Georgia State University
Digital Archive @ GSU

Sociology Theses | Department of Sociology

8-3-2007

College Students' Prejudiced Attitudes toward Homosexuals: A Comparative Analysis in Japan and the United States

Daisuke Ito
taishodai@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/sociology_theses

Recommended Citation
Ito, Daisuke, "College Students' Prejudiced Attitudes toward Homosexuals: A Comparative Analysis in Japan and the United States" (2007). *Sociology Theses*. Paper 15.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Sociology at Digital Archive @ GSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Sociology Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Archive @ GSU. For more information, please contact digitalarchive@gsu.edu.

College Students' Prejudiced Attitudes toward Homosexuals:
A Comparative Analysis in Japan and the United States

by

Daisuke Ito

Under the Direction of Dawn Baunach

Abstract

This thesis examined the prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals among university students in Japan, and the relationships of these attitudes with the students' demographic information, contact experiences with homosexuals, attitudes toward men's and women's roles, and living experience in foreign countries. In addition, this thesis compared Japanese and American university students' prejudice toward homosexuals. Survey data were collected from 166 university students in Japan, which is then compared to data on 956 university students in the United States (Baunach and Burgess 2002). The regression results demonstrated that Japanese respondents who had contact with homosexuals and who had relatively egalitarian gender role attitudes were less prejudiced than those who had no contact and who had relatively traditional gender role attitudes. American students expressed more prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals than Japanese students. Even after controlling for gender, parents' education, gender role attitudes, and contact experiences, American students were more prejudiced than Japanese students.

INDEX WORDS: Prejudice, Homosexuality, Japan, Comparative Study, Homophobia

College Students' Prejudiced Attitudes toward Homosexuals: A Comparative Analysis in Japan and the United States

by

Daisuke Ito

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree of

Master of Arts

in the College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

2007

Copyright by
Daisuke Ito
2007

College Students' Prejudiced Attitudes toward Homosexuals:
A Comparative Analysis in Japan and the United States

by

Daisuke Ito

Major Professor: Dawn Baunach
Committee: Elisabeth Burgess
Toshimasa Kii

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies
College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University
August 2007

Acknowledgements

I could not have finished this thesis without numerous supports from Dr. Dawn Baunach. She read my drafts many times and gave me suggestions to make my thesis better. It is Dawn who encouraged me throughout the entire study process saying that my thesis is exciting. This encouragement kept my passion for this study until the very end. I also would like to thank Dr. Elisabeth Burgess and Dr. Toshimasa Kii for their constructive advice and valuable time dedicated to this thesis.

I would like to express my special thanks to all of my friends, fellow graduate students and all the other important people I have met in my life. I do not think I need to mention their names here as they know who I am talking about.

Last but not least, I am thankful to my parents, Tomiji and Toeyo Ito. Although they are obviously reluctant about my leaving Japan for the United States and still constantly ask me to quit school and come back to Japan, they have given me numerous supports after all. As I have not shown enough gratitude yet, this is a good opportunity to do so. "*Arigato*."

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ……... iv

List of Tables …… viii

Chapter 1: Introduction ……. 1

Terminology ……. 3

Chapter 2: Theoretical Perspective ……..... 6

Role Theory ……. 6

Contact Theory ……. 10

Heterosexism ……..... 14

Chapter 3: Homosexuality in Japan …….. 18

The Situation of Japanese Homosexuals …….. 18

Gender-Inverted Images of Homosexuals in Japan ……..... 21

Gender Role Attitudes in Japan ……... 23

Religion in Japan ……..... 26

Chapter 4: Hypotheses ……..... 28

Gender ……..... 28

Gender Role Attitudes ……..... 32

Contact Experience ……..... 33

Religion …… 37

Parents' Education ……... 37

Living Experience in Foreign Countries ……..... 38

The Difference between Japanese and American Subjects …… 39

Chapter 5: Method …… 41

Data Collection …… 41

Measures ……..... 43

Respondents ……. 43

Dependent Variables …… 48

Independent Variables ……. 49

Analytic Technique ……...……... 56

Chapter 6: Results ……..... 57

Study 1: Japanese Attitudes toward Homosexuals, Phase 1 …… 58

Study 1: Japanese Attitudes toward Homosexuals, Phase 2 …… 61

Study 1: Japanese Attitudes toward Lesbians, Phase 1 ……..... 63

Study 1: Japanese Attitudes toward Lesbians, Phase 2 …… 66

Study 1: Japanese Attitudes toward Gay Men, Phase 1 ……... 67

Study 1: Japanese Attitudes toward Gay Men, Phase 2 ……... 70

Study 1: Comparisons of Results, Attitudes toward Lesbians and Gay Men ….. 71

Study 2: Results of T-Test ……... 74

Study 2: Japanese and American Attitudes toward Homosexuals, Phase 1 …… 77

Study 2: Japanese and American Attitudes toward Homosexuals, Phase 2 …… 79

Study 2: Japanese and American Attitudes toward Lesbians, Phase 1 …… 82

Study 2: Japanese and American Attitudes toward Lesbians, Phase 2 …… 84

Study 2: Japanese and American Attitudes toward Gay Men, Phase 1 ……... 86

Study 2: Japanese and American Attitudes toward Gay Men, Phase 2…… 88

Chapter 7: Discussion ……... 91

Discussion: Study 1 ……. 91

Discussion: Study 2 ……. 95

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research ……... 99

Chapter 8: Conclusion ……... 103

References ……. 106

Appendices …… 121

A Questionnaire ……... 121

B Questionnaire (Translated into English) …….. 132

List of Tables

Table 1. List of Hypotheses …….. 40

Table 2. Demographic Information of Japanese and American Respondents …….. 45

Table 3. Definitions of Variables, Study 1 & Study 2 …….. 55

Table 4a. The OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Homosexuals, Japan ……. 60

Table 4b. The OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Homosexuals, Japan ……. 62

Table 5a. The OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Lesbians, Japan ……. 65

Table 5b. The OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Lesbians, Japan ……. 67

Table 6a. The OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Gay Men, Japan …… 69

Table 6b. The OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Gay Men, Japan …… 71

Table 7. Mean Comparisons, Japan and the United States ……... 75

Table 8a. The OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Homosexuals,
Japan and the United States …….. 78

Table 8b. The OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Homosexuals,
Japan and the United States …….. 81

Table 9a. The OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Lesbians,
Japan and the United States …….. 83

Table 9b. The OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Lesbians,
Japan and the United States …….. 85

Table 10a. The OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Gay Men,
Japan and the United States …….. 87

Table 10b. The OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Gay Men,
Japan and the United States …….. 89

Table 11a. List of Hypotheses and Results of Study 1 ……. 94

Table 11b. List of Hypotheses and Results of Study 2…….. 98

Chapter 1: Introduction

In a study of the mental health of Japanese gay and bisexual men, Ichikawa (2005) found that many respondents reported a prejudiced image of homosexuality and homosexual people and of hardships living in Japan as homosexuals. For example, one participant said that Japanese heterosexual people perceived homosexuality as something dirty or abnormal, and another respondent stated that he felt guilty to be gay (Ichikawa 2005). As these statements suggest, Japan holds conservative attitudes toward homosexuality, and Japanese people tend to express a good deal of prejudice toward homosexuals. The respondents in Ichikawa's study hoped that more Japanese people would understand their sexuality, and that they would be able to live without oppression and the need to hide their sexual orientation. Although Ichikawa's study (2005) is helpful to understand the well-being of Japanese homosexuals, the study does not address oppression as a social problem.

Although Japanese homosexuals reported that they were oppressed, no study has sought to explain prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals expressed by Japanese heterosexuals. It is important to investigate how Japanese heterosexuals perceive homosexuality and homosexuals. Clarifying the degree of prejudice toward homosexuals is one way to identify heterosexism embedded in Japanese society. Moreover, seeking explanations of prejudice is one way to identify ways to reduce prejudice. Therefore, this study contributes to the understanding of Japanese heterosexuals' prejudice toward homosexuals and, more generally, to cross-cultural patterns in sexual prejudice.

In this thesis, I investigated negative attitudes toward homosexuals among university students in Japan and in the United States. To determine the factors which are associated with prejudiced attitudes, I collected information on the respondents' demographics, contact experiences with homosexuals, attitudes toward men's and women's roles, living experiences in foreign countries, and attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. The collected data were analyzed using multivariate regression techniques. Contrasting university students in Japan with those in the United States, I examined environmental effects on prejudiced attitudes. This comparison permitted a discussion of the cultural differences in the degree of prejudice toward homosexuals and variables associated with university students' prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals.

I discuss terminology in the rest of this chapter. I suggest that "homophobia" is not an appropriate word to describe heterosexuals' prejudice toward homosexuals. Chapter 2 addresses the theoretical perspective of this thesis. I explain role theory, contact theory and the concept of heterosexism. In Chapter 3, I discuss Japanese cultural characteristics, which may affect Japanese college students' prejudice toward homosexuals. In Chapter 4, I consider the results of previous studies and unique Japanese cultural characteristics and offer 13 hypotheses. Chapter 5 details the method used in this study. I discuss how I collected the data and which measures I utilized in this study. I also explain each independent and dependent variable and how I recoded these variables. In Chapter 6, I present the results of statistical analyses. In Chapter 7, I verify whether the hypotheses were supported and offer explanations for the rejected hypotheses. Finally, I

discuss the contributions of this thesis and offer some ways to reduce prejudice in Japan in Chapter 8.

Terminology

George Weinberg (1972) first used the word "homophobia" to describe the fearful attitudes toward homosexuality and homosexuals. He argued that people express their hatred to or assault homosexuals because they are afraid of homosexuals. Weinberg (1972) also stated

> When a phobia incapacitates a person from engaging in activities considered decent by a society, the person himself is the sufferer. He loses out on the chance to go skiing perhaps, if it is acrophobia, or the chance to take the elevator to the street each day if it is claustrophobia. But here the phobia appears as antagonism directed toward a particular group of people, and to mistreatment of them. This phobia in operation is a prejudice, which means that we can widen out understanding of it by considering the phobia from the point of view of its being a prejudice and uncovering its chief motives (P. 8).

In his usage of "homophobia," it seems that Weinberg mixed clinical meaning of "phobia" with the prejudiced attitudes or acts (Wickberg 2000). Although homophobia became a popular term to describe heterosexuals' prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals (Adam 1998; Neisen 1990), this usage of the term "homophobia" has been criticized by researchers because it suggests that heterosexuals with such beliefs are pathological or mentally ill (Baunach, Burgess and Muse n.d.; Herek 2000, 2004; Morin and Garfinkle 1978). Haaga (1991) further clarified the distinction between phobia and

prejudice concluding that prejudice is a better word to describe heterosexuals' negative attitudes toward homosexuals. He presented five distinguishable points. First, the emotion that phobia implicates is anxiety, whereas that of prejudice is anger. Second, phobia regards one's fear as irrational. In contrast, anger generated from prejudice is justified by oneself. Third, phobic people try to avoid a situation or people which cause them anxiety, unlike people with prejudice who show hostility and sometimes behave violently. Fourth, a phobia does not have a political agenda. For example, acrophobic people do not complain about the accessibility to skiing. Finally, phobic people think that they want to change their phobic reactions, but prejudiced people do not feel that way. Rather, it is the people who are the targets of the discrimination that would like the prejudiced people to change their negative views. From these comparisons, Haaga (1991) argued that homophobia is not an appropriate word to describe heterosexuals' prejudice toward homosexuals.

By comparing attitudes toward homosexuals with racism and sexism, Wickberg (2000) pointed out two major problems of using the term, homophobia, to indicate the prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuality and homosexuals. First, sexism refers to "discrimination and oppression of women" and racism refers to "discrimination and oppression of blacks and, later, other people of color" (Wickberg 2000:44). These terms do not specify any characteristics of the prejudiced person, only the target of the prejudice. White people and men can claim reverse-racism and -sexism depending on the occasions. However, homophobia makes people regard homosexuals as "objects and victims" (Wickberg 2000:44). Second, racism and sexism problematize the social

ideologies as well as social structure, whereas homophobia attributes the reason for discrimination and oppression to psychological issues. However, it is sometimes understood that homophobic people cannot control their psychological fear of homosexuals; therefore, homophobia can be used to defend homophobes' assaults of homosexuals (Wickberg 2000).

To clarify whether heterosexuals are homophobic or prejudiced toward homosexuals, Logan (1996) created two different measurements for anti-homosexual attitudes. One addressed the prejudiced and discriminative attitudes toward homosexuals, and the other addressed homophobia. The questions assessing prejudice and discrimination measured unnaturalness, disgust, and perverseness of homosexuality. Logan (1996:41) produced the homophobia scale from "the clinical definition of phobia" and "'the simple phobia scale' of the Revised Anxiety Disorders Interview Schedule by DiNardo and Barlow (1988). Logan found that the homophobic attitudes consisted of a very small portion of anti-homosexual attitudes, whereas prejudice occupied the majority of such attributes. He suggested that using homophobia to characterize negative attitudes toward homosexuals in a broad sense was incorrect and unsuitable. For these reasons, I intentionally avoid using the word "homophobia" in this thesis. Instead, I use phrases such as "heterosexuals' prejudice" or "heterosexuals' prejudiced attitudes."

Chapter 2: Theoretical Perspective

In this thesis, I utilize role theory and contact theory. Role theory clarifies why heterosexuals are prejudiced toward homosexuals focusing on heterosexuals' idea that homosexuals violate expected social roles. Contact theory, on the other hand, explains positive attitudes toward homosexuals generated through heterosexuals' interpersonal contact with homosexuals.

