

Homophobic Hip-Hop Music and Its Effect on Attitudes Toward Homosexuality

by

Kevin Binder

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts  
with Honors in Psychology from the  
University of Michigan

2013

Advisor: Dr. L. Monique Ward

## Abstract

Critics of hip-hop and rap music have long identified these genres as problematic due to the aggressive, misogynist, and homophobic attitudes their performers sometimes display. However, few empirical studies have examined the effects of these negative messages in hip-hop music, particularly the effects of its homophobic messages. Experimenters exposed 183 undergraduate men to one of three music conditions. The first participant group listened to homophobic rap music, the second group listened to neutral rap music, and the last group listened to no music. Participants' attitudes were measured immediately afterward by their evaluations of both a heterosexual and a homosexual male professorial candidate. Participants were not aware of the connection between the musical stimuli and the subsequent evaluations. Assessments of the two candidates showed that variables associated with perceptions of the candidates' research and job readiness were not strongly affected by the stimuli. However, participants' willingness to engage in close, one-on-one contact with each candidate, in the form of attending his office hours, showed significant differences across music condition and sexuality of the candidate. The homophobic rap group expressed the lowest intention to attend the homosexual male candidate's office hours and, within this group, participants were less likely, on average, to attend the homosexual candidate's office hours than they were the heterosexual candidate's. This finding appears to indicate that negative messages related to marginalized groups tend to influence consumers' need for social distance from these marginalized individuals more than they influence consumers' assessment of these individuals' societal worth.

*Keywords:* hip-hop music, homophobia, media effects, music, LGBT identity, socialization

### Homophobic Hip-Hop Music and Its Effect on Attitudes Toward Homosexuality

Hip-hop music and its social influence have been points of contention for many years. Parents, social advocates, and pundits from both sides of the political spectrum have criticized some hip-hop artists for their use of violent, misogynist, and homophobic lyrics, claiming that these messages have a negative influential impact on rap listeners. For example, one of the genre's most outspoken critics, C. Delores Tucker, often claimed that the genre was abasing and offensive to African-American women. She was often supported in her denunciations by both William Bennett, a Republican former Secretary of Education, and former Senator Joseph Lieberman, who was a Democrat at the time (Shinhoster Lamb, 2005). However, little research has explored this issue in depth, making it difficult to prove that exposure to hip-hop music causes listeners to adopt potentially harmful messages contained within it. There has been a particularly noteworthy dearth of research on the impact that hip-hop music has on attitudes toward homosexuality and other lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) orientations. This discrepancy between public opinion and experimental findings leads us to investigate this issue empirically and ask: are homophobic messages in popular music "contagious?" If so, does only homophobic hip-hop content cause listeners to adopt homophobic beliefs, or will any hip-hop content do so? If these effects exist, are there background variables that moderate them, and to what extent do they do so?

### ***Hip-Hop and Rap as Labels and Music Genres***

Although *rap* and *hip-hop* are often defined differently, the distinction between the two is hard to pinpoint. *Rap* has been defined as a method of rhythmic talking, and *hip-hop* as the musical beat that often accompanies this type of vocal performance (Jones, 1997). Jones also noted that *rap* has been used to refer to the gritty, hard-core version of the music genre that

incorporates both of these elements, while *hip-hop* has been described as its modern, or commercialized, alternative. Finally, *hip-hop* might also be identified as the wider cultural movement that produced *rap* music (Rose, 1994). However, the terms *hip-hop* and *rap* are frequently used interchangeably to refer to the genre of music that incorporates rhythmic spoken word and an accompanying beat, one that is often energetic and electronic (Jones, 1997). In this paper, *rap* and *hip-hop* will be used synonymously to avoid any confusion surrounding these semantic nuances.

Hip-hop music, which first gained access to the mainstream music industry in the early 1980's, gained popularity due to its ability to convey sophisticated messages from the margins of society (Rose, 1994). In this way, rap music has often been touted as an educational tool and a medium through which artists can draw attention to the issues of racism and economic oppression. Although the genre began, and continues today in some ways, as "black cultural expression" (p. 2), Rose (1994) explained that it has appealed to many white adolescents due to its image as a "forbidden narrative... [and] a symbol of rebellion" (p. 5). As a result, the genre quickly grew from the product of a small counter-cultural movement to one of the top-selling music genres in the United States. According to the Recording Industry Association of America (2008), hip-hop music accounted for over 10% of record sales every year from 1999-2008.

### **Homophobia in Hip-Hop Music: Cultural Critiques and Analyses**

However, scholars of hip-hop music have tied this genre to stereotypically "masculine" themes, such as violence and the denunciation of LGBT identity, in their essays on the subject. As early as 1991, Riggs (1991) noted that "references to, and representations of, [African-American homosexuality] seem a rite of passage among ... Black male rappers" (p. 389). At the same time, Riggs also noted that the increased "popularity" of African-American homosexuality

as a subject of discussion did not make gay African-American men any more accepted than before. More recently, Hill (2009) commented that “while it can be argued that all forms of popular music are pervasively heteronormative... explicitly homophobic discourses are lyrically overrepresented within hip-hop culture” (p. 32). Rose (2008) explained this phenomenon by pointing out that hip-hop culture embraces a particular form of tough, aggressive, and occasionally violent masculinity. Within this form of masculinity, machismo, sexism, homophobia, and manhood are all inexorably linked. Higgins (2009) noted that this link most likely exists within hip-hop culture due to its ties to “street culture, where over-the-top machismo drove the music’s earliest energies” (p. 93). Gay stereotypes are thought to run counter to this masculine image (Higgins 2009), and thus some incredibly popular artists, such as Nas, DMX, 50 Cent, and Jay-Z, have recorded blatantly homophobic songs (Oware, 2011).

A few examples of homophobic lyrics help highlight this trend. For example, in his song *Criminal* from 2000, Eminem, who is particularly known for his inclusion of homophobic lyrics, unleashes a particularly vitriolic verse against all LGBT individuals, rapping

Whether you're a fag or lez,  
Or the homosex, hermaph or a trans-a-vest,  
Pants or dress - hate fags? The answer's 'yes.'  
(Eminem, *Criminal*)

In addition, in Ice Cube’s famous “diss” song from 1991, which was unfortunately named *No Vaseline*, he attacks the remaining members of his former group N.W.A. in part by claiming that they engage in sexual acts with one another. Throughout the song, Ice Cube uses male-male

intercourse as a symbol for exploitation, telling Dr. Dre that “Eazy-E saw your ass and went in it quick,” claiming that “Eazy’s dick is smellin’ like MC Ren’s shit,” and finally concluding the song by addressing Eazy-E personally, rapping “You little maggot, Eazy-E turned faggot, With your manager fella, fuckin’ MC Ren, Dr. Dre, and Yella.” More recently, in 2011, Tyler, the Creator targets and questions the sexuality of two celebrities by rapping

Bruno Mars is still sucking dick and fucking male butts,

In the same closet that Tyler Perry gets clothes from.

(Tyler, the Creator, *Martians vs. Goblins*)

It is important to note that these examples are evenly spread throughout a range of 20 years, signifying that homophobia in hip-hop has been a pervasive trend. Moreover, Rose (2008) categorized that homophobic lyrics are most often found in the subgenre of “gangsta rap,” whose artists occasionally rely on masculine posturing to construct their images, but noted that even some progressive and “conscious” rappers such as Common and Immortal Technique have been known to include homophobic references in their songs.

Furthermore, testimonials of rappers themselves help illustrate the pervasiveness of this issue. For example, according to Higgins (2009), Kanye West admitted in a 2005 interview that he occasionally felt the need to include homophobic content in his songs to bolster his own masculine image. This societal pressure within rap culture could account for why even West, who has spoken out against homophobia and is purported to have a close family member who is homosexual, used the word “faggot” in a derogatory fashion even after his denunciation of the word. In fact, he even reported that he received much more backlash for his defense of LGBT

orientations than he ever did for speaking out against President George W. Bush after Hurricane Katrina (Higgins, 2009). Largely for this reason, the gay rapper Tim'm, in an interview with Chang (2006), called hip-hop "the last stubborn bastion of self-congratulating homophobia" (p. 200), but also noted that heterosexual rappers rely on homosexual bashing to construct their masculine identities. Pointing out that many hip-hop artists have been suspected of homo- or bisexuality, he stated that, among hip-hop artists, "hard edge and masculinity almost always means you hate fags" (p. 200). In this way, he highlighted the idea that hip-hop masculinity and homosexuality are diametrically opposed, yet also linked. In fact, he noted that the term "Homohop" arose both from hip-hop culture's need to categorize the music of LGBT performers like him as a distinct subgenre and from mainstream culture's wish to have it exist as an entity separated from, but also connected to, mainstream hip-hop.

Indeed, as Tim'm mentioned, one can also witness the homophobia inherent in hip-hop culture from the extent to which many rappers need to defend themselves from rumors related to their sexuality. Hill (2009) explained that rappers commonly "out" or question the sexuality of rival performers, hoping to embarrass their opponents by generating public laughter against them. In many cases, these accusations of homosexual tendencies are largely playful and unpersuasive. However, Hill also noted that industry giants such as Dr. Dre, Eazy-E, and P. Diddy have all been targets of persistent rumors pertaining to their sexualities. In the case of Dr. Dre, these rumors were largely due to attacks on his sexuality by rival rappers, Tupac Shakur and Eazy-E (Hill, 2009). Finally, Hill mentioned that the hip-hop careers of both Big Daddy Kane and Ja Rule were ultimately ruined at least in part by allegations of homo- or bisexuality. This trend in hip-hop culture helps illustrate the large role homophobia has played in shaping the cultural and social landscape of hip-hop.

### **Homophobia in Hip-Hop Music: Empirical Analyses**

Although there has been a notable absence of content analyses documenting the prevalence of homophobic messages in hip-hop music, the presence of traditional notions of masculinity within hip-hop music has been attested to by studies that have examined gendered behavior in this genre. For example, Herd (2009) found that the amount of violence in rap lyrics increased from 1979 to 1997. Herd's sample consisted of 340 songs that were rated as the most popular rap songs in their given year by both Billboard and Gavin charts. Herd's analysis segmented songs into four- or five-year periods and showed that the percentage of rap songs containing violence increased from each period to the next. Overall, this figure increased from 27% of all rap songs from 1979 to 1984 to 60% from 1994 to 1997. Similarly, Jones (1997) analyzed 203 music videos from different music genres in the summer of 1994 and noted that the rap music in his sample contained significantly more references to or representations of violence, such as guntalk or grabbing another person, than any other genre he studied. Kubrin and Weitzer (2009), meanwhile, found that misogynistic messages existed in 22% of the 403 rap songs they coded and thus identified it as a "significant theme" in the rap music they studied (p. 11). In addition, the authors suggested that the specific brand of sexism that rap music displays outlines a set of gender norms to which not only women, but also men must adhere. Their sample was obtained randomly from the 1,922 songs on the rap albums from 1992 to 2000 that achieved platinum status.

Research suggests that these masculine themes, such as sexism, violence, and aggression, are associated with homophobia. Rose's (2008) claim to this effect is substantiated by a study by Pleck, Sonenstein, and Ku (1994), which investigated gender norms and gender norm adherence among adolescent boys. Their results indicated that homophobia is correlated with adherence to



traditional male gender roles. Finally, in Oware's (2011) content analysis of 478 popular rap recordings, he primarily investigated instances of male-male non-sexual camaraderie, but noted as a point of contrast that "homophobia [and other traditionally masculine traits] saturated all the albums and nearly every song" (p. 27). Thus, despite the lack of content analyses scientifically proving the pervasiveness of homophobia in hip-hop, critical essays on the subject, scientific findings on related issues, and illustrative examples help define the scale and nature of this issue.

### **Media Effects Theories**

Despite claims by hip-hop artists such as Eminem and Tyler, the Creator that their use of the words "gay" and "faggot" are not derogatory because they are either used in an abstract manner (Pascoe, 2005) or employed simply for their shock-value (MacPherson, 2011), the literature behind socialization and psychological priming suggests that the negative characterizations of specific racial groups, genders, or sexual minorities can cause consumers to unconsciously mirror these negative views. Bandura's social learning theory, for example, states that individuals model their behaviors on the actions of those around them (Bandura, 1965). Researchers have noted that media constitute a form of social information that people use when making decisions about their personal lives. Celebrities, such as musicians, are especially considered to be influential because their lifestyles are seen as desirable, and their music supposedly provides a window into these lifestyles (Allen, Herrett-Skjellum, Jorgenseon, Kramer, Ryan, & Timmerman, 2007).

Similarly, Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, Signorielli, and Shanahan's (2002) cultivation theory holds that media have the power to shape the attitudes of their users, as television and other media come to define "mainstream culture" for them, influencing them to adopt their perspective of society. Bargh, Chen, and Burrows (1996), indicated that even brief exposure to semantically

charged words, phrases, or ideas can automatically activate similar attitudes or ideas in response to subsequent stimuli, an effect referred to as *priming*. The authors ventured that this effect could be the cause of stereotyping, because it influences individuals to apply previously encountered stimuli to new social situations, without considering how the two situations might be different. In many cases, the actor may even be unaware of the change in his or her attitudes and actions. Shrum (1996) argues this as well, stating that media prime existing schema and make these notions more readily accessible. Shrum also mentions that heavy media exposure can make these schemas chronically accessible, thus solidifying a mental link between a given image of social group and a set of attitudes.

