

## ATTITUDES TOWARD LESBIANS AND GAY MEN: RELATIONS WITH GENDER, RACE AND RELIGION AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Marlene Arndt\*  
Department of Psychology  
University of Johannesburg  
P O Box 524  
Auckland Park 2006

Gideon de Bruin\*\*  
Department of Psychology  
University of Johannesburg  
P O Box 524  
Auckland Park 2006

\*Correspondence should be addressed to Marlene Arndt, Department of Psychology, University of Johannesburg, Box 524, Auckland Park 2006. Email: [marndt@uj.ac.za](mailto:marndt@uj.ac.za)

\*\*Gideon de Bruin is now at the Department of Industrial Psychology, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg.

### **Abstract.**

*This study posits that although the South African government has shown an unprecedented commitment to acknowledging and upholding the human rights of lesbians and gay men, negative attitudes exist towards lesbians and gay men in university communities. A survey of 880 heterosexual students (356 men and 524 women) in a university community was conducted using the Attitudes Towards Lesbian and Gay Male Scale (ATLG). The results indicate that heterosexual students at a university in Gauteng have negative attitudes towards lesbians and gay men, that gender and religiosity has an influence on attitudes towards lesbians and gay men, and that no differences exist between race groups concerning attitudes towards lesbians and gay men. The results are discussed against the background of previous studies, and suggestions for future research are made.*

Lesbians and gay men have historically been the victims of discriminatory laws and prejudices in South Africa. Legislation prior to 1994 denied lesbians and gay men their basic human rights and reduced them to social outcasts and criminals (Gevisser & Cameron, 1994). This oppression served its purpose for many years keeping lesbians and gay men invisible (Potgieter, 1997).

The unravelling of the legal and social stigma attached to homosexuality did not commence until 1993. The "Equality Clause" of article nine of the constitution was adopted on May 8, 1996. As a result, South Africa has one of the most progressive and inclusive constitutions with regards to homosexuality in the world. The South African government has shown unprecedented commitment to acknowledging and upholding the human rights of lesbians and gay men (Human Rights Watch, 2003).

The challenges faced by lesbians and gay men in university communities have become the focus of research in recent years in the United States of America. Herek (1995) found evidence of prejudice and discrimination against lesbians and gay men on campuses. Evans and D'Augelli (1996) found the campus environment to be unwelcoming and hostile towards lesbians and gay men. Wong, McCreary, Carpenter, Engle and Korchynsky (1999) reported that heterosexual students have negative attitudes towards lesbians and gay men. Several studies (Griffin, 1998; Lance, 2002) showed that verbal and behavioural hostility are directed towards lesbians and gay men, and Peters (2003) supported these findings.

At the same time, the prevailing images of lesbians and gay men were pejorative stereotypes, which fuelled homophobia. Homophobia in its extreme form is evident, even in the absence of research. Newspapers and television news reveal the nature of acts of hatred against lesbians and gay men. The story of the 21-year-old Matthew Shepard illustrates the abovementioned. In 1998, Shepard, a student at the University of Wyoming, was a victim of a fatal anti-gay attack. He was brutally beaten, burned, and then tied to a fence in freezing weather. He eventually died (Harper & Schneider, 2003).

Research indicates that there is also an undercurrent of hostility and violence against gay men and lesbians in South Africa. Findings from studies conducted (Theron, 1994; Theunick, 2000; Reid & Dirsuweit, 2001), point out that gay bashing and the prominence of rape is not uncommon. In addition, survey questionnaires completed by Equality Project for the years 2001 and 2002 indicate a high level of sexual assault as an element of homophobic violence. Therefore, regardless of the fact that the South African constitution has extensive human rights protections, acknowledging the respect due to diversity in a way that the ideologies prevalent in many other countries still do not recognize, negative attitudes exist towards lesbians and gay men.

Many lesbians and gay men undergo an identity transformation during their university years where they acknowledge their sexual orientation to themselves and others. Research has shown that lesbian and gay students go through a process that involves "shifting one's identity from the socially accepted heterosexual identity to the socially denigrated non-heterosexual lesbian and gay identity" (Dworkin, 2000:165). Theorists have attempted to describe the shift in identity or "coming out" process. Lewis, Derlega, Griffin and Krowinski (2003) conceptualised the coming out process as a series of stages proceeding from an initial awareness of being different through dissonance, grieving, and inner conflict, to gradually building a stable lesbian or gay identity complete with long-term relationships. However, research has shown that rigid stage models do not provide an accurate picture of identity development for many lesbians and gay men (Dube, 2000).