To explain the power relationship between heterosexuals and homosexuals, I draw the concept of heterosexism from radical feminist theory and discuss how homosexuals are oppressed in society. Then, I integrate role theory and contact theory into the concept of heterosexism and present how I use role theory and contact theory in this thesis.

Role Theory

According to Biddle (1979:4), "role theory … is a science concerned with the study of behaviors that are characteristic of persons within contexts and with various processes that presumably produce, explain, or are affected by those behaviors." He also defined roles as "a behavioral repertoire characteristic of a person or a position; a set of standards, descriptions, norms, or concepts held for the behaviors of a person or social position; or (less often) a position itself" (Biddle 1979:9). In other words, people are assigned to play certain roles and behave accordingly based on their personal characteristics or the positions they fill. Examples of personal characteristics include sex, age, and race. Such physical characteristics are relatively fixed, unlike some behavioral

characteristics or positions which are often more malleable (Biddle 1979). For this reason, physical characteristics can delineate power relationships.

There are specific expectations that people need to satisfy their roles. These expectations are shared by many people and are learned through socialization. These expectations are learned from parents, siblings, and peers and can be taught through social institutions such as schools and churches (Eagly 1987). Not only are expectations shared, but so are the reactions. People who follow the expected behaviors anticipate being rewarded, while those who violate them anticipate punishments.

Social behavior expectations rely heavily on sex and gender categorizations (Eagly 1987). Gender roles are "those shared expectations (about appropriate qualities and behaviors) that apply to individuals on the basis of their socially identified gender" (Eagly 1987:12). Specifically, women are expected to care for others and to complete household chores more than men, and men are considered to be more assertive and more suitable as breadwinners (Eagly 1987). However, women's roles have changed over time. Twenge's (1997) meta analysis found that both women's and men's masculinity scores have increased since 1973, although women's scores changed more rapidly than men's. On the other hand, men's and women's femininity scores have not changed significantly. As a result, the difference between men's and women's masculinity scores is decreasing. In other words, women are acquiring more masculine traits and are becoming more androgynous. This result indicates that women have fewer social constraints in the attainment of masculine traits, whereas men continue to face strong negative responses from others if they attain feminine characteristics (Feinman 1981; Twenge 1997).

Kite and Deaux (1987) studied the stereotypes associated with gay men and lesbians. Their results demonstrated that heterosexuals associated gay men with heterosexual female characteristics and lesbians with heterosexual male traits. For example, lesbians are masculine and have short hair, and gay men walk femininely, have high-pitched voices, and wear jewelry. Moulton and Adams-Price (1997) conducted an analysis about heterosexual and homosexual men's attitudes toward heterosexual crossdressers, homosexual crossdressers, and homosexual non-crossdressers. Heterosexual men did not distinguish the degree of masculinity among the three groups and expressed equally negative attitudes toward them. These results indicate that heterosexual men regard gay men as feminine, much like crossdressers. Moreover, gay men are considered to be *violating* traditional male sex roles rather than *expressing* traditionally female characteristics. Because feminine gay men and masculine lesbians violate or are thought to violate traditional gender roles, heterosexuals expressed prejudice toward them.

However, recent research finds that images of homosexuals are getting more complex. According to Clausell and Fiske (2005), when asked about images of gay men, respondents identified both feminine and masculine characteristics, although they reported feminine characteristics such as flamboyant and crossdresser more frequently than masculine traits like hyper-masculine, physically fit, and straight-acting. In their study of stereotypes about lesbians, Geiger, Harwood and Hummert (2006) found that their respondents held both positive and negative images. The positive stereotypes included so-called lipstick lesbians (beautiful, sexy, attractive, etc.) and career-oriented

feminist (cool, liberal, independent, etc.), and the negative stereotypes included hypersexual, sexually deviant (dirty, disgusting, immoral, etc.) and angry butch (aggressive, masculine, overweight, etc.). Heterosexuals not only hold images of gender inverted homosexuals, but also gender confirming homosexuals. Therefore, heterosexuals may show more prejudiced attitudes toward feminine gay men and masculine lesbians than masculine gay men and feminine lesbians.

Schope and Eliason (2004) researched whether heterosexuals showed different attitudes toward feminine and straight-acting gay men. They asked their respondents how they would react in twelve different situations such as studying in the respondent's room, hanging out at bar, and introducing to the respondent's parents. Although they found that gay men and lesbians who acted in cross-gender ways received some negative evaluations, the final results did not support those patterns. Rather than the violation of traditional gender roles, the authors argued that homosexuality itself generated negative attitudes among heterosexual respondents. These results ran counter to those from previous studies, but Schope and Eliason (2004) did not control for the traditional gender role beliefs of their respondents, which may explain their anomalous findings.

Heterosexuals tend to perceive homosexuals as gender-inverted and consider that homosexuals violate traditional gender roles. Therefore, heterosexuals who have relatively traditional gender role attitudes may express prejudice toward homosexuals because they think that homosexuals deserve for punishment for not following shared roles.

Contact Theory

In *The Nature of Prejudice*, Gordon W. Allport (1954) proposed contact theory, in which majority group members' prejudice toward a minority group is reduced through interaction with members of the minority group. In order for contact theory to work effectively, four conditions must be satisfied. First, the contact needs to occur between groups with equal status. If one group has higher status than the other, the interaction does not contribute to the reduction of prejudice. Second, group members have to work on trying to reach the same goal, which creates solidarity across the groups. Third, cooperation, not competition, is necessary. Fourth, institutional supports can increase the effects of contact.

Researchers have been conducting studies on whether contact theory is applicable to different group settings, such as the interaction between Whites and Blacks (Fine 1979), the general public and homeless people (Lee, Farrell and Link 2004), and various other groups. These studies demonstrated the effectiveness of contact theory in explaining and reducing prejudice. At the same time, many researchers have reformulated contact theory and have offered several important challenges to the theory. First, Pettigrew (1998) suggested that personalized interaction should be a necessary condition for contact theory to successfully reduce prejudiced attitudes. In the following paragraphs, I discuss other issues raised about contact theory, including causal order and generalization processes.

One of the primary problems with contact theory is causal order. It is unclear whether those who have had prior contact with people from the prejudiced groups then

have more positive attitudes or whether those who have more positive attitudes then have more contacts with group members (Baunach et al. n.d.; Van Dick et al. 2004; Herek and Glunt 1993; Pettigrew 1998). Pettigrew (1998) suggested three ways to clarify the causal order; these are (1) to study situations where participants cannot make a voluntary decision to interact with members of prejudiced groups, (2) to use special statistical methods, and (3) to conduct longitudinal study designs.

In their study of German high school students' contact with racial/ethnic minority groups, Van Dick et al. (2004) conducted two studies utilizing the first and second methods to see whether the causal order from contact to prejudice fits better than that from prejudice to contact. They assumed that students could not avoid the interaction with racial/ethnic minorities when they were in the racially-mixed workplaces, schools, and neighborhoods. Their findings demonstrated that contact increased acquaintances and friends, and then reduced the antipathy toward racial/ethnic minorities. The statistical tests found that the effect of contact to positive attitudes was larger than that of positive attitudes to contact. Longitudinal analysis performed by Eller and Abrams (2004) found that contact with prejudiced members positively changed prejudiced attitudes. As these results demonstrate, it may be reasonable to conclude that the causal order from contact to prejudice is the primary causal ordering, rather than the opposite order from prejudice to contact.

A second limitation of contact theory is the "problem of generalization." Contact theory assumes that contact with members in a prejudiced group changes the attitudes toward the whole group. However, it is ambiguous as to how people can generalize their

experience with a particular person or a small number of people to all of the prejudiced group members (Pettigrew 1998; Rothbart and John 1985). Hewstone and Brown (1986) presented one generalization process, and Brewer and Miller (1984; 1988) and Brewer (1996) presented two generalization processes. Pettigrew argued that these three generalization processes can be effective when they are used in the suggested order; (1) decategorization, (2) high group status salience, and (3) recategorization.

Brewer and Miller (1984; 1988) and Brewer (1996) suggested "decategorization" as a possible generalization process. People pay "attention to information at the individual level that replaces category identity as the most useful basis for classifying participants" (Brewer 1996:293). Ideally, people should develop their friendship through interpersonal interaction. Because the prejudiced membership status is an obstacle to develop a close friendship, the prejudiced membership status should not be obvious. In the case of interaction with homosexuals, homosexuals may develop friendship with heterosexuals without disclosing their sexual orientation.

Hewstone and Brown (1986) suggested that people can generalize the interaction with members from a prejudiced group to the whole group when the group salience is obvious, because it keeps reminding participants of their membership differences. Once a certain degree of friendship is established, the high group salience encourages the reduction of prejudice toward the whole group members. The participants notice that they belong to different groups and may value their differences. Specifically, heterosexuals should be constantly aware that their friends are homosexuals during the interaction.

When heterosexuals consider their homosexual friends as acquaintances or distant friends, friends' homosexuality may be salient because homosexuality can be a master status.

Finally, "recategorization" means that by emphasizing "suborordinate category identification that encompasses both the ingroup and outgroup in a single social group representation," people pay less attention to the different membership status (Brewer 1996:294). In this stage, the participants regard that members of minority group and themselves belong to the same larger group. For example, heterosexuals may categorize their homosexual friends based on the larger category such as human beings, and then they share the same membership status. Therefore, the prejudiced membership status, which is homosexuality in this example, does not become a barrier to interactions.

Eller and Abrams (2004) analyzed British people's prejudice toward French people and Mexican people's prejudice toward Americans using contact theory. The authors also considered whether the levels of categorization mediated the effects of contact on prejudice reduction. British and Mexican respondents who had contact with French and American people respectively categorized their friends either in the interpersonal category (identifying their friends as unique individuals), which is equivalent to "decategorization," or in the superordinate category (identifying their friends as someone who belongs to the same group), which is equivalent to "recategorization." These two variables did not function as mediators of contact. Rather, each variable had a direct and independent effect on prejudice reduction toward outgroup members. The respondents who categorized their friends either in the interpersonal level or in the superordinate level expressed more positive attitudes toward the whole outgroup

members. Eller and Abrams (2004) concluded that the levels of categorization reflect the quality of friendship. Heterosexuals who develop close friendship with homosexuals either categorize their homosexual friends in the interpersonal level (e. g. colleagues, classmates) or in the superordinate level (e. g. human beings). In either way, heterosexuals focus on the membership status which is shared with their homosexual friends.

Thus, contact theory has been challenged and reformulated by numerous researchers. Throughout the reformulations, though, contact reduces prejudice.

Heterosexism

Heterosexism is frequently discussed in feminist theory. Adrienne Rich (1980) argued that the oppression of women is inseparable from heterosexual relationships with men. She urged the importance to address heterosexism as a form of oppression. Heterosexism is a useful concept to clarify the power relationship between heterosexuals and homosexuals and to consider heterosexuals' prejudice toward homosexuals.

Many scholars have compared the power relationship between homosexuals and heterosexuals to that between blacks and whites or between women and men; in other words, heterosexism is akin to racism and sexism. Heterosexism regards prejudice toward homosexuals as not only a personal problem, but also a social structural problem (Adam 1998; Bernstein, Kostelac, and Gaarder 2003; Lorde 1984; Neisen 1990). Adam (1998), drawing on Omi and Winant's *Racial Formation in the United States* (1994), argued that the matrix which explains racism could be applied to heterosexual-homosexual relations.

In short, the distribution of rewards, the organization of social structure and everyday life, and individuals' classifications of people into different categories are all based on sexual orientation. Furthermore, Neisen (1990) stated that various institutions, including family, work, and religion, affect a person's acceptance of stereotypes, perceptions of self-interest, stratification beliefs, and a sense of group position, all of which reinforce heterosexual privilege over homosexuals. One form of homosexual oppression is explained by feminist theories. Because heterosexuality is dominant in society, and other forms of sexuality are considered abnormal (Schneider and Gould 1987), heterosexual norms prevail in television, movies, advertisements and song lyrics (Rich 1980). As Rubin (1984:280) states, "sexuality that is 'good,' 'normal,' and 'natural' should ideally be heterosexual, marital, monogamous, reproductive, and non-commercial." For example, men's control over women's reproduction in families reconstructs male and female homosexuals as deviants (Adam 1998). Gay men are not incorporated into this structure because they do not construct a relationship with women, whereas lesbians are ignored because no man is present to take control.

Another way to address heterosexism in society is to examine law. One aspect of law is to express public morality, which determines what is and is not acceptable (Leonard 1991). One of the case examples used by Leonard (1991) is when a lesbian mother is denied visitation rights and joint custody because her homosexual relationship is considered inferior to the traditional male-female relationship. This kind of court decision has profound effects on the societal perception of homosexual relationships. Leonard (1991:90) states that the "legal system is probably no more homophobic or

heterosexist than the larger society, but because of its power to control people's lives through stigmatization and discrimination, legal homophobia and heterosexism may be much more damaging."

These examples demonstrate that homosexuality is constructed as bad, abnormal, and unnatural through social institutions. Homosexual lifestyles and patterns are considered inferior to heterosexual ones. For gay men and lesbians living in the United States, acquiring a positive homosexual identity and disclosing the sexual orientation were no longer primary concerns; rather finding friends, establishing relationships, obtaining legal rights, and having their lives recognized by their co-workers, close friends, and family members had become primary (Seidman, Meeks and Traschen 1999). On one hand, American society has become more accepting of homosexuals (Seidman et al. 1999) On the other hand, gay men and lesbians still need to negotiate to whom they "come out" because there is still a chance of rejection, and heterosexism continues to exist in law, policy, and public culture (Seidman et al. 1999).