Other theories, such as Lazarsfeld's limited-effects model (Katz & Lazarsfeld, 1955), may counter the aforementioned ones by noting that media effects are moderated by factors such as family and peer influence and duration of exposure (Gitlin, 1978). However, another factor that strongly moderates the influence of media on its viewers is the previous level of experience users have with the content depicted. Gerbner et al. (2002) stressed that individuals are most likely to adopt the viewpoint of the media when confronted with an issue with which they have no direct experience. This moderating effect makes media content a primary socializing factor concerning beliefs about alternative sexualities and attitudes toward LGBT individuals, because 40% of Americans do not know first-hand anyone who identifies as LGBT (Pew Research Center, 2003). In addition, adolescents are more likely to learn about LGBT issues from the media than from anywhere else, because the media are more likely to discuss sexual orientation than other socializing actors, such as parents (Calzo & Ward, 2009a). Thus, the fundamental basis of each theory claims that media messages have a large socializing impact on individuals,

and that these messages are particularly powerful when discussing an issue that is not highly visible outside of the media, such as LGBT identity.

### **Gender, Age, and Their Impact on Views Toward Homosexuality**

Whether shaped by media or by other forces, such as parents and friends, young people's attitudes toward LGBT individuals and issues are not likely to be uniform, but instead are likely to vary based on background factors such as age and gender. Indeed, the existing literature indicates that negative messages about alternative sexualities are particularly likely to resonate with men in their adolescent and young-adult years. According to the theories of Gerbner et al. (2002), adolescents are most likely to adopt opinions on LGBT identity and individuals from mass media, due to the paucity of information they receive about alternative sexualities from other sources. Moreover, 58% of African-American young adults (aged 15-25), 45% of Latino young adults, and 23% of Caucasians in that age group listened to rap every day in 2007 (Center for the Study of Race, Politics, and Culture, 2007), suggesting that young adults are particularly susceptible to the influence of messages contained in this genre.

Within the young adult age group, homophobic messages may be particularly influential for men, due to the fact that men are more likely to hold negative views concerning homosexuality than women (Herek, 2002). Furthermore, heterosexual men generally view gay men less favorably than they view lesbian women, possibly because they view gay men as a threat to their masculine status (Herek, 2002). Indeed, Pascoe (2005) found that the threat of homosexuality or the threat of being labeled as homosexual is a strong force in the masculinization of adolescent men. The author explains "'Fag' may be used as a weapon with which to temporarily assert one's masculinity by denying it to others" (p. 342). Indeed, this phenomenon appears to directly parallel the usage of "outing" in hip-hop culture that Hill (2009)

examined. For these reasons, it is imperative to understand how hip-hop music can affect social attitudes in adolescent men.

### **Auditory Media Effects on Sexual Attitudes**

Studies concerning music and its effect on attitudes toward gender and sexuality appear to support the theoretical perspectives outlined above, as many indicate that media exposure can shift individuals' attitudes about sexuality and gender roles. Experimental studies have found that positive music messages can increase the likelihood of a listener acting pro-socially. For example, Greitemeyer (2009) found that participants exposed to a pro-social song were more likely, compared to those exposed to a neutral song, to complete a word stem so that it had a pro-social connotation, to respond empathetically to a fictional character's ordeal, and to donate money to a non-profit charity. Within the realm of sexual attitudes, Gueguen, Jacob, and Lamy (2010) found that young women who were exposed to romantic song lyrics, as compared to neutral ones, were more likely to later accept a request for their telephone numbers.

However, few studies have found such positive effects. Instead, a number of studies have linked certain music content to expressing more misogynist attitudes. For example, Gan, Zillmann, and Mitrook (1997) exposed participants to seductive songs written by female African-American singers and found that those exposed to this music gave a lower assessment, on average, of African American women. Similarly, Johnson, Olivo, Gibson, Reed, and Ashburn-Nardo (2009) reported that Caucasian participants of both genders were generally less likely to support political funding for pregnant African-American women after listening to highly-sexualized hip-hop music. In addition, Fischer and Greitemeyer (2006) discovered that men exposed to misogynist music—both sexist hip-hop and sexist rock music—were more likely to engage in aggressive actions toward women, recall negative attributes of women, and report

feelings of vengeance toward women. Researchers have also discovered this link to misogynistic attitudes when investigating rap music specifically. Cobb and Boettcher (2007) found that male participants in their experiment typically expressed more misogynistic attitudes after listening to misogynistic hip-hop music than they did after listening to hip-hop music without sexist content (but see Sprankle, End, and Bretz (2012) for null results).

Similarly, other studies have found support for the idea that rap music can cause listeners to exhibit overtly masculine traits. Jamison (2006) discovered that among African-American men, rap listeners exhibited higher levels of hypermasculinity—masculinity that incorporates violent and sexist themes—than non-rap listeners. Furthermore, participants in the study who preferred “conscious rap,” which focuses more on societal problems than it does sex, violence, or masculinity, scored lower on a hypermasculinity scale than those who preferred other forms of rap music, such as “recreational” and “reality” rap. Johnson, Jackson, and Gatto (1995), meanwhile, used experimental methods to test the effects of different subgenres of hip-hop music. They exposed inner-city young men to either violent or non-violent hip-hop. Their data indicated that only the violent rap music promoted violent behaviors and dispositions. Overall, these studies indicate that music media can lead listeners to adopt the viewpoints they advance. Specifically, the current literature suggests that hip-hop songs that discuss these traditional tenets of masculine identity in rap culture—misogyny, aggressiveness, and even violence—can influence young men to espouse these forms of masculinity, as well.

### **Media Effects on Attitudes Toward Alternative Sexualities**

As of yet, however, there has been no research empirically testing the link between hip-hop music and homophobia. Part of this fact is due to the landscape surrounding the hip-hop world. Rose (2008) noted that even socially liberal critics of hip-hop tend not to mention the

homophobia displayed in some songs of this genre, for fear of alienating the genre's socially conservative critics. The lack of research on this subject is also due to the relative dearth of research on media effects and attitudes towards LGBT individuals in general. In fact, most of the papers on this subject have been content analyses or correlational results that have focused on television programs. For example, Hestroni (2007), in his meta-analysis of studies that investigated American prime-time network programming between 1975 and 2004, found that the amount of content mentioning LGBT issues or sexual minorities peaked in 2000, and that it is referenced much more today in the media than it was before the turn of the century. Some researchers have argued that the increased visibility of LGBT persons and characters in media will have positive social implications. For example, two separate surveys investigated the effects of exposure to *Will & Grace*, a popular television show that featured multiple LGBT characters. They discovered that viewing this program correlated with less prejudicial attitudes toward sexual minorities (Schiappa, Gregg, & Hewes, 2006), greater ease around sexual minorities, and a reduced need for social distance from them (Ortiz & Harwood, 2007).

However, other studies noticed that representations of gay characters on television are generally very narrow and stereotypical; often, these characters' defining features are their sexualities (Fouts & Inch, 2005; Netzley, 2010; Raley & Lucas, 2006). A correlational study by Calzo and Ward (2009b), which investigated how attitudes toward alternative sexualities were influenced by all kinds of media exposure, found that media, in general, have a "mainstreaming" effect on their consumers. The authors found that media use is correlated with *higher* levels of acceptance of LGBT individuals within groups that are typically less accepting of them, and that it correlates with *lower* levels of acceptance among those who are generally more accepting of LGBT individuals. This pattern could result from the sympathetic, yet stereotypical, identity that

some television shows construct for their LGBT characters. Thus, given that men are more likely to hold negative views toward LGBT individuals (Herek, 2002), Calzo and Ward's (2009b) study found that men's attitudes toward homosexuality generally became more favorable as media exposure increased.

Furthermore, the small number of experimental studies that have examined this issue indicated that media messages about LGBT individuals can indeed *cause* shifts in viewers' attitudes towards this group. For example, Rossler and Brosius (2001) tested the attitudes of youths who were exposed to either a neutral condition or a talk show condition that featured unrestricted commentary on same-sex attraction and other LGBT issues. The students in the talk show condition subsequently estimated that there was a greater number of LGBT individuals in society and rated social acceptance of LGBT individuals as higher. In a study by Riggle, Ellis, and Crawford (1996), researchers showed some participants a documentary about the life and death of Harvey Milk, the famous gay city supervisor in San Francisco. The participants who viewed this video were more likely to subsequently express more positive attitudes toward sexual minorities in comparison to a control group.

Levina, Waldo, and Fitzgerald (2000) expanded on this model by adding a negative video condition. Directly after this exposure, participants who had watched the negative video were significantly more likely to express negative attitudes about LGBT individuals than those in the positive video condition. In addition, during a follow-up questionnaire 10 days later, these effects remained, with the positive video group continuing to express attitudes that were significantly more positive toward LGBT individuals than those in the negative condition. Additionally, although the scores of participants in the control condition did not differ *significantly* from scores in the other conditions, participants in the control condition always

reported more positive attitudes than those in the negative condition, but less positive attitudes than those in the positive condition. In short, the literature on this subject indicates that media discussion of LGBT issues can have both a positive and a negative impact on consumers' attitudes toward LGBT individuals, depending on the tone of the content.

In summary, the current body of research indicates that the hip-hop industry is influenced by undercurrents of homophobia that most likely find their origin in the genre's roots in street culture, which emphasizes a form of aggressive masculinity that eschews gender norm transgressions among boys and men. This culturally-enforced style of masculinity often pressures performers to reinforce their masculine images by questioning the sexuality of rival rappers or attacking the idea of homosexuality, in general. This homophobia is more commonly found in so-called "gangsta rap" songs, but is also occasionally exhibited in songs by socially-conscious performers, too. Research has found that exposure to certain types of hip-hop music and sexual pop music can cause listeners to both endorse more traditional attitudes toward gender roles and view women less favorably. In addition, the literature on media messages and LGBT issues found that media play a large role in shaping attitudes and opinions related to this issue. Media, overall, appear to have a "mainstreaming" effect on their consumers, with both positive and negative messages effectively swaying viewers to accept these viewpoints. Studies suggest that young men are the most susceptible to negative messages about homosexuality, especially because men are, on average, less accepting of alternative sexualities than women and because of the powerful role that homosexual labeling plays in the conformation of adolescent men.

### **Limitations in Existing Research**



Despite the interesting media effects findings emerging, a number of gaps in the research still exist. First, as Kubrin and Weitzer (2010) note, there is a dearth of empirical research on hip-hop music, especially as it relates to its impact on the sexual attitudes of its consumers. Although a number of studies have investigated music and the sexual attitudes it engenders, many of these studies did not focus on hip-hop specifically. Secondly, although the past fifteen years have witnessed a growth in research on attitudes toward LGBT issues and how the media affect them, there is still a profound shortage of experimental studies on this subject. Many of these studies have been correlational studies or content analyses. In addition, the majority of these articles have examined the influence of *visual* media, namely television and film, on attitudes toward LGBT issues. There has been comparatively no research examining music's influence on these attitudes. This oversight is curious, given that hip-hop music is a known source of homophobic messages.

### **The Current Study**

Thus, the current study seeks to address these gaps in the literature by experimentally examining the effect exposure to homophobic hip-hop music has on the attitudes of young adult men toward gay men. The researchers intended to determine how exposure to this sort of music might affect the impressions that college-aged men have toward a homosexual male job applicant. A priming design was used to allow for quicker collection of data, because a more in-depth design would not allow us to obtain data from as many participants. Furthermore, by measuring attitudes toward gay men via job applicant evaluations, the researchers were able to determine how changes in attitudes might affect employment decisions, as job discrimination based on sexual orientation has traditionally been a significant issue for the LGBT community (Byrne, 1993). Only men were used in this experiment because men are more likely to hold

negative attitudes toward homosexual men than women (Herek, 2002). Furthermore, men are most likely more susceptible to gendered messages in hip-hop music, due to the masculine themes that Rose (2008) noted are featured in much hip-hop music. Finally, this study investigates attitudes toward gay men only, and not lesbian women or other LGBT groups, because homosexual men are the main group targeted by homophobic rap lyrics. In contrast, bisexuality, transsexuality, and asexuality are very rarely mentioned in rap songs, and rappers occasionally fetishize lesbian women.<sup>1</sup> The design of this study was adapted from Rudman and Borgida (1995), who investigated whether sexist television commercials could affect male participants' later interactions with female job candidates.

We hypothesized that participants exposed to homophobic hip-hop music would evaluate a gay male job candidate less favorably than those who were exposed to non-homophobic hip-hop music, or no music at all. This prediction represented our primary hypothesis. If true, this development would indicate that homophobic messages in hip-hop music could cause listeners to treat gay men more negatively by priming an existing schema that links male homosexuality with negative traits and images. In addition, a difference between the effects of homophobic and non-homophobic hip-hop would indicate that the homophobic messages contained in the music, and not the style of hip-hop music itself, was the cause of this attitude shift. Our second hypothesis predicted that participants in the homophobic hip-hop music condition would rate a gay male job candidate less favorably than a heterosexual male job candidate. Third, we hypothesized that an interaction would exist between the music condition and the sexuality of the job candidate in terms of the participants' ratings of the candidate, because the ratings of a heterosexual candidate would not change across music conditions. Thus, the researchers believed that listening to homophobic hip-hop would not change participants' attitudes toward men in general, but only

gay men. If these hypotheses are supported by the results of this study, it would support the theory that the homophobic content of certain rap songs can influence listeners to exhibit less favorable attitudes and behaviors toward sexual minorities, especially homosexual men.

