), $F(1, 186) = 7.40, p = .007$.

A 2 (condition) x 3 (sexual orientation) ANOVA was performed on well-being and happiness (lesbian, $n = 65$; gay, $n = 55$; bisexual, $n = 79$). There was no significant interaction between the two factors; however, in addition to the video condition effect, there was a significant main effect of sexual orientation on well-being [$F(2, 193) = 3.94, p = .021$] and happiness [$F(2, 193) = 4.76, p = .010$]. Lesbian women reported significantly greater well-being ($M = 4.63$; $SD = 0.91$) than bisexual people ($M = 4.20$; $SD = 1.04$). Lesbian participants also reported greater happiness ($M = 8.66$; $SD = 2.12$) than bisexual people ($M = 7.43$; $SD = 2.53$). Gay men were not significantly different from lesbian or bisexual participants in terms of their well-being ($M = 4.55$; $SD = 1.03$) and happiness ($M = 7.82$; $SD = 2.26$).

Finally, given the differences found between students and non-students in Study 1, I examined the effect of student status on well-being and happiness in a 2 (condition) x 2 (student status) ANOVA (student, $n = 49$; non-student, $n = 172$). There was no significant interaction between the two factors, but the main effect of student status approached significance on well-

being [$F(1, 217) = 3.49, p = .063$] and there was a significant main effect of student status on happiness [$F(1, 217) = 5.48, p = .02$]. Non-students reported greater well-being ($M = 4.50; SD = 1.01$) than students ($M = 4.14; SD = 0.94$), and non-students were happier with being LGBQ ($M = 8.15; SD = 2.24$) than students ($M = 7.24; SD = 2.63$). These results should be interpreted with caution given the relatively low number of students in this study.

Discussion

In Study 3, I examined the relationship between heterosexual stereotypes and LGBQ people's well-being. This study is a significant contribution because, using these data, I replicated the effect found in Study 2 and, most importantly, I replicated Study 2's effect using a new control group (the no stereotypes condition). After exposure to LGBQ people's stereotypes about heterosexual people, participants felt greater happiness and well-being (e.g., pride, respect, affirmation) than those who were not exposed to stereotypes about heterosexual people (i.e., either exposed to stereotypes about LGBQ people or no stereotypes). However, there is evidence to suggest that individual differences may qualify this effect—in these data, gender of participants significantly interacted with the condition. In particular, the effect appears to be exacerbated for men in the study compared to women. Of note, sexual orientation did not significantly interact with the condition in Study 2 or in Study 3, although there were too few men in Study 2 to evaluate gender differences. Future research should recruit enough participants to make comparisons between subsamples.

Contrary to my hypothesis, there was no relationship between upward contempt and stereotypes about heterosexuals. Perhaps upward contempt is a rather stable psychological experience that is not easily altered by experimental conditions. In this case, upward contempt might be better used as an individual difference factor or moderator (tested before the

manipulation) in future research. Moreover, it is possible that *exposure* to stereotypes about heterosexual people does not affect upward contempt, but *endorsement* of stereotypes about heterosexual people would predict LGBTQ people's feelings of upward contempt. Future research should test these hypotheses to determine how upward contempt as an affective form of prejudice fits into a broader framework of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination.

As found in Study 1, upward contempt significantly correlated with the extent to which participants' acknowledged status discrepancies between LGBTQ and heterosexual people in both conditions. It was also negatively associated with positive emotion and positively related to negative emotion. Although less than one quarter of the participants were students, there were no differences between students and non-students in feelings of upward contempt, as found in Study 1. Further examining upward contempt's relationship to well-being is beyond the scope of the current study; however, future research should continue to investigate under which conditions upward contempt may relate to psychological well-being among LGBTQ people.

Limitations and Future Directions

One limitation to the current study is that a single item measured happiness with being LGBTQ. Future research can address this limitation by using a more comprehensive measure of happiness, as well as including validated measures that might be related to happiness with being LGBTQ (e.g., scales of group pride and measures of internalized homophobia). The inclusion of multiple measures related to psychological health and well-being will allow researchers to test the ways in which outgroup stereotypes fit into a broader picture of psychological processes among minority group members.

Now that the relationship between outgroup stereotypes and participants' well-being is established, future research should consider how outgroup stereotypes might relate to other

aspects of minority groups' health. If heterosexual stereotypes elicit well-being and happiness related to being LGBTQ, and similar feelings of pride, belonging, and affirmation are well-documented buffers to psychological stress (Fingerhut, Peplau, & Gable, 2010; Major & O'Brien, 2005; Meyer, 2003; C. T. Miller & Kaiser, 2001), then stereotypes about heterosexual people might attenuate stress and negative outcomes associated with stigma and prejudice (e.g., reduced self-esteem, increased internalized homophobia). It is well documented that high levels of internalized homophobia and self-reported stress drastically contribute to minorities' mental and physical health and are strongly related to increased suicide rates among LGBTQ adults and youth (e.g., Duncan & Hatzenbuehler, 2014; Frost & Meyer, 2009; Hatzenbuehler, 2009; Hatzenbuehler, Nolen-Hoeksema, & Erickson, 2008; Huebner & Davis, 2007; Kaysen et al., 2014; Meyer, 2003, 2013; Williamson, 2000). Thus, understanding how outgroup stereotypes foster psychological well-being has more applied implications when considered in larger frameworks of stigma, stress, and health. To summarize, outgroup stereotypes might reduce LGBTQ people's stress because outgroup stereotypes trigger the buffers to stress (e.g., well-being and happiness with LGBTQ identities). If this is the case, outgroup stereotypes may be useful for minorities when they are in stress-inducing contexts (e.g., faced with anti-gay prejudice). That is, outgroup stereotypes might be one of many mechanisms that interrupt the relationship between stigma and stress.

As I discussed in Study 2, stereotypes about dominant outgroups may serve a unique (if not an adaptive) purpose for minority groups. Drawing on the results from Studies 2 and 3 and research on stress and coping, one purpose of these stereotypes might be that outgroup stereotypes enhance ingroup solidarity and psychological health even when ingroup membership

is devalued and stigmatized. The results of Study 3 move us closer to understanding the role that outgroup stereotypes may play in a larger picture of minority groups' psychological adjustment.

Conclusion

In Studies 2 and 3, I tested how a minority group's stereotypes about a dominant outgroup affect minority group members' psychological well-being. These data indicate that exposure to stereotypes about a dominant group benefits minority group members—LGBQ participants who viewed stereotypes about heterosexual people experienced greater psychological well-being and happiness with being a member of the LGBQ community than those who were not exposed to heterosexual stereotypes. This finding contributes to a broader body of research related to the effects of ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation. In particular, these data suggest that outgroup stereotypes strengthen the ingroup through their well-being vis-à-vis LGBQ identities. In sum, this research signifies that some outgroup stereotypes might hold adaptive value for a minority ingroup.

CHAPTER 5: General Discussion

The current package of studies prioritizes minority standpoint by treating LGBTQ people as informative and active agents in intergroup relations. Study 1 aimed to empirically validate a measure of upward contempt as felt by members of minority groups (LGBTQ people) toward dominant groups (heterosexual people). Studies 2 and 3 examined the potential for stereotypes about a dominant outgroup to affect the psychological health and well-being of a minority ingroup. Across all studies, the minority-focused approach to research fosters productive new research questions for understanding perceptions of heterosexual people. Directions for future research were discussed within each study; here, I address whether minority groups' psychological processes are unique from those of dominant groups, I identify individual and contextual considerations for future research, and I develop new research questions that allow for an intersectional analysis of intergroup perceptions.

Different Social Status: Same Process?

One question beyond the scope of the current research is whether all groups, regardless of status, similarly experience psychological processes related to contempt and outgroup stereotypes. Put differently, it is unclear whether the findings from these studies elucidate nuances in intergroup behavior among minority group samples (i.e., LGBTQ people) or merely strengthen extant knowledge in the field of intergroup relations about how all ingroups and outgroups behave. Although there may be similarities between minority and dominant ingroups, I argue that there is uniqueness to the psychological experience of being a member of a low

status group and perceiving an outgroup that is of higher social status. In agreement with feminist methodologists and prejudice researchers who are pushing the boundaries of how we study intergroup relations, it is unwise to overlook the distinctive social locations and lived experiences of participants. Being a member of a devalued group in real life, on a day-to-day basis, is not a situation that can be imitated by randomly assigning group membership in a laboratory experiment (as commonly performed in minimal group paradigms) or learned about by studying the psychological processes of dominant group members. Minority groups deserve research about them not because they can replicate what we already know, but because we cannot know everything we can know about human psychology without their inclusion. As further evidence, I discuss how minority groups and dominant groups may differ in lieu of the current results regarding upward contempt and stereotypes about outgroups.