Even with regard to what progress has been made, social constraints against homosexuals and assumptions that everyone is heterosexual make many homosexuals pretend to be heterosexual to avoid heterosexist prejudice. Homosexuals have to be careful about the way they dress, the way they speak, and their gender performance. In conclusion, sexuality produces the power relationship which gives benefits to those who follow heterosexual norms and deprives privileges from those who violate them (Rubin 1984).

The concept of heterosexism and role theory are interconnected. Role theory suggests that people are assigned to play roles based on their personal characteristics, such as gender. Once roles are assigned, people are expected to satisfy their roles in certain ways. If they do not fill roles as expected, they are punished. The distribution of roles and the shared expectations are based on heterosexuality. Therefore, homosexuals are considered violating expected roles and are punished for that. On one hand, heterosexism is perpetuated by enforcing people to follow expected roles and punishing those who do not. On the other hand, heterosexism contributes to determining who should be assigned to specific roles and how they should fill them. In this thesis, I use this framework to address the effects of respondents' attitudes toward gender roles on their prejudice toward homosexuals.

Heterosexism provides the macro level framework that heterosexuals are privileged over homosexuals. Because people are socialized in the society that heterosexuality is considered normal, they are likely to hold prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals. Contact theory challenges this idea and explains prejudice reduction in the individual level. Contact theory predicts that heterosexuals who have personal interaction with homosexuals express fewer prejudiced attitudes toward all homosexuals. Although individuals' contact experience may not change the heterosexist structure dramatically, it is likely to change individuals' attitudes toward homosexuals. In this thesis, I verify whether contact experience reduces prejudice toward homosexuals in spite of heterosexism in society.

Chapter 3: Homosexuality in Japan

There are some unique characteristics regarding Japanese culture, which may affect Japanese college students' prejudice toward homosexuals. Before forwarding the hypotheses, I discuss the environment for homosexuals, gender-inverted images of homosexuals, gender role attitudes, and religion in Japan.

The Situation of Japanese Homosexuals

According to Sunagawa (2006), the Japanese environment for gay men is changing. In his interviews with Japanese gay men, the author found that younger generations acquired positive gay identities relatively easily compared to previous generations. Younger generations had more opportunities to buy gay-themed magazines and had greater access to the gay-themed websites. In addition, Sunagawa (2006) reported that textbooks for sexual education courses recently started including homosexuality. Homosexuals are starting to be recognized as a sexual minority in Japan.

However, the situation for gay people in Japan is still difficult when it comes to the issue of acceptance. The majority of Japanese homosexuals understand that their attraction to someone of the same-sex is prohibited from the negative reactions of those around them. A survey of heterosexuals' attitudes toward same-sex sex conducted by NHK (1999), Japan's national television broadcaster, found that approximately half of the respondents considered same-sex sex to be wrong.

Ichikawa (2005) surveyed approximately 2000 Japanese gay men regarding their experiences as homosexuals. More than 80 percent of the respondents had heard

discriminative statements against homosexuality. Because gay men across different age groups reported similar experiences, Japanese heterosexuals' prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals may not have changed over time. Over 55 percent of the participants experienced name-calling, and the discriminative words include "*homo*" (a shortened version of homosexual) and "*okama*," which can be translated into "queen" in English (McLelland 2000). The latter word derives from slang and refers to anal sex (Long 1996). These terms suggest that Japanese people imagine that Japanese homosexuals are feminine and engage in anal sex, which is considered deviant. According to Ichikawa (2005), approximately 15 percent of Japanese gay men reported losing friends or being physically harassed due to their sexual orientation, and more than 20 percent of teenagers and 13 percent of gay men in their twenties and thirties had experienced physical violence. Younger gay men were more likely to be harassed by their peers. Compared to the United States, the number of physical assaults appears smaller; however, this may be because fewer Japanese homosexuals reveal their sexual orientation to others.

Ichikawa (2005) also described the difficulties homosexuals have making other homosexual friends. The majority of homosexuals used the internet to find and to befriend other homosexuals. Even with a relatively anonymous medium like the internet, 50 to 70 percent of Japanese homosexuals reported that they did not get real names from those they met online. Japanese homosexuals may be afraid of having their sexual orientation revealed and to being labeled as homosexual by their family members and friends. Japanese homosexuals in their twenties and thirties reported more stress than older homosexuals. At these ages, Japanese people tend to experience various transitions,

such as entering the workforce and getting married. Therefore, they may feel much social pressure to fulfill their traditional male gender roles as workers and fathers. Ichikawa's (2005) respondents reported pressure from heterosexual family members and peers. For example, parents may express desires for grandchildren. In addition, the young gay men reported seeing their friends laugh at gay-jokes on television. The respondents also reported that they did not want others to see them when they went to restaurants with their boyfriends; they bought gay-themed magazines furtively; and they endeavored to speak "manly" by using a low pitched voice. All of these examples demonstrate that Japanese gay men play heterosexual roles to hide their sexual orientation.

According to Ichikawa (2005), only 14 percent of Japanese homosexuals had come out to their parents. Of these, 6.9 and 6.6 percent were out to both of their parents or only to their mothers respectively. Just 0.3 percent had come out only to their fathers. Half of the respondents had come out to someone besides their parents. Nearly 10 percent were out to only one person, and approximately 11 percent told their sexual orientation to two to three people. Of those who came out to someone besides their parents, 15 percent of them were out to 10 or more people. Respondents were primarily out to significant others and were not totally open about their sexuality to their heterosexual friends or family or in their workplace (Sunagawa 2006). Therefore, few heterosexuals may have openly homosexual friends. In the extreme case, homosexuals face social isolation and discrimination, such as being abandoned by family members and relatives, and they risk losing a job if their sexual orientation is revealed. That is why few homosexuals disclose their sexual orientation to family members and their heterosexual friends.

In his study, Ichikawa (2005) included a section permitting respondents to write their opinions freely. Some respondents wrote that they had had a hard time when they first realized that they were homosexual. One respondent commented that he wished he could love women instead of men and that it is acceptable to deny oneself a homosexual life. Another respondent claimed that he was against the gay rights movement because he did not think it is necessary to publicly disclose one's sexual orientation. These comments indicate that these respondents think it is easier to play heterosexual roles than to "make waves" by trying to overcome prejudice. A few respondents discussed biological causes of homosexuality, perhaps in an attempt to ease their guilt over their homosexuality. Another stated that he is happy living in a foreign country, but worries about returning to Japan, a comment that relates directly to this project, although the respondent did not specify his current country of residence. All these comments demonstrate the existence of strong heterosexism in Japan.

Gender-Inverted Images of Homosexuals in Japan

The majority of Japanese people consider gay men to be feminine and lesbians to be masculine (McLelland 2000). Ishida and Murakami (2006) traced the media depiction of gay men after the World War II. In the 1950s, both masculine and feminine men were depicted equally without mentioning their sexual orientation. In the 1960s, magazines began to depict gay men with feminine features. With the help of media representations of cross-gender males throughout the 1980s and 1990s, many Japanese people were exposed to feminine gay men (Ishida and Murakami 2006). Currently, some

television stars are feminine gay men in real lives, while other male television stars and comedians use gender-inverted characteristics as performances, and are not homosexual. Therefore, both feminine gay men and heterosexuals who perform gender-inversions are frequently represented on television. Because those who use gender-inverted characteristics as performances do not disclose their sexual orientation, viewers do not clearly distinguish gender-inverted heterosexual performers from feminine gay men. Because of the absence of depictions of masculine men being attracted to other masculine men in the mass media, Japanese heterosexuals tend to connect gay men with cross-gender behaviors (McLelland 2000). For example, when McLelland (2000) asked Japanese heterosexual college students to introduce him to their homosexual friends for the interviews, Japanese college students recommended that he go to transgender bars in Tokyo. As this example illustrates, Japanese college students thought only of feminine, cross-gender, men as being gay. Thus, the images of feminine gay men are wide spread in Japan. Japanese people may connect gay men to feminine characteristics more closely than they connect lesbians to masculine characteristics because the media represent effeminate gay men frequently, while lesbians are underrepresented (McLelland 2000). Because Japanese people have strong traditional gender role expectations, the images of feminine gay men and masculine lesbians may have negative effects on attitudes toward homosexuals, especially male homosexuals.

Gender Role Attitudes in Japan

Sugihara and Katsurada (2000, 2002) studied Japanese people's attitudes on masculinity and femininity. They created a sex role scale taking Japanese peculiar cultural aspects into consideration. Items on the masculinity scale included leadership ability, willingness to take risks, competitiveness, and strong will, and items on the femininity scale included affectionate, tender, love children, and like to care for others. Surprisingly, their results suggested that Japanese men's scores on the two scales were similar. Japanese women's femininity attitudes score was higher than the masculinity attitudes score. Men's and women's masculinity attitudes scores were not largely different. These results are contradictory to the expectation that the enforcement of traditional gender roles in Japan is strict. Sugihara and Katsurada (2000, 2002) raised a few possible explanations for these unexpected results. One of them is that women are usually responsible for household chores, including childcare and financial management. Because they are required to discipline their children and make money-related decisions, they learn masculine characteristics. In contrast, Japanese men are often in hierarchical relationships based on seniority and status differences. Seniors are expected to take good care of their juniors, and juniors are expected to follow orders from and show respect to seniors. The former role is similar to a mother's role, and the latter to a wife's role. This explanation makes sense only when the division of labor between Japanese men and women is clear (Sugihara and Katsurada 2000, 2002).

In a study of television commercials, Roberson (2005) found two masculine ideologies for Japanese men, "worker as a breadwinner" and "masculine body." The

television commercials indicated that Japanese men did not engage in household work and childrearing and were expected to have strong bodies to overcome obstacles (Roberson 2005). According to National Personnel Authority (2002) cited in Women's International Network News (2003), of those eligible to take childcare leave, more than 90 percent of Japanese women took childcare leave in 2001, while only 0.3 percent (56 men) took leave from work. The Ministry of Public Management, Home Affairs, Posts and Telecommunications (2002) cited in Women's International Network News (2003) revealed that Japanese men spent only 33 minutes a day on household work, including childcare, whereas Japanese women spent 3 hours and 45 minutes. Even if both husbands and wives work, Japanese men spent an average of 36 minutes a day on household chores, and Japanese women spent 3 hours and 50 minutes. Yet another study found that nearly 60 percent of Japanese men did one fifth or less of household chores, and that 16 percent of them performed no household chores (Iwama 2005). The gender gap in household labor has not changed dramatically over time in Japan. Japanese men spent only 0.6 percent more time on household work in 2001 than they did in 1996 (National Personnel Authority 2002 cited in Women's International Network News 2003). These results suggested that Japanese men still follow traditional gender roles.

Tsuya and Bumpass (2004) analyzed the effects of gender role attitudes on hours spent on household work in the United States and Japan. Their results demonstrated that Japanese men's participation in household work was low regardless of their gender role attitudes, while American husbands who and whose wives support egalitarian gender roles are more likely to do household work compared to those with traditional gender role

beliefs. Similarly, Iwama (2005) argued that women's gender ideology affects the husbands' participation in household work in Japan. If women have egalitarian gender role attitudes, their husbands are more helpful than those whose wives have more traditional gender role attitudes. Women with egalitarian gender role beliefs may ask their husbands to do household chores more often than those with traditional gender role beliefs.

The gender role expectation is also rigid for Japanese women, although recent studies indicate that there are contradictory attitudes toward women's gender roles. Hirao (2001) argued that the "good wife, wise mother" concept was still the ideal for Japanese women. This concept requires women to complete household work as a "good wife" and to look after children as a "wise mother" (Hirao 2001). Cross-national research found that Japanese women were underrepresented in the workplace compared to other countries such as the United States (Wright, Baxter and Birkelund 1995). According to the Human Development Report's (2007:398) Gender Empowerment Measure, which measures women's opportunities in each country based on "political participation and decision-making power," "economic participation and decision-making power," and "power over economic resources," Japan was ranked 42 out of 75, while the United States was ranked 12. The percentage of seats in parliament held by women in Japan was 10.7 (15 in the United States), that of female legislators, senior officials and managers was 10 (42 in the United States), and the ratio of estimated female to male earned income was .44 (.62 in the United States). Moreover, approximately 65 percent of Japanese men expect their future wives to take care of the household and children and not to work outside the home

either until or even after their children are grown (National Institute of Population and Social Security Research 2002).

In contrast, Japanese women are portrayed both as workers and as "good wives" in the recent television commercials (Roberson 2005). According to National Institute of Population and Social Security Research (2002), approximately 40 percent of married Japanese women with children are full-time homemakers, and approximately 20 percent of married women with children work full time. Less than 15 percent of unmarried women plan to become full-time homemakers. Interestingly, unmarried Japanese women expect to work and fulfill their "good wives and mothers" roles.

There are unique aspects to the gender role attitudes of Japanese people. Japanese people expect ideal men and women to have both masculine and feminine characteristics because both characteristics are necessary to be successful workers for men and leaders in the family for women, which sets the clear division of labor as a premise. On the other hand, Sugihara and Katsurada (2000) argued that Japanese women are acquiring more egalitarian gender role attitudes than Japanese men because of the women's rights movements and Japan's adaptation of Western lifestyles. It seems that there is still a gap between women's gender role beliefs and their behavior.