In contrast to stage models, recent models of sexual identity suggest that identity formation is not a linear process but a fluid one, involving movement back and forth or a spiralling of progression and regression (Marszalek & Cashwell, 1999; Reynolds & Hanjorgiris, 2000). These newer models recognize that environmental constraints may prohibit public disclosure despite a successfully achieved lesbian or gay identity (Reynolds & Hanjorgiris, 2000).

The above findings also indicate that the environment had a strong influence on whether, and to what extent, a person came out to others. Factors that encouraged lesbian and gay students to come out included; being around supportive people, perceiving the overall climate as supportive, and having lesbian and gay role models in the environment (Cohen & Savin-Williams, 1996; Evans & Broido, 1999).

Hence, it seems that context, especially the level of perceived risk, seemed to greatly influence the extent to which gay men and lesbian women choose to be open about their sexual identity. In such a context, coming out then appears to be less of a stage or development process than an assessment of the environment (Harry, 1993; Love, 1998).

Certain heterosexual group differences regarding attitudes towards lesbians and gay men have been observed and documented by researchers (Herek, 2000; Whitley, 2001; Lewis, 2003). In the following section these group differences, namely gender, religion and race will be examined. Research has shown that gender is related to heterosexuals' attitudes toward homosexuals. Over the last two decades one of the most significant findings to emerge from research is that, heterosexual men manifest more negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women than do heterosexual women. Wellings, Field, Johnson and Wadsworth (1994) found a higher prevalence of negative attitudes toward homosexuals in heterosexual men than women. Similarly, Herek and Capitanio (1999) found a consistent tendency for male students to express more hostile attitudes toward homosexuals than female students. Schieman (1998) found in his sample of university students that, heterosexual men reported significantly higher levels of social distance and homophobia towards gay men than towards lesbians.

Societal values, especially as determined by religion, are important factors related to the formation of attitudes and stereotypes about specific groups. Specifically, homophobic attitudes may result from societal values and religious factors (Gray, Kramer, Minick, McGehee, Thomas & Greiner, 1996). Previous studies have found that individuals who are more religious, have more conservative religious beliefs and those that attend church frequently are more homophobic (Kunkel & Temple, 1992; Herek & Glunt, 1993; Gray, et al, 1996; Greene & Rademan, 1997). Waldo (1998) conducted research with students and their perception about the degree to which the campus is accepting, supportive (or otherwise) of lesbian and gay male students and their concerns. Findings from the study indicate that heterosexual students with strong religious convictions demonstrated less favourable views toward lesbian and gay male students.

Less is known about the relationship between race and attitudes towards lesbians and gay men. The research evidence that suggests that attitudes held by white and black

heterosexuals differ is mixed. Levit and Klassen (1974) found that white heterosexuals have significantly more negative attitudes towards lesbians and gay men than do black heterosexuals, whereas Hudson and Ricketts (1980), Schneider and Lewis (1984) and Lewis (2003) found the opposite results. Considering the role of race with regards to attitudes towards lesbians and gay men is important given evidence that concepts related to sexual orientation are culturally and historically defined (Waldo, 1998).

Measuring the attitudes toward lesbians and gay men, finding the most significant predictors of homophobia, and documenting attitudes towards lesbian and gay male students within a South African university setting, is a critical step towards a healthy campus climate (Davis, 1998).

Based on the literature review, hypotheses were formulated about the relationship of attitudes towards lesbians and gay male students at a university in Gauteng: Hypothesis 1: Male and female students have different attitudes towards lesbians and gay men; Hypothesis 2: Students who are more religious have more negative attitudes towards lesbians and gay men; and Hypothesis 3: black and white students have different attitudes towards lesbians and gay men.

## **METHOD.**

### **Participants.**

A convenience sample of 1125 undergraduate students attending a university in Gauteng participated in this study. As a result of a Rasch Item Response analysis, the data of 183 participants were discarded based on inconsistent responses. A further 62 surveys were not included as these students indicated that they were homosexual or bisexual. The final sample therefore consisted of 880 heterosexual students. The students were from different faculties. These included Arts ( $n = 376$ ), Economics ( $n = 202$ ), Law ( $n = 109$ ), Natural Sciences ( $n = 62$ ) and Engineering ( $n = 114$ ). The sample included 356 men and 524 women.