Finally, we asked one additional research question: How, if at all, do background factors moderate the effects of homophobic music messages? As the limited-effects model points out, individuals do not encounter media messages in a vacuum. Rather, the way in which each person interprets and accommodates each message depends on his or her upbringing and regular media habits. Thus, this study wished to determine which background factors moderate the influence of homophobic rap messages, and to what extent. Specifically, we sought to determine how one's normal rap diet influences how one processes homophobic rap music. Multiple effects could be accounted for. It is highly possible that a greater normal rap diet would cause homophobic rap music to produce smaller attitude shifts, because the stimuli would be less novel to the consumer. On the other hand, Shrum (1996) noted that chronic exposure to semantically-charged stimuli might make related schemas constantly accessible. This theory suggests that constant consumers of hip-hop music would be influenced to a greater extent by homophobic hip-hop music, because their schemas connecting LGBT individuals and negative attitudes would be easier to prime. In addition, rap music fans would likely have a greater desire to identify with rap artists, further increasing the likelihood that more habitual consumption of rap music would push homophobic rap music to be more impactful. Both of these potential outcomes were tested here.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

The participants were 183 undergraduate men from a large Midwestern public university. Participants ranged from 17 to 23 years of age ( $M = 19.34$ ,  $SD = 0.93$ ). No attempt was made to oversample particular ethnic groups; 70.9% of participants identified as Caucasian, 19.2% identified as East or Southeast Asian, 3.8% identified as Hispanic, 3.3% identified as African-American, 2.2% identified as originating from the Middle East, and .5% identified as multi-racial. The participants were recruited through an introductory psychology subject pool and no attempts were made to control or limit the number of participants on account of any other variable, including socioeconomic status, state or country of origin, or language preference. The participants were awarded 1 hour of experiential course credit for their participation.

On two separate 9-point scales of paternal education ( $M = 5.96$ ,  $SD = 1.96$ ) and maternal education ( $M = 5.05$ ,  $SD = 1.69$ ), with higher numbers representing higher degree attainment, participants reported that they came from a variety of educational backgrounds, leading to varying results in their aggregate parental education scores ( $M = 11.01$ ,  $SD = 3.20$ ). Participants were also diverse in terms of their religiosity. On scales of 1 to 5, with higher numbers indicating higher levels of religious involvement, participants' responses concerning their own assessment of their religiosity ( $M = 2.62$ ,  $SD = 1.17$ ), the frequency with which they attended religious services ( $M = 2.99$ ,  $SD = 1.18$ ), and the frequency with which they prayed ( $M = 2.67$ ,  $SD = 1.38$ ) varied greatly, resulting in diverse aggregate religiosity scores ( $M = 8.17$ ,  $SD = 3.44$ ), as well. Responses on a 5-point scale concerning sexual orientation, with 1 signifying *exclusively homosexual* and 5 signifying *exclusively heterosexual*, revealed that 94% of participants identified as exclusively heterosexual, 5.5% identified as predominantly heterosexual, and .5% identified as bisexual.

Finally, participants were quite diverse in terms of their music consumption habits. They showed great variation in the average number of weekly hours spent listening to music ( $M = 21.56$ ,  $SD = 15.60$ ), the average number of weekly hours spent listening to *rap* music specifically ( $M = 6.73$ ,  $SD = 8.96$ ), and the percentage of rap that constituted their overall music diet ( $M = 32.01$ ,  $SD = 26.96$ ).

### **Procedure and Materials**

Participants were randomly recruited from an introductory psychology class. The study was conducted in a 3 (music condition: homophobic hip-hop, non-homophobic hip-hop, no music) X 2 (which pair of applications were reviewed) design. Thus, the participants were split into six groups, with each group containing approximately 30 participants. This number of participants was chosen to give each group an acceptable level of power when computing average scores on measures.

This experiment took place in one room in the psychology department of a large Midwestern university. The study involved the use of one room outfitted with a table and chairs. Other materials included an iPod with the two experiment-related playlists saved on it, as well as a set of speakers. Also required for the experiment were several documents, such as a background survey, a music preference and study habits questionnaire, a math test, the cover letters and résumés of the fake job applicants, evaluation forms, as well as a debriefing document and a consent form. Three clipboards were required for students who did not have space to sit at a table.

The participants completed the entire study within groups of approximately 10 participants each. At the beginning, the participants were informed that this experiment pertained to male math performance, and contained two parts: one about music's effect on math

performance, and one about male students' teacher preferences. They were first handed a survey pertaining to their background information (e.g., name, year, major, ethnicity), as well as their study habits and regular music diet. They were given 15 minutes to fill out this two-page questionnaire.

Upon completing this quick survey, the participants were then instructed to perform simple mathematical tasks while being exposed to a music stimulus condition. In a between-subjects experimental design, the participants were split into three separate music conditions. One group was exposed to a homophobic hip-hop condition, where rap music with a significant amount of homophobic lyrical content was played. Four songs were played, but two of the four songs did not contain homophobic lyrics, to disguise the true nature of the study. The second group was exposed to a neutral hip-hop condition, in which the four rap songs they heard during the task did not contain homophobic lyrical content. The two hip-hop conditions were composed of songs by the same artists to ensure that the styles of different hip-hop artists did not confound the results. In addition, the two non-homophobic songs in the homophobic condition were also included in the non-homophobic music condition, to maintain constancy. In the third condition, the participants did not listen to any music during the task.

The songs featured in this experiment were chosen via a pretest. Five hip-hop songs containing negative allusions to LGBT individuals or homosexual men, specifically, were initially chosen and randomly distributed throughout a playlist of 12 hip-hop songs. The other seven songs in the playlist were devoid of any homophobic content, yet still aggressive or confrontational in content. Of the seven non-homophobic songs featured in this playlist, five were performed by the same artists featured in the homophobic songs, and two were performed by different artists. The participants in this pretest were a multi-race, mixed-gender sample of 10

undergraduate and graduate students. The pretest participants listened to the 12 songs and assessed to what extent they were homophobic (1 = *not at all*, 9 = *totally*), violent (1 = *not at all*, 9 = *totally*), misogynistic (1 = *not at all*, 9 = *totally*), and enjoyable (1 = *not at all*, 9 = *totally*).

From this sample of 12 songs, the investigators selected the two songs to be used solely in the homophobic condition, the two non-homophobic songs by the same artists to be featured in the non-homophobic condition only, and the two non-homophobic songs to be played in both conditions. These songs were selected in such a way that the two songs that only appeared in the homophobic condition were considered significantly more homophobic ( $M = 7.85$ ,  $SD = 1.77$ ) than their counterparts that appeared only in the non-homophobic condition ( $M = 2.95$ ,  $SD = 2.07$ ). The two homophobic songs that the researchers chose were *Where the Hood at?* by DMX and *Punks Jump up to Get Beat down* by Brand Nubian (see Appendix A for lyrics). Within the neutral hip-hop condition, *Ruff Ryder's Anthem* by DMX and the clean re-release of *Punks Jump up to Get Beat down* by Brand Nubian were used in the place of the songs with homophobic lyrics (see Appendix B for lyrics). Finally, the two songs devoid of homophobic content that were featured in both music conditions were *Soul Survivor* by Young Jeezy and Akon, and *Can't Tell Me Nothing* by Kanye West (see Appendix C for lyrics).

Even when these two filler songs were added to each group, the homophobic condition ( $M = 4.78$ ,  $SD = 3.52$ ) was considered to contain more homophobic content than the control music condition ( $M = 2.33$ ,  $SD = 1.91$ ). At the same time, however, the songs in the experimental condition were not rated to be significantly more violent ( $M = 6.03$ ,  $SD = 2.64$ ) than those in the control condition ( $M = 5.75$ ,  $SD = 2.45$ ) and were not rated as more misogynistic ( $M = 3.85$ ,  $SD = 2.54$ ) than those in the control condition ( $M = 3.59$ ,  $SD = 2.39$ ). On the whole, the songs in the experimental condition were also rated to be just as likeable ( $M =$

4.18,  $SD = 2.48$ ) as those in control condition ( $M = 4.64$ ,  $SD = 2.51$ ). Thus, outside of homophobic lyrics, the songs featured in the homophobic condition did not contain any other gendered or hypermasculine content not found in the neutral condition. In addition, the comparable likeability ratings of both conditions' stimuli implied that participants' responses on the dependent variables would not be influenced in any way by negative moods brought on by listening to music that was hard on the ears.

Participants worked on the math exam and were exposed to their respective independent variable condition for 17.5 minutes. After this task, participants were asked to put their pencils down and stop their work on the math test. After the math tests were collected, the participants were told that they would be continuing on to the next section of the study, which measured male students' ratings of math teachers. They were handed a packet containing the résumés and cover letters of two different male candidates for a math professor position within their university. One of these candidates referenced his involvement and membership in the LGBT community, while the other made no mention of such affiliations.

All participants evaluated the Curriculum Vitae and cover letters of both a "heterosexual" and "homosexual" candidate, but for half of the participants the sexualities of the candidates were switched. That is to say, in one condition the homosexual candidate was named Tyler Pollack, and was a pure mathematics student from Rutgers University. Meanwhile, the heterosexual candidate was Kenneth Maddon, an applied mathematics student from University of California, San Diego. In the other condition, Tyler Pollack was the heterosexual candidate, while Kenneth Maddon was the homosexual candidate. Again, the "homosexual" candidate was identified by information in his résumé and cover letter referencing his membership in LGBT academic circles, work for LGBT community groups, and awards he had won for his



achievement within the LGBT community. By contrast, the “heterosexual” candidate was identified by a lack of any information on his application materials that pertained to his sexual orientation. Outside of these features, no differences existed between each candidate’s “heterosexual” résumé or cover letter and that of his “homosexual” identity.

The inclusion of a “heterosexual” and “homosexual” identity for each candidate ensured that any differences in attitude toward the homosexual candidate across music condition were not caused by less favorable attitudes about other men in general. The homosexual job applicant featured during the application review process was male because hip-hop culture has a particularly negative slant against gay, bisexual, or transgendered men, and not necessarily against lesbian or bisexual women. Thus, the use of a gay man in the experimental condition of the job applicant variable of the study, rather than a lesbian woman, was designed to maximize any change in attitudes and behaviors caused by the exposure to rap music.

While reviewing these materials, the participants were instructed to fill out an assessment of each applicant, containing a number of different questions about each candidate’s qualifications for the position and the student’s likelihood to interact with such a professor. Participants were given 15 minutes to review and evaluate both sets of application materials.

After completing the assessment, the participants were debriefed and then dismissed. The participants were not told the true purpose of the study until they were debriefed. The debriefing consisted of the principal investigator’s explanation that deception was involved in the survey, while handing the participants a debriefing form outlining the deception and the true aims of the study. During this debriefing, the investigator also informally asked whether any of the participants had discovered the true purpose of the study. Afterwards, the principal investigator remained in the study room to field any questions the participants might have had.

The debriefing process lasted approximately 3 minutes. The entire study lasted approximately 1 hour.

### **Measures**

The first independent variable of this study was the type of music to which a given participant was exposed. There were three conditions for this variable: homophobic hip-hop music, non-homophobic hip-hop music, and no music. The second independent variable in this study was the sexual orientation of the job applicant evaluated. The dependent variable, the assessment of a given job applicant, was operationalized via the candidate evaluation forms. This assessment of applicant measure allowed the researchers to compare attitudes about a homosexual man and a heterosexual man across all three music conditions. By comparing these results, the researchers were able to determine whether exposure to hip-hop music affected the participants' assessments of a homosexual man, while not affecting their assessment of a heterosexual man.

A participant's evaluation of a given candidate consisted of 10 questions. All but one of the answers to these questions were gauged on a 7-point Likert scale. For example, the participants were asked, "How was your overall perception of the job candidate?" (1 = *Very Negative*, 7 = *Very Positive*) and "How likely would you be to take a class with this applicant, should he/she receive a position?" (1 = *Very Unlikely*, 7 = *Very Likely*). The only question not answerable on a Likert scale asked what salary the applicant should receive if hired. The answer again included seven options, ranging from *\$50,000 per Annum* to *\$80,000 per Annum*, in 5,000-dollar increments. All questions were presented so that the answer indicating the most positive assessment of the candidate corresponded with the highest number on the scale, so that no items were scored inversely. See Appendix D for the full list of questions that were used for

this measure. This scoring measure was based on a similar one used by Rudman and Borgida (1995) to measure whether sexist advertisements affected men's perceptions of female job applicants.