Religion in Japan

Japanese people have a unique attitude toward religion. Many Japanese practice Buddhism and Shintoism. Japanese people rarely practice only one religion or believe in one god (Kobayashi 2005). According to Takeda (1997), memorial services for ancestors

come from neither Buddhism nor Shintoism, but from traditional fears of the spirits of the dead. Japanese Christians comprise fewer than one percent of the Japanese population. Christianity is unpopular because it is exclusive of other religions and is "at odds with their [Japanese] traditional pluralistic religiosity" (Kobayashi 2005:686). Thus, Japanese people practice multiple religions and do not have strong ties to any one religion. Also, these religions are integrated into Japanese culture, making it hard for Japanese people to distinguish cultural acts from religious ones. Religion in Japan is very different from the United States; therefore, it is difficult to measure the religiosity of Japanese people. Typical methods may not clarify their true religious practices and beliefs.

Concerning the effects of religion on the attitudes of Japanese people toward homosexuality, neither Buddhism nor Shintoism prohibits homosexual acts as Christianity does. Moreover, Buddhist priests imported homosexual acts from China, and used to engage in homosexual acts with their apprentices (Leupp 1995; Watanabe and Iwata 1989). Therefore, religion may not affect the prejudiced attitudes of Japanese students, as if often does for Americans.

Chapter 4: Hypotheses

Harassment of gay men and women is wide spread in the United States (Franklin 2000; Herek, Cogan and Gillis 2002). Through interviews with 450 homosexual and bisexual adults in the United States, Herek et al. (2002) found that nearly all of their respondents have experienced some type of hate crime. Moreover, Franklin (2000) argued that harassment of homosexuals is closely related to the perpetrators' prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals (Franklin 2000).

Previous studies in the United States discussed why certain people were more likely to be prejudiced than others. Researchers focused on diverse factors such as people's demographic and social characteristics and beliefs. I discuss each factor in the following section. I highlight the roles that gender, gender role attitudes, contact experiences with homosexuals, religion, and parents' education play in explaining the prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals in the United States and other countries. After discussing the results of previous studies for each variable, I generate hypotheses taking particular Japanese cultural aspects into consideration. Table 1 presents the summary of my hypotheses.

Gender

Previous research demonstrated that gender was an important factor in explanations of prejudice toward homosexuals. Heterosexual males tended to show more negative attitudes toward homosexuals than did heterosexual females (Aguero, Bloch, and Byrne 2002; Altemeyer 2001; Baker and Fishbein 1998; Bouton et al. 1987; Cullen,

Wright and Alessandri 2002; Herek 1988; Herek and Capitanio 1999; Kite 2002; Kite and Deaux 1986; Lamar and Kite 1998; Larsen, Reed and Hoffman 1980; Louderback and Whitley 1997; Morin and Garfinkle 2002; Pratte 1993; Whitley 1988). This pattern was evident in studies of both African-Americans (Battle and Lemelle 2002; Herek and Capitanio 1995) and whites (Schuttle 2002) in the United States and on people in the United Kingdom (Davies 2004), Australia (Hopwood and Connors 2002), and Turkey (Sakalli 2002).

Many early studies did not distinguish attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. This is problematic because respondents tend to think of males when asked about homosexual relations (MacDonald and Games 1974). However, more recent research has examined attitudes toward gay men and lesbians separately. According to Herek (1988, 2002), heterosexual's attitudes toward gay men were more negative compared to attitudes toward lesbians. Studies by LaMar and Kite (1998) and Schulte (2002) and Whitley (1987) support this finding. Other results distinguished the gender of the respondents. Heterosexual men were more likely to express negative attitudes toward gay men than lesbians (Baker and Fishbein 1998; Herek 1988, 2002; Herek and Capitanio 1995; Kite and Whitley 2003; LaMar and Kite 1998; Louderback and Whitley 1997, 2001; Steffens and Wagner 2004). Heterosexual women's attitudes toward homosexuals were inconsistent. Some studies reported that heterosexual women's attitudes toward gay men and lesbians tended not to be significantly different (Herek, 2002; Herek and Capitanio 1995; LaMar and Kite 1998; Louderback and Whitley 2001; Steffens and Wagner 2004), while other studies indicated that heterosexuals showed more negative attitudes toward

their same-sex homosexuals (Baker and Fishbein 1998; Herek 1988; Kite and Whitley 2003; Millham, Miguel and Kellogg 1976).

Role theory explains the overall negative attitudes toward homosexuals and the gender differences. In a gender polarized cultures like the United States and Japan, gay men and lesbians are considered to possess the characteristics of their opposite biological sex. In other words, there is a stereotype that gay men are feminine and lesbians are masculine (Anderssen 2002; Kite and Deaux 1987; LaMar and Kite 1998; Lance 1987; Lippa and Tan 2001; Louderback and Whitley 1997; Schulte 2002). People expect men to enact appropriate gender roles more so than the expect women to (Baker and Fishbein 1998; Cullen, Wright and Alessandri 2002; Kite and Whitley 1996, 2003); therefore, men are more likely to expect and express traditionally masculine behavior (Theodore and Basow 2000). Davies (2004) and Kite and Deaux (1986) stated that heterosexual men who were more prejudiced toward homosexuals were more likely than those who were less prejudiced to stress the importance of masculinity and consider that they were not masculine enough. Because they exhibited incongruence within themselves, men tried to express their masculine characteristics by showing prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals. According to Herek (2002), heterosexual men are constantly required to prove that they are not homosexual. One way to do that is to attack, physically and verbally, homosexuals. Therefore, compared to heterosexual women, heterosexual men have more negative attitudes toward both gay men and lesbians.

Other reasons for the gender difference in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians include the degree of gender inversion, the eroticization of lesbians, and the common

characteristics for heterosexual women and homosexuals. First, the connection between gay men and feminine characteristics is stronger than the connection between lesbians and masculine characteristics among heterosexuals (Kite and Deaux 1987). As a result, gay men might be rated more negatively than lesbians. Second, according to Louderback and Whitley (2001), while heterosexual men eroticize lesbians' sexual relations, gay men's sexual relations are not eroticized by either heterosexual men or women. Therefore, heterosexual men might hold more favorable attitudes toward lesbians than gay men, and heterosexual women's attitudes might not differ across gay men and lesbians. Finally, because heterosexual women are themselves an oppressed minority group and share minority group status with gay men and lesbians, they may hold more positive attitudes toward homosexuals (Herek 2002).

As discussed in the previous chapter, Japanese people hold rigid ideas about men's and women's roles and think that homosexuals, especially gay men, are gender inverted. In addition, lesbian pornographic videos are widely available to Japanese adults, which may encourage heterosexual Japanese men to eroticize lesbian relations or may reflect an existing eroticization. Taking these points into consideration, I forward the following three hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1-1: Heterosexual men show more negative attitudes toward homosexuals than heterosexual women.

Hypothesis 1-2: Heterosexual men show more negative attitudes toward gay men than heterosexual women.

Hypothesis 1-3: Heterosexual men and women do not differ in their negative attitudes toward lesbians.

Gender Role Attitudes

Heterosexuals' attitudes toward traditional men's and women's roles provide further explanation of gender differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. Previous studies indicated that heterosexuals who had strong traditional gender role beliefs and held more sexist attitudes expressed more negative attitudes toward homosexuals, and heterosexual men tended to have these characteristics more than heterosexual women (Davies 2004; Louderback and Whitley 2001; Sakalli 2002). Furthermore, Basow and Johnson's (2000) study of female college students found that heterosexual women who emphasized feminine attributes and did not endorse gender equality had the most negative attitudes toward lesbians. However, a study by Cullen et al. (2002) demonstrated that traditional gender role attitudes were not significantly related to prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals. They argued that the respondents might have a large gap between their beliefs and practices. Even if they believe in more traditional gender roles, their actual practices may be more liberal. Then, the results did not support the relationship between gender roles and the prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals.

Role theory provides an explanation of the relationship between sexism and sexual prejudice toward homosexuals. Because homosexuals are considered to violate traditional gender roles (Kite and Deaux 1987), they are disliked by heterosexuals who rate the importance of traditional gender roles high. Therefore, heterosexual men are

more prejudiced toward homosexuals than heterosexual women. However, because of the women's rights movements, people tend to be more tolerant of women who violate traditional gender norms. As a result, gay men are rated more negatively than lesbians.

As explained earlier, Japanese men and women possess rigid attitudes toward traditional gender roles and practice them. Based on the above, I forward the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2: Heterosexuals with relatively traditional gender role attitudes have more prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals than those who hold relatively egalitarian gender role attitudes.

Contact Experience

Much research has focused on heterosexuals' contact experience with gay men and lesbians. Studies consistently demonstrated that heterosexuals who knew homosexuals had more positive attitudes toward gay men and lesbians than those who did not (Anderssen 2002; Basow and Johnson 2000; Baunach et al. n.d.; Cullen et al. 2002; Glassner and Owen 1976; Herek and Capitanio 1996; Hopwood and Connors 2002; Lane 1987; Sakalli 2002). Moreover, heterosexuals who knew more homosexuals and had closer relationships with homosexuals were less prejudiced than those who knew fewer homosexuals or had more distant relationships (Herek and Capitanio 1996). The number of homosexual friends was related to the degree of closeness (Bowen and Bourgeois 2001). In other words, the more homosexuals that a heterosexual knew, the closer the relationships tended to be.

In order to isolate the effects of contact, Sakalli and Ugurlu (2002) conducted an experiment. In the experiment, Sakalli and Ugurlu (2002) introduced a lesbian to the classroom, and she had a conversation about her life experiences with heterosexual students who had no previous contact with homosexuals. The results indicated that heterosexuals' attitudes changed positively after the interaction. In his two-year interval longitudinal analysis, Anderssen (2002) reported that contact with homosexuals was positively related to attitudes toward homosexuals for both men and women. Herek and Capitanio (1996) reported that no significant change was observed between the first and second studies among respondents newly acquainted with homosexuals. The respondents who did not know any gay men or lesbians in the first study, but had befriended homosexuals by the second study, reported the same degree of negative attitudes toward homosexuals as those who did not know any homosexuals in both studies. To explain why their results were contradictory to previous studies, Herek and Capitanio (1996) focused on the quality of contact. They found that the number of gay people the respondents knew and the closeness of their relationship affected the attitudes toward homosexuals. The results consistently demonstrated that heterosexuals who had more homosexual friends showed more positive attitudes toward homosexuals than those who had either fewer or no homosexual friends. Heterosexuals who had close relationships expressed fewer prejudiced attitudes than those who had distant relationships. Thus, the quality of the relationships with homosexuals is an important factor.

Researchers have investigated what kinds of people were more likely to have contacts with homosexuals. Heterosexual females tended to know more homosexuals

than heterosexual males (Cullen et al. 2002; Glassner and Owen 1976; Herek and Capitanio 1996). Women tended to view society from broader cognitive perspectives, and because of this, they could befriend homosexuals easier than men (Cullen et al. 2002). Mohr and Sedlacek (2000) conducted research on the barriers for heterosexual college students to befriend homosexuals. Of their respondents, about 40 percent were willing to have homosexual friends, although nearly 20 percent were unwilling. The authors found that a diversity orientation, which addresses respondents' motivation to get to know people from different races, classes, religious beliefs, and cultures, and religious commitments broke down any barriers to befriend homosexuals. Herek and Capitanio (1996) also reported that people who had higher education and higher income, lived on the Pacific coast, were young and were not religious had more contacts with homosexuals. Although Herek and Capitanio (1996) did not provide the explanations for why these people had more contact, Overby and Barth (2002) offered an explanation. Overby and Barth (2002) claimed that the environment which encourages heterosexuals to communicate with homosexuals, increased the opportunities to befriend homosexuals. The respondents who reported that there were many homosexuals in their community had more contact experiences than those who lived in a community with fewer homosexuals. People with demographic characteristics described by Herek and Capitanio (1996) may be more likely to reside in environments where they have more opportunities to interact with homosexuals.

Contact theory explains the reduction of prejudice toward homosexuals among heterosexuals who have contact with homosexuals. Allport (1954) stated that contacts

with the prejudiced population reduce prejudice and leads to positive attitudes toward the prejudiced group. People who have contact with homosexuals and develop friendships with them may have emotional attachments to homosexuals as close friends (Tropp and Pettigrew 2005). Therefore, heterosexuals with homosexual friends have more positive attitudes toward homosexuals than those without friends.

Contact theory may be applied to Japanese attitudes because the cultural difference does not seem to affect the utility of the contact hypothesis. However its effects may be reduced because Japanese people have fewer opportunities to communicate or have contact with homosexuals in Japan. In the United States, 30 to 40 percent of heterosexuals have either gay friends or acquaintances (Herek and Capitanio 1996; Schope and Eliason 2000). However, most Japanese homosexuals have disclosed their sexual orientation only to their significant others or homosexual friends. Therefore, the number of heterosexuals who know homosexuals in Japan may be small compared to the United States. Furthermore, not many Japanese heterosexuals have multiple gay friends or have close relationships with homosexuals. Based on the above, I forward the following three hypotheses.

Hypothesis 3-1: Heterosexuals who have contact with homosexuals show fewer prejudiced attitudes than those who have no contact.

Hypothesis 3-2: Heterosexuals who have close relationships with homosexuals show fewer prejudiced attitudes than those who do not have close relationships with homosexuals.