### **Measuring instrument.**

In order to ascertain the attitudes towards lesbians and gay men in a university setting, respondents were required to complete a questionnaire. This survey included an assessment of the participants' attitudes towards lesbians and gay men, operationalized by the respondent's scores on the Attitudes towards Lesbians and Gay Men Scale (ATLG) (Herek, 1994). Assessment of reliability and validity of the ATLG was conducted with a sample of 368 undergraduate volunteers. Alpha coefficients indicated satisfactory levels of internal consistency for the ATLG scale ( $\alpha = 0.90$ ) and the subscales ( $\alpha = 0.89$  for the ATG, and  $\alpha = 0.77$  for the ATL) (Herek, 1994).

### **Biographical questionnaire.**

The biographical questionnaire was constructed to obtain relevant personal information about individual respondents. Emphasis was placed on acquiring information that would allow for the testing of the hypotheses in respect of the variables of interest. The biographical questionnaire also served to identify certain features specific to the sample. The information required was the following: gender, sexual orientation, degree of commitment to religion and race group.

### Procedure.

The research procedure involved first gaining permission from, and arranging with the course coordinators from the different faculties to use students registered in undergraduate studies. The students were informed about the testing procedure and confidentiality. During this session, an explanation of the purpose and the aim of the study were provided by the researcher. All students completed the questionnaire in class.

### Results.

The results showed a statistically significant and strong positive correlation between the two scales ( $r = 0.778$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ).

Hypothesis 1: Male and female students have different attitudes towards lesbians and gay men.

Table 5.1  
*Means and Standard Deviations for Male and Female Students Responses on the ATLG*

Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Attitude Towards Lesbians Subscale			
Men	356	4.67	2.07
Women	524	3.98	2.08
Attitude Towards Gay Male Subscale			
Men	356	6.26	1.76
Women	524	4.76	1.85

The means and standard deviations of the male and female students' responses to the lesbian and gay male scores of the ATLG are reported in Table 5.1. The differences in the attitudes of male and female students towards lesbians and gay men were tested by means of a MANOVA, where gender served as the independent variable and the lesbian and gay male scales of the ATLG served as dependent variables.

The MANOVA showed a statistically significant difference between male and female students [ $F(2, 877) = 98.021$ , Wilk's  $\Lambda = 0.817$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ,  $\eta^2 = 0.183$ ], with gender accounting for approximately 18% of the variance in the linear combination of the lesbian and gay male scales of the ATLG. This might be described as a strong relation and shows that the differences in the global attitudes of men and women are statistically and practically significant.

Follow-up univariate ANOVAs showed statistically significant differences between male and female students for the lesbian scale [ $F(1, 878) = 23.356$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ,  $\eta^2 = 0.026$ ], and for the gay male scale [ $F(1, 878) = 143.010$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ,  $\eta^2 = 0.140$ ]. For the lesbian scale, gender accounted for approximately 3% of the variance, whereas for the gay male scale, gender accounted for approximately 14% of the variance. Hence, the practical significance of the gender differences with regard to the lesbian scale is relatively small, but for the gay male scale, it is relatively large. Inspection of the means

in Table 5.1 showed that the male students held more negative attitudes to both lesbians and gay men than did female students.

Hypothesis 2: Students who are more religious have more negative attitudes towards lesbians and gay men.

The means and standard deviations of three different religious groups (Not at all religious, moderately religious and deeply religious) are given in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2  
*Means and Standard Deviations for Religion on the ATLG*

Religion	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Attitude Towards Lesbians Subscale			
Not at all religious	80	2.84	1.77
Moderately religious	558	3.85	1.89
Deeply religious	242	5.67	1.94
Attitude Towards Gay Male Subscale			
Not at all religious	80	4.40	2.01
Moderately religious	558	5.04	1.90
Deeply religious	242	6.46	1.60

The differences in attitudes towards lesbians and gay men were tested by means of a MANOVA, where religion served as the independent variable and the lesbian and gay male scales of the ATLG served as the dependent variables. The results showed that religion had a statistically significant relation with attitudes towards lesbians and gay men [ $F(4, 1752) = 48.602$ , Wilk's  $\Lambda = 0.810$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ,  $\eta^2 = 0.100$ ], with religion accounting for approximately 10% of the variance in the linear combination of the lesbian and gay male scales of the ATLG, which might be interpreted as a moderately strong effect.