Upward contempt. Across disciplinary lines, scholars believe contempt to be an interpersonal emotion that is about status, morality, and the disapproval of those who fail to fulfill their roles in society (see Izard, 1977; Solomon, 1993). In contrast, more recent definitions of contempt in psychology that distinguish between morally-driven emotions (e.g., anger and disgust) suggest that contempt is directed toward groups who are perceived as incompetent and toward groups that suffer negative outcomes that are believed to be avoidable (Hutcherson & Gross, 2011). For example, welfare recipients, people of lower income, drug addicts, obese individuals, and gay men with HIV are met with contempt (e.g., Cuddy et al., 2008; Fiske et al., 2002; Osborne & Davies, 2012; Vartanian, Thomas, & Vanman, 2013)—these groups are perceived as incompetent and destructive to larger society and the common good. When considering the “contempt” that low status groups may hold toward high status groups, the given definition of contempt is ill-fitting. Thus, we are left with two options for

moving forward with studying “contempt” as a prejudicial emotion: (a) we must conclude that, based on the definition of contempt in psychology, it is unlikely that contempt can ever be held for high-ranking groups or (b) we must re-work the definition of contempt to allow for contempt to be held in an upward direction. Given Miller’s writings on contempt and the results from Study 1, broadening our understanding of contempt and its directional limits is a promising course of action. In doing so, we cannot merely apply the definition of *downward* contempt to describe the experience of *upward contempt*; instead, we should treat upward contempt as a new form of contempt that exists within minority groups.

How does upward contempt differ from downward contempt? Drawing on Miller’s work (who called upward contempt a form of rebellion), previous qualitative data (Matsick & Conley, 2016a), and participants’ responses on the newly developed *Upward Contempt Scale* (Study 1), I suspect that upward contempt might include some degree of social and political resistance—a concept omitted from previous work on (downward) contempt in psychology. Resistance, in this case, describes one’s desire to push back against those with power and to critique systems that maintain group inequality. That is, upward contempt may be driven by people’s willingness to resist the given status and superiority of the dominant group; thus, resistance may be a key feature of upward contempt used to distinguish upward contempt from downward contempt.

Future research should empirically tease apart downward contempt and upward contempt by identifying common and unique factors that motivate both forms of contempt. Another way to differentiate downward and upward contempt is to consider how a minority group may hold downward contempt for a group below them and hold upward contempt for a group above them. In this scenario, it seems unlikely that identical contextual factors would elicit contempt to both the high and low status targets and that identical individual differences and psychological

mechanisms would explain both forms of contempt held to targets differing in status. For example, downward contempt may serve to maintain the status quo whereas upward contempt may function to challenge the status quo. Moreover, Miller (1997) suggests that downward contempt has a greater likelihood to occur with doubts about its legitimacy (e.g., feelings of guilt, shame, or concern for the target may accompany feelings of downward contempt) than upward contempt—a contempt that is presumably free of guilt, shame, or pity for the high status target. In addition, future studies should confirm that upward contempt, as currently presented and defined, is not held by dominant groups toward minority groups in order to verify that upward contempt is truly an *upward* psychological response among people who are of lower status.

I expect there are some points of commonality between upward and downward contempt. The desire to belong to the ingroup can foster feelings of contempt toward the outgroup as a way to enhance ingroup solidarity (Brewer, 1999). Both upward and downward contempt may serve as mechanisms of reinforcing group differences and engaging in ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation. These basic social psychological processes should play similar roles in enhancing the ingroup and an ingroup's psychological health regardless of the direction of contempt. Thus, in the context of group relations, though the *outcomes* of upward and downward contempt may be the same, the contexts and predictors of both forms of contempt may differ.

Outgroup stereotypes. The results from Studies 2 and 3 indicate that exposure to stereotypes about an outgroup cause ingroup members to feel greater psychological well-being and greater happiness about their group membership. Further, extant theories of intergroup biases and social identity would suggest that outgroup derogation (e.g., outgroup stereotypes) enhance psychological outcomes among the ingroup. As a result, it may be tempting for

researchers to infer that the same intergroup processes are at play in intergroup dynamics regardless of the ingroup's status (low or high). However, there are fundamental differences between stereotypes about minority outgroups versus stereotypes about dominant outgroups. First and foremost, minority groups have limited social, political, and economic power; therefore, the stereotypes that they hold about dominant outgroups have relatively less impact on the lives of dominant outgroups than vice versa. The stereotypes that minority group members hold about dominant outgroups cannot influence the social hierarchy and social values to the same extent as dominant groups' stereotypes about a minority outgroup. I would imagine that stereotypes about dominant outgroups serve a more meaningful psychological purpose for minority groups than they influence dominant groups who are the targets of these stereotypes. Although there are similarities regarding the basic aspects of stereotypes about any group (e.g., they are over-simplified, exaggerated, and used as cognitive shortcuts), I suggest our knowledge of stereotype functionality is limited if we only evaluate stereotypes that dominant groups hold about other outgroups (i.e., stereotypes that can influence and maintain status discrepancies).

Outgroup stereotypes as held by minority groups are worth revisiting for both theoretical and applied purposes. First, psychological theories created from the standpoint of dominant groups should be tested (and, if needed, reworked) with minority groups. In order for theories to be generalizable, they should be tested in multiple contexts. In particular, theories and frameworks related to stereotyping should be tested with flipped scripts: positioning minorities as perceivers and dominant groups as targets. Knowledge that results from dominant groups' perspectives may not accurately describe the perspectives of minority groups. For example, we would likely discourage researchers from applying theories built exclusively on gay men's perspectives to the lives of heterosexual people without carefully evaluating the costs of doing

so; the same restraint should be employed when applying frameworks developed from dominant groups' perspectives to explain those of minority groups. This double standard reflects heterosexist bias in research— researchers assume that research conducted with heterosexual participants is useful to everyone, whereas research with LGBTQ participants is only relevant to other LGBTQ people (McClelland & Dutcher, 2016). Thus, by examining outgroup stereotypes from the minority perspective, we have the opportunity both to refine preexisting theories of stereotyping and to uncover new ones.

In addition to the theoretical benefits of a minority-focused approach to research, the study of outgroup stereotypes among minority groups yields applied implications. If outgroup stereotypes are part of a minority groups' toolkit for dealing with inequality and managing a stigmatized identity, then we can start to bridge research on intergroup biases with that of social and minority stress. As mentioned previously, minority groups' perceptions of dominant groups are omitted from both bodies of work (i.e., intergroup behavior and social stress), yet the current research would suggest that there is a link between the two. Perceptions of dominant groups should not only be of interest to intergroup relations researchers wanting to push theory forward; but also, perceptions of dominant groups may help to explain why some stigmatized group members have more positive or negative outcomes than others. Perhaps, there are certain ways of perceiving the dominant outgroup that can disrupt the relationship between stigma and stress (e.g., psychological and physical health disparities). If someone who is a target of stigma and prejudice holds certain outgroup stereotypes, do they feel better about their own group belonging? By considering outgroup stereotypes as an adaptive strategy for coping with prejudice, we can extend our knowledge of mechanisms that buffer stress. As stigma and prejudice researchers push for more interventional research, I note that the potential for

intervention with outgroup stereotyping is limited. That is, it would be unethical to encourage outgroup stereotypes as a way for minority groups to enhance their ingroup; however, by understanding the role of intergroup perceptions in the context of minority stress, we may better identify the tools that members of minority groups have in their arsenal to overcome stigma and prejudice.

Individual Differences in Intergroup Perceptions

Future research should examine individual differences among members of minority groups that are linked with their perceptions of dominant groups. Here, I consider some factors that should theoretically predict LGBTQ people's perceptions of heterosexual people in terms of upward contempt and outgroup stereotypes.

Previous experiences with anti-gay prejudice. One individual difference variable that contributes to the psychological health of members of minority groups is their previous experience with outgroup members (e.g., being targets of prejudice and discrimination; Frost et al., 2015; Meyer, 2003, 2007). Moreover, Johnson and Lecci (2003) found that experiences of previous discrimination— an irrelevant factor when examining dominant group members' attitudes towards minority groups— predict Black people's attitudes towards whites. Specifically, to the extent that one has experienced racial discrimination, s/he holds more negative attitudes toward white people. Thus, not only do previous experiences with prejudice and discrimination vary from person to person, but these experiences are associated with their psychological health, physical health, and attitudes toward the dominant group. Given the role of previous experiences with prejudice as an individual difference factor in minority stress research and intergroup attitudes research, I expect that LGBTQ people who have experienced a greater extent of anti-gay prejudice would report more upward contempt than people who have

had less exposure to anti-gay prejudice. Moreover, this factor may also moderate the relationship between outgroup stereotypes and psychological health, such that the effect is intensified among those who have had the most experience with anti-prejudice and discrimination.

Internalized prejudice. Another factor that should relate to minority group members' perceptions of dominant groups is internalized prejudice (also known as internalized homophobia among LGBQ people or outgroup favoritism). Internalized homophobia is the process in which sexual minorities internalize and hold negative societal attitudes directed toward their own group (see Meyer & Dean, 1998). It is well documented that some minority group members, including LGBQ people, experience "self-hate" and even favor the outgroup and the systems that oppress them (e.g., Herek, Cogan, Gillis, & Glunt, 1997; Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004; Ross & Rosser, 1996; Williamson, 2000). Models of minority stress account for internalized homophobia; for example, those who score high on measures of internalized homophobia experience more negative psychological outcomes (e.g., stress and depression related to their identities; DiPlacido, 1988) and encounter greater relationship problems in their same-sex relationships (e.g., Frost & Meyer, 2009). Clearly, internalized homophobia is an important component of LGBQ people's psychological experiences and adjustment. Future studies that use the *Upward Contempt Scale* could test if internalized homophobia is linked to LGBQ people's perceptions of heterosexual people (e.g., those who internalize anti-gay prejudice may feel less upward contempt). Moreover, research that examines the effect of outgroup stereotypes on psychological well-being should consider whether stereotypes about the dominant group alleviates feelings of internalized homophobia.