**Scoring.** Each item on the participants' evaluation forms was recorded and analyzed separately. However, the participants' overall rankings of each candidate were also computed by combining all 10 measures on the form. This aggregate measure was scored on a 60-point scale. For each Likert scale answer, the participants were awarded  $N - 1$  points for every answer they submitted, where  $N$  equaled the number they chose as their answer. Thus, if a participant answered a "7" for a certain question, he was awarded 6 points for that question. Meanwhile, an answer of "4" was equivalent to 3 points, and a "1" was worth 0 points. For the answer recommending a certain salary for the candidate in question, 6 points was again the maximum score on this item, with an answer of *\$80,000 per Annum* earning that score. Answering *\$50,000 per Annum* corresponded with a score of zero, and all the other answers fell in between, from second-highest to second-lowest, in one-point increments. The points awarded for all items were then summed, resulting in the participant's final score, out of a maximum of 60 points. A high score indicated a high regard for the applicant, whereas a low score indicated negative attitudes toward the applicant. This measure assumed that negative attitudes toward the applicant's sexuality translated to negative attitudes toward the applicant himself. Thus, when evaluating the homosexual candidate, this measure indicated the participants' attitudes toward homosexual men.

### Overview of Analyses

We used a series of analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests and t-tests to evaluate our main experimental effects. Post-hoc analyses (Tukey) were conducted on all  $F$  values for which  $p <$

.10, and the confidence level of any post-hoc analyses or t-test results related to one of our three hypotheses was reported using one-tailed tests. The contributions of background and participant variables were tested using correlational analysis and chi-squared tests.

## Results

### Preliminary Analyses

Before testing the main hypotheses, we first used a one-way ANOVA test to investigate whether participants' assessments of the two different candidate identities differed on any of the 10 evaluation variables or their aggregate measure. Findings indicated that there were not significant differences in the participants' perceptions of each of the two *homosexual candidates* overall, their perceptions of the suitability of his qualifications, their likeliness to take his class, their likeliness to recommend his class to a friend, their likeliness to attend his office hours, their perceptions of the benefit he would bring to his department, their willingness to recommend his hiring, their proposed salaries for the candidate, and their composite scores for the candidate that aggregates the 10 items, (all  $F_s < 2.8$ , n.s.). Significant differences were found with regards to how interesting the candidates' research was considered to be,  $F(1, 181) = 12.37, p < .001$ , and how important the research was thought to be,  $F(1, 181) = 6.52, p = .011$ . These findings indicated that Kenneth Maddon's research was thought to be more interesting ( $M_s = 4.52$  vs. 3.72) and more important ( $M_s = 4.67$  vs. 4.14) than Tyler Wollack's. Subsequent analysis hinted that these two research evaluations were more influenced by the participants' background information than the experimental stimulus to which they were exposed. Thus, these two scores were not analyzed heavily.

Concerning their evaluations of the two *heterosexual candidates*, participants' assessments of each candidate were significantly different in regards to perceptions of interesting

research,  $F(1, 181) = 4.21, p = .042$ , perceptions of important research,  $F(1, 181) = 11.69, p < .001$ , and likelihood of attending the candidate's office hours,  $F(1, 181) = 7.207, p = .008$ . In this case, respondents expressed more willingness to attend Kenneth's office hours ( $M_s = 4.79$  vs. 4.21), but judged Tyler's research to be more interesting ( $M_s = 4.70$  vs. 4.20) and more important ( $M_s = 4.98$  vs. 4.30) than Kenneth's. No other differences between the two heterosexual candidates' qualifications were significant (all  $F_s < .857$ , n.s.). This test revealed no consistent differences concerning how Kenneth Maddon and Tyler Wollack, whether they were homosexual or heterosexual, were evaluated, outside of the two research variables. As a result, the researchers were able to collapse the evaluations of the homosexual and heterosexual candidates to two cohesive data sets, rather than four.

As a second set of preliminary analyses, we used ANOVAs to investigate whether each of the following background factors was equally distributed across both music condition and the identity of the homosexual candidate evaluated: participants' age in months, two parental education factors, three measurements of religiosity, sexual orientation, and three measures of music-listening habits. None of these factors showed significant differences across candidate identity (all  $F_s < 1.70$ , n.s.). These same measures were compared across music condition, and there was a significant difference revealed for the participants' ages,  $F(2, 180) = 7.037, p < .001$ . No other significant differences of background variables were found across music condition (all  $F_s < 1.50$ , n.s.). Later analyses showed that the ages of participants did not significantly affect their performance on the dependent variables. Thus, we were confident that the background factors measured did not significantly affect the experimental results.

An additional set of analyses was conducted to examine the distribution across condition of participant ethnicity, major, and area of origin. To simplify the analysis of these variables,

which each contained many possible values, some of the variables were reduced to two values. For example, participants' majors were categorized as math-related—this categorization included any participant who concentrated in math, economics, engineering, computer science, informatics, or statistics—or not math-related because the two candidates evaluated were math professors. Finally, area of origin was pared down to two values as well: raised outside the United States, or raised wholly inside the United States. Participants who had spent their formative years both inside and outside the United States were considered to be raised outside of the United States. We used chi-square analyses to test whether these demographic factors were evenly distributed across conditions. These tests found that the ethnicity of participants did not differ significantly by music condition,  $\chi^2(10, n = 182) = 10.534$ , n.s., nor identity of the homosexual candidate evaluated,  $\chi^2(5, n = 182) = 9.154$ , n.s. Similarly, participants with math-related majors did not show a significantly uneven distribution across music condition,  $\chi^2(2, n = 182) = .433$ , n.s., nor identity of the homosexual candidate evaluated,  $\chi^2(1, n = 182) = .258$ , n.s. In the case of area of upbringing, the researchers found that the proportion of participants raised in foreign countries did not differ significantly across music conditions,  $\chi^2(2, n = 182) = 4.088$ , n.s., but did differ across the identity of the homosexual candidate they evaluated,  $\chi^2(1, n = 183) = 5.045$ ,  $p = .025$ .

### **Testing Research Hypotheses**

The first hypothesis predicted that participants would rate the gay male candidate more negatively in the homophobic hip-hop condition than they would in either the non-homophobic music condition or the no music condition. A series of one-way ANOVAs was conducted in which music condition was the independent variable, and the 10 questions representing evaluations of the gay male candidate and their aggregate measure were the dependent variables.

The means of 10 dependent variables and their aggregate score for both hetero- and homosexual candidates across music condition are illustrated in Table 1. They are accompanied by both sets of F-values showing the magnitude of differences across music condition for each candidate. Findings revealed a significant group difference in participants' overall perceptions of the homosexual candidate's qualifications and their willingness to go to the homosexual candidate's office hours. Post-hoc analyses (Tukey) found that participants in the homophobic condition were significantly less likely to judge the gay male candidate's qualifications as suitable for a math professor position than those in the no music condition,  $p = .040$ , and significantly less likely to attend the gay male candidate's office hours than those in the control condition,  $p = .019$ . In both cases, however, no significant difference was observed between the assessments of those in the non-homophobic hip-hop condition and those in the homophobic one. The assessments of the heterosexual candidate on any measure did *not* differ significantly across music condition.

The second hypothesis predicted that participants would evaluate the homosexual candidate more negatively than the heterosexual one within the homophobic music condition. A paired-samples t-test was used to check for differences in assessment scores between the homosexual and heterosexual candidates for each of the 10 dependent variables. These tests were performed within each music condition. Table 1 also shows the t-values illustrating the magnitude of differences in ratings between the heterosexual and homosexual candidates within the homophobic music condition only. Within the homophobic music condition, participants were significantly less likely to anticipate attending the homosexual candidate's office hours than they were the heterosexual candidate's,  $t(63) = -2.008$ ,  $p = .025$ ; they believed the homosexual candidate would bring less of a benefit to the math department in question than the heterosexual

candidate,  $t(63) = -1.940, p = .029$ ; and they were less likely to recommend hiring the homosexual candidate than they were the heterosexual candidate,  $t(63) = -1.688, p = .048$ . In addition, participants' overall perceptions of the candidate, their perceptions of his qualifications, and their aggregate assessment of the candidate showed relationships across the candidates' sexuality that were nearing significance, in that a one-tailed t-test would have been significant at the  $\alpha = .10$  level. In each case, the assessments of the homosexual candidate were lower than those of his heterosexual counterpart. Within both the non-homophobic hip-hop condition and the no music condition, no significant differences between the homosexual and heterosexual candidates were found on any measure.

Similarly, the third hypothesis predicted that there would be an interaction between music condition and sexuality of the candidate in regards to how the participants evaluated the candidate. To simplify analysis, this interaction test was only run for the two dependent variables that could reasonably show an interaction: those that showed a significant variation across music conditions. All other dependent variables were assumed to show no interaction. Two split-plot ANOVAs were run for both participants' ratings of the candidates' qualifications and their willingness to attend the candidates' office hours, with music condition as the between-subjects independent variable, the sexuality of candidate as the within-subjects variable. Neither interaction was found to be significant. Ratings of the candidates' qualifications did not show any meaningful interaction,  $F(2, 180) = .46, p = .631$ , but participants' likelihood of attending their office hours was approaching significant,  $F(2, 180) = 2.72, p = .069$ , that is, it would have been significant at the  $p = .10$  level.

### **Correlations Between Background and Dependent Variables**



Finally, we investigated whether background variables might affect participants' evaluations of the gay male candidate. In order to conduct these analyses, we ran a series of zero-order correlations between the 10 dependent variables and their aggregate score, and the 12 background factors mentioned above: age, sexual orientation (coded as described above), paternal education, maternal education, an aggregate parental education score, a self-report measure of religiosity, the frequency with which the participant attends religious services, the frequency with which a participant prays, an aggregate of the three religiosity measures, weekly music intake in hours, weekly rap intake in hours, and the amount of rap music the participant listens to as a percentage of overall music diet. First, the researchers examined these correlations across all music conditions, which are listed in Table 2. This analysis revealed a number of effects. For example, participants whose fathers had obtained a higher level of education were less likely to have a positive overall perception of the candidate and were less likely to think he would benefit his new department. Factors relating to religiosity correlated positively with a number of dependent variables. Most notably, participants who were reported being more religious, who attended religious services more often, and who prayed more often were more likely to recommend hiring the gay male candidate. Finally, participants who listened to music, and rap music specifically, were less likely to rate the homosexual candidate positively on some factors; they were especially unlikely to recommend one of the candidate's classes to a friend.

These correlations were also run within each music condition to examine which factors might have moderated responses to certain types of stimuli. The correlations found during the *no music condition* can be found in Table 3. This table shows that, within this condition, students who were more religious, that is, those who recorded higher scores on the three religiosity factors in the study, were much more likely to rate the homosexual candidate more positively on

an array of different dependent variables. For example, participants with a higher aggregate religiosity score were significantly more likely to have better overall perceptions of the homosexual candidate, recommend his class to a friend, perceive his hiring as beneficial to the local math department, and give him a higher composite evaluation score. In addition, participants with a higher aggregate religiosity score were extremely more likely to rate the gay male candidate's qualifications as acceptable, and recommend hiring him within the no music condition. It is also interesting to note that, within this condition, higher levels of religiosity, as measured by the composite score of all three religiosity factors, correlated with better ratings of gay male candidate on every single evaluation variable. These correlations were *not* found with participants' evaluations of the heterosexual candidate.

The correlations within the *non-homophobic music condition* can be found in Table 4. Within this condition, a number of negative correlations appeared between music consumption habits and the dependent variables. Participants who listened to more music weekly, listened to more rap music specifically in a given week, and listened to more rap as opposed to other genres of music were less likely to rate the homosexual candidate positively on many of the evaluation variables. Most notably, participants who listened to more music, of any genre, weekly were extremely less likely to recommend the gay male candidate's class to a friend studying math, and gave the homosexual candidate a much lower aggregate score, on average. Meanwhile, participants who listened to more rap music per week were much less likely to recommend hiring the homosexual candidate in the non-homophobic music condition. Again, within this condition, higher levels of music and rap consumption correlated with lower ratings of the homosexual candidate on every evaluation item, save for the items about the candidate's research. These correlations were *not* found with participants' evaluations of the heterosexual candidate.

The correlations found during the *homophobic music condition* are listed in Table 5. In the experimental condition, it appeared that the level of education attained by the participants' parents correlated negatively with some of the dependent variables; that is, on a few of the evaluation measures, participants whose parents were better educated rated the gay candidate worse, on average. For example, participants whose fathers were better educated, and those with two better educated parents, on average, were less likely to have a better overall perception of the homosexual candidate, were less willing to take a class with him, and were less willing to recommend hiring him. Meanwhile, participants whose mothers were better educated proposed a lower salary for the gay candidate, on average. Within this condition once again, higher levels of parental education correlated with worse ratings of the homosexual candidate on every single dependent variable. However, these sorts of negative correlations, especially with maternal education, were also found with participants' evaluations of the heterosexual candidate, weakening the probability that this effect was related to the sexuality of either candidate.

Finally, categorical background variables, such as ethnicity, major, and place of upbringing were simplified into binary groupings prior to analyses. For ethnicity, analyses were only run comparing East and Southeast Asian participants with other participants because this ethnic group was the only non-Caucasian one to which more than 10 participants belonged. In addition, academic major and area of upbringing were reduced to two variables according to the same process as described above.