Hypothesis 3-3: Heterosexuals who have distant relationships with homosexuals show fewer prejudiced attitudes than those who do not have distant relationships with homosexuals.

Religion

Much research has attested to the consistent effect of religion on the prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals in the United States. Respondents who were less or not involved in religion showed fewer negative attitudes toward homosexuality than those who were more involved in religion (Battle and Lemelle 2002; Glenn and Weaver 1979; Herek 1988; Herek and Capitanio 1995; Larsen, Cate and Reed 1983; Larsen, Reed and Hoffman 1980; Levitt and Klassen 1974; Marsiglio 1993). Yet, researchers focused on different aspects of religion. They mainly used religiosity, the level of fundamentalism, and the frequency of church attendance to test the effects of religion on prejudice toward homosexuals. Almost all studies focused on Western countries where Christianity was the dominant religion. However, Japanese people have very different attitudes toward religion as described earlier. Therefore, I do not present any hypotheses for this factor.

Parents' Education

According to Marsiglio (1993), the higher the parents' education, the fewer prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals held by the participants. Many studies demonstrated that the more education respondents completed, the fewer negative attitudes toward homosexuality (Battle and Lemelle 2002; Glenn and Weaver 1979;

Herek 1984; Herek and Capitanio 1995; Schulte 2002; Steffens and Wagner 2004), which indicates that parents with higher education themselves were less prejudiced than parents with lower education. According to Glassner and Owen (1976), respondents tended to learn negative attitudes from their parents, which means that if someone's parents show tolerant attitudes toward homosexuality, that person is also likely to be more tolerant. The same effect is expected to be observed for Japanese respondents. For this reason, I forward the following two hypotheses.

Hypothesis 4-1: Heterosexuals whose fathers have more education are less prejudiced than those whose fathers have less education.

Hypothesis 4-2: Heterosexuals whose mothers have more education are less prejudiced than those whose mothers have less education.

Living Experience

As mentioned earlier, because many Japanese homosexuals are closeted, few Japanese heterosexuals have contact with openly gay people. However, if they travel to Western countries, like the United States, and stay at least several months, they may have opportunities to interact with homosexuals. In addition, Japanese people may find that Western countries are looser about traditional gender roles and adopt these attitudes. Therefore, respondents' travel experiences may indirectly affect their prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals.

Furthermore, respondents who had lived in any foreign country, regardless of which country it is, may have more flexible attitudes toward people with different

characteristics. They may have learned different cultural lifestyles and have had more opportunities to communicate with diverse people. As a result, these respondents may have more favorable attitudes toward homosexuals. Based on these, I forwarded the following two hypotheses.

Hypothesis 5-1: Heterosexuals with living experiences in Western countries are less prejudiced than those without such experiences.

Hypothesis 5-2: Heterosexuals with living experiences in any foreign country are less prejudiced than those without such experiences.

The Difference between Japanese and American Subjects

According to Davies (2004), Asians held more negative attitudes toward homosexuals than whites in the United Kingdom. Although the majority of Asians in the study were Muslim, which prohibits homosexual acts, I assume that Asian culture also affected their perceptions of homosexuality. Moreover, the strong rigidity of gender roles and anticipated fewer contacts with homosexuals may cause more prejudiced attitudes among Japanese university students compared to U.S. university students. Taking this into consideration, I forward the following two hypotheses.

Hypothesis 6-1: Japanese university students have more negative attitudes toward homosexuals than American university students.

Hypothesis 6-2: After controlling for gender roles and contact experiences, Japanese and American university students are not significantly different in their attitudes toward homosexuals.

Table 1. List of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1-1	Heterosexual men show more negative attitudes toward homosexuals than heterosexual women.
Hypothesis 1-2	Heterosexual men show more negative attitudes toward gay men than heterosexual women.
Hypothesis 1-3	Heterosexual men and women do not differ in their negative attitudes toward lesbians.
Hypothesis 2	Heterosexuals with relatively traditional gender role attitudes have more prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals than those who hold relatively egalitarian gender role attitudes.
Hypothesis 3-1	Heterosexuals who have contact with homosexuals show fewer prejudiced attitudes than those who have no contact.
Hypothesis 3-2	Heterosexuals who have close relationships with homosexuals show fewer prejudiced attitudes than those who do not have close relationships with homosexuals.
Hypothesis 3-3	Heterosexuals who have distant relationships with homosexuals show fewer prejudiced attitudes than those who do not have distant relationships with homosexuals.
Hypothesis 4-1	Heterosexuals whose fathers have more education are less prejudiced than those whose fathers have less education.
Hypothesis 4-2	Heterosexuals whose mothers have more education are less prejudiced than those whose mothers have less education.
Hypothesis 5-1	Heterosexuals with living experiences in Western countries are less prejudiced than those without such experiences.
Hypothesis 5-2	Heterosexuals with living experiences in any foreign country are less prejudiced than those without such experiences.
Hypothesis 6-1	Japanese university students have more negative attitudes toward homosexuals than American university students.
Hypothesis 6-2	After controlling for gender roles and contact experiences, Japanese and American university students are not significantly different in their attitudes toward homosexuals.

Chapter 5: Method

I conducted two statistical analyses using two different data sets in this thesis. In Study 1, the data set included only Japanese respondents. In Study 2, the data set combined the data for Japanese and American respondents. The American data were collected by Baunach and Burgess (2002). Because some of the variables were measured differently across the two samples, some recodes were made necessary for Study 2. These differences are detailed below.

In this chapter, I discuss the data collection process in Japan and measures used in the analysis. Next, I describe the characteristics of the respondents, and the limitations of measurements of religiosity and urbanicity in the Japanese study. I also discuss each of independent and dependent variables, including recoding methods and Japanese frequencies. Table 1 presents a summary of the Japanese data. Frequencies for the American data are discussed in the results section when I report the results comparing the Japanese and American respondents. Lastly, I explain the methods used for statistical analyses.

Data Collection

This study employed quantitative techniques. The subjects were Japanese students attending a university in Japan. I contacted Japanese students through my personal contacts with a Japanese university professor in Japan. I went to his intercultural communication class and English writing class. I explained the purpose of this research and their rights to refuse or withdraw from the survey anytime without penalty. After I

received verbal consent, I distributed the questionnaire to the participants. The questionnaire took approximately 20 to 30 minutes to complete. No one refused to complete the questionnaire. The majority of my respondents majored in English communication, with minors in various subjects such as American politics, American history, American literature, second language acquisition, gender and intercultural communication. The intercultural communication class was one of the electives for the major, while English writing was a requirement. The university is a Christian private school. The number of students is approximately 10,000, and the university is known for foreign studies. Although students who do not practice Christianity can attend the university, they are required to take one course about the Christian bible, and it is optional for students to attend church services or other Christian events. As far as I could tell, few students were involved in these services and events. Therefore, the effects of the Christian characteristics of university on students' perceptions about homosexuality are expected to be small.

The American data were collected by Baunach and Burgess in 2002. Respondents were university students attending a large public university located in a metropolitan area in the South. After sampling undergraduate sociology courses, including both introductory and upper-level courses, Baunach and Burgess distributed the questionnaire to respondents. As sociology courses are popular among female and racial/ethnic minority students, these groups were slightly overrepresented compared to their portion in the entire university.

Measures

This thesis is a replication and extension of the study about prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals among U.S. university students conducted by Baunach and Burgess (2002). I created a shorter version of their questionnaire and slightly modified it to fit Japanese culture. I translated the questionnaire into Japanese. To improve the reliability of my translation, I asked five Japanese people to compare the Japanese version with the English questionnaire and obtained their advice. Based on their advice, I changed some words. Furthermore, I also asked two Japanese people who can speak English to translate the Japanese version of my questionnaire into English. I compared it with the original one, and their meanings matched. This strategy is the same as that used by Sakalli (2002), who created the Turkish version of Herek's ATLG scale. Although it is said that the validity of the original version of ATLG scale is high (Herek 1994), that of the Japanese version is as yet unknown.

The Japanese version of questionnaire included measures addressing prejudiced attitudes toward HIV positive people. However, I did not use this information in this analysis. Instead, I focused on Japanese people's attitudes toward homosexuals.

Respondents

I collected completed questionnaires from 166 Japanese university students. Respondents were asked to indicate their sexual orientation, heterosexual, bisexual, gay or lesbian. If they did not find an appropriate category, they could choose other and specify their sexual orientation. Although no one selected the gay, lesbian, or bisexual

categories, two respondents chose “other.” They specified that they were unsure about their sexual orientation. Because I am studying heterosexuals’ perceptions of homosexuals in this study, I eliminated these two respondents. In addition, one respondent did not answer all the questions measuring the prejudiced attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. This respondent was also eliminated from the analysis. As a result, the total number of respondents for the analyses is 163. Approximately 12 percent of the respondents were male, and 88 percent were female. The average age was 20.3, and the age range was from 18 to 23. Twenty-two (13 percent) respondents knew at least one homosexual person, and 56 respondents (34 percent) had lived in foreign countries. Of 56 respondents, 46 had lived in western countries, while others had lived in Asian countries.

I also collected information on respondents’ religiosity and urbanicity. However, these two variables were left out of the analysis. Approximately 70 percent of the respondents claimed Buddhism was their religion, and nearly 24 percent said they did not practice any religion. The respondents were asked to pick the religion category that matched their beliefs; therefore, they were forced to choose one. However, many respondents wrote a comment in the nearby space saying that they were spiritual, but did not practice any specific religion. Therefore, the difference between the students who chose Buddhism and those who selected no religion is unclear. For this reason, I did not include religion in my analysis.

Because Japan is a small country, urbanicity is measured differently than in the United States. According to the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport (2005), urban areas include core cities and their suburban areas. The requirements to be a core

city are that at least 100,000 people live in the area, and the population ratio of morning time and the evening time should be equal to or greater than one. The morning time population reflects how many people leave or enter the city, while the evening population is the number of people who live in the area. Thus, the morning population is calculated with the following formula: morning population = evening population (number of people who reside in the area) – number of people who leave the area + number of people who enter the area. The population ratio of morning time and the evening time is calculated with the following formula: morning population / evening population. The 2000 data from Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport (2005) indicated that approximately 90 percent of the entire Japanese population lived in an urban area. When applying this definition to my respondents, all of them lived in the urban area. Because there was no variation, I left this variable out of my analyses.

Table 2. Demographic Information of Japanese and American Respondents

	Japan (N=163)		U.S.A. (N=746)	
Year in School	Freshmen	15%	Freshmen	13%
	Sophomore	1%	Sophomore	22%
	Junior	68%	Junior	32%
	Senior	17%	Senior	32%
	Other	0%	Other	1%
Age	Mean	20.3	Mean	22.4
Race	N/A		White	50%
			Black	35%
			Latino	2%
			Asian	5%
			Native American	0%
			Multiracial	4%
			Other	3%

Table 2. Demographic Information of Japanese and American Respondents (continued)

	Japan (N=163)		U.S.A. (N=746)	
Contact	General Contact (Yes)	14%	General Contact (Yes)	66%
	Close Friend (Yes)	7%	Close Friend (Yes)	6%
	Distant Friend (Yes)	9%	Distant Friend (Yes)	58%
Gender	Male	12%	Male	34%
	Female	88%	Female	66%
Mothers' Education	Less Than High School	1%	Less Than High School	8%
	High School Degree	29%	High School Degree	20%
	Assoc/Tech Degree	40%	Assoc/Tech Degree	33%
	4yr College Degree	28%	4yr College Degree	27%
	Graduate Degree	1%	Graduate Degree	13%
Fathers' Education	Less Than High School	1%	Less Than High School	10%
	High School Degree	23%	High School Degree	15%
	Assoc/Tech Degree	4%	Assoc/Tech Degree	29%
	4yr College Degree	66%	4yr College Degree	30%
	Graduate Degree	6%	Graduate Degree	17%
Living Experience	Western Country (Yes)	34%	N/A	
	Any Foreign Country (Yes)	28%		
MRS	Mean	28.3	Mean	27.4
WRS	Mean	22.9	Mean	23.2
ATLG	Mean	39.2	Mean	48.3
ATL	Mean	17.6	Mean	21.7
ATG	Mean	21.5	Mean	26.8

Note: Analysis is restricted to the heterosexual respondents who are not foreign students. MRS stands for men's role scale and WRS stands for women's role scale.

Baunach and Burgess (2002) collected data from a total of 956 American students. Of them, 71 respondents (7 percent) claimed that they were bisexual, gay, lesbian, or other. I excluded these respondents from the analysis. To analyze the difference in attitudes toward homosexuals, lesbians, and gay men between Japanese and American university students, I also excluded all foreign students from the U. S. sample.

Respondents who did not provide complete data were excluded as well. As a result, the total number of respondents for Study 2 is 909, 746 from the United States and 163 from Japan. The summary statistics of Japanese and American respondents is presented in Table 2. American respondents consisted of 82 percent of the sample. Approximately 15 percent of Japanese sample were freshmen, and only 1 percent were sophomore. The majority of Japanese respondents were either junior (68 percent) or senior (17 percent). Approximately, 13 percent of American respondents were freshmen, 22 percent were sophomore, 32 percent were junior, 32 percent were senior, and 1 percent were other which included graduate students and students who took courses as community members. The mean age of U.S. respondents was 22.4, and that of Japanese respondents was 20.3. The mean age of combined sample was 22.0.