Critiques of social boundaries. As I alluded to in my discussion of upward versus downward contempt, upward contempt might be one way for members of minority groups to express their critiques of social boundaries (e.g., symbolic lines that create and maintain institutional differences in social status; see Lamont & Molnár, 2002 for a review of the study of social boundaries in the social sciences). Cultural sociologists suggest that symbolic boundaries explain group differentiation processes and self-categorization, such that people create conceptual distinctions between social categories while uniting with ingroup members based on similarities and distancing from outgroup members based on differences. The current research has implications for understanding how LGBQ people think about social boundaries that cultivate and maintain sexual inequality.

The *Upward Contempt Scale* is a test of people's engagement with the broader social boundaries between LGBQ and heterosexual people. In particular, I argue that feelings of upward contempt reframe symbolic boundaries from the minority standpoint. That is, upward contempt does not deconstruct boundaries (e.g., by framing heterosexual people and LGBQ people as more similar than different); instead, upward contempt simultaneously reinforces boundaries while it contests the given construction of those boundaries. For example, participants' scores on the *minorities' superiority subscale* assess participants' reinforcement of differences; specifically, this subscale measures the extent to which LGBQ people perceive themselves as positively different from heterosexual people. Scores on the *unwarranted status subscale* challenge the current structure of boundaries, such that LGBQ people perceive heterosexuals as underserving of their given status in the social hierarchy. Put simply, we can think of one's endorsement of minorities' superiority as a demonstration of ingroup support and

one's endorsement of heterosexual people's unwarranted status as a critique of the current social structure.

Similarly, social psychological theories can explain how people defend and promote the status quo created by symbolic boundaries. For example, those who score high in social dominance orientation, right-wing authoritarianism, and political conservatism are more likely to favor their ingroup and justify a social hierarchy of groups (e.g., Jost & Hunyady, 2005; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). However, it is unclear how sexual minorities would score on these measures (e.g., by scoring high on social dominance orientation, are LGBTQ people endorsing their own oppression or agreeing with their superiority to groups of lower status?). For example, if white gay men completed a measure of social dominance orientation, it would be necessary to identify the aspects of social hierarchies that they endorse (e.g., racial hierarchies, gender hierarchies, or hierarchies based on sexual orientation). As currently used in social psychology, these theories do not easily account for multiple group memberships; thus, understanding how these factors explain outgroup perceptions from the minority standpoint would be a challenge for feminist researchers concerned with people's multiple group memberships. Adapted measures to assess social dominance orientation from the minority group perspective would be a useful tool to investigate how personality traits that predict sociopolitical values might shape perceptions of dominant outgroups.

In sum, by drawing on previous research, I predict that those who have little experience with anti-gay prejudice, experience high levels of internalized homophobia, and have little desire to critique social boundaries will hold less upward contempt toward heterosexual people. All of these factors can help us to further understand upward contempt's nomological network and to gain more insight into how minority group members psychologically benefit from exposure to

outgroup stereotypes.

Intergroup Perceptions within Hostile Contexts

The purpose of the current research was to develop a measure of upward contempt and to test the relationship between outgroup stereotypes and ingroup well-being. One subsequent step for both projects is to consider how social contexts influence feelings of upward contempt and outgroup stereotypes. In fact, part of the scale development process is to examine how a newly developed scale functions in different contexts, under different experimental conditions, and across different time points. Future research should consider how contextual factors, such as anti-gay prejudice compared to LGBTQ-affirming context, might trigger LGBTQ people's feelings of upward contempt toward heterosexual people. There is clear evidence to suggest that anti-gay contexts have dire effects on the lives of LGBTQ people. For example, Duncan and Hatzenbuehler (2014) evaluated the relationship between anti-gay hate crimes and the psychological health of people who identify as LGBTQ. Duncan and Hatzenbuehler (2014) found that the prevalence of hate crimes in communities was associated with suicidal thoughts and attempts among LGBTQ-identified adolescents. Thus, research that tests how upward contempt and outgroup stereotypes serve protective functions in these midst of anti-gay prejudice would be of particular relevance to members of stigmatized groups who are in less accepting and affirming communities.

Intersectional Considerations

Although this research applies a feminist and queer lens to social psychological theories of group processes, it is limited in its intersectional focus. An intersectional perspective allows for a deeper analysis of individuals and their multiple group memberships and, more specifically, the ways in which multiple disadvantaged identities texturize an individual's experience (see

Cole, 2009 for a discussion of intersectionality in psychology research). Because the results of the current research are based on predominantly white LGBQ samples, it is unclear how perceptions of heterosexual groups may influence the psychological health of LGBQ people of color. Moreover, it is unclear *who* is included in heterosexual target groups (e.g., white heterosexual people, heterosexual people of color). Previous research on intergroup perceptions indicates that people tend to think of the most prototypical members of target groups when forming their impressions of a target (i.e., drawing on perceptions of male group members to form one's perceptions of the group at large; Eagly & Kite, 1987; Matsick & Conley, 2016a); thus, I expect that participants' feelings and attitudes captured in this current research are mostly directed toward white and male heterosexual people.

Future studies should attend to the intersections of race, gender, and sexual orientation by accounting for the perceiver's identities as well as the identities of the target. For example, feelings of upward contempt toward heterosexual people may vary by the race of the target group. On one hand, LGBQ people may feel more upward contempt to white heterosexual people (i.e., those with greater societal status) than heterosexual people of color. In other words, to the extent that a group holds societal power, it will be a target of upward contempt. However, LGBQ people may hold more negative attitudes to people of color. First, white people's stereotypes about Black people commonly include the idea that Black Americans are very religious and this stereotype might be perceived as at odds with the goals of LGBQ people (G. M. Gilbert, 1951; Madon et al., 2001). Second, although research suggests that homophobia among Black men and women does not appear to be more prevalent than among their white counterparts, (Herek & Capitanio, 1995), conversations surrounding the passing of Proposition 8 to ban same-sex marriage in California largely blamed Black American and Latino voters (see

Abrajano, 2010 for a discussion of political attitudes toward same-sex marriage in the midst of Proposition 8). Future research on LGBQ people's perceptions of heterosexuals should investigate the ways in which participant race and target race compound the dynamics between LGBQ and heterosexual people.

Final Remarks

As Shelton (2000) thoughtfully stated, the study of minority groups' perspectives does not override the value of studying dominant groups' perceptions of minority groups. At the root of prejudice and social inequality is power; if the goal is to reduce prejudice, we must continue to study dominant groups' perspectives and experiences. Moreover, researchers that empower minority groups as active agents in intergroup dynamics should note that minority groups' attitudes are not nearly as destructive or influential even if they hold negative biases toward other groups. Those with relatively less societal power cannot use prejudice as a weapon of injustice to the same extent as groups with greater power. In other words, it would be unrealistic to expect that minority groups' negative attitudes toward or perceptions of other groups have the same consequences as when dominant groups hold negative attitudes toward other groups.

Furthermore, despite political strides toward equality that are made within minority groups (i.e., LGBTQ communities), status discrepancies between LGBQ and heterosexual people are far from being resolved and still play an influential role in the lives of LGBQ people (e.g., LGBTQ people experience discrimination, health issues, stigma in receiving health care, suicide ideation, obstacles to having families, and microaggressions at greater rates than their heterosexual counterparts; Barbara, Quandt, & Anderson, 2001; Cochran, 2001; Duncan & Hatzenbuehler, 2014; Hatzenbuehler et al., 2008; Meyer, 2003, 2007). Moreover, many of these issues are exacerbated for people of color (e.g., Balsam, Molina, Beadnell, Simoni, & Walters,

2011). Thus, the need for research that examines relations between LGBTQ people and heterosexual people is far from becoming obsolete. Ultimately, prejudice is still a “wicked problem” in society— one with multiple causes and multiple consequences. An issue as complex as this one requires that we cover it from every angle, including people’s views from the bottom.

FOOTNOTES

1. These data were collected prior to the June 26, 2015 ruling of Obergefell v Hodges in favor of same-sex marriage in the United States.
2. It is reasonable to assume that most researchers who conduct multifaceted psychological studies prefer shorter scales with high internal consistency in order to simultaneously test multiple measures in one study. Therefore, researchers should mind the length of newly developed scales. When developing a new measure, if the alpha is at least .70 and there are plenty of retained items, one can choose to eliminate items that will not negatively influence the reliability of the scale (Hinkin, 1998). It is common to retain approximately 50% of the original items in the final scale (Cortina, 1993; Hinkin, 1998). None of the included items in the new upward contempt measure drastically increase reliability if they are removed; however, if scale length is a concern, revisiting tests of internal consistency may be one approach to identifying additional items to remove.
3. There was an administrative error made in the random assignment of the conditions in Study 3, such that Qualtrics Survey Software presented the conditions that included videos slightly more often than the condition that did not include a video (control). This explains why there were fewer participants in the control group than the conditions that required participants to watch a video. This error was rectified midway through data collection to ensure that Qualtrics evenly presented the conditions to participants.