Follow-up univariate ANOVAs showed statistically significant differences between religious categories for the lesbian scale [ $F(2, 877) = 101.746$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ,  $\eta^2 = 0.188$ ], and for the gay male scale [ $F(2, 877) = 62.655$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ,  $\eta^2 = 0.125$ ]. For the lesbian scale, religion accounted for approximately 18% of the variance, whereas for the gay male scale, religion accounted for approximately 12% of the variance.

Post hoc Scheffé tests showed statistically significant differences between the means of all three religious groups for the lesbian scale. Inspection of the means in Table 5.2 showed that the deeply religious group held the most negative attitudes ( $M = 5.67$ ), followed by the moderately religious group ( $M = 3.85$ ), and the non-religious group ( $M = 2.84$ ). Similarly, post hoc Scheffé tests showed statistically significant differences between the means of all three groups for the gay male scale, where the deeply religious group held the most negative attitudes ( $M = 6.46$ ), followed by the moderately religious group ( $M = 5.04$ ), and the non-religious group ( $M = 4.40$ ).

Hypothesis 3: Black and white students have different attitudes towards lesbians and gay men than white students.

Table 5.3  
*Means and standard Deviations for Race Groups on the ATLG*

Race group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Attitude Towards Lesbians Subscale			
Black	202	4.20	2.00
White	556	4.32	2.12
Coloured	52	3.86	2.21
Asian	70	4.28	2.10
Attitude Towards Gay Male Subscale			
Black	202	5.20	1.82
White	556	5.50	2.00
Coloured	52	4.90	1.93
Asian	70	5.24	1.93

Table 5.3 shows the means and standard deviations of four race groups, namely Black, White, Coloured and Asian, for the scales of the ATLG. The results of a MANOVA showed that race did not have a statistically significant effect on attitudes towards lesbians and gay men [ $F(6,1750) = 1.618$ , Wilk's A = 0.989,  $p = 0.138$ ,  $\eta^2 = 0.006$ ]. Race explained less than 1% of the variance in the linear combination of the lesbian and gay male scales of the ATLG, which might be described as a very small effect.

## **DISCUSSION.**

Hypothesis one stated that male and female students have different attitudes towards lesbians and gay men. The results indicate that both a respondent's gender as well as perceptions of the gender of participants in homosexual relationships was differential predictors of attitudes concerning homosexuals. For the Attitude towards Lesbian Subscale (ATL), gender accounted for approximately 3% of the variance, whereas for the Attitude towards Gay Male Subscale (ATG), gender accounted for approximately 14% of the variance.

Therefore, the findings from the present investigation are consistent with the gender difference literature on attitudes towards homosexuality (Wellings, Field, Johnson & Wadsworth, 1994; Herek & Capitanio, 1996). Both a respondent's gender as well as perceptions of the gender of participants in homosexual relationships was differential predictors of attitudes concerning homosexuals.

Various explanations have been offered for the gender difference in attitudes towards gay men and lesbians. With regards to the fact that men have less negative attitudes towards lesbians, Whitley, Wiederman and Wryobek (1999) purport that it could be the case that heterosexual men have less homophobic attitudes towards lesbians in part due to the erotic value they associate with lesbianism. Despite the fact that heterosexual men typically respond more negatively toward homosexuality than women

do, many heterosexual men find the idea of sex between women appealing. Therefore, the positive value associated with this eroticism may positively influence their attitudes toward lesbians (Louderback & Whitley, 1997).

Gender differentiation reflects the belief that the natures of women and men require them to hold different social roles. Heterosexism reflects the belief that heterosexual relationships are necessary for a complete and happy life, especially for men (Glick & Fiske, 1997). From a gender-role belief system perspective, men hold more negative attitudes towards lesbians and especially gay men as they place higher value on female dependence, gender differentiation, and heterosexuality. Because homosexuality is seen, in part, as a rejection of traditional gender roles, homosexuality would present a stronger threat to the self-concept of individuals who are highly invested in traditional gender roles.

The above is substantiated by the research findings of Whitley (2001), in that gender-role beliefs are closely linked to men's attitudes towards homosexuality. Consequently, men have more negative attitudes towards lesbians and gay men than women have, and might even engage in anti-gay behaviour as a form of self-reaffirmation, demonstrating the magnitude of their rejection of homosexuality (Kite & Whitley, 1998). In addition, if women's roles are viewed as lower in status than men's, prejudice toward lesbians should not be as strongly culturally sanctioned as is prejudice toward gay men (LaMar & Kite, 1998). The aforesaid is evident in the current research findings as both sexes are relatively more accepting of lesbians.