Approximately 75 percent of American respondents were Christian, and nearly 10 percent of them were fundamentalists. On average, American respondents attended religious services from once a month to several times a year. Compared to Japanese respondents who practiced Buddhism and/or Shintoism with some influence of Confucianism, the majority of American respondents believed in Christianity. There are large religious differences between the Japanese and American respondents; because of the measurement issues previously discussed, though, these differences cannot be explored in the multivariate analyses. Nearly two thirds of American respondents came from urban areas, while approximately 20 percent of them were from rural areas. In contrast, all of Japanese respondents were from urban areas. Because urbanicity is measured differently between Japan and the United States, it is unclear whether Japanese

and American respondents are similar in urbanicity. Therefore, the combined analyses cannot investigate the effects of these differences.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables in Study 1 and 2 were attitudes toward gay men, lesbians, and homosexuals. The degree of prejudice toward gay men and lesbians was measured by the revised version of the Attitudes toward Gay Men and Lesbians (ATLG) scale created by Herek (1988). My Japanese version of the ATLG scale consisted of 20 questions in total, including 10 questions each for gay men and lesbians, which is the same as for the original scale. (Please see the attached questionnaire in Appendix A for the original Japanese version or B for the English translated version for more information.) The respondents were asked to choose a response from a 5-point Likert scale of strongly agree, agree, unsure, disagree, and strongly disagree. Adding the ten questions assessing prejudice toward gay men, I produced the attitudes toward gay men (ATG) scale. Also, I combined the ten questions measuring prejudice toward lesbians and created the attitudes toward lesbians (ATL) scale. Finally, I produced the ATLG scale by adding all twenty questions. The scores of the ATG and ATL scales ranged from 10 to 50, and the score of the ATLG scale ranged from 20 to 100, respectively. The higher number indicates more prejudiced attitudes for all three scales. The Cronbach's alpha scores were approximately .84 for the ATL scale, .85 for the ATG scale and .91 for the ATLG scale. In Baunach and Burgess' study (2002), the values of Crombach's alpha were .89, .93 and .95 for the ATL, ATG and ATLG scales, respectively. Although my scores were a

little lower than theirs, all of the scores are high enough to continue the analyses. The mean scale scores for the Japanese respondents were 21.5, 17.6 and 39.2 for the ATG, ATL and ATLG scales, respectively. Being relatively low, all these scores indicated more favorable attitudes toward gay men, lesbians and homosexuals.

Independent Variables

The independent variables in Study 1 included contact experiences, gender, fathers' and mothers' education, male and female gender role attitudes, and travel experience outside Japan. There were seven independent variables in Study 2, including nationality, contact experiences, gender, fathers' and mothers' education, attitudes toward male gender roles, and attitudes toward female gender roles. Because there is no equivalent variable to living experiences in foreign countries in the U. S. sample, this variable was omitted from the second analysis. Contact experiences, gender, and attitudes toward male and female gender roles were measured in the same way both in Japanese and American questionnaires. Therefore, these variables were recoded in the same way in both studies. However, the fathers' and mothers' education categories were modified to fit the Japanese case; these two variables are coded differently between Study 1 and 2.

***Contact Experience*:** Respondents were asked if they had any homosexual friends or family members. If the answer was yes, they answered the following questions, which were "how many homosexuals do you know?" and "what is your relationship with them?" For the first question, respondents entered a number, and for the latter question, they were asked to choose every relationship which applied from ten categories,

including father, mother, siblings, grandparents, other family members, close friends, distant friends, co-workers, neighbors, and other acquaintances. Of all Japanese respondents, the number of respondents who had at least one homosexual friend was 22, approximately 13 percent of respondents. Of the 22 people who knew at least one homosexual, only one person was male.

I recoded the contact variable into a dummy variable. The respondents who knew at least one homosexual were recoded to 1, while those who did not know any homosexuals were recoded to 0. To consider whether the quality of the relationship with homosexuals affected their perception of homosexuals, I created a set of dummy variables. Two dummy variables summarized the type of relationships with homosexuals: "close friend" and "distant friend." The respondents indicated that the homosexuals they knew were "good friends," "other friends," or "other." That is, no one selected any of the other seven categories of relationship type. Those who chose "other" were asked to specify the relationship. My respondents specified that these "other" relationships were either "mother's friend" or "teacher." The respondents who reported having "good" homosexual friends were coded as "close friends," and those who knew homosexuals as "other friends," "mother's friends" or "teacher" were coded as "distant friends." In sum, the dummy variables were "close friend" (0 = no close homosexual friend, 1 = at least one close homosexual friend) and "distant friend" (0 = no distant friend, 1 = at least one distant homosexual friend). The number of Japanese respondents who had close homosexual friends was 11 out of 163 respondents and who have distant relationship with homosexuals was 14. Three people had both close and distant homosexual friends. The

variables assessing the quality of contact were entered in the second phase of regression analysis.

Gender: Respondents were asked to choose their biological sex, either male or female. I recoded this variable into a dummy variable (0=women, 1=men). In Study 1, Women comprised approximately 88 percent of my sample. Only 19 men (12 percent) participated in the study.

Parents' Education in Study 1: Participants were asked to indicate their mothers' and fathers' educational attainments separately. There were seven choices for each in the Japanese questionnaire: "completed middle school," "completed high school," "completed vocational school," "completed two year college," "completed college," "completed Master's degree," and "completed Doctoral degree." Fathers' education was relatively higher than mothers' education in the data of Japanese respondents. Approximately 70 percent of fathers and 30 percent of mothers had four years of college or more. Nearly one third and one fifth of mothers received a two year college degree or a vocational school degree, respectively, while fathers who received these kinds of degrees were less than 4 percent (two year college = 1.2 percent and vocational school = 2.5 percent). The percentages of respondents who had at most a high school degree were 23 for fathers and 29 for mothers.

Parents' Education in Study 2: In the American questionnaire, respondents were asked to choose one from nine choices regarding fathers' and mother's educational attainments. The choices included "some grade school," "completed grade school," "some high school," "completed high school," "completed high school and technical

training (not college)," "some college," "completed college," and "some graduate work," and "graduate degree (MD, JD, PhD, MA, etc.)." To combine the two different measurements of parents' education, I created five categories: "less than high school degree," "completed high school," "completed associate/technical school," "completed four year college," and "completed any graduate degree." "Less than high school degree" included respondents who chose "some grade school," "completed grade school," and "some high school" in the American questionnaire, and "completed middle school" in the Japanese questionnaire. "High school degree" was mentioned as "completed high school" in both questionnaires. I regarded "completed associate/technical school" as equivalent to "completed high school and technical training," and "some college" in the American questionnaire, and "completed vocational school" and "completed two year college" in the Japanese questionnaire. "Completed four year college" was expressed as "completed college" in both questionnaires. Finally, "completed any graduate degree" includes "some graduate work" and "graduate degree" in the American questionnaire, and "completed Master's degree" and "completed Doctoral degree" in the Japanese questionnaire.

Gender Role Attitudes: Gender role attitudes were divided into two categories, attitudes toward men's gender roles and attitudes toward women's gender roles. Men's gender role attitudes were measured using a shortened version of Thompson and Pleck's (1986) Male Role Norm Scale. Baunach and Burgess (2002) selected ten questions from the men's role and toughness subscales. The specific questions addressed attitudes toward the importance of success at work, the breadwinner role in the family, emotional and physical toughness, and risk taking. Eleven questions often used by the General Social

Survey (Davis, Smith and Marsden 2005) were selected to measure women's role attitudes. The questions included "it is okay if a married woman earns money in business or industry if she has a husband capable of supporting her," "a preschool child is likely to suffer if his or her mother works," and "having a job is the best way for a woman to be an independent person." These questions address the respondents' notions of women's roles in the workplace and family. Participants were asked to choose from the same 5-point Likert scale. In my analysis, the Cronbach's alpha for the men's gender role attitudes scale was .81 and that for the women's gender role attitudes scale was .65. The internal consistency of Baunach and Burgess' index (forthcoming) was similar; Cronbach's alpha equaled .82 for men's gender roles and .68 for women's gender roles. These values are high enough to continue with the statistical analyses. The scale scores range from 10 to 50 for the men's role scale (12 to 44 in Japanese data) and from 11 to 55 for the women's role scale (12 to 37 in Japanese data). Higher values indicate that the respondent has more traditional gender role attitudes. The average score for Japanese respondents on the men's role scale was approximately 28 and that for the women's role scale was 23. Japanese respondents' scores on the men's role scale fell approximately in the middle of the range, whereas Japanese respondents leaned to more traditional attitudes on women's roles.

Living Experience: Participants were asked whether they had ever lived in a foreign country. Those who answered yes to this question were asked to indicate where and for how long they lived outside of Japan. Fifty-six out of 163 (34.4 percent) respondents had lived in a foreign country. Forty-six out of these 56 (82.1 percent) respondents had lived in Western countries; all others had lived in non-Western countries.

I created a dummy variable based on whether the respondents had ever lived in a Western foreign country. In general, Western countries hold more positive attitudes toward homosexuals than Asian countries, and more homosexuals are open about their sexual orientations in Western countries. Although there are some exceptions like Thailand, where homosexuals are relatively accepted, there is no information available to indicate which Asian countries have more positive attitudes toward homosexuals. In my thesis, Western countries included the United States, Australia, the Great Britain, New Zealand, Canada, Germany, Spain, and Belgium, and non-Western countries included China, South Korea, Singapore, India, Indonesia, Ecuador, Brazil, Thailand, and Mexico. Respondents who had lived in a Western foreign country were coded as 1, and otherwise 0.

To consider whether heterosexuals who had lived in any foreign country have more positive attitudes toward homosexuals compared to those who had never lived in any foreign country, I created an additional dummy variable. On this variable, zero indicates that the respondents had no experience living in any foreign country, and one indicates that they had lived in a foreign country. This variable was entered into the equation instead of the living experience in Western countries variable in the second phase of regression analysis.

The length that the respondents had lived in Western countries ranged from one month to 136 months (11 years and 4 months). Nearly 10 percent had lived in Western countries for a year, which was the modal score. The next longest times that a respondent spent in Western countries were for a month or for three years.

Table 3. Definitions of Variables, Study 1 & Study 2

Male	Equals 1 if male, 0 if female.
Mothers' & Fathers' Education (Study 1)	Ordinal variables with seven categories. The higher number indicates the higher education.
Mothers' & Fathers' Education (Study 2)	Ordinal variables with five categories. The higher number indicates the higher education.
Men's Role Attitudes	The score ranges from 10 to 50. The higher score indicates more traditional gender role attitudes.
Women's Role Attitudes	The score ranges from 11 to 55. The higher score indicates more traditional gender role attitudes.
Contact Experiences (Phase 1)	Equals 1 if respondents had any homosexual friend, 0 otherwise.
Close Friend (Phase 2)	Equal 1 if respondents had at least one close homosexual friend, 0 otherwise.
Distant Friend (Phase 2)	Equals 1 if respondents had at least one distant homosexual friend, 0 otherwise.
Living Experiences in Western countries (Study 1, Phase 1)	Equals 1 if respondents had lived in Western countries, 0 otherwise.
Living Experiences in any foreign country (Study 1, Phase 2)	Equals 1 if respondents had lived in any foreign country, 0 otherwise.
Nationality (Study 2)	Equals 1 if Japanese, 0 if American.
ATLG	The score ranges from 20 to 100. The higher score indicates more prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals.
ATL	The score ranges from 10 to 50. The higher score indicates more prejudiced attitudes toward lesbians.
ATG	The score ranges from 10 to 50. The higher score indicates more prejudiced attitudes toward gay men

Nationality: Respondents in Study 2 were either American or Japanese. I produced a dummy variable to indicate the sample origin by recoding American respondents to zero and Japanese respondents to one. Approximately 82 percent of respondents were from the United States, and only 18 percent were from Japan.

Analytic Technique

I used Ordinary Least Squares Regression to analyze the causal relationships between the independent and dependent variables. I used T-Tests of mean differences to examine the differences between Japanese and American respondents on each of the dependent and independent variables. SPSS version 14 was used for data entry and analyses. I utilized the listwise method to cope with the missing data. Because of the small sample size, it may be difficult to see significant effects in the regression analysis of Study 1. Furthermore, the nonprobability sampling design precludes the use of significance tests. Therefore, I focus my interpretations on the pattern and strength of the relationships.

Chapter 6: Results

I report the results of the statistical analyses of the Japanese sample (Study 1) and of the combined sample (Study 2) in this chapter. I regressed the attitudes toward lesbians and gay men (ATLG) scale, the attitudes toward lesbians (ATL) scale, and the attitudes toward gay men (ATG) scale on the set of independent variables and tested the hypotheses. For each dependent variable in Study 1, I ran four models. In Phase 1 of Study 1, a contact variable was entered in Model 1. In Model 2, I added the sex and parents' education variables, allowing me to analyze whether the effect of contact was mediated by respondents' demographic characteristics. In Model 3, I entered the gender role variables and observed whether the gender role variables mediated the effects of contact and sex variables. In Model 4, I added living experiences in Western countries. I analyzed whether having lived in a Western country mediated the effects of contact and the other variables. In Phase 2 of Study 1, I entered the type of contact variables instead of the general contact variable used in Phase 1. The same variables as in Phase 1 were entered in Models 2 and 3. In Model 4 (Phase 2, Study 1), I added the living experience in any foreign country variable instead of the living experience in a Western country variable.