A one-way ANOVA for ethnicity uncovered few differences on the evaluation variables. In fact, participants who identified as East or Southeast Asian only differed from participants of other ethnicities in their evaluations of the heterosexual candidate's qualifications,  $F(1, 181) = 5.86, p = .017$ , and the heterosexual candidate's aggregate score,  $F(1, 181) = 4.57, p = .034$ . In

both of these cases, the participants who identified themselves as East or Southeast Asian were less likely to rate the heterosexual candidate positively. No significant differences were found regarding other evaluation variables of the heterosexual candidate (all  $F_s < 3.70$ , n.s.). Finally, no significant differences were found regarding evaluations of the homosexual candidate (all  $F_s < 2.30$ , n.s.).

A one-way ANOVA for academic major showed similarly sparse results. Only one significant effect was found, this one regarding how interesting the gay male candidate's research was thought to be,  $F(1, 181) = 4.02, p = .047$ . The relationship in terms of how interesting the heterosexual candidate's research was almost significant,  $F(1, 181) = 3.87, p = .051$ . Unsurprisingly, participants with more quantitative majors were more interested in both candidates' research. No other significant differences were found regarding evaluations of either candidate across academic major (all  $F_s < 2.30$ , n.s.).

A one-way ANOVA was also run concerning place of upbringing (i.e., United States versus abroad), and several significant results emerged. These results are shown in Table 6. On average, participants raised outside the United States rated the homosexual candidate lower on over half of the 10 evaluation items than did students raised within the U.S. This difference was particularly large regarding participants' ratings of the homosexual candidate's qualifications and their willingness to recommend hiring him. On these two measures, participants raised outside the United States rated the homosexual candidate a point lower, on average, than their counterparts raised within the United States. For this reason, foreign-raised participants' aggregate scores were strongly significantly lower than those of participants raised in the U.S. ( $M_s = 30.14$  vs.  $38.04$ ). On some dependent variables, participants raised outside the United States were also more critical of the heterosexual candidate than those raised inside the United

State. For example, they were less likely to recommend the heterosexual candidate's class to a friend, on average, and tended to be less interested in the heterosexual candidate's research.

However, no other significant differences were witnessed in ratings of the heterosexual candidate across place of upbringing (all  $F$ s < 3.70, n.s.).

### **Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether homophobic hip-hop music can influence young men to assess a gay male job candidate more negatively than they would otherwise. Prior studies have found that hip-hop music containing other forms of overly-masculine messages, such as misogynist or violent lyrics, can cause listeners to espouse more misogynist or violent attitudes and dispositions, respectively (Cobb & Boettcher, 2007; Johnson, Jackson, & Gatto, 1995). In addition, past research has indicated that attitudes toward LGBT individuals can be altered by negative messages pertaining to these individuals in visual media (Levina et al., 2000). However, no study has before examined the effect of homophobic rap lyrics on these attitudes.

#### **Discussion of Hypotheses Testing**

Hypothesis one predicted that participants within the homophobic hip-hop music condition would rate the homosexual candidate less favorably than those in the non-homophobic and no music conditions. This hypothesis was supported, in part, by the fact that participants in the homophobic condition were less likely to rate the homosexual candidate's qualifications as acceptable and were less likely to express interest in attending the homosexual candidate's office hours as compared to participants in the no music condition. The homosexual candidate was rated lower on all measures in the homophobic music condition than he was in the no music condition. However, support for this hypothesis was limited by the fact that no significant

differences were found for measures other than the aforementioned two. Furthermore, the prediction that differences would exist between the rating of the gay male candidate in the homophobic and non-homophobic music conditions was not substantiated.

Our second hypothesis stated that participants within the homophobic music condition would rate the homosexual candidate less favorably than they would the heterosexual candidate. Indeed, this difference existed when participants in this condition rated candidates in terms of their willingness to attend each candidate's office hours, the perceived benefit each candidate's hiring would bring to the university's math department, and their willingness to recommend hiring each candidate. However, this finding was limited by a lack of significant differences within the homophobic rap condition between the hetero- and homosexual candidates on any of the other evaluation measures.

Our third hypothesis stated that there would be an interaction between the music condition and the sexuality of the candidate for the candidate evaluation measures. This hypothesis was not supported by the data. In fact, the only two variables that merited considering, because they showed variation across music condition, did not exhibit any interaction in effects across music condition and sexuality of the candidate. This potential interaction was approaching significant only for the participants' willingness to attend the office hours of a candidate.

These findings suggest that the sexuality of the candidates and the music to which the participants were exposed most strongly affected the item pertaining to the candidates' office hours. Thus, it seems that homophobic hip-hop music may influence young men to increase their social distance from gay men. This particular response would explain why more abstract measures, such as ratings of a gay male candidate's research and his projected salary, might be

less affected because the participants, themselves, were not directly affected by these outcomes. Even the prospect of attending such a candidate's class may not seem overly important at a large university where lectures with 400 students are quite common. However, after listening to stimuli that argue that homosexuality, and male homosexuality especially, is something to be eschewed, it comes as no surprise that participants were less willing to sit alone in an office with a homosexual male professor, as compared to participants who encountered no stimulus.

### **Discussion of Correlates of Dependent Variables**

Finally, we investigated different background factors to determine how they correlated with ratings of the homosexual candidate and whether these correlations changed across music condition. Within the no music condition, it appeared that religiosity variables correlated positively with many evaluation scores of the homosexual candidate, meaning that participants who considered themselves religious, prayed more frequently, and attended religious services more frequently were also more likely to rate the homosexual candidate *positively* on a number of evaluation measures. This positive association was extremely significant for participants' ratings of this candidate's qualifications, and their willingness to recommend hiring him. At first, this finding may seem counterintuitive, but two different theories could explain this trend. First, because this experiment took place on a fairly liberal, Midwestern college campus, it is possible that many religious participants in this study subscribed to a more socially liberal brand of religion or religious thought (e.g., Unitarian), one that emphasizes inclusiveness and acceptance. Alternatively, it is possible that religious participants, understanding that many popular stereotypes cast religious individuals as homophobic, actively worked to counteract this stereotype by positively rating the gay male candidate.

Within the non-homophobic music condition, participants who listened to more music per week and specifically more rap music per week were more likely to negatively evaluate the gay male candidate. This outcome was especially true regarding their likelihood of recommending this candidate's class to a friend, the extent to which they would recommend hiring him, and their proposed salary for the candidate. This finding could be due to *spreading activation*, a process by which a certain stimulus can activate closely related stimuli, thereby priming a whole network of second- and third-degree connections (Collins & Loftus, 1975). In this instance, if participants typically listened to DMX and associated him with homophobic lyrics, then even listening to a non-homophobic song by this artist might have activated the idea of homophobia through this association. However, participants without a lot of prior music exposure would likely not have previously made this association, or it might have been weaker, and thus this spreading activation effect would not have occurred.

Within the homophobic music condition, moderate negative correlations appeared between the levels of education of the participants' parents and participants' assessments of the homosexual candidate. Within this condition, participants whose fathers were more educated were less likely to perceive this candidate positively, express willingness to take his class, and recommend hiring him. Participants whose mothers were more educated recommended a lower salary for the homosexual candidate, on average, than those whose mother attained a lower level of education. However, because some negative correlations were also found between parental education and the ratings of the *heterosexual* candidate in this condition, it seemed that these trends were not influenced by the sexuality of either candidate, but rather some confounding interplay between this background factor and the homophobic stimulus. Perhaps students with more educated parents are taught to be more critical, in general, of educators.



Finally, it is interesting to note that the effects of these aforementioned background factors appeared wholly within separate music conditions. That is, none of them showed significant effects in the same direction within *multiple* conditions. Concerning the religious factors, we believe that the lack of any music stimulus allowed this background factor to influence participants' perceptions of the gay candidate. However, these background influences disappeared once any stimulus was presented to overshadow this effect. Concerning music listening habits, it is clear that any spreading activation effect could not have taken place during the no music condition, due to the absence of any stimulus. In the homophobic music condition, as well, the spreading activation effect would have been nullified by the presence of clear homophobic messages. As a result, contrary to our expectations, habitual hip-hop consumption did not significantly influence participants' processing of homophobic hip-hop music in any manner.

Across all music conditions, we found consistent differences in evaluations of the homosexual candidate when comparing students raised in the United States to those raised abroad. Students raised abroad were less likely to have a positive overall perception of the homosexual candidate, to be impressed by his qualifications, to recommend his class to a friend, to express interest in his office hours, to recommend hiring him, and to perceive the benefit of hiring him. Whereas part of this difference could be explained by the fact that foreign students were tougher on candidates overall, for they were also less likely to recommend the class of the *heterosexual* candidate and find the *heterosexual* candidate's research important, many more differences were observed in participants' evaluations of the gay male candidate. This pattern indicates that participants raised outside of the United States were less accepting of homosexual job candidates than those raised in the United States. Such a pattern matches existing findings

on the prevalence of homophobia throughout the world, which indicates that Americans are, on the whole, more accepting of LGBT individuals than are citizens of East and Southeast Asia, Eastern Europe, the Middle East, and Africa (Pew Research Global Attitudes Project, 2007).

Although we can attribute causality to the experimental results, no such causal attributions can be drawn from the correlational data. Thus, even though our condition-by-condition analysis allowed for a clearer picture concerning which background factors come into play most when encountering specific stimuli, the significant connections between the ratings of the gay candidate and these factors, such as religiosity and music-listening habits, could be caused by unforeseen confounding variables.

### **Summary of Experimental Findings**

The literature on media effects and priming (e.g., Allen et al., 2007; Bargh et al., 1996; Gerbner et al., 2002) suggests that the messages in various media, whether auditory or visual, can influence users to echo the messages they have encountered. This study appears to support this theory, to a degree. Experimental results indicated that exposure to homophobic hip-hop music can influence male listeners to rate situations involving close contact with homosexual men, such as attending the office hours of a homosexual male professor, as undesirable. To a lesser extent, some effects were observed regarding homophobic hip-hop's effect on listeners' evaluations of a homosexual male candidate's suitability for a certain job, but these findings were inconsistent. However, no results were found regarding homophobic hip-hop's effect on more abstract evaluations of a homosexual candidate, such as his proposed salary and items about his research. As such, these results indicate that the homophobic messages contained in some rap songs do not necessarily cause male listeners to question the achievements of a gay man or the amount he should be paid for a given job, but that they can make male listeners less

willing to spend time in close proximity with gay men. Overall, these findings appear to indicate that not all aspects of media users' perceptions of minority groups are affected equally strongly by discriminatory stimuli. In the case of homophobic rap music, abstract judgments of a homosexual man's work performance are less affected than listeners' willingness to spend time with the person.

### **Limitations and Implications**

However, a number of limitations in this study affected its internal and external validity. In terms of internal validity, this study was limited by the fact that sexuality is commonly never listed on academic résumés. Thus, to convey sexuality in this setting, the researchers merely noted that one candidate was involved with LGBT organizations. Clearly, membership in these organizations does not equate with LGBT orientation, so the researchers needed participants to assume from this information that the candidate in question was not heterosexual. Similarly, the so-called "heterosexual" male candidate was never explicitly labeled as heterosexual in either his résumé or cover letter. Rather, these materials were simply devoid of any reference to his sexual orientation, and thus researchers required participants to assume that this candidate was heterosexual. These vague hints concerning the sexual orientation of the candidates represent a limitation of this study, because it is possible that a number of participants either missed the data that hinted toward the homosexual candidate's sexual orientation or failed to make the assumptions the researchers expected them to make. If either of these two instances occurred for a given participant, then his evaluations would not have been influenced by the sexuality of the candidates, thus damaging the internal validity of the study.

Furthermore, because little research had previously been performed in this field, this study attempted to test for a variety of effects, not only between music condition and sexuality of

the candidate in question, but even within these conditions. This method of dividing participants into smaller groups in order to analyze data reduced the power of some of these tests. As mentioned before, the homosexual candidate was rated more negatively on all evaluation items in the homophobic music condition than he was in the no music condition, but not all of these differences were significant. Increasing the power of these tests might have uncovered more significant results.

Finally, this research was conducted at a fairly liberal Midwestern university, and all of the participants were enrolled in an introductory psychology class. Thus, the responses recorded in this experiment likely reflected this background to some extent, especially in a study relating to a social issue such as discrimination against LGBT individuals. It is highly likely that the researchers would have recorded different results if this study were conducted in a different country, or even a different region of the United States.

As such, future research should be done to corroborate these findings, while addressing these limitations. Specifically, future studies should focus on a single finding from this study and investigate it by itself, in order to preserve the power of each test performed. It is possible that both including a greater number of participants and limiting the scope of the experiment to one or two sets of analyses in future studies could uncover more significant results.

In addition, if further research investigates the effects of homophobic rap music on other LGBT issues, these studies should include dependent variable measures that clarify that the situations participants are examining involve LGBT individuals. These measures could include asking participants to allot funding to LGBT groups or resolve roommate conflicts involving an LGBT student. Using these evaluations as the source of the dependent variable could ensure that every participant recognizes that their decisions are tied to the well-being of LGBT groups or

individuals, which may lead to a stronger observed difference in these evaluation results for students exposed to homophobic hip-hop music.