Table 1.1

Exploratory Factor Analysis Loading Matrix (three-factor solution; N = 371)

	Factor Loading		
	1	2	3
Factor 1: Minorities' Superiority			
LGBQ people have some better traits than heterosexual people do.	.70	.09	-.01
In some ways, LGBQ people are superior to heterosexuals.	.70	.00	.01
LGBQ people have better attitudes than heterosexual people do.	.79	-.02	-.05
LGBQ people have better personalities than heterosexuals do.	.86	-.04	-.06
Heterosexuals are inferior to LGBQ people in some ways.	.66	-.04	-.01
Heterosexuals' lives are boring compared to LGBQ people's lives.	.73	.00	.02
LGBQ people have had greater life experiences than heterosexuals.	.71	-.04	.05
LGBQ people are more informed about the world than heterosexuals are.	.71	.03	.05
Factor 2: Unwarranted Status			
Heterosexuals think they are better than they really are.	.16	.60	.06
A lot of things heterosexuals get to enjoy in life are unearned.	.21	.64	-.07
It is unfair that heterosexuals get special treatment in society over other people.	-.13	.74	.06
The privileges that heterosexuals are given are unjustified.	.01	.71	.00
Heterosexuals are wrong to think that their way of life is the best way of life.	-.12	.62	.10
Heterosexual people aren't as great as they think they are.	.13	.72	-.03
The power that heterosexual people hold isn't deserved.	.03	.77	-.07
Heterosexuals aren't as superior to other people as they'd like to believe.	-.18	.76	.02
Factor 3: Devaluing Attributes			
Heterosexuals care about silly things.	.30	-.07	.54
Some of heterosexuals' values are unimportant.	-.05	.04	.74
Some of heterosexuals' moral values are ridiculous.	-.13	.10	.63
Heterosexuals' values are inessential.	.20	.01	.46
Heterosexuals care too much about traditions that aren't important in life.	.06	-.03	.68
Items Dropped for Failing to Correlate with Any Other Items at $r > 0.30$			
Heterosexuals are better than LGBQ people in most ways. (rev)			
Heterosexuals deserve to be a high status group in society. (rev)			
Heterosexuals promote values that are necessary to live a fulfilling life. (rev)			
Heterosexuals' morals help to create a better society. (rev)			
The traditions that heterosexuals care about are a meaningful part of life. (rev)			
Some of heterosexuals' religious values are senseless.			

Note. Boldface indicates the factor onto which each of the strongest items loads. Loadings are reported from the oblique rotation pattern matrix for the three-factor solution. Participants indicated their agreement with each item on a seven point-scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 7 = *Strongly Agree*).

Table 1.2

Exploratory Factor Analysis Loading Matrix (two-factor solution; N = 371)

	Factor Loading	
	1	2
Factor 1: Minorities' Superiority		
LGBQ people have some better traits than heterosexual people do.	.71	.07
In some ways, LGBQ people are superior to heterosexuals.	.71	.00
LGBQ people have better attitudes than heterosexual people do.	.77	-.04
LGBQ people have better personalities than heterosexuals do.	.83	-.07
Heterosexuals are inferior to LGBQ people in some ways.	.65	-.04
Heterosexuals' lives are boring compared to LGBQ people's lives.	.73	.01
LGBQ people have had greater life experiences than heterosexuals.	.73	-.03
LGBQ people are more informed about the world than heterosexuals are.	.74	.04
Factor 2: Unwarranted Status		
Heterosexuals think they are better than they really are.	.18	.63
A lot of things heterosexuals get to enjoy in life are unearned.	.17	.61
It is unfair that heterosexuals get special treatment in society over other people.	-.11	.76
The privileges that heterosexuals are given are unjustified.	.00	.71
Heterosexuals are wrong to think that their way of life is the best way of life.	-.08	.66
Heterosexual people aren't as great as they think they are.	.12	.71
The power that heterosexual people hold isn't deserved.	-.01	.75
Heterosexuals aren't as superior to other people as they'd like to believe.	-.17	.77

Note. Boldface indicates the factor onto which each of the strongest items loads. Loadings are reported from the oblique rotation pattern matrix for the two-factor solution. Participants indicated their agreement with each item on a seven point-scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 7 = *Strongly Agree*).

Table 1.3

Intercorrelations Among Upward Contempt and Validity Measures (N = 371)

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. UC: Minorities' Superiority	3.69	1.24	(.90)						
2. UC: Unwarranted Status	4.95	1.19	.35**	(.89)					
3. Upward Contempt (full scale)	4.32	1.00	.89**	.81**	(.89)				
4. Acknowledge Status Discrep.	5.25	1.09	.15*	.50**	.39**	(.74)			
5. Positive Emotion	4.22	1.28	-.13*	-.30**	-.26**	-.27**	(.86)		
6. Negative Emotion	3.28	1.24	.34**	.34**	.42**	.23**	-.18**	(.95)	
7. Social Desirability	5.58	2.89	.07	-.16*	-.05	-.13*	.15*	-.14*	(.71)

Note. UC = upward contempt; *M* = mean; *SD* = standard deviation; Coefficient *as* are reported in parentheses along the diagonal of the correlation matrix; **p* ≤ .01 and ***p* < .001.

Table 2.1

Means (Standard Deviations) by Video Condition (N = 146)

Outcome	Video Condition	
	Heterosexual Stereotypes	LGBTQ Stereotypes
Psychological Well-Being	4.41 (0.96) ^a	3.93 (0.96) ^b
Happiness with Being LGBTQ	9.08 (1.23) ^a	8.26 (1.85) ^b
Collective Self-Esteem	4.44 (0.72)	4.35 (0.81)

Note. $N = 146$ ($n = 72$ in heterosexual stereotypes condition and $n = 74$ in LGBTQ stereotypes condition).

Subscripts indicate instances in which a differs from b at $p < .01$.

Table 3.1

Means (Standard Deviations) by Video Condition (N = 221)

Outcome	Video Condition		
	Heterosexual Stereotypes	LGBTQ Stereotypes	Control
Psychological Well-Being	4.67 (0.81) ^a	4.29 (1.15) ^b	4.18 (1.00) ^b
Happiness with Being LGBTQ	8.49 (1.94) ^a	7.62 (2.54) ^b	7.48 (2.58) ^b
Upward Contempt	4.19 (0.91)	4.37 (0.91)	4.44 (0.82)
Minorities' Superiority (subscale)	3.67 (1.04)	3.82 (1.13)	3.69 (1.17)
Unwarranted Status (subscale)	4.71 (1.24) ^a	4.92 (1.13)	5.19 (0.99) ^b

Note. $N = 221$ ($n = 91$ in heterosexual stereotypes condition, $n = 76$ in LGBTQ stereotypes condition, and $n = 54$ in control condition). Subscripts indicate instances in which a differs from b at $p < .05$.

Table 3.2

Correlations Among Upward Contempt and Primary Variables

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. UC: Minorities' Superiority	–	.23**	.80***	.09	-.12	.24**	-.05	.10
2. UC: Unwarranted Status	.26*	–	.77***	.56***	-.25**	.40***	-.20*	.03
3. Upward Contempt	.75***	.83***	–	.40***	-.23**	.41***	-.13	.08
4. Acknowledge Status Discrep.	.18	.62***	.53***	–	-.26**	.39***	-.27**	-.19*
5. Positive Emotion	-.10	-.33**	-.28**	-.34***	–	-.43***	.48***	.35***
6. Negative Emotion	.17	.26**	.27**	.32**	-.36***	–	-.45***	-.23**
7. Psychological Well-Being	.04	-.20*	-.11	-.31**	.39***	-.44***	–	.50***
8. Happiness with Being LGBTQ	.29**	-.04	.13	-.03	.12	-.34***	.38***	–

Note. Correlations below the diagonal represent relationships between variables in the control condition ($n = 130$) and correlations above the diagonal represent relationships between variables in the heterosexual stereotypes condition ($n = 91$). Participants provided their responses on measures 1-6 on seven-point scales (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 7 = *Strongly Agree*), psychological well-being (six-point scale; greater numbers indicate greater well-being), and happiness with being LGBTQ (1 = *Not at All*, 10 = *Extremely*); * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Study 1 Measures

Upward Contempt (original set of items; 1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 7 = *Strongly Agree*)

1. Heterosexuals think they are better than they really are.
2. A lot of things heterosexuals get to enjoy in life are unearned.
3. It is unfair that heterosexuals get special treatment in society over other people.
4. The privileges that heterosexuals are given are unjustified.
5. Heterosexuals are wrong to think that their way of life is the best way of life.
6. Heterosexuals deserve to be a high status group in society. (Rev)
7. Heterosexual people aren't as great as they think they are.
8. The power that heterosexual people hold isn't deserved.
9. Heterosexuals aren't as superior to other people as they'd like to believe.
10. Heterosexuals are better than LGBQ people in most ways. (Rev)
11. LGBQ people have some better traits than heterosexual people do.
12. In some ways, LGBQ people are superior to heterosexuals.
13. LGBQ people have better mentalities than heterosexuals.
14. LGBQ people have better attitudes than heterosexual people do.
15. LGBQ people have better personalities than heterosexuals do.
16. Heterosexuals are inferior to LGBQ people in some ways.
17. Heterosexuals' lives are boring compared to LGBQ people's lives.
18. LGBQ people have had greater life experiences than heterosexuals.
19. LGBQ people are more informed about the world than heterosexuals are.
20. Heterosexuals care about silly things.
21. Some of heterosexuals' values are unimportant.
22. Some of heterosexuals' moral values are ridiculous.
23. Heterosexuals' values are inessential.
24. Heterosexuals promote values that are necessary to live a fulfilling life. (Rev)
25. Some of heterosexuals' religious values are senseless.
26. Heterosexuals' morals help to create a better society. (Rev)
27. Heterosexuals care too much about traditions that aren't important in life.
28. The traditions that heterosexuals care about are a meaningful part of life. (Rev)

Acknowledgement of Status Discrepancies (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 7 = *Strongly Agree*)

1. Heterosexuals are more often in positions of power in society than LGBQ people.
2. It is generally believed that LGBQ people are inferior to heterosexuals.
3. Heterosexuals have greater societal status than LGBQ people.
4. LGBQ people are treated like second-class citizens in society compared to heterosexuals.