In Study 2, I used the combined data set of Japanese and American respondents. Like Study 1, I regressed three dependent variables (the ATL, ATG and ATLG scales) on the set of independent variables. There were two phases, and each phase had four models. In Phase 1, I entered the dummy variable for respondents' nationality. In Model 2, the contact variable was entered. In Model 3, I entered gender, parents' education and gender

role attitudes. Finally, an interaction term for nationality and contact was entered in Model 4. In Phase 2, I added the type of contact variables instead of the general contact variable in Model 2 and the interaction between nationality and type of contact in Model 4.

Study 1: Japanese Attitudes toward Homosexuals, Phase 1

Table 4a presents a regression analysis for Japanese respondents' attitudes toward homosexuals with general contact and living experience in Western countries. In Model 1, I added the contact variable, which addressed whether Japanese students had at least one homosexual friend or not. The result indicated that contact experience with homosexuals had a significant effect on their attitudes toward homosexuals ($p < .01$). Those who had contact with homosexuals showed more positive attitudes toward homosexuals. Specifically, compared to heterosexuals without any contact with homosexuals, those with contact scored 6.9 points lower on the ATLG scale, which is nearly nine percent of the range of the ATLG scale. Contact experience explains approximately five percent of the variation in the prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals.

I added the sex and parents' education variables in Model 2. Contact experience continued to have a significant effect on respondents' prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals. The size of the effect was similar to the first model, which indicates that sex and parents' education variables did not capture any of the explanatory power of homosexual contact. Moreover, the standardized coefficients show that contact has the strongest effect on prejudice. Japanese men expressed more prejudiced attitudes toward

homosexuals than did Japanese women. The ATLG score of Japanese men was approximately 6.5 points higher than that of Japanese women, which is nearly the same size of effect as that of contact. Parents' education was not a significant predictor of attitudes toward homosexuals. The R-squared for Model 2 was .094, which is almost double the value for Model 1. Sex and parents' education variables added 4.6 percent more explained variation.

In Model 3, two more variables were added, attitudes toward men's and women's gender roles. As before, contact reduced respondents' scores on the ATLG scale by six points. After controlling for gender roles, Japanese men and women did not have significantly different attitudes toward homosexuals, although men did continue to score slightly higher on the ATLG scale. This change supported the contention that men held more traditional gender role attitudes than women, and those who held more traditional views toward gender roles had more prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals. The results of a T-Test demonstrated that Japanese men and women were different in male and female gender role attitudes. The mean scores for men's gender role attitudes were 27.8 for men and 32.4 for women, and those of women's gender role attitudes were 22.6 for men and 25.8 for women. A one point increase on the men's gender role scale produced a .47 points increase in the ATLG scale and a one point increase on the women's gender role scale produced a .93 points increase. Thus, the effect of attitudes toward women's gender roles was approximately 1.5 times larger than the effect of attitudes toward men's gender roles. These results also showed that traditional gender role attitudes had stronger effects on prejudice than contact. Fathers' and mothers' education continued to have no

Table 4a. OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Homosexuals, Japan

	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**
Contact Experience	-6.859**	-6.627**	-6.601**	-5.888**
	(2.429)	(2.411)	(5.337)	(2.097)
Male		6.452*	1.420	1.830
		(2.592)	(2.345)	(2.359)
Mothers' Education		-.935	-.688	-.789
		(.780)	(.675)	(.677)
Fathers' Education		.957	.864	.934
		(.695)	(.600)	(.599)
Men's Role Attitudes			.466***	.464***
			(.123)	(.122)
Women's Role Attitudes			.931***	.927***
			(.161)	(.161)
Living Experience in Western Country				2.169
				(1.616)
Constant	40.086***	38.525***	3.966	3.924
	(.898)	(2.987)	(5.337)	(5.323)
R^2	.048	.094	.333	.341

Note: Numbers are unstandardized coefficients, standard errors are in parentheses.
* p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001 (two-tailed tests)

significant effect on the prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals. Model 3 explained 33.3 percent of the variation in attitudes toward homosexuals, a sizable increase over Model 2. The addition of the gender role attitudes variables increased explained variation in attitudes toward homosexuals by 23.9 percent.

In Model 4, I added the variable measuring whether the respondent had ever lived in a Western country. The size of contact's effect remains; heterosexuals who had at least one homosexual friend scored approximately 5.9 points lower on the ATLG scale compared to those who had no homosexual friends. Consistent with the results in Model 3, both men's and women's gender roles were statistically significant (p < .001). The

sizes of the effects of gender role attitudes did not differ from Model 3. Parents' education, respondents' sex, and living experience in Western countries did not have any significant effects on the prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals. Unexpectedly, respondents who had lived in Western countries expressed slightly more prejudice toward homosexuals compared to those who had not lived in Western countries. The final set of independent variables explained 34.1 percent of variation in attitudes toward homosexuals.

Study 1: Japanese Attitudes toward Homosexuals, Phase 2

Phase 2 of the regression analysis tested the effects of the type of homosexual contact and the general experience of living in any foreign country. I present the results of the regression analysis in Table 4b. One of two dummy variables measuring the quality of contact was "close friend" and the other was "distant friend." All respondents who had lived in any foreign country were coded one, while those who had no experience living in a foreign country were coded zero.

The results from Model 1 indicated that heterosexuals with a distant gay friend had significantly different attitudes towards homosexuals compared to those without such contact experience. The ATLG score for these respondents was 8.6 points lower than the respondents without distant homosexual contact. Surprisingly, the respondents who had a close relationship with a homosexual did not differ in their attitudes toward homosexuals from those without such contact. Together, these two variables explained 5.8 percent of

Table 4b. OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Homosexuals, Japan

	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**
Close Friend	-2.242	-2.004	-4.265	-4.157
	(3.353)	(3.375)	(2.957)	(2.942)
Distant Friend	-8.645**	-8.378**	-6.050*	-5.801*
	(3.002)	(2.980)	(2.603)	(2.593)
Male		6.599*	1.418	1.843
		(2.593)	(2.362)	(2.363)
Mothers' Education		-.791	-.679	-.796
		(.792)	(.687)	(.687)
Fathers' Education		.886	.825	.735
		(.693)	(.600)	(.600)
Men's Role Attitudes			.465***	.465***
			(.124)	(.123)
Women's Role Attitudes			.928***	.932***
			(.161)	(.161)
Living Experience in Foreign Country				2.514
				(1.538)
Constant	40.054***	38.257***	4.175	3.964
	(.890)	(3.018)	(5.353)	(5.325)
R^2	.058	.074	.306	.314

Note: Numbers are unstandardized coefficients, standard errors are in parentheses.
* p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001 (two-tailed tests)

the variation in attitudes toward homosexuals. In Models 2, 3, and 4, I obtained the similar results to the first phase of the analysis. Respondents with "distant gay friends" consistently showed more positive attitudes toward homosexuals throughout the four models.

In Model 4, living experience in any foreign country was entered in the equation. Although nonsignificant, heterosexuals who had ever lived in any foreign country showed more prejudice toward homosexuals than those who had never lived abroad. The ATLG score of the first group was 2.5 points higher than the latter group. All of my

variables combined explained 34.8 percent of the variation in prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals, similar to the results for Phase 1 of the analysis.

Study 1: Japanese Attitudes toward Lesbians, Phase 1

The results of the regression analysis for Japanese attitudes toward lesbians are presented in Table 5a. In Model 1, general contact had a significant effect on prejudiced attitudes toward lesbians ($p < .05$). Heterosexuals who had at least one homosexual friend showed more positive attitudes toward lesbians than those who did not know any homosexuals. The ATL score of the former group of people was 2.6 points lower than that of the latter group of people. Contact experience explained only 2.7 percent of variation in prejudice.

In Model 2, contact experience was still significantly related to the prejudice, and the size of the effect was similar to that found in Model 1. Japanese men expressed slightly more prejudiced attitudes toward lesbians than Japanese women; their ATL scores were 2.2 points higher than women's scores. The effect of sex approached significance ($p = .098$). Both fathers' and mothers' education did not affect the respondents' prejudiced attitudes significantly. Model 2 explained five percent of variation in prejudiced attitudes. The added variables, sex and parent's education, increased variation by only 2.3 percent, which is less than the amount explained by the contact variable.

Men's and women's gender roles attitudes were entered into the equation in Model 3. The results indicated that respondents with homosexual contact had more positive attitudes toward lesbians than those without contact, which is consistent with the

previous models. The effect of sex no longer even approached significance once the gender role attitude variables were entered into the model. This change suggests that the effect of sex is mediated by men's and women's role attitudes. Japanese men showed more prejudiced attitudes toward lesbians than women in Model 2 because they tended to hold more traditional gender roles than women, as demonstrated in the T-Test reported above. Respondents' attitudes toward traditional men's and women's roles had statistically significant effects on prejudice. Respondents who endorsed more traditional gender role attitudes also expressed more negative attitudes toward lesbians. A one point increase in the men's and women's role scales increases the ATL score by .21 and .44, respectively. Thus, the effect of women's gender role attitudes was 1.6 times as large as men's gender role attitudes, an effect supported by the standardized coefficients. Indeed, once these variables were entered, contact experience no longer had the strongest effect on prejudice. The gender roles variables increased the explained variation from 5 percent in Model 2 to 25.4 percent in Model 3, a sizable 20.4 percent increase.

In Model 4, respondents' living experience in Western countries was added to the equation. Once this variable was added, contact experience became nonsignificant, although it did approach significance ($p = .062$). However, the size of effect did not change. Heterosexuals with contact experience continued to score higher on the ATL scale than those without any contact experience by 2.1 points. Men's and women's role attitudes were also statistically significant. The effect size and the relative importance of the two variables remained the same as Model 3. Living experience in Western countries was marginally significant, ($p = .064$). Contrary to expectations, respondents who had

lived in Western foreign countries had more prejudiced attitudes toward lesbians. The ATL score of respondents with living experience in Western countries was 1.6 points higher than the scores of those without such living experience. Sex and parents' education did not have significant effects on the attitudes toward lesbians. All of my variables explained 34.1 percent of the variation in the prejudiced attitudes toward lesbians.

Table 5a. OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Lesbians, Japan

	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**
Contact Experience	-2.562*	-2.477*	-2.197*	-2.070
	(1.224)	(1.230)	(1.106)	(1.100)
Male		2.202	-.096	.203
		(1.323)	(1.236)	(1.237)
Mothers' Education		-.393	-.278	-.351
		(.398)	(.356)	(.355)
Fathers' Education		.315	.274	.252
		(.355)	(.371)	(.314)
Men's Role Attitudes			.206**	.205**
			(.065)	(.064)
Women's Role Attitudes			.436***	.432***
			(.085)	(.084)
Living Experience in Western Country				1.583
				(.848)
Constant	17.971***	17.750***	1.901	1.871
	(.452)	(1.524)	(2.814)	(2.791)
R^2	.027	.050	.254	.270

Note: Numbers are unstandardized coefficients, standard errors are in parentheses.
* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests)

Study 1: Japanese Attitudes toward Lesbians, Phase 2

The type of contact variables and the living experience variable were entered in the Phase 2 analysis as it was for attitudes toward homosexuals, generally. Table 5b shows the regression models for attitudes toward lesbians, including two types of contact variables and living experience in any foreign country. Consistent with the results for attitudes toward homosexuals, heterosexuals with at least one distant homosexual friend showed more positive attitudes toward lesbians than those without such homosexual friend. The former scored lower than the latter on the ATL scale by 3.3 points. The respondents who had at least one close homosexual friend did not differ on the ATL score from those without such homosexual friend. These two variables explained 3.6 percent of the variation in attitudes toward lesbians. In Model 2, where sex and parents' education variables were entered, the distant friendship variable retained its significance. However, after controlling for the men's and women's gender role attitudes, the distant friendship variable became nonsignificant, which could indicate that people who had at least one distant homosexual friend held more liberal attitudes toward men's and women's gender roles, which could then lead to more positive attitudes toward lesbians, but T-Test results did not support this contention. There was no significant difference in men's and women's gender role attitudes between those with a distant homosexual friend and those without such friend. Both men's and women's gender role attitudes had significant effects on the prejudiced attitudes toward lesbians.

In Model 4, living experience in any foreign country was marginally significant (p =.07). Again, respondents with experience living in any foreign country were more

Table 5b. OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Lesbians, Japan

	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**
Close Friend	-.976	-.960	-1.984	-1.920
	(1.691)	(1.724)	(1.558)	(1.546)
Distant Friend	-3.341*	-3.206*	-2.122	-1.974
	(1.514)	(1.522)	(1.371)	(1.363)
Male		2.238	-.143	.109
		(1.324)	(1.244)	(1.242)
Mothers' Education		-.347	-.293	-.363
		(.405)	(.362)	(.361)
Fathers' Education		.293	.265	.212
		(.354)	(.316)	(.315)
Men's Role Attitudes			.208**	.208**
			(.065)	(.065)
Women's Role Attitudes			.435***	.437***
			(.085)	(.084)
Living Experience in Foreign Country				1.495
				(.808)
Constant	17.978***	17.683***	1.963	1.838
	(.449)	(1.542)	(2.820)	(2.799)
R^2	.036	.058	.259	.275

Note: Numbers are unstandardized coefficients, standard errors are in parentheses.
* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests)

prejudiced toward lesbians than those with no living experience. The former group scored higher than the latter group on the ATL scale by 1.5 points. With all of these variables, 27.5 percent of the variation in attitudes toward lesbians were explained, approximately seven percent lower than for the first phase analysis.