The present study suggests that negative attitudes of South African students towards lesbians and gay men may be partially explained by the abovementioned. The violation of traditional gender roles may be particularly aversive to heterosexual men because of the perceived threat this may pose to male power and privilege. Therefore, it seems that negative attitudes toward gay men are part of a larger construct than just negative attitudes toward homosexuality and that endorsing all of these attitudes demonstrates a general belief in traditional gender roles.

The more positive attitudes of South African females towards lesbians and gay men in the survey might be as a result of the fact that feminism has expanded women's roles in South Africa. Furthermore, women might display more empathy for the social status of lesbians and gay men because of women's greater care-giving roles, as well as their subjective experience of sexism (Greene, 1997).

Hypothesis two stated that students who are more religious have more negative attitudes towards lesbians and gay men. The findings from the present study suggest that a higher level of negative attitudes exists when students are deeply religious, particularly with regards to gay males. The result from the present study is therefore consistent with studies conducted in the United States of America (Herek, 1987; Kunkel & Temple, 1992; Greene & Rademan, 1997; Waldo, 1998).

From a Christian perspective, Schmidt (1995) interprets the above results as reflecting the influence of the conservative Christian tradition regarding male-male sexual behaviour on society. According to Herman (1997), conservative Christians consider only the sexual behaviour of gay men in their discussions regarding homosexuality, and



in their representations of gay men in antigay publicity. Furthermore, the relative lack of attention toward lesbian sexual behaviour by conservative Christianity may account for the greater generality of the influence of religiosity on participants' impressions of lesbians. Herman (1997) found that lesbians were more often discussed in the Christian literature within the context of antifeminism rather than the context of a posture against sexual immorality, as is typical for gay men.

Hypothesis three stated that students from different race groups have different attitudes towards lesbians and gay men. The results from the present study showed that race did not have a statistically significant effect on attitudes towards lesbians and gay men. Race explained less than 1% of the variance in the linear combination of the lesbian and gay scales of the ATLG.

Waldo (1998) explains the abovementioned by suggesting that this may be as a result of the black students' own status as minorities in the university population. In view of the South African context and a history of discrimination, black heterosexual individuals have also experienced minority stress (Meyer, 1995). According to Meyer (1995:39), this is a state resulting from "culturally sanctioned, categorically ascribed inferior status and discrimination". Therefore, black heterosexual students might also have been subjected to negative life events directly and indirectly because of their own stigmatisation and discrimination.

In view of the results and notwithstanding the fact that the South African constitution specifically protects the rights of lesbian and gay citizens, it appears as if litigation has not filtered down to the level of everyday life in South Africa and prejudice against lesbians and gay men persist.

#### **LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.**

Several limitations of the present study merit discussion. This study used a student sample. As is typical with research conducted using participant pools from universities, the present sample is not representative of the general population of South Africa. Most previous studies referred to in this study have used student samples from the United States, therefore it was useful to test attitudes towards lesbians and gay men in a sample of students in South Africa. However, the limitations of using student samples are worthy of note here.

According to Herek (2000), university students may be one of the most liberal subcultures, therefore the degree of homophobia might actually be underestimated. Herek (1996) has also suggested that age and education could be factors that influence attitude towards lesbians and gay men. Previous research has shown that educational attainment has a significant impact on homophobia, with students with higher educational qualifications having more positive attitudes towards lesbians and gay men (Smith, 1998).

Furthermore, younger respondents have also grown up in an era characterised by increasingly greater tolerance for sexual minorities (Herdt, 2001). Hence, people who are younger and who have a higher level of education are likely to have more positive attitudes towards lesbians and gay men. Thus, caution must be used in generalising the results of the present study to the general population. There are several avenues

that need to be explored in future research. It is recommended that attitudes toward a range of homosexual rights and practices be investigated. For example, attitudes toward the legal rights of homosexuals to marry deserve examination, as well as their right to adopt children.

Although the sample was quite large, it was drawn from a single university. Data from other colleges and universities may have yielded different results. Further investigation is required with regards to the attitudes of the academic staff towards lesbian and gay male students. According to Evans (2000), both students and academic staff at universities needs to take the lead in shifting the values of higher education to support all students, and to develop interventions to change negative attitudes.