5. LGBTQ and heterosexual people hold equal social status. (Rev)

Measures of Affect (1 = *Definitely Not*, 7 = *Definitely*)

1. Jealous
2. Envious
3. Suspicious
4. Afraid
5. Upset
6. Nervous
7. Hurt
8. Judged
9. Distressed
10. Frustrated
11. Inspired
12. Enthusiastic
13. Angry
14. Resentful
15. Happy
16. Comfortable
17. Pity
18. Fear
19. Hatred
20. Disdain
21. Love
22. Positive
23. Negative
24. Disgust

Social Desirability Scale (1 = *True*, 0 = *False*)

1. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
2. On a few occasions, I have given up something because I thought too little of my ability.
3. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
4. No matter who is talking, I'm always a good listener. (Rev)
5. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.
6. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.
7. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake. (Rev)
8. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
9. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. (Rev)
10. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. (Rev)
11. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
12. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
13. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. (Rev)

APPENDIX B: Study 2 and 3 Video Materials

Figure B.1

Images from Video Materials



Actress 1



Actor 1



Actress 2



Actress 3



Actor 2

Table B.1

Stereotype Content: Heterosexual Video Condition

“Stuff that Straight People Say... (Re-enacted by members of the gay community)”

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M8aOIRHtM70>

Video length: 1:40 minutes; 12 heterosexual woman comments, 12 heterosexual man comments

Role	Heterosexual Stereotype	Statement
Actress 1	Unintelligent/Ditzy	“No, I don’t follow the news. What am I? Like 60?”
Actor 1	Unemotional	“My dad says real men don’t cry, so I don’t.”
Actress 2	“Fag Hag”	“I don’t understand, like, why are all of the good guys gay?”
Actor 2	Arrogant	“I outdrank all my bros last night...I’m always the last one standing.”
Actress 3	Judgmental	“We’re not living together until we’re married. That’s what God wants us to do.”
Actress 1	Dependent on Men	“I don’t know how to pay this bill! My husband always does it for me.”
Actor 1	Sexist	“A woman’s place is in the kitchen and in my bedroom.”
Actress 2	Latent Homosexuality	“I mean, yeah I’ve been attracted to women before, but my parents would freak out!”
Actor 2	Unattractive	“How am I supposed to know what boot cut jeans are? Jeans are jeans.”
Actress 3	Submissive to Men	“The hubby is hungry, so I need to make him a sandwich.”
Actor 2	Closed-minded	“I meant gay like stupid, not gay like <i>gay</i> !”
Actor 1	Latent Homosexuality	“I swear I’m not really gay, just please don’t tell my girlfriend about this!”
Actress 1	Breeder	“Gotta get married soon – mom wants grandkids!”
Actor 1	Intolerant	“I’m cool with gay guys...I just don’t want them looking at me.”
Actress 2	Tease	“Well, I mean, my boyfriend does think it’d be hot if we kissed.”
Actor 2	Sexualizes Lesbians	“You’re a lesbian? Can I watch?”
Actress 3	Has Bad Sex	“Well I never expect to orgasm but it’s still fun I guess.”
Actress 1	Hyper-Femininity	“I’m on my 10 th store and I still haven’t found the perfect formal dress for tonight!”
Actor 1	Macho	“Baseball, sex, and women are my only interests.”
Actress 2	Emotional	“Well you know me, I just always cry at weddings!”
Actor 2	Aggressive	“I got kicked out of the bar for fighting those punks.”
Actress 3	Vain	“Uhhh...does this make me look fat?”
Actor 2	Homophobic	“No homo! Real dudes don’t sleep with dudes.”
Actor 1	Member of Fraternity	“Being hazed on my high school team was nothing like being hazed at my fraternity.”

Table B.2

Stereotype Content: LGBTQ Video Condition

“Stuff that Gay People Say... (Re-enacted by members of the gay community)” <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aAE9uEi2yJc>
 Video length: 1:34 minutes; 12 lesbian comments, 12 gay comments

Role	Gay/Lesbian Stereotype	Statement
Actress 1	Can Fix Things	“I’ll bring a six pack and a tool kit...best weekend ever!”
Actor 1	Devoted Gay Fan	“Shut up! Lady Gaga is totally better than Katy Perry.”
Actress 2	Lipstick Lesbian	“All right, yeah, I get it, I don’t look like a lesbian!”
Actor 2	Sensitive	“If that jerk breaks up with you, come on over. We’ll watch a marathon of <i>Girls</i> , and there’s an entire pint of ice cream with your name on it!”
Actress 3	Hypersexual	“She’s only straight...until she’s not.”
Actress 1	Soft Butch	“Which flannel looks better on me?”
Actor 1	Thin	“Beer? Gross!”
Actress 2	Athletic	“Guys, I can’t Softball is on Saturday.”
Actor 2	Top/Bottom Dynamics	“Oh my god, he is such a bottom!”
Actress 3	U-Haul/Fast Relationships	“We’re moving in together. Pack up the U-Haul!”
Actor 2	Afraid of Vaginas	“Can you <i>not</i> say ‘vagina’ around me please?”
Actor 1	Not Athletic	“Is football the one with the innings?”
Actress 1	Devoted Lesbian Fan	“I’ve seen Tegan and Sara in concert like, six times.”
Actor 1	Feminine	“Girrrrl, you look fierce!”
Actress 2	Free Spirit	“Wait, what do you mean you’re not vegan anymore?”
Actor 2	Great Dancers	“Why do people even go to bars if they’re not going to dance?”
Actress 3	Ex-Drama	“My ex and her girlfriend will meet us for dinner at seven.”
Actress 1	Anti-Men	“Have I slept with men? No! I’m a gold star.”
Actor 1	Great Dressers	“He’s just jealous I have better hair, clothes, and shoes.”
Actress 2	Relationship-Oriented	“She’s like the Portia to my Ellen DeGeneres.”
Actor 2	Promiscuous	“There are not enough new men in town for me to sleep with.”
Actress 3	Independent	“What do you mean you don’t know how to change a tire?”
Actor 2	Dramatic	“Oh my god! That boy is such a diva! I can’t. I can’t even.”
Actor 1	Vain	“No, I’m not wearing makeup...I’m naturally flawless.”

APPENDIX C: Study 2 Measures

Pre-testing Video Items (Scale of 1 to 5)

1. Not at all Entertaining to Very Entertaining
2. Not at all Funny to Very Funny
3. Very Uninteresting to Very Interesting
4. Not at all Accurate to Very Accurate
5. Not at all Offensive to the LGBTQ Community to Very Offensive to the LGBTQ Community
6. Not at all Attractive to Very Attractive
7. Not at all Likeable to Very Likeable
8. Not at all Amusing to Very Amusing
9. Very Unappealing to Very Appealing
10. Not at all Artistic to Very Artistic
11. How do LGBTQ people look for making this video? (1 = *Not Very Good*, 5 = *Very Good*)

Psychological Well-Being (Scale 1-6, *greater numbers indicate more positive outcomes*)

1. Ashamed to Proud
2. Inferior to Equal
3. Discouraged to Encouraged
4. Disrespected to Respected
5. Afraid to Unafraid
6. Unsafe to Safe
7. Rejected to Accepted
8. Threatened to Affirmed
9. Stigmatized to Supported
10. Alone to Close to Others
11. Strong to Vulnerable (Rev)

Collective Self Esteem Scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 6 = *Strongly Agree*)

1. I feel that belonging to the LGBTQ community is not a good thing for me. (Rev)
2. My membership in the LGBTQ community is an important reflection of who I am.
3. My membership in the LGBTQ community has little to do with how I feel about myself. (Rev)
4. Belonging to the LGBTQ community is an important part of my self-image.
5. I feel good about belonging to the LGBTQ community.
6. I make a positive contribution to the LGBTQ community.
7. I regret belonging to the LGBTQ community. (Rev)
8. I feel I don't have much to offer the LGBTQ community. (Rev)
9. I'm glad I belong to the LGBTQ community.

General Happiness Item (1 = *Not at All*; 10 = *Extremely*)

1. I feel happy to be LGBTQ.

APPENDIX D: Study 3 Measures

Pre-testing Video Items (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 5 = *Strongly Agree*)

1. The video was funny.
2. The video was entertaining.
3. I was offended by the video.
4. Other LGBTQ people would enjoy watching the video.
5. I did not like the video.
6. I would share this video with my friends who identify as LGBTQ.