Because this study involved a priming design, which allowed for quick evaluation of participants' attitudes after receiving the stimuli, this study was not able to study the long-term effects of these stimuli. Thus, further research should test the longevity of any and all attitude shifts caused by homophobic music, to investigate the extent to which one-time or repeated exposure to these messages may cause lasting effects.

Most importantly, this study appeared to indicate that priming young men with negative messages caused larger shifts in attitudes along some variables than along others. Specifically, homophobic hip-hop listeners were more likely to rate a one-on-one meeting with a gay male professor as significantly less desirable than they were to give the candidate a significantly more negative review overall. Further studies should investigate this difference to examine whether negative messages affect attitudes toward personal contact with the discriminated group more than they do attitudes toward the discriminated group's professional capacities or the extent to which the group deserves greater social acceptance. If the findings in this study are reinforced by later research, we will continue to find that discriminatory messages create a "not in my backyard" attitude, whereby listeners accept the social aspirations of the targeted group, so long as these listeners are not forced into personal contact with any members of this group.

### **Conclusion**

Hip-hop music has long been influenced by homophobic undertones, which result from the aggressive masculinity that dominated the street culture that gave rise to rap music. This study sought to test the effects homophobic hip-hop music has on its listeners. It did so by exposing male college students to homophobic hip-hop, non-homophobic hip-hop, or no music

before asking them to evaluate two professorial candidates, one of which was a heterosexual man, the other of which was a homosexual man. It found that participants were likely to rate the homosexual candidate lower in the homophobic condition than they would have in the no music condition across some evaluation criteria, especially their willingness to attend the candidate's office hours. It also found that significant prior exposure to hip-hop and other genres of music was correlated with lower ratings of the homosexual candidate within the non-homophobic music condition. Further research should build on these findings to test the longevity of these effects and determine whether negative messages about a group always affects attitudes toward interpersonal contact with that group more than they do attitudes about the abstract qualifications of an individual in that group, such as his or her job readiness. With this further research, we might be able to more fully determine the extent to which homophobic hip-hop music affects our society's outlook on sexual minorities.

## References

- Allen, M., Herrett-Skjellum, J., Jorgenseon, J., Kramer, M. R., Ryan, D. J., & Timmerman, L. (2007). Effects of music. In Preiss, R. W., Gayle, B. M., Burrell, N., Allen, M., and Bryant, J. (Eds.), *Mass media effects research: A dvances through meta-analysis* (pp. 199-214). Mahweh, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Bandura, A. (1965). Influence of models' reinforcement contingencies on the acquisition of imitative responses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1*(6), 589-595.
- Bargh, J. A., Chen, M., & Burrows, L. (1996). Automaticity of social behavior: Direct effects of trait construct and stereotype activation on action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*(2), 230-244.
- Byrne, J. S. (1993). Affirmative action for lesbians and gay men: A proposal for true equality of opportunity and workforce diversity. *Yale Law & Policy Review, 11*(1), 47-108.
- Calzo, J. P., & Ward, L. M. (2009a). Contributions of parents, peers, and media to attitudes toward homosexuality: Investigating gender and ethnic differences. *Journal of Homosexuality, 56*, 1101-1116.
- Calzo, J. P., & Ward, L. M. (2009b). Media exposure and viewers' attitudes towards homosexuality: Evidence for mainstreaming or resonance? *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 52*(2), 280-299.
- Chang, J. (2006). It's all one. In J. Chang (Ed.), *Total chaos: The art and aesthetics of hip-hop* (pp. 198-208). New York: Basic Civitas Books.
- Center for the Study of Race, Politics, and Culture (2007). *The attitudes and behaviors of young black Americans*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

- Cobb, M. D., & Boettcher, W. A. (2007). Ambivalent sexism and misogynistic rap music: Does exposure to Eminem increase sexism? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37*(12), 3025-3042.
- Collins, A. M., & Loftus, E. F. (1975). A spreading activation theory of semantic processing. *Psychological Review, 82*(6), 407-428.
- Fischer, P., & Greitemeyer, T. (2006). Music and aggression: The impact of sexual-aggressive song lyrics on aggression-related thoughts, emotions, and behavior toward the same and the opposite sex. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*(9), 1165-1176.
- Fouts, G., & Inch, R. (2005). Homosexuality in TV situation comedies: Characters and verbal comments. *Journal of Homosexuality, 49*(1), 35-45.
- Gan, S. L., Zillmann, D., & Mitrook, M. (1997). Stereotyping effect of black women's sexual rap on white audiences. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 19*(3), 381-399.
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., Signorielli, N., & Shanahan, J. (2002). Growing up with television: Cultivation processes. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 43-67). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gitlin, T. (1978). Media sociology: The dominant paradigm. *Theory and Society, 6*, 205-253.
- Greitemeyer, T. (2009). Effects of songs with prosocial lyrics on prosocial thoughts, affect, and behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, 186-190.
- Gueguen, N., Jacob, C., & Lamy, L. (2010). 'Love is in the air': Effects of songs with romantic lyrics on compliance with a courtship request. *Psychology of Music, 38*(3), 303-307.
- Herd, D. (2009). Changing images of violence in rap music lyrics: 1979-1997. *Journal of Public Health Policy, 30*(4), 395-406.



- Herek, G. (2002). Gender gaps in public opinion about lesbians and gay men. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 66, 40-66.
- Hestroni, A. (2007). Three decades of sexual content on prime-time network programming: A longitudinal meta-analytic review. *Journal of Communication*, 57(2), 318-348.
- Higgins, D. (2009). *Hip hop world*. Toronto: Groundwood Books.
- Hill, M. C. (2009). Scared straight: Hip-hop, outing, and the pedagogy of queerness. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 31(1), 29-54.
- Jamison, D. F., (2006). The relationship between African self-consciousness, cultural misorientation, hypermasculinity, and rap music preference. *Journal of African American Studies*, 9(4), 45-60.
- Johnson, J., Jackson, L. A., & Gatto, L. (1995). Violent attitudes and deferred academic aspirations: Deleterious effects of exposure to rap music. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 16, 27-41.
- Johnson, J. D., Olivo, N., Gibson, N., Reed, W., & Ashburn-Nardo, L. (2009). Priming media stereotypes reduces support for social welfare policies: The mediating role of empathy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(4), 463-476.
- Jones, K. (1997). Are rap videos more violent? Style differences and the prevalence of sex and violence in the age of MTV. *Howard Journal of Communications*, 8(4), 343-356.
- Katz, E., & Lazarsfeld, P. F. (1955). *Personal influence: The part played by people in the flow of mass communications*. New York: Free Press.
- Kubrin, C. E., & Weitzer, R. (2009). Misogyny in rap music: A content analysis of prevalence and meanings. *Men and Masculinities*, 12(1), 3-29.
- Kubrin, C. E., & Weitzer, R. (2010). Rap music's violent and misogynist effects: Fact or fiction?

- Sociology of Crime, Law, and Deviance*, 14, 121-143.
- Levina, M., Waldo, C., & Fitzgerald, L. (2000). We're here, we're queer, we're on TV: The effects of visual media on heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30(4), 738-758.
- MacPherson, M. (2011). Is hip-hop homophobia at a tipping point? *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/music/musicblog/2011/may/09/hip-hop-homophobia>.
- Netzley, S. B. (2010). Visibility that demystifies: Gays, gender, and sex on television. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 57, 968-986.
- Ortiz, M., & Harwood, J. (2007). A social cognitive theory approach to the effects of mediated intergroup contact on intergroup attitudes. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 51(4), 615-631.
- Oware, M. (2011). Brotherly love: Homosociality and black masculinity in gangsta rap music. *Journal of African American Studies*, 15, 22-39.
- Pascoe, C. J. (2005). 'Dude, you're a fag': Adolescent masculinity and the fag discourse. *Sexualities*, 8(3), 329-346.
- Pew Research Center (2003). Republicans unified, democrats split on gay marriage: Religious beliefs underpin opposition to homosexuality. Retrieved from <http://pewforum.org/docs/index.php?DocIDD39>.
- Pew Research Global Attitudes Project (2007). Views on religion and morality. In A. Kohut (Ed.), *World publics welcome global trade – but not immigration: 47-Nation Pew global attitudes survey* (pp. 33-40). Retrieved from <http://www.pewglobal.org/2007/10/04/world-publics-welcome-global-trade-but-not-immigration/>.
- Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (1994) Attitudes toward male roles among adolescent

- males: A discriminant validity analysis. *Sex Roles*, 30(7/8), 481-501.
- Raley, A., & Lucas, J. (2006). Stereotype or success? Prime-time television's portrayals of gay male, lesbian, and bisexual characters. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 51(2), 19-38.
- Recording Industry Association of America (2008). Consumer trends chart: 1999-2008. Retrieved from <http://76.74.24.142/CA052A55-9910-2DAC-925F-27663DCFFFF3.pdf>.
- Riggle, E. D., Ellis, A. L., & Crawford, A. M. (1996). The impact of "media contact" on attitudes toward gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 31(3), 55-69.
- Riggs, M. T. (1991). Black macho revisited: Reactions of a snap! queen. *Black American Literature Forum*, 25(2), 389-394.
- Rose, T. (1994). *Black noise: Rap music and Black culture in contemporary America*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Rose, T. (2008). *The hip hop wars: What we talk about when we talk about hip hop – and why it matters*. Philadelphia: Basic Books.
- Rosler, P., & Brosius, H. (2001). Do talk shows cultivate adolescents' views of the world? A prolonged exposure experiment. *Journal of Communication*, 51, 143-163.
- Rudman, L. A., & Borgida, E. (1995). The afterglow of construct accessibility: The behavioral consequences of priming men to view women as sexual objects. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 31, 483-517.
- Schiappa, E., Gregg, P., & Hewes, D. E. (2006). Can one TV show make a difference? *Will & Grace* and the parasocial contact hypothesis. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 51(4), 15-37.
- Shinoster Lamb, Y. (2005). C. Delores Tucker dies at 78; Rights and anti-rap activist. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/10/13/AR2005101300024.html>.

Shrum, L. J. (1996). Psychological processes underlying cultivation effects: Further tests of construct accessibility. *Human Communication Research, 22*, 482-509.

Sprankle, E., End, C., & Bretz, M. (2012). Sexually degrading music videos and lyrics: Their effects on males' aggression and endorsement of rape myths and sexual stereotypes. *Journal of Media Psychology, 24*(1), 31-39.

## Footnotes

<sup>1</sup> Examples of this can be found in the Kanye West song *Stronger*, where he raps, “Heard they’d do anything for a Klondike, Well I’d do anything for a blonde d\*\*\*” and the Young Money song *Every Girl* where Drake asks anonymous women “Are any of y’all into women like I am? Let’s be honest (pronounced like ‘lesbi-honest’).”

## Author Note

Kevin J. Binder, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. L. Monique Ward, for all of her support and guidance throughout the duration of this project. Her input has been instrumental in shaping the nature and course of this project. I would also like to thank Monica Foust, as my experience aiding her with her research led me, in part, to pursue this project. Finally, I would like to thank the rest of the Ward lab for their input on both my experimental stimuli and my results.

Table 1

*Candidate Evaluation Means by Music Condition and Candidate Sexuality*

Evaluation variable	Homosexual candidate Ms by condition				Heterosexual candidate Ms by condition				Comparison of heterosexual candidate Ms across condition		Heterosexual vs. homosexual candidate in homophobic condition	
	Non-homophobic		No music		Homophobic		No music		F	t	F	t
	Homophobic	Non-homophobic	Homophobic	No music	Homophobic	Non-homophobic	Homophobic	No music				
Overall perception	5.23	5.56	5.47	5.47	5.45	5.74	5.38	5.38	2.52	-1.32	2.52	-1.32
Rating of candidates' qualifications	5.23	5.66	5.72	5.72	5.58	5.80	5.80	5.80	0.80	-1.48	0.80	-1.48
Willingness to take class	4.56	4.37	4.72	4.72	4.73	4.58	4.58	4.58	0.23	-0.72	0.23	-0.72
Willingness to recommend class	4.73	4.77	4.97	4.97	4.94	5.03	4.93	4.93	0.11	-0.80	0.11	-0.80
Willingness to attend office hours	3.94	4.42	4.64	4.64	4.45	4.68	4.35	4.35	0.72	-2.01*	0.72	-2.01*
Rating of benefits candidate would bring to department	4.73	5.03	5.02	5.02	5.19	5.31	5.07	5.07	0.56	-1.94*	0.56	-1.94*
Interest in candidate's research	4.31	3.92	4.10	4.10	4.53	4.44	4.38	4.38	0.13	-1.15	0.13	-1.15
Reported importance of candidate's research	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.38	4.41	4.76	4.77	4.77	1.40	0.43	1.40	0.43
Willingness to recommend hiring	4.92	5.07	5.20	5.20	5.30	5.44	5.15	5.15	0.90	-1.69*	0.90	-1.69*
Proposed salary (in thousands of dollars)	66.72	65.59	67.00	67.00	66.95	67.11	66.33	66.33	0.31	-0.25	0.31	-0.25
Aggregate score (out of 60)	36.50	37.25	38.61	38.61	38.95	40.20	38.68	38.68	0.62	-0.16	0.62	-0.16

*Note.* Scale scores range from 1 to 7 unless otherwise specified, with higher scores indicating a more favorable evaluation \* $p < .05$  (one-tailed), ^For Tukey's post-hoc test between homophobic and no music conditions,  $p < .05$  (one-tailed).