Qualitative methods also may be used to investigate subtle prejudice against lesbians and gay men. Given that in the South African context, most heterosexuals no longer consider it appropriate to express prejudice openly, negative attitudes might be expressed in covert and subtle ways (Buttney & Williams, 2000). Given the clear and consistent findings with regard to attitudes towards lesbians and gay men in the research literature (Herek, 1994; Evans & Broido, Waldo, 1998; Harper & Schneider, 2003), it may now be the time to shift the focus of research from attitudes toward lesbians and gay men to the dissemination of the research findings so that appropriate intervention programmes can be instituted.

In view of the abovementioned, and based on extensive research (Rhoads; 1995; Malaney, Williams & Geller 1997), the following suggestions are offered to challenge negative attitudes towards lesbians and gay men in university communities:

- Training should be provided for faculty and staff members that specifically addresses homophobia. This training ought to incorporate discussions of the environment that lesbians and gay male students face, both in and out of class.
- A concerted effort needs to be made to increase students' awareness to differences in sexual preferences. For students, there could be specific academic courses and programmes on homosexual issues. Most likely, universities would find it easier to include discussions of homosexual issues within existing courses. Instruction also needs to occur outside of the classroom, especially within residence halls and student organisations.
- It is recommended that stable resources and staff assistance be available to lesbians and gay men, and furthermore, to encourage leaders of the faculties and administrative staff to offer visible support to lesbian and gay male students. "Safe" places should be established for lesbians and gay men on campus. Such places are offices or departments where any member of the campus community can go to, and be assured of confidentiality and of sensitivity to their sexual identity.
- The development of formal policies is an important step for communicating and practicing inclusiveness. University policies should make it clear that harassment and bias directed at lesbians and gay men is no more tolerable than racist behaviour and will be subject to the same procedure and penalties. Finally, it is recommended that

faculty members and students be encouraged to conduct research on homosexual issues.

### **CONCLUSION.**

The findings of this study have significant implications with regards to attitudes towards lesbians and gay men in a university setting. One of the greatest challenges for South African higher education is to develop a healthy campus climate where opportunities for learning include cultural appreciation and reciprocity among people of diverse backgrounds.

It is important to keep in mind that within the category “homosexual”, there are a diverse array of individuals who are also members of other oppressed or marginalised groups with varying levels of social power and influence, for example, women, people of colour, people living with chronic illness and people with disabilities. Even when people share membership in some of these multiple identity groups, each individual will have his or her own unique set of reactions and expectations (Greene & Croom, 2000).

Not only is individual assessment important, but also each university campus and the whole of South African higher education must be examined on a continual basis. It is imperative that empirical research be conducted to illuminate the nature of heterosexuals’ attitudes towards lesbians and gay men, to track changes in such attitudes over time, and to identify effective strategies for overcoming prejudice directed at lesbians and gay men. This data would provide indicators for developing a climate that is supportive of learning, personal growth, and professional development. Such knowledge, coupled with a firm belief in the importance of a healthy campus environment for lesbians and gay men, may influence the culture of each institution, by presenting South African higher education as an equitable and humanised social environment in an increasingly conflictual global community.

As lesbians and gay men become progressively more visible in the South African society, the heterosexual public’s attitudes towards them will continue to evolve. It is only because of comprehensive research in this area that we can move further away from homophobia and towards accepting people regardless of sexual orientation (Herek, 2000).

However, there is no easy solution to combating negative attitudes towards lesbians and gay men on campus. For at least eighteen years before students arrive on campus, they have likely internalised at least some of the negative attitudes prevalent in South African culture - a culture that has yet to shake its misconceptions and negative attitudes of persons who are lesbians or gay men.

According to Levine and Cureton (1998:159): “today’s undergraduates are living in a world in which differences are multiplying and change is the norm, but they attend colleges that are often segregated on the basis of differences and where relationships between diverse groups are strained. It is imperative that college students learn to recognize, respect and accept their differences”.