Psychological Well-Being (Scale 1-6, *greater numbers indicate more positive outcomes*)

1. Ashamed to Proud
2. Inferior to Equal
3. Discouraged to Encouraged
4. Disrespected to Respected
5. Afraid to Unafraid
6. Unsafe to Safe
7. Rejected to Accepted
8. Threatened to Affirmed
9. Stigmatized to Supported
10. Alone to Close to Others
11. Strong to Vulnerable (Rev)

General Happiness Item (1 = *Not at All*, 10 = *Extremely*)

1. I feel happy to be LGBTQ.

Upward Contempt (original set of items; 1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 7 = *Strongly Agree*)

1. Heterosexuals think they are better than they really are.
2. A lot of things heterosexuals get to enjoy in life are unearned.
3. It is unfair that heterosexuals get special treatment in society over other people.
4. The privileges that heterosexuals are given are unjustified.
5. Heterosexuals are wrong to think that their way of life is the best way of life.
6. Heterosexuals deserve to be a high status group in society. (Rev)
7. Heterosexual people aren't as great as they think they are.
8. The power that heterosexual people hold isn't deserved.
9. Heterosexuals aren't as superior to other people as they'd like to believe.
10. Heterosexuals are better than LGBTQ people in most ways. (Rev)
11. LGBTQ people have some better traits than heterosexual people do.
12. In some ways, LGBTQ people are superior to heterosexuals.
13. LGBTQ people have better mentalities than heterosexuals.
14. LGBTQ people have better attitudes than heterosexual people do.
15. LGBTQ people have better personalities than heterosexuals do.

16. Heterosexuals are inferior to LGBTQ people in some ways.
17. Heterosexuals' lives are boring compared to LGBTQ people's lives.
18. LGBTQ people have had greater life experiences than heterosexuals.
19. LGBTQ people are more informed about the world than heterosexuals are.
20. Heterosexuals care about silly things.
21. Some of heterosexuals' values are unimportant.
22. Some of heterosexuals' moral values are ridiculous.
23. Heterosexuals' values are inessential.
24. Heterosexuals promote values that are necessary to live a fulfilling life. (Rev)
25. Some of heterosexuals' religious values are senseless.
26. Heterosexuals' morals help to create a better society. (Rev)
27. Heterosexuals care too much about traditions that aren't important in life.
28. The traditions that heterosexuals care about are a meaningful part of life. (Rev)

Acknowledgement of Status Discrepancies (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 7 = *Strongly Agree*)

1. Heterosexuals are more often in positions of power in society than LGBTQ people.
2. It is generally believed that LGBTQ people are inferior to heterosexuals.
3. Heterosexuals have greater societal status than LGBTQ people.
4. LGBTQ people are treated like second-class citizens in society compared to heterosexuals.
5. LGBTQ and heterosexual people hold equal social status. (Rev)

Measures of Affect (1 = *Definitely Not*, 7 = *Definitely*)

1. Jealous
2. Envious
3. Suspicious
4. Afraid
5. Upset
6. Nervous
7. Hurt
8. Judged
9. Distressed
10. Frustrated
11. Inspired
12. Enthusiastic
13. Angry
14. Resentful
15. Happy
16. Comfortable
17. Pity
18. Fear
19. Hatred
20. Disdain
21. Love
22. Positive

- 23. Negative
- 24. Disgust

REFERENCES

- Abrajano, M. (2010). Are blacks and latinos responsible for the passage of Proposition 8: Analyzing voter attitudes on California's proposal to ban same-sex marriage in 2008. *Political Research Quarterly*, 63(4), 922-932.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Amir, Y. (1969). Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. *Psychological Bulletin*, 71(5), 319-342. doi:10.1037/h0027352
- Anderson, K. J., & Kanner, M. (2011). Inventing a gay agenda: Students' perceptions of lesbian and gay professors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41(6), 1538-1564.
- Bailey, J., Wallace, M., & Wright, B. (2013). Are gay men and lesbians discriminated against when applying for jobs? A four-city, Internet-based field experiment. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 60(6), 873-894.
- Ballard, R. (1992). Short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Psychological Reports*, 71, 1155-1160.
- Balsam, K. F., Molina, Y., Beadnell, B., Simoni, J., & Walters, K. (2011). Measuring multiple minority stress: The LGBT people of color microaggressions scale. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 17(2), 163-174.
- Barbara, A. M., Quandt, S. A., & Anderson, R. T. (2001). Experiences of lesbians in the health care environment. *Women & Health*, 34(1), 45-62.
- Barker, N. (2013). *Not the marrying kind: A feminist critique of same-sex marriage*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ben-Ze'ev, A. (2001). When you are bad, I am mad--Anger, hate, disgust, and contempt. *The subtlety of emotions*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Branscombe, N. R., & Wann, D. L. (1994). Collective self-esteem consequences of outgroup derogation when a valued social identity is on trial. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 64(6), 641-657.
- Branscombe, N. R., Wann, D. L., Noel, J. G., & Coleman, J. (1993). In-group or out-group extremity: Importance of the threatened social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19(4), 381-388.
- Brewer, M. B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 307-324.
- Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17(5), 475-482.
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? . *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 429-444.
- Brewer, M. B. (2007). The social psychology of intergroup relations: Social categorization, ingroup bias, and outgroup prejudice. In A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (2 ed., pp. 695-715). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

- Brewer, M. B., Dull, V., & Lui, L. (1981). Perceptions of the elderly: Stereotypes as prototypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41*(4), 656-670.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cadinu, M. R., & Rothbart, M. (1996). Self-anchoring and differentiation processes in the minimal group setting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(4), 661-677.
- Caprariello, P. A., Cuddy, A. J. C., & Fiske, S. T. (2009). Social structure shapes cultural stereotypes and emotions: A causal test of the stereotype content model. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 12*(2), 147-155.
- Castelli, L., & Carraro, L. (2010). Striving for difference: On the spontaneous preference for ingroup members who maximize ingroup positive distinctiveness. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 40*(6), 881-890.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1*, 245-276.
- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment, 7*(3), 309-319.
- Cochran, S. D. (2001). Emerging issues in research on lesbians' and gay men's mental health: Does sexual orientation really matter? *American Psychologist, 56*(11), 932-947.
- Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist, 64*(3), 170-180. doi:10.1037/a0014564
- Collins, P. H. (1986). Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of black feminist thought. *Social Problems, 33*(6), S14-S32.
- Comrey, A. L. (1988). Factor-analytic methods of scale development in personality and clinical psychology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56*, 754-761.
- Conley, T. D., Calhoun, C., Evett, S. R., & Devine, P. G. (2001). Mistakes that heterosexual people make when trying to appear non-prejudiced: The view from LGB people. *Journal of Homosexuality, 42*(2), 21-43. doi:10.1300/J082v42n02_02
- Conley, T. D., Devine, P. G., Rabow, J., & Evett, S. R. (2003). Gay men and lesbians' experiences in and expectations for interactions with heterosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality, 44*(1), 83-109.
- Conley, T. D., & Rabinowitz, J. L. (2004). Scripts, close relationships, and symbolic meanings of contraceptives. *Personal Relationships, 11*(4), 539-558.
- Conley, T. D., Rabinowitz, J. L., & Matsick, J. L. (2015). U.S. ethnic minorities' attitudes toward Whites: The role of shared reality theory in intergroup relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, (available online, early view).
- Conley, T. D., Rubin, J. D., Matsick, J. L., Ziegler, A., & Moors, A. C. (2014). Proposer gender, pleasure, and danger in casual sex offers among bisexual women and men. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 55*, 80-88.
- Contrada, R. J., Ashmore, R. D., Gary, M. L., Coups, E., Egeth, J. D., Sewell, A., . . . Chasse, V. (2000). Ethnicity-related sources of stress and their effects on well-being. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 9*(4), 136-139.
- Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*(98-104).
- Cox, W. T. L., Abramson, L. Y., Devine, P. G., & Hollon, S. D. (2012). Stereotypes, prejudice, and depression: The integrated perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 7*(5), 427-449.

- Crocker, J., & Luhtanen, R. (1990). Collective self-esteem and ingroup bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(1), 60-67.
- Crocker, J., Luhtanen, R., Blaine, B., & Broadmax, S. (1994). Collective self-esteem and psychological well-being among White, Black, and Asian college students. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(5), 503-513.
- Crocker, J., & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review*, 96(4), 608-630.
- Crocker, J., Major, B., & Steele, C. (1998). Social stigma. In D. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 504–553). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 24, 349-354.
- Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2008). Warmth and competence as universal dimensions of social perception: The stereotype content model and the BIAS map. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 61-149.
- D'Augelli, A. R., & Grossman, A. H. (2001). Disclosure of sexual orientation, victimization, and mental health among lesbian, gay, and bisexual older adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16(10), 1008-1027.
- Diehl, M., & Jonas, K. (1991). Measures of national stereotypes as predictors of the latencies of inductive versus deductive stereotypic judgments. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 21(4), 317-330.
- DiPlacido, J. (1988). Minority stress among lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals: A consequence of heterosexism, homophobia, and stigmatization. In G. M. Herek (Ed.), *Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals* (Vol. 4, pp. 138-159). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dovidio, J. F., Major, B., & Crocker, J. (2000). Stigma: Introduction and overview. In T. F. Heatherton, R. E. Kleck, M. R. Hebl, & J. G. Hull (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Stigma* (pp. 1-28). New York: Guilford Press.
- Duncan, D. T., & Hatzenbuehler, M. L. (2014). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender hate crimes and suicidality among a population-based sample of sexual-minority adolescents in Boston. *American Journal of Public Health*, 104(2), 272-278.
- Dyson, S., Mitchell, A., Smith, A., Dowsett, G., Pitts, M., & Hiller, L. (2003). "Don't ask, don't tell." Hidden in the crowd: The need for documenting links between sexuality and suicidal behaviour among young people. *Monograph Series*, 45.
- Eagly, A. H., & Kite, M. E. (1987). Are stereotypes of nationalities applied to both women and men? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(3), 451-462.
- Ekman, P. (2003). *Emotions revealed: Recognizing faces and feelings to improve communication and emotional life*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, LLC.
- Ellemers, N., Kortekaas, P., & Ouwerkerk, J. W. (1999). Self-categorisation, commitment to the group and group self-esteem as related but distinct aspects of social identity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 371-389.
- Esses, V. M., Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1993). Values, stereotypes, and emotions as determinants of intergroup attitudes. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception* (pp. 137-166). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