Table 2

*Correlations of Background Factors with Ratings of Homosexual Candidate Across All Music Conditions*

Evaluation variable	Background factors											
	Age (in months)	Paternal education	Maternal education	Aggregate parental education	Self-reported religiosity	Frequency attending religious services	Frequency of prayer	Aggregate religiosity measure	Sexuality	Weekly music intake (in hours)	Weekly rap intake (in hours)	Rap as percentage of music diet
Overall perception	-0.16*			-0.15*			0.16*					
Rating of candidates' qualifications												
Willingness to take class												
Willingness to recommend class								0.15*		-0.19*	-0.21**	-0.19**
Willingness to attend office hours												
Rating of benefits candidate would bring to department									0.17*			-0.17*
Interest in candidate's research												
Reported importance of candidate's research												
Willingness to recommend hiring					0.15*				0.17*	0.16*	0.18*	
Proposed salary (in thousands of dollars)												
Aggregate score (out of 60)												-0.15*

*Note.* Higher scores on parental education and religiosity measures reflect higher levels of parental education and religiosity, respectively. Higher scores on sexuality measure reflect higher reported levels of opposite-sex attraction. \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ .



Table 3

*Correlations of Background Factors with Ratings of Homosexual Candidate in No Music Condition*

Evaluation variable	Background factors											
	Age (in months)	Paternal education	Maternal education	Aggregate parental education	Self-reported religiosity	Frequency attending religious services	Frequency of prayer	Aggregate religiosity measure	Sexuality	Weekly music intake (in hours)	Weekly rap intake (in hours)	Rap as percentage of music diet
Overall perception					0.29*	0.32*	0.30*					
Rating of candidates' qualifications					0.31*	0.42**	0.37**					
Willingness to take class												
Willingness to recommend class								0.28*				
Willingness to attend office hours									0.29*			
Rating of benefits candidate would bring to department					0.28*	0.30*	0.29*					
Interest in candidate's research												
Reported importance of candidate's research					0.40**	0.35**	0.43**					
Willingness to recommend hiring						0.39**	0.43**					
Proposed salary (in thousands of dollars)												
Aggregate score (out of 60)					0.27*	0.31*	0.30*					

*Note.* Higher scores on parental education and religiosity measures reflect higher levels of parental education and religiosity, respectively. Higher scores on sexuality measure reflect higher reported levels of opposite-sex attraction. \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ .

Table 4

*Correlations of Background Factors with Ratings of Homosexual Candidate in Non-Homophobic Music Condition*

Evaluation variable	Background factors										
	Age (in months)	Paternal education	Maternal education	Aggregate parental education	Self-reported religiosity	Frequency attending religious services	Aggregate religiosity measure	Sexuality	Weekly music intake (in hours)	Weekly rap intake (in hours)	Rap as percentage of music diet
Overall perception											
Rating of candidates' qualifications						-0.28*					
Willingness to take class											
Willingness to recommend class											
Willingness to attend office hours											
Rating of benefits candidate would bring to department											
Interest in candidate's research											
Reported importance of candidate's research											
Willingness to recommend hiring											
Proposed salary (in thousands of dollars)											
Aggregate score (out of 60)											

*Note.* Higher scores on parental education and religiosity measures reflect higher levels of parental education and religiosity, respectively. Higher scores on sexuality measure reflect greater higher levels of opposite-sex attraction. \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ .

Table 5

*Correlations of Background Factors with Ratings of Homosexual Candidate in Homophobic Music Condition*

Evaluation variable	Background factors									
	Age (in months)	Paternal education	Maternal education	Aggregate parental education	Self-reported religiosity	Frequency attending religious services	Aggregate religiosity measure	Weekly music intake (in hours)	Weekly rap intake (in hours)	Rap as percentage of music diet
Overall perception		-0.25*		-0.26*						
Rating of candidates' qualifications										
Willingness to take class		-0.25*		-0.25*						
Willingness to recommend class										
Willingness to attend office hours										
Rating of benefits candidate would bring to department										
Interest in candidate's research					-0.36**				-0.28*	
Reported importance of candidate's research					-0.35**			-0.27*	-0.28*	
Willingness to recommend hiring		-0.28*		-0.28*						
Proposed salary (in thousands of dollars)				-0.27*						
Aggregate score (out of 60)										

*Note.* Higher scores on parental education and religiosity measures reflect higher levels of parental education and religiosity, respectively. Higher scores on sexuality measure reflect higher reported levels of opposite-sex attraction. \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ .

Table 6

*Candidate Evaluation Means Across Area of Upbringing*

Evaluation variable	Sexuality of candidate	Means		Outside U.S. vs. inside U.S. <i>F</i>
		Outside U.S.	Inside U.S.	
Overall perception	Homosexual	4.79	5.47	5.65*
	Heterosexual	5.14	5.56	2.51
Rating of candidates' qualifications	Homosexual	4.43	5.62	12.55***
	Heterosexual	5.57	5.73	0.27
Willingness to take class	Homosexual	4.00	4.60	1.92
	Heterosexual	4.64	4.63	< .01
Willingness to recommend class	Homosexual	3.85	4.91	7.79**
	Heterosexual	4.29	5.02	3.90*
Willingness to attend office hours	Homosexual	3.36	4.40	5.64*
	Heterosexual	4.50	4.49	< .01
Rating of benefits candidate would bring to department	Homosexual	4.14	4.99	5.17*
	Heterosexual	5.00	5.20	0.35
Interest in candidate's research	Homosexual	3.79	4.14	0.65
	Heterosexual	4.00	4.49	1.19
Reported importance of candidate's research	Homosexual	3.93	4.44	1.70
	Heterosexual	3.71	4.71	6.96**
Willingness to recommend hiring candidate	Homosexual	3.93	5.15	11.94***
	Heterosexual	4.71	5.34	3.62
Proposed salary (in thousands of dollars)	Homosexual	64.64	66.60	1.37
	Heterosexual	66.43	66.83	0.06
Aggregate score	Homosexual	30.14	38.04	8.67**
	Heterosexual	35.86	39.55	2.19

*Note.* Scale scores range from 1 to 7 unless otherwise specified, with higher scores indicating a more favorable evaluation, \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

## Appendix A

*Lyrics of hip-hop songs that were included in the homophobic hip-hop condition only: Where the Hood at? by DMX and Punks Jump up to Get Beat down (Explicit) by Brand Nubian.*

*Homophobic lyrics are italicized.*

*Where the Hood at? by DMX*

Ay yo, you niggas must be outcha fucking mind

Thinking dog can't pull another motherfucking rabbit out the hat

Nigga I ain't gotta check out my motherfucking sleeves you bitch ass niggas

Fuck is y'all niggas...

Y'all niggas just thinking I'm sitting around doing nothing?

Oh my God, y'all niggas can't be serious

*[Chorus (Repeat 2X)]*

Where the hood, where the hood, where the hood at?

Have that nigga in the cut, where the wood at?

Oh, them niggas actin up?!? Where the wolves at?

You better BUST THAT if you gonna pull that

*[DMX]*

Man, cats don't know what it's gonna be

Fucking with a nigga like me, D-to-the-M-to-the-X

*Last I heard, y'all niggas was having sex, with the same sex*

*I show no love, to homo thugs*

Empty out, reloaded and throw more slugs

*How you gonna explain fucking a man?*

*Even if we squashed the beef, I ain't touching your hand*

*I don't buck with chumps, for those to been to jail*

*That's the cat with the Kool-Aid on his lips and pumps*

*I don't fuck with niggas that think they broads*

Only know how to be ONE WAY, that's the dog

I know how to get down, know how to BITE

Bark very little, but I know HOW TO FIGHT

I know how to chase a cat up in the tree

Man, I give y'all niggas the business for fucking with me, is you crazy?!?

*[Chorus]*

Once a song, I come though, guns is drawn

BLAM BLAM, lungs are gone, sons will mourn

From dusk till dawn, nighttime belongs to the dog

On the street passed midnight, look for 'em in the morgue

Don't play with these cats cause I ain't got nothing to say to these cats

For the mothers that really do love 'em, please pray for these cats

Cause I know niggas is hardheaded but I ain't got the patience

Don't want me having no patience turn into more patience

More trips to ICU cause I see you

Trying to get away with shit a real nigga wouldn't do

Where my dogs at? (Right here!) See them niggas? (Right where?!?)

Get 'em boy! (Right there!) That's how we do... (Alright then!)

This is for my dogs, this is for my dogs

Yo, where we at baby?!? (Creeping though the fog)

From then till now, don't ask me how

Know that we gonna roll like them niggas and hit every block on the job

*[Chorus]*

I get tapes doing times, stop niggas like grapes making wine

Five CD's with mad rhymes

Don't hit me with that positive shit, I know you lying

You really wanna stop niggas from dying? Stop niggas from trying

I cause I ain't really got that time to waste

and I thought I told you to get these fucking bums out my face

Looking at you in your grill, I might be nice to cut

Once I split your ass in two, you'll be twice as butt

Yeah, you right, I know your style - PUSSY cause I'm fucking it

Since we all right here, *you hold my dick while he sucking it*

Motherfucker! Don't you know you'll never come near me

Shove your head up your ass, have you seeing shit clearly

Never heard that D be running, cause D be gunning

I beat my dick and bust off in your eye so you can see me coming

Empty clips and shells are what I leave behind

and if they get me with the joint, they hit me with a three-to-nine

*[Chorus]*

*[Spoken]*

Where the fucking hood at?!? (It's all good, the dog is the hood)

No one's fucking with me nigga, for real! (It's all good, the dog is the hood)

I am the hood, I am the streets! (It's all good, the dog is the hood)

You bitch ass nigga! (It's all good, the dog is the hood)

Take it how you want, motherfucker! (It's all good, the dog is the hood)

I'm in the hood all day! (It's all good, the dog is the hood)

I think I'm like the only nigga, dog (It's all good, the dog is the hood)

That can go to the projects (School street, home of the brave)

By his fucking self and be good!

Yeah nigga, ask niggas on Y.O. (My projects, Y.O.)

When the last time they seen dog! (Not too long ago baby)

Motherfucker!

D! Y! Ugh! (Y'all niggas is homeless)

Kato! (Where the hood at?)



*Punks Jump up to Get Beat down (Explicit)* by Brand Nubian

("Get nothing but a beat down!")

*[Refrain (4x)]*

Punks jump up to get beat down!

("Get nothing but a beat...")

*[Sadat X]*

One day when I was riding on the train I seen these two kids talking  
about the Nubian reign had fallen.

I didn't say nothing cause these kids caught my goat,  
even wore my coat like a murder that they wrote.

So this kid with mouth swagger 'n I'll blaze the cloak and dagger  
so I gotta show Dukes the macho lot that I am.

I can rock a jam, make the world drop ham,  
oh yes, I'm the bad man, and bad men wear black.

And if it comes to dropping bombs, yo, I'm with that.

*Though I can freak, fly, flow, fuck up a faggot.*

*Don't understand their ways I ain't down with gays.*

*You wanna grab the style that was made from my mom and my dad,*  
when I was young I used to run with a notepad.

Then dimes knew and somehow I knew that I was bad to the bone...  
black prodigy since the age of twen-ty.

I could write a rhyme, rip it up and write a next one,

right on the spot, sign my name with a dot.

Diamond D threw me some smooth shit, Bronx crowd roar.

Stick up your wack jam, everybody hit the floor.

Okay it's you, Slim, the hard rock of the pack,

don't wanna kneel to the brothers, you must be holing.

Bust some shit in his chest, now his whole body's swollen.

Why did I have to do it? He asked for it.

His man saw it, so it don't mean shit to me.

He's gone, that's how it's supposed to be....check it out now.

I ain't going out, man that short shit is dead,

have you heard what I said? If not, ask the dread.

He got a can and that's bad...similar to the one that I got from my own dad.

*[Refrain (4x)]*

*[Lord Jamar]*

Your punk ass'll be grass quick fast like my name was flash

when a nigga try and rob me for my cash.

You thought you had a sweet vic, a nice pick,

but you didn't anticipate that I might be sick.

Now who's the trick, cause I'm not a up. (No, no-no-no!)

I always do the fucking, just might do the bucking.

I leave my Nikes stuck in your rectum, till you learn

Brand Nubian, yo, you gotta respect 'em.

Dissect 'em, yo, our word is bond regardless.

To my what, and do the Puma strut.

So step the fuck off, before I punch you in your face,

with the motherfucking bass!

Then you're gonna taste blood in your mouth, it's gonna flood south

to the ground, and you're gonna know I don't fuck around.

So if you think you had two soft new jacks,

we're gonna have to off you with a few cracks

to the jaw and you won't pop that shit no more.

Explaining to your friends why you're laying on the floor.

Did you want some more? I didn't think so.

*Just got whipped like a faggot in the clink, so*

I suggest you take your bloody mess and find a piece of wire,

fix your broken jaw, then it's time to retire.

Lord Jamar will live long, cause I give strong blows the heads of my foes.

Dread flows, gives me power as it grows.

Watch how rass-cladda you catch the speed knot,

heed not, and hell will be your home,

Lord Jamar, Sadat, as we swell your dome.