## REFERENCES.

- Buttney, R & Williams, P (2000) Demanding respect: The uses of reported speech in discursive constructions of interracial contact. **Discourse and Society**, **77**, 109-133.
- Cohen, K M & Savin-Williams, R C (1996) Developmental perspectives on coming out to self and others, in Savin-Williams, R C & Cohen, K M (eds) (1996) **The lives of lesbians, gays and bisexuals: Children to adults**. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.
- Davis, W M (1998) Toward civility: Assessment as a means toward improving campus climate. **College Student Affairs Journal**, **18**, 72-84.
- Dube, E M (2000) The role of sexual behaviour in the identification process of gay and bisexual males. **The Journal of Sex Research**, **37**, 123-132.
- Dworkin, S H (2000) Individual therapy with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients, in Perez, R M, DeBord, K A & Bieschke, K J (eds) (2000) **Handbook of counselling psychotherapy with lesbian, gay and bisexual clients**. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Evans, N J (2000) The impact of LGBT safe zone project on campus climate. **Journal of College Student Development**, **43**, 522-539.
- Evans, N J & D'Augelli, A R (1996) Lesbians, gay men, and bisexual people in college, in Savin-Williams, R C & Cohen, K M (eds) (1996) **The lives of lesbians, gays and bisexuals: Children to adults**. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.
- Evans, N J & Broido, E M (1999) Coming out in college residence halls: Negotiation, meaning making, challenges, supports. **Journal of College Student Development**, **40**, 658 -667.
- Gevisser, M & Cameron, E (eds) (1994) **Defiant desire**. Johannesburg: Ravan Press.
- Glick, P & Fiske, S T (1997) Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. **Psychology of Women Quarterly**, **21**, 119-137.
- Gray, D P, Kramer, M, Minick, P, McGee, L, Thomas, D & Greiner, D (1996) Heterosexism in nursing education. **Journal of Nursing Education**, **35**, 204-210.
- Greene, B (ed) (1997) **Ethnic and cultural diversity among lesbians and gay men**. London: Sage.
- Greene, B & Croom, G L (eds) (2000) **Education, research and practice in lesbian, gay bisexual and transgendered psychology**. London: Sage.
- Greene, G & Rademan, P (1997) Evangelical leaders and people with HIV. **AIDS Care**, **9**, 715-726.
- Griffin, G (1998) Understanding heterosexism – the subtle continuum of homophobia. **Women and Language**, **21**, 33-40.
- Harry, J (1993) Being out: A general model. **Journal of Homosexuality**, **26**, 25-39.

Harper, G W & Schneider, W S (2003) Oppression and discrimination among lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered people and communities: A challenge for community psychology. **American Journal of Community Psychology, 31**, 243-252.

Herdt, G H (2001) Social change, sexual diversity, and tolerance for bisexuality in the United States, in D'Augelli, A R & Patterson, C J (eds) (2001) **Lesbian, gay and bisexual identities and youth: Psychological perspectives**. New York: Oxford University Press.

Herek, G M (1987) Religious orientation and prejudice. **Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 13**, 34-44.

Herek, G M (1994) Assessing heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbian and gay men: A review of empirical research with the ATLG scale, in Green, B & Herek, G M (eds) (1994) **Psychological perspectives on lesbian and gay issues: Lesbian and gay psychology: Theory, research, and clinical applications**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Herek, G M (ed) (1995) **Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals. Psychological Perspectives on Lesbian and gay issues**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Herek, G M (1996) Heterosexism and homophobia, in Cabaj, R & Stein, T (eds) (1996) **Textbook of homosexuality and mental health**. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.

Herek, G M (2000) The psychology of sexual prejudice. **Current Directions in Psychological Science, 9**, 19-22.

Herek, G M & Capitano, J P (1996) Some of my best friends: Intergroup contact, concealable stigma and heterosexual attitudes towards gay men and lesbians. **Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22**, 412-424.

Herek, G M & Capitano, J P (1999) Sex differences in how heterosexuals think about lesbians and gay men: Evidence from survey context effects. **The Journal of Sex Research, 36**, 348-361.

Herek, G M & Glunt, E K (1993) Interpersonal contact and heterosexuals attitudes towards gay men: Results from a national survey. **The Journal of Sex Research, 30**, 239-244.

Herman, D (1997) **The antigay agenda: Orthodox vision and the Christian Right**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hudson, W W & Rickets, W A (1980) A strategy for the measurement of homophobia. **Journal of Homosexuality, 5**, 357-372.

Human Rights Watch (2003) Hatred in the hallways: Violence and discrimination against lesbians, gay, bisexual and transgender students. Retrieved 25 January 2004 – <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2001/us/lgbt>

Kite, M E & Whitley, B E (1998) Do heterosexual women and men differ in their attitude toward homosexuality? in Herek, G M (ed) (1998) **Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men and bisexuals**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kunkel, L E & Temple, L L (1992) Attitudes towards AIDS and homosexuals: Gender, marital status and religion. **Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22**, 1030-1040.