- Fein, S., & Spencer, S. J. (1997). Prejudice as self-image maintenance: Affirming the self through derogating others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(1), 31-44.
- Fine, M., & Gordon, S. M. (1992). Feminist transformations of/despite psychology *Disruptive Voices: The Possibilities of Feminist Research* (pp. 1-25). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Fingerhut, A. W., & Peplau, L. A. (2006). The impact of social roles on stereotypes of gay men. *Sex Roles*, 55(3-4), 273-278.
- Fingerhut, A. W., Peplau, L. A., & Gable, S. L. (2010). Identity, minority stress and psychological well-being among gay men and lesbians. *Psychology & Sexuality*, 1(2), 101-114.
- Fiske, S. T. (1993). Controlling other people: The impact of power on stereotyping. *American Psychologist*, 48(6), 621-628.
- Fiske, S. T. (2010). Envy up, scorn down: How comparison divides us. *American Psychologist*, 65(8), 698-706.
- Fiske, S. T. (2011). *Envy up, scorn down: How status divides us*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 878-902.
- Fiske, S. T., & Neuberg, S. L. (1990). A continuum of impression formation, from category-based to individuating processes: Influences of information and motivation on attention and interpretation. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 23, 1-74.
- Fonow, M. M., & Cook, J. A. (1991). Back to the future: A look at the second wave of feminist epistemology and methodology. In M. M. Fonow & J. A. Cook (Eds.), *Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived research* (pp. 1-15). Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Ford, J. K., MacCallum, R. C., & Tait, M. (1986). The application of exploratory factor analysis in applied psychology: A critical review and analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 39(291-314).
- Frankel, M. S., & Siang, S. (1999). Ethical and legal aspects of human subjects research on the internet. <http://www.aaas.org/spp/dspp/sfml/projects/intres/main.htm>.
- Frost, D. M. (2011). Social stigma and its consequences for the socially stigmatized. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5(11), 824-839.
- Frost, D. M., Lehavot, K., & Meyer, I. H. (2015). Minority stress and physical health among sexual minority individuals. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 38(1), 1-8.
- Frost, D. M., & Meyer, I. H. (2009). Internalized homophobia and relationship quality among lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 56(1), 97-109.
- Geiger, W., Harwood, J., & Hummert, M. L. (2006). College students' multiple stereotypes of lesbians: A cognitive perspective. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 51(3), 165-182.
- Gilbert, D. T., & Hixon, J. G. (1991). The trouble of thinking: Activation and application of stereotypic beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(4), 509-517.
- Gilbert, G. M. (1951). Stereotype persistence and change among college students. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 245-254.
- Goldenberg, A., Halperin, E., van Zomeren, M., & Gross, J. J. (2016). The process model of group-based emotion: Integrating intergroup emotion and emotion regulation perspectives. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 20(2), 118-141.

- Gottman, J. M., & Levenson, R. W. (1999). How stable is marital interaction over time? *Family Process*, 38(2), 159-165.
- Guadagnoli, E., & Velicer, W. F. (1988). Relation of sample size to the stability of component patterns. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 265-275.
- Haddock, G., Zanna, M. P., & Esses, V. M. (1993). Assessing the structure of prejudicial attitudes: The case of attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(6), 1105-1118.
- Halperin, D. M., & Traub, V. (2010). Beyond gay pride. In D. M. Halperin & V. Traub (Eds.), *Gay shame* (pp. 3-40). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575-599.
- Harding, S. (1986). *The science question in feminism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Harding, S. (2004). Introduction: Standpoint theory as a site of political, philosophic, and scientific debate. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies* (pp. 1-16). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hart, K. P. (2004). We're here, we're queer--and we're better than you: The representational superiority of gay to heterosexuals on Queer Eye for the Straight Guy. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 12(3), 241-253.
- Hartsock, N. C. M. (1983). The feminist standpoint: Developing the ground for a specifically feminist historical materialism. In M. B. Hintikka & S. Harding (Eds.), *Discovering reality: Feminist perspectives on epistemology, metaphysics, methodology, and philosophy of science* (pp. 283-310). Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Hatzenbuehler, M. L. (2009). How does sexual minority stigma "get under the skin"? A psychological mediation framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135(5), 707-735.
- Hatzenbuehler, M. L., Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Erickson, S. J. (2008). Minority stress predictors of HIV risk behavior, substance use, and depressive symptoms: Results from a prospective study of bereaved gay men. *Health Psychology*, 27(4), 455-462.
- Herek, G. M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences. *Journal of Sex Research*, 25(4), 451-477.
- Herek, G. M. (1989). Hate crimes against lesbians and gay men: Issues for research and policy. *American Psychologist*, 44(6), 948-955.
- Herek, G. M. (1991). Stigma, prejudice, and violence against lesbians and gay men. In J. C. Gonsiorek & J. D. Weinrich (Eds.), *Homosexuality: Research implications for public policy* (pp. 60-80). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Herek, G. M. (2000). The psychology of sexual prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9(1), 19-22.
- Herek, G. M. (2009). Sexual Prejudice. In T. Nelson (Ed.), *Handbook of Prejudice* (pp. 439-465). New York: Psychology Press.
- Herek, G. M., & Capitano, J. P. (1995). Black heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men in the United States. *Journal of Sex Research*, 32(2), 95-105.
- Herek, G. M., Cogan, J. C., Gillis, J. R., & Glunt, E. K. (1997). Correlates of internalized homophobia in a community sample of lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Medical Association*, 2, 17-25.
- Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 575-604.

- Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods, 1*(1), 104-121.
- Hoelter, J. W. (1983). The analysis of covariance structures: Goodness-of-fit indices. *Sociological Methods and Research, 11*, 324-244.
- Huebner, D. M., & Davis, M. C. (2007). Perceived anti-gay discrimination and physical health outcomes. *Health Psychology, 26*(5), 627-634.
- Hutcherson, C. A., & Gross, J. J. (2011). The moral emotions: a social-functionalist account of anger, disgust, and contempt. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*(4), 719-737.
- Iyer, A., & Leach, C. W. (2008). Emotion in inter-group relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 19*(1), 86-125.
- Izard, C. E. (1977). *Human emotions*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Jetten, J., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1997). Distinctiveness threat and prototypicality: Combined effects on intergroup discrimination and collective self-esteem. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 27*(6), 635-657.
- Johnson, J. D., & Lecci, L. (2003). Assessing anti-white attitudes and predicting perceived racism: The Johnson-Lecci scale. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(3), 299-312.
- Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of System Justification Theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology, 25*(6), 881-919.
- Jost, J. T., & Hunyady, O. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of system-justifying ideologies. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 14*(5), 260-265.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1970). A second-generation little jiffy. *Psychometrika, 35*, 401-415.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika, 39*, 31-36.
- Kay, A. C., & Jost, J. T. (2003). Complementary justice: Effects of “poor but happy” and “poor but honest” stereotype exemplars on system justification and implicit activation of the justice motive. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*(5), 823-837.
- Kaysen, D. L., Kulesza, M., Balsam, K. F., Rhew, I. C., Blayney, J. A., Lehavot, K., & Hughes, T. L. (2014). Coping as a mediator of internalized homophobia and psychological distress among young adult sexual minority women. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 1*(3), 225-233.
- Kim, J., & Mueller, C. W. (1978). *Introduction to factor analysis: What it is and how to do it*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Kite, M. E., & Deaux, K. (1987). Gender belief systems: Homosexuality and the implicit inversion theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11*(1), 83-96.
- Kite, M. E., & Whitley, B. E. (1996). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexual persons, behavior, and civil rights. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*(4), 336-353.
- Krzystofiak, F., Cardy, R. L., & Newman, J. (1988). Implicit personality and performance appraisal: The influence of trait inferences on evaluation behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*, 515-521.
- Lamont, M., & Molnár, V. (2002). The study of boundaries in the social sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology, 28*, 167-195.
- Lemyre, L., & Smith, P. M. (1985). Intergroup discrimination and self-esteem in the minimal group paradigm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*(3), 660-670.