*[Refrain (4x)]*

## Appendix B

*Lyrics of hip-hop songs that were included in the non-homophobic hip-hop condition only: Ruff Ryder's Anthem by DMX and Punks Jump up to Get Beat down (Clean Re-release) by Brand Nubian.*

*Ruff Ryder's Anthem by DMX*

*[Chorus (2x)]*

Stop, drop, shut 'em down open up shop

Oh, no

That's how Ruff Ryders roll

*[DMX]*

Niggas wanna try, niggas wanna lie

Then niggas wonder why, niggas wanna die

All I know is pain

All I feel is rain

How can I maintain, with mad shit on my brain

I resort to violence, my niggas move in silence

Like you don't know what are style is

New York niggas the wildest

My niggas is wit' it

You want it? come and get it

Took it then we split it

You fucking right we did it

What the fuck you gonna do, when we run up on you

fucking with the wrong crew, don't know what we going thru

I'mma have to show niggas how easily we blow niggas

When you find out there's some more niggas, that's running with your niggas

Nothing we can't handle, break it up and dismantle, light it up like a candle

just cause I can't stand you

Put my shit on tapes, like you busting grapes

Think you holding weight? Then you haven't met the Apes

*[Chorus (2x)]*

Is ya'll niggas crazy?

I'll bust you and be swazy

Stop actin' like a baby, mind your business lady

Nosy people get it too, when you see me spit at you

you know I'm trying ta get rid of you

Yeah I know it's pitiful

That's how niggas get down

Watch why niggas spit round

Make ya'll niggas kiss ground, just for talking shit clown

Oh you think it's funny? Then you don't know me money

It's about to get ugly, fuck it dog I'm hungry

I guess you know what that mean, come up off that green

Five niggas or a fiend, don't make it a murder scene

Give a dog a bone, leave a dog alone

let a dog roam and he'll find his way home

Home of the brave, my home is a cage

and yo I'mma slave til' my home is a grave

I'mma pull paper, it's all about the papers

Bitches talking paper and now they wanna rape us

*[Chorus (2x)]*

Look what you dun started,

Asked for it, you got it

had it, should have shot it

Now your dearly departed

Get at me dog, did I rip shit with this one here I flip shit

Niggas know when I kick shit

It's gonna be some slick shit

What was that look for, when I walked in the door

Oh you thought you was raw, boom not anymore

Cause now you on the floor, wishing you never saw me walk

through that door, with that 4-4

Now it's time for bed

Two more to the head, got the floor red

Yea that nigga's dead

Another unsolved mystery, It's going down in history

Niggas ain't never did shit to me

Bitch ass niggas can't get to me

Gotta to make the move, got a point to prove

Got a make 'em grove, got 'em all like ooh

So to the next time, you hear this nigga rhyme

Try to keep your mind, on getting pussy and crime

*[Chorus (1x)]*

*Punks Jump up to Get Beat down (Clean)* by Brand Nubian

("Get nothing but a beat down!")

*[Refrain (4x)]*

Punks jump up to get beat down!

("Get nothing but a beat...")

*[Sadat X]*

One day when I was riding on the train I seen these two kids talking  
about the Nubian reign had fallen.

I didn't say nothing cause these kids caught my goat,  
even wore my coat like a murder that they wrote.

So this kid with mouth swagger 'n I'll blaze the cloak and dagger  
so I gotta show Dukes the macho lot that I am.

I can rock a jam, make the world drop ham,  
oh yes, I'm the bad man, and bad men wear black.

And if it comes to dropping bombs, hey, I'm with that.

Though I can freak, fly, flow, rough up a party,  
danced all night and at the end caught a body.

You wanna grab the style that was made from my mom and my dad,  
when I was young I used to run with a notepad.

Then dimes knew and somehow I knew that I was bad to the bone...  
black prodigy since the age of twen-ty.

I could write a rhyme, rip it up and write a next one,



right on the spot, sign my name with a dot.

Diamond D threw me a smooth beat, Bronx crowd roar.

Stick up your wack jam, everybody hit the floor.

Okay it's you, Slim, the hard rock of the pack,

don't wanna kneel to the brothers, you must be holing.

Put something good in his chest, now his whole body's swollen.

Why did I have to do it? He asked for it.

His man saw it, so it don't mean jack to me.

He's gone, that's how it's supposed to be....check it out now.

I ain't going out, man that short style is dead,

have you heard what I said? If not, ask the dread.

He got a can and that's bad...similar to the one that I got from my own dad.

*[Refrain (4x)]*

*[Lord Jamar]*

Your punk --- be grass quick fast like my name was flash

when a sucker try and rob me for my cash.

You thought you had a sweet vic, a nice pick,

but you didn't anticipate that I might be sick.

Now who's the trick, cause I'm not a up. (No, no-no-no!)

I always do the selling, if I gotta do the swelling.

My Nikes getting smelling in your rectum, till you learn

Brand Nubian, yo, you gotta respect 'em.

Dissect 'em, yo, our word is bond regardless.

To my what, and do the Puma strut.

So step the hell off, before I punch you in your face,

with the ----- bass!

Then you're gonna taste blood in your mouth, it's gonna flood south

to the ground, and you're gonna know I don't play around.

So if you think you had two soft new jacks,

we're gonna have to off you with a few cracks

to the jaw and you won't pop that junk no more.

Explaining to your friends why you're laying on the floor.

Did you want some more? I didn't think so.

Just got whipped like a sissy in the clink, so

I suggest you take your bloody mess and find a piece of wire,

fix your broken jaw, then it's time to retire.

Lord Jamar will live long, cause I give strong blows the heads of my foes.

Dread flows, gives me power as it grows.

Watch how rass-cladda you catch the speed knot,

heed not, and hell will be your home,

Lord Jamar, Sadat, as we swell your dome.

*[Refrain (4x)]*

## Appendix C

*Lyrics of hip-hop songs that will be included in both the homophobic and non-homophobic hip-hop conditions as neutral points of comparison: Can't Tell Me Nothing by Kanye West and Soul Survivor by Young Jeezy and Akon.*

*Can't Tell Me Nothing* by Kanye West

I had a dream I can buy my way to heaven

When I awoke, I spent that on a necklace.

I told God I'd be back in a second,

Man it's so hard not to act reckless.

To whom much is given much is tested.

Get arrested, guess until they get the message.

I feel the pressure, under more scrutiny,

and what I do? Act more stupidly.

bought more jewelry, more Louis V, my momma couldn't get through to me.

The drama, people suing me,

I'm on T.V. talking like it's just you and me.

I'm just saying how I feel man,

I ain't one of the Cosbys I ain't go to Hill man

I guess the money should've changed him,

I guess I should've forgot where I came from.

*[Chorus]*

La, la, la, la wait till I get my money right  
la, la, la, la then you cant tell me nothing right

Excuse Me, is you saying something?

Uh, uh, you can't tell me nothing

(Ha ha) you can't tell me nothing

Uh, uh, you can't tell me nothing

*[Kanye West]*

Let up the suicide doors.

This is my life homey, you decide yours.

I know that Jesus died for us,

But I couldn't tell you who decide wars.

So I parallel double parked that motherfucker sideways

Old folks talking about back in my day

But homey this is my day.

Class started 2 hours ago, oh am I late?

You know I already graduated

And you can live through anything if Magic made it.

They say I talk with so much emphasis,

Oh, they're so sensitive.

Don't ever fix your lips like collagen

Say something were you gone end up apologizing.

Let me know if it's a problem man,

Alright man, holla then.

*[Chorus]*

Let the champagne splash, let that man get cash,

Let that man get past.

You don't need a stop to get gas,

If he can move through the rumors, he can drive off the fumes cause

How he move in a room full of no's?

How he stay faithful in a room full of hoes?

Must be the pharaohs, he in tune with his soul,

So when he buried in a tomb full of gold.

Treasure. What's your pleasure?

Life is a, uh, depending how you dress her.

So if the devil wear Prada,

Adam Eve wear Nada,

I'm in between, but way more fresher.

With way less effort, 'cause when you try hard,

That's when you die hard.

Ya homies looking like "Why God?"

When they reminisce over you, my god.

*[Chorus]*

*Soul Survivor* by Young Jeezy and Akon

*[Intro (Akon)]*

Convict

Akon and Young Jeezy

Tryin' to take it easy

Only way to go

And So...

*[Chorus (Akon)]*

If you looking for me I'll be on the block

With my thing cocked possibly sitting on a drop (Now)

Cause I'm a rida (Yeah)

I'm just a Soul Survivor (Yeah)

Cause everybody know the game don't stop

Trying to make it to the top for your ass get popped (Now)

If you a rida (Yeah)

Or just a Soul Survivor

*[Young Jeezy]*

(Let's get it) Tonight I can't sleep--we living in Hell (Yeah)

First they, give us the work then they throw us in jail (Ayy)

Road Trip ya--I'm trafficking in the white

Please Lord don't let me go to jail tonight (Yeah)

Who Me?? I'm a Soul Survivor

Ask about 'em in the street, the boy Jeez a rida (Jeez a rida)

A hundred grand on my wrist, yeah life sucks

Fuck the club, dawg, I rather count a million bucks (Ayy)

*[Chorus]*

*[Young Jeezy]*

Another day, another dollar (dollar)-same block, same nigga, same part, same green

I guess we got the same dreams (Ayy)

Or is it the same nightmares (nightmares)

We let the doves do it for us -- we don't cry tears (That's right)

Real niggas don't budge

When Mail Man got his time he shot birds at the judge (Yeah)

I'm knee deep in the game

So when it's time to re-up, I'm knee deep in the cane (Damn)

Real talk, Look, I'm telling you man (telling you man)

If you get jammed up don't mention my name

Forgive me Lord--I know I ain't living right

Gotta feed the block, niggas starving, they got appetites (Ayy)

And this is every day, it never gets old (Old)

Thought I was a juvenile stuck to the G-Code (Yeah)

This ain't a rap song, nigga this is my life (this is my life)

And if the hood was a battlefield then I'd earn stripes (Yeah)

*[Chorus]*

*[Young Jeezy]*

Gotta watch every move cause them eyes be on you (eyes be on you)

Gotta drive real cool when them pies be on you (pies be on you)

Just because we stack paper and we ball outrageous (ball outrageous)

Them alphabet boys got us under surveillance (Ayy)

(Like animals) They lock us in cages

The same nigga that's a star when you put 'em on stages

I ain't cheat--played the hand I was dealt

Tried to tax the grand pearl when I got it myself

(Let's Get It) No nuts, no glory (no glory)

My biography, you damn right, the true story (Yeah)

Set the city on fire, and I didn't even try (try)

Run these streets all day, I can sleep when I die (Ayy)

*[Akon]*

Cause if you looking for me you can find me

On the block disobeying the law

Real G, thoroughbred from the streets

Pants sagging with my gun in my draws

Just to keep on moving now

Just to keep on moving now

Just to keep on moving now

Just to keep on moving now

*[Chorus (2x)]*



## Appendix D

*Items on the candidate evaluation form, which were used as the dependent variables in this study. Participants filled out this questionnaire once for each candidate after reading their résumés.*

1. How was your overall perception of the job candidate?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>Very</i>						<i>Very</i>
<i>Negative</i>			<i>Moderate</i>			<i>Positive</i>

2. How suitable were the candidate's qualifications for the position of mathematics professor?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>Very</i>						<i>Very</i>
<i>Unsuitable</i>			<i>Moderately</i>			<i>Suitable</i>

3. How likely would you be to take a class with this applicant, should he/she receive a position?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>Very</i>						<i>Very</i>
<i>Unlikely</i>			<i>Somewhat</i> <i>Likely</i>			<i>Likely</i>

4. How likely would you be to recommend this professor to a friend majoring in math?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>Very</i>						<i>Very</i>
<i>Unlikely</i>			<i>Somewhat</i> <i>Likely</i>			<i>Likely</i>

5. If you were enrolled in this professor's class how likely would you be to attend his/her office hours?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>Very</i>						<i>Very</i>
<i>Unlikely</i>			<i>Somewhat</i> <i>Likely</i>			<i>Likely</i>

6. How beneficial do you believe the hiring of this candidate would be for the math department here?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>Not At All</i>						<i>Very</i>
			<i>Somewhat</i>			

7. How interesting do you find the candidate's research interests to be?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>Not At All</i>						<i>Very</i>
			<i>Somewhat</i>			

8. How important do you find the candidate's research interests to be?

<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Not At All</i>			<i>Somewhat</i>			<i>Very</i>

9. Would you recommend the hiring of this candidate?

<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Not At All</i>			<i>Somewhat</i>			<i>Very much so</i>

10. Should this teacher receive a position here, what do you believe his/her salary should be (NOTE: the average starting salary of a math professor in the U.S. is \$65,000 per annum)?

<i>\$50,000 per</i>	<i>\$55,000</i>	<i>\$60,000</i>	<i>\$65,000 per</i>	<i>\$70,000</i>	<i>\$75,000</i>	<i>\$80,000</i>
<i>Annum</i>	<i>per Annum</i>	<i>per Annum</i>	<i>Annum</i>	<i>per</i>	<i>per</i>	<i>per</i>
<i>Annum Annum Annum Annum Annum Annum Annum</i>						