LaMar, L & Kite, M (1998) Sex differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians: A multidimensional perspective. **The Journal of Sex Research**, **35**, 189-197.

Lance, L M (2002) Heterosexism and homophobia among college students. **College Student Journal**, **36**, 410-415.

Levine, A & Cureton, J S (1998) **When hope and fear collide**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levitt, E E & Klassen, A D (1974) Public attitudes toward homosexuality: Part of the 1970 National survey by the Institute of Sex Research. **Journal of Homosexuality**, **1**, 29-43.

Lewis, G B (2003) Black-white differences in attitudes toward homosexuality and gay rights. **Public Opinion Quarterly**, **67**, 59-79.

Lewis, R J, Derlega, V J, Griffin, J L & Krowinski, A C (2003) Stressors for gay men and lesbians: Life stress, gay-related stress, stigma consciousness, and depressive symptoms. **American Journal of Community Psychology**, **31**, 313-326.

Louderback, L A & Whitley, B E (1997) Perceived erotic value of homosexuality and sex-role attitudes as mediators of sex differences in heterosexual college students' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. **The Journal of Sex Research**, **34**, 175-182.

Love, P G (1998) Cultural barriers facing lesbian, gay and bisexual students at college. **Journal of Higher Education**, **69**, 298-323.

Malaney, G D, Williams, E A & Geller, W W (1997) Assessing campus climate for gays, lesbians, and bisexuals at two institutions. **Journal of College Development**, **38**, 365-376.

Marszalek, J F & Cashwell, C S (1999) The gay and lesbian affirmative developmental model: Facilitating positive gay identity development. **Adulthoodspan Journal**, **1**, 13-31.

Meyer, I (1995) Minority stress and mental health in gay men. **Journal of Health and Social Behavior**, **36**, 38-56.

Peters, J P (2003). Isolation or inclusion: Creating safe spaces for lesbian and gay youth. **Families in Society**, **84**, 331-340.

Potgieter, C (1997) **Black, South African Lesbians – discourses of invisible lives**. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Western Cape, Cape Town.

Reid, G & Dirsuweit, T (2001) **Understanding systematic violence: Homophobic attack in Johannesburg and its surrounds**. Unpublished Dissertation. Johannesburg: Wits Institute of Social and Economic Research.

Reynolds, A L & Hanjorgiris, W F (2000) Coming out: Lesbian, gay and bisexual identity development, in Perez, R M, DeBord, K A & Bieschke, K J (eds) (2000) **Handbook of counselling and psychotherapy with lesbian, gay and bisexual clients**. Washington, DC: APA.

Rhoads, R A (1994) The campus climate for gay students who leave the closet. **The Chronicles of Higher Education**, **41**, 56-67.

Schieman, S (1998) Gender and AIDS related psychosocial processes: A study of perceived

susceptibility, social distance and homophobia. **AIDS Education and Prevention**, **10**, 264-277.

Schmidt, T E (1995) **Straight and narrow? Compassion and clarity in the homosexuality debate**. Downers Grove: Intervarsity.

Schneider, W & Lewis, I A (1984) The straight story on homosexuality and gay rights. **Public Opinion**, **7**, 16-20.

Smith, G W (1998) The ideology of fag: The school experience of gay students. **Sociological Quarterly**, **39**, 309-335.

Theron, A (1994) Anti-gay hate crimes: Need for police involvement to curb violence committed against gays. Paper presented at the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, Johannesburg.

Theunick, A (2000) **The traumatic impact of minority stressors on males self-identity as homosexual or bisexual**. Unpublished Masters thesis. University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

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

Wellings, K, Field, J Johnson, A M & Wadsworth, J (1994) **Sexual behaviour in Britain**. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Whitley, B E (2001) Gender-role variables and attitudes toward homosexuality. **Sex Roles**, **45**, 691-701.

Whitley, B E, Wiederman, M W & Wryobek, J M (1999) Correlation of heterosexuals men eroticisation of lesbianism. **Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality**, **11**, 25-41.

Wong, F Y, McCreary, R D, Carpenter, K M, Engle, A & Korchynsky, R (1999) Gender-related factors influencing perceptions of homosexuality. **Journal of Homosexuality**, **37**, 19-30.