- Loevinger, J. (1957). Objective tests as instruments of psychological theory. *Psychological Reports*, 3, 635-694.
- Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18(3), 302-318.
- Mackinnon, A., Jorm, A. F., Christensen, H., Korten, A. E., Jacomb, P. A., & Rodgers, B. (1999). A short form of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule: Evaluation of factorial validity and invariance across demographic variables in a community sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 27(3), 406-416.
- Madon, S. (1997). What do people believe about gay males? A study of stereotype content and strength. *Sex Roles*, 37(9-10), 663-685.
- Madon, S., Guyll, M., Aboufadel, K., Montiel, E., Smith, A., Palumbo, P., & Jussim, L. (2001). Ethnic and national stereotypes: The Princeton Trilogy revisited and revised. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(8), 996-1010.
- Major, B., Mendes, W., & Dovidio, J. F. (2013). Intergroup relations and health disparities: A social psychological perspective. *Health Psychology*, 32(5), 514-524.
- Major, B., & O'Brien, L. T. (2005). The social psychology of stigma. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 393-421.
- Massey, S. G. (2010). Valued differences or benevolent stereotypes? Exploring the influence of positive beliefs on anti-gay and anti-lesbian attitudes. *Psychology & Sexuality*, 1(2), 115-130.
- Matsick, J. L., & Conley, T. D. (2016a). Cultural stereotypes and personal beliefs: Perceptions of heterosexual men, women, and people. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation & Gender Diversity*, 3(1), 113-128.
- Matsick, J. L., & Conley, T. D. (2016b). The positive, negative, and ambivalent: Attitudes toward whites as held by ethnic minorities in the U.S. In A. Pratt (Ed.), *Ethnic minorities: Perceptions, cultural barriers, and health inequalities* (pp. 1-24). New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- McClelland, S. I., & Dutcher, H. (2016). Heterosexist bias in research. In A. E. Goldberg (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of LGBTQ studies* (pp. 502-515). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(5), 674-697.
- Meyer, I. H. (2007). Prejudice and discrimination as social stressors. In I. H. Meyer & M. E. Northridge (Eds.), *The health of sexual minorities: Public health perspectives on lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender populations* (pp. 242-267). New York: Springer.
- Meyer, I. H. (2013). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 1(S), 3-26.
- Meyer, I. H., & Dean, L. (1998). Internalized homophobia, intimacy, and sexual behavior among gay and bisexual men. In G. M. Herek (Ed.), *Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals* (Vol. 4, pp. 160-186). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, I. H., Schwartz, S., & Frost, D. M. (2008). Social patterning of stress and coping: Does disadvantaged social status confer more stress and fewer coping resources? *Social Science & Medicine*, 67(368-379).

- Miller, C. T., & Kaiser, C. R. (2001). A theoretical perspective on coping with stigma. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(1), 73-92.
- Miller, C. T., & Major, B. (2000). Coping with stigma and prejudice. In T. F. Heatherton, R. E. Kleck, M. R. Hebl, & J. G. Hull (Eds.), *The social psychology of stigma*. (pp. 243-272). New York, NY US: Guilford Press.
- Miller, W. I. (1995). Upward contempt. *Political Theory, 23*(3), 476-499.
- Miller, W. I. (1997). Mutual contempt and democracy. *The anatomy of disgust*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Monteith, M. J., & Spicer, C. V. (2000). Contents and correlates of Whites' and Blacks' racial attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36*, 125-154.
- Moon, J. (2010). Gay shame and the politics of identity. In D. M. Halperin & V. Traub (Eds.), *Gay shame* (pp. 357-368). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Morrison, M. A., & Morrison, T. G. (2002). Development and validation of a scale measuring modern prejudice toward gay men and lesbian women. *Journal of Homosexuality, 43*(2), 15-37.
- Morrison, M. A., Morrison, T. G., Harriman, R. L., & Jewell, L. M. (2008). Old-fashioned and modern prejudice toward Aboriginals in Canada. In M. A. Morrison & T. G. Morrison (Eds.), *The psychology of modern prejudice* (pp. 277-306). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Osborne, D., & Davies, P. G. (2012). When benevolence backfires: Benevolent sexists' opposition to elective and traumatic abortion. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*(2), 291-307. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00890.x
- Oyserman, D., & Swim, J. K. (2001). Stigma: An insider's view. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(1), 1-14.
- Pelzer, P. (2005). Contempt and organization: Present in practice — Ignored by research? *Organizational Studies, 26*(8), 1217-1227.
- Pinel, E. C. (1999). Stigma consciousness: The psychological legacy of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*(1), 114-128. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.76.1.114
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(4), 741-763.
- Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1986). *Handbook of organizational measurement*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman.
- Reinharz, S. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Riggle, E., Rostosky, S., & Reedy, C. (2005). Online surveys for BGLT research: Issues and techniques. *Journal of Homosexuality, 49*(2), 1-21.
- Ross, M. W., & Rosser, B. R. S. (1996). Measurement and correlates of internalized homophobia: A factor analytic study. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 52*(1), 15-21.
- Rosser, B. R. S., Oakes, M. J., Bockting, W. O., & Miner, M. (2007). Capturing the social demographics of hidden sexual minorities: An internet study of the transgender population in the United States. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy, 4*(2), 50-64.
- Rozin, P., Lowery, L., Imada, S., & Haidt, J. (1999). The CAD triad hypothesis: A mapping between 3 moral emotions (contempt, anger, disgust) and 3 moral codes (community, autonomy, divinity). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*(4), 574-586.

- Rubin, G. (1984). Thinking sex: Notes for a radical theory of the politics of sexuality. In C. S. Vance (Ed.), *Pleasure and danger: Exploring female sexuality* (pp. 267-319): Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Rubin, M., & Hewstone, M. (1998). Social identity theory's self-esteem hypothesis: A review and some suggestions for clarification. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2, 40-62.
- Rummel, R. J. (1970). *Applied factor analysis*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Schwab, D. P. (1980). Construct validity in organizational behavior. In B. M. Shaw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 2, pp. 3-43). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Scott, J. C. (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Shelton, J. N. (2000). A reconceptualization of how we study issues of racial prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(4), 374-390.
- Shelton, J. N., Alegre, J. M., & Son, D. (2010). Social stigma and disadvantage: Current themes and future prospects. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66(3), 618-633.
- Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2006a). Ethnic minorities' racial attitudes and contact experiences with white people. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 12(1), 149-164.
- Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2006b). Interracial interactions: A relational approach. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 121-181). New York: Academic Press.
- Smith, E. R. (1993). Social identity and social emotions: Toward new conceptualizations of prejudice. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception* (pp. 297-315). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Solomon, R. C. (1993). *The passions: Emotions and the meaning of life*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.
- Springer, D. W., Abell, N., & Hudson, W. W. (2002). Creating and validating rapid assessment instruments for practice and research: Part 1. *Research of Social Work Practice*, 12(3), 408-439.
- Stangor, C., & Schaller, M. (1996). Stereotypes as individual and collective representations. In C. N. Macrae, C. Stangor, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Stereotypes & stereotyping* (pp. 3-41). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Stevens, J. P. (2002). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (4 ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stewart, A. J. (1998). Doing personality research: How can feminist theories help? In B. M. Clinchy & J. K. Norem (Eds.), *The Gender and Psychology Reader* (pp. 54-68). New York: New York University Press.
- Stewart, A. J., & McDermott, C. (2004). Gender in psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 519-544.
- Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(2), 199-214.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2012). *Using multivariate statistics* (6 ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Tajfel, H. (1981). Social stereotypes and social groups. In J. C. Turner & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup behavior* (pp. 144-167). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Tajfel, H., Billig, M. G., Bundy, R. P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 1*(2), 149-178.
- Tajfel, H., & Forgas, J. P. (1981). Social categorization: Cognitions, values, and groups. In J. P. Forgas (Ed.), *Social cognition: Perspectives on everyday understanding* (pp. 113-140). London: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (2004). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In J. T. Jost & J. Sidanius (Eds.), *Political psychology: Key readings*. (pp. 276-293). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Turner, J. C. (1987). A self-categorization theory. In J. C. Turner, M. A. Hogg, P. J. Oakes, S. D. Reicher, & M. S. Wetherell (Eds.), *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory* (pp. 42-67). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Turner, J. C., & Oakes, P. J. (1989). Self-categorization theory and social influence. In P. B. Paulus (Ed.), *Psychology of group influence (2nd ed.)*. (pp. 233-275). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Vartanian, L. R., Thomas, M. A., & Vanman, E. J. (2013). Disgust, contempt, and anger and the stereotypes of obese people. *Eating and Weight Disorders, 18*(4), 377-382.
- Vaughn, A. A., & Teeters, S. A. (2015). Development and psychometric properties of the attitudes towards heterosexuals scale (ATHS): A useful tool alone or in combination. *Psychology & Sexuality, 6*(4), 311-324.
- Voci, A. (2006). The link between identification and in-group favouritism: Effects of threat to social identity and trust-related emotions. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 45*, 264-284.
- Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2011). A brief social-belonging intervention improves academic and health outcomes of minority students. *Science, 331*, 1447-1451.
- Ward, J. (2015). *Not gay: Sex between straight white men*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Warner, M. (1999). *The trouble with normal: Sex, politics, and the ethics of queer life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Weston, R., & Gore, P. (2006). A brief guide to structural equation modeling. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34*, 719-751.
- White, S. M., & Franzini, L. R. (1999). Heteronegativism?: The attitudes of gay men and lesbians toward heterosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality, 37*(1), 65-79.
- Whitley, B. E., Wiederman, M. W., & Wryobeck, J. M. (1999). Correlates of heterosexual men's eroticization of lesbianism. *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality, 11*(1), 25-41.
- Williamson, I. R. (2000). Internalized homophobia and health issues affecting lesbians and gay men. *Health Education Research, 15*(1), 97-107.