Study 1: Japanese Attitudes toward Gay Men, Phase 1

I report the results of the regression analysis predicting attitudes toward gay men in Table 6a. In Model 1, heterosexuals who had contact with homosexuals showed more

positive attitudes toward gay men than those who had no contact. The former group of respondents scored lower on the ATG score than the latter group by 4.3 points. Contact experience solely explained six percent of the variation in prejudiced attitudes toward gay men.

The sex and parents' education variables were entered in Model 2. Although mother's education was not significantly related to Japanese students' attitudes toward gay men, father's education was marginally significant ($p = .095$). Contrary to the expectation, the higher the father's education, the more negative the attitudes toward gay men. Sex also had a significant effect on attitudes ($p < .01$). Japanese men expressed more prejudiced attitudes toward gay men than Japanese women. Men's scores on the ATG scale were higher than women's scores by 4.3 points after controlling contact experience and parents' education. These variables explained 12.2 percent of the variation, a 6.2 percent increase over Model 1.

After adding the composite variables of attitudes toward men's and women's roles in Model 3, contact experience retained a significant effect. Respondents with homosexual contact experience scored lower than those who without any homosexual contact by 3.9 points. Father's education was still marginally significant. Heterosexuals whose fathers had higher education showed more prejudiced attitudes toward gay men than those whose fathers had relatively lower education. Controlling for the gender roles mediated the effect of sex. As a result, sex was not significantly related to the prejudiced attitudes. This change suggests that men have more traditional attitudes toward gender

Table 6a. OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Gay Men, Japan

	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**
Contact Experience	-4.297**	-4.151**	-3.865***	-3.818***
	(1.349)	(1.327)	(1.162)	(1.166)
Male		4.249**	1.516	1.627
		(1.426)	(1.299)	(1.312)
Mothers' Education		-.542	-.410	-.437
		(.429)	(.374)	(.377)
Fathers' Education		.642	.590	.582
		(.382)	(.332)	(.333)
Men's Role Attitudes			.260***	.259***
			(.068)	(.068)
Women's Role Attitudes			.495***	.494***
			(.089)	(.089)
Living Experience in Western Country				.586
				(.899)
Constant	22.115***	20.775***	2.065	2.054
	(.499)	(1.644)	(2.955)	(2.961)
R^2	.060	.122	.346	.347

Note: Numbers are unstandardized coefficients, standard errors are in parentheses.
* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests)

roles, and then they are more prejudiced toward gay men, which was supported in the T-Test reported above. Both men's and women's gender role attitudes affected prejudiced attitudes significantly ($p < .001$). The respondents with relatively traditional gender role beliefs were more prejudiced toward gay men than those with relatively liberal beliefs. A one point increase on the men's and women's gender role scales is worth .26 and .50 points on the ATG scale respectively. Comparing the standardized coefficients, women's gender roles attitudes were approximately 1.5 times stronger than men's gender roles attitudes. Mother's education did not have significant effects. All of these variables

explained 34.6 percent of variation in prejudiced attitudes toward gay men. The gender role attitudes variables increased R-squared by 22.4 percent.

In Model 4, the respondent's living experience in Western countries was added. Contact experience had a significant effect throughout all four models. The effect size was same as that found in Model 3. Father's education also had a marginally significant negative effect on prejudiced attitudes toward gay men. Consistent with Model 3's results, the gender role variables were statistically significant ($p < .001$), and the effect sizes were the same. Respondents' sex, mothers' education, and living experience did not affect the prejudiced attitudes toward gay men significantly. Taken together, my set of independent variables explained 34.7 percent of variation in attitudes toward gay men.

Study 1: Japanese Attitudes toward Gay Men, Phase 2

Table 6b presents the unstandardized coefficients and standard errors for attitudes toward gay men with general contact and living experiences in Western countries. Just as I found in the Phase 2 analyses for the ATLG and ATL scales, heterosexuals who had at least one distant homosexual friend showed more positive attitudes toward gay men than those without such contact. The ATG score for heterosexuals with a distant homosexual friend was 5.4 points lower than that for heterosexuals with no distant homosexual friend. Attitudes toward gay men were not different between the respondents with at least one close friend and those without such a homosexual friend. The two types of contact variables explained approximately seven percent of variation in prejudiced attitudes toward gay men.

Table 6b. OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Gay Men, Japan

	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**
Close Friend	-1.265	-1.044	-2.281	-2.237
	(1.864)	(1.858)	(1.641)	(1.639)
Distant Friend	-5.305**	-5.173**	-3.928**	-3.828**
	(13669)	(1.640)	(1.444)	(1.444)
Male		4.360**	1.561	1.733
		(1.427)	(1.310)	(1.316)
Mothers' Education		-.444	-.386	-.433
		(.436)	(.381)	(.383)
Fathers' Education		.594	.560	.523
		(.382)	(.333)	(.334)
Men's Role Attitudes			.257***	.256***
			(.069)	(.069)
Women's Role Attitudes			.493***	.495***
			(.090)	(.089)
Living Experience in Foreign Country				1.019
				(.857)
Constant	22.076***	20.574***	2.211	2.126
	(.495)	(1.661)	(2.970)	(2.966)
R^2	.069	.130	.347	.353

Note: Numbers are unstandardized coefficients, standard errors are in parentheses.
* p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001 (two-tailed tests)

Unlike the results of attitudes toward lesbians, men's and women's gender role attitudes variables did not mediate the effects of contact. Also living experience in any foreign country was not a significant predictor of attitudes toward gay men in Model 4. All of these variables explained 35.3 percent of variation in attitudes toward gay men.

Study 1: Comparisons of Results, Attitudes toward Lesbians and Gay Men

I found both similarities and differences in the results across the two dependent variables. Sex and gender role attitudes had similar effects on prejudice toward gay men

and lesbians. In contrast, contact, fathers' education, and living experience in any foreign country had slightly different effects on attitudes toward gay men than on attitudes toward lesbians.

When the sex variable was entered into the equation, the results demonstrated that Japanese men expressed more prejudiced attitudes than Japanese women consistently across the two dependent variables. However, it became nonsignificant after gender role attitudes were entered. Respondents who held relatively traditional gender role attitudes showed more prejudiced attitudes toward both gay men and lesbians than those who held relatively egalitarian attitudes. The scores of unstandardized coefficient were similar between prejudice toward lesbians and gay men.

The contact variable had a significant effect on all dependent variables. Respondents with homosexual contact had fewer prejudiced attitudes toward gay men and lesbians than those without such contact. The comparison of unstandardized coefficients showed that contact had a larger effect on attitudes toward gay men than those toward lesbians. The unstandardized coefficient of attitudes toward gay men was 1.8 times larger than that of attitudes toward lesbians. Surprisingly, respondents with a distant friend showed fewer prejudiced attitudes than those without such a friend, while respondents with a close friend did not differ in prejudice from those without such a homosexual friend. Again, according to the comparison of unstandardized coefficients, the effect size of the distant friend variable on attitudes toward gay men was 1.9 times larger than that on attitudes toward lesbians. The significant effects of general contact, "distant friend," and "close friend" were mediated by the gender role and two types of

living experience in any foreign country variables only when the dependent variable was prejudice toward lesbians. However, the unstandardized coefficients of contact, “distant friend,” and “close friend” were similar across Models 2, 3 and 4 in attitudes toward lesbians.

Mothers’ education did not have any significant effect on the dependent variables. Although fathers’ education was not significantly related to attitudes toward lesbians, there was a marginally significant effect on attitudes toward gay men. Contrary to expectations, respondents whose fathers’ education was relatively high showed more prejudiced attitudes than those whose fathers’ education was relatively low.

Living experience in Western countries did not have a significant effect on attitudes toward gay men, but it was marginally significant on attitudes toward lesbians. Unexpectedly, respondents who had lived in a Western country expressed more prejudiced attitudes toward lesbians than those who had no such experience. The comparison of unstandardized coefficient demonstrated that the effect size of living experience was 2.7 times larger for attitudes toward lesbians than attitudes toward gay men. When living experience in any foreign country were entered in Phase 2, it was marginally significantly related to attitudes toward lesbians, but there was no significant effect on attitudes toward gay men. Respondents who had lived in any foreign country expressed more prejudiced attitudes toward lesbians than those who had never lived in any foreign country. The unstandardized coefficient for attitudes toward lesbians was 1.5 times larger than that for attitudes toward gay men.

Study 2: T-Test Results

To determine whether the mean prejudice scores for Japanese respondents differ from those for American respondents, I conducted a T-Test on each dependent and independent variable. Among the 11 variables including 3 dependent variables and 8 independent variables, 7 of them were significantly different between the Japanese and American samples. The results are presented in Table 7.

Approximately 66 percent and 88 percent of American and Japanese respondents, respectively, were women. The result of the T-Test suggested that the gender ratio was significantly different between Japanese and American respondents ($p < .001$). The mean values for fathers' education and mothers' education were 3.3 and 3.2 for American respondents and 3.5 and 3.0 for Japanese respondents, respectively. Fathers' education for both groups and mothers' education for American respondents only fell somewhere between "completed associate/technical school" and "completed four year college." Mothers' education for Japanese respondents fell in the "completed associate/technical school." The results of the T-Test demonstrated that the means for fathers' education were significantly different between the Japanese and American respondents, but those for mothers' education were not different.

Of the 746 American respondents, approximately 66 percent claimed that they had at least one homosexual friend. In contrast, only 13 percent of Japanese respondents knew at least one homosexual. Japanese and American respondents were significantly different in contact experience with homosexuals. Around six percent of American and seven percent of Japanese respondents reported that they had at least one close

Table 7. Mean Comparisons, Japan and the United States.

Variables	**Japan**		**U.S.A.**		**Mean Difference (JPN – USA)**
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	
Male	.12	.322	.34	.472	-.22***
Mothers' Education	2.99	.823	3.17	1.128	-.18
Fathers' Education	3.53	.956	3.28	1.195	.25*
MRS	28.34	6.155	27.40	6.986	.94
WRS	22.94	4.594	23.18	5.785	-.24
Contact Experience	.13	.343	.65	.477	-.52***
Close Friend	.07	.252	.06	.238	.01
Distant Friend	.09	.281	.57	.495	-.50***
ATLG	39.18	10.791	48.26	17.905	-9.08***
ATL	17.64	5.377	21.72	8.615	-4.08***
ATG	21.54	6.030	26.75	10.236	-5.21***

Note: MRS stands for men's role scale and WRS stands for women's role scale.
* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests)

homosexual friend. The percentage of American respondents who had at least one distant homosexual friend was approximately 58, and that of Japanese respondents was 9. T-Tests demonstrated that there was a significant difference for the "distant friend" variable between the Japanese and the American in the population, but no significant difference was observed for the "close friend" variable.

Contrary to my expectations that Japanese respondents would express rigid gender role attitudes, the results of the T-Tests suggested that both attitudes toward men's and women's gender roles were not significantly different between the Japanese and American samples. The mean scores for men's gender role attitudes were 27.4 for American respondents and 28.3 for Japanese respondents. Those for women's gender role attitudes were 23.2 and 23.0, respectively. The men's gender role scale ranges from 10 to 50 and the women's gender role scale from 11 to 55. Both Japanese and American respondents' men's gender role scores leaned toward the slightly egalitarian side. The Japanese and American respondents expressed more egalitarian beliefs in the women's gender role attitudes than the men's gender role attitudes.

The T-Tests demonstrated that the ATLG, ATL and ATG scores were significantly different between Japanese and American respondents. The mean ATLG, ATL and ATG scores were 48.3, 21.7, and 26.8 for American respondents and 39.2, 17.6, and 21.5 for Japanese respondents, respectively. As the ATLG score ranges from 20 to 100, the ATLG scores of both Japanese and American respondents fall in the relatively positive side. The ATL and ATG scales ranges from 10 to 50, and the mean scores also lean toward the relatively positive side. Across all three scales, American students scored higher, indicating greater prejudice. The difference between the mean Japanese and American ATL and ATG scores showed that American and Japanese students were more dissimilar on attitudes toward gay men than on attitudes toward lesbians.

Study 2: Japanese and American Attitudes toward Homosexuals, Phase 1

Table 8a presents the results of regression analysis for Japanese and American respondents' attitudes toward homosexuals. Contrary to my expectations, American respondents expressed more prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals than Japanese respondents in Model 1. Being American increased the ATLG scale by 8.8 points compared to being Japanese. Model 1 explained approximately four percent of variation.

The contact variable was entered in the equation in Model 2. American respondents still showed more prejudice toward homosexuals than Japanese respondents. After controlling for contact experience, the unstandardized coefficient increased by 172 percent, from 8.8 in Model 1 to 15.2 in Model 2. This change indicates that American respondents had more homosexual contacts than Japanese respondents, and American respondents with contact contributed to a decrease in the overall ATLG score. The contact variable itself also had a significant effect ($p < .001$). Respondents who had homosexual contact expressed fewer prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals than those who did not. Specifically, respondents with homosexual contact scored lower than those without such contact by 12 points. These two variables explained 14 percent of variation in prejudice toward homosexuals.

In Model 3, gender, parents' education and gender role attitudes were entered. Consistent with the previous two models, American respondents were more prejudiced toward homosexuals than Japanese respondents. The effect size of the unstandardized coefficient did not change between Models 2 and 3. Contact experience also had a significant effect. Respondents who had contact with homosexuals expressed less

Table 8a. OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Homosexuals, Japan and the United States

	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**
Japanese	-8.849***	-15.184***	-14.426***	-15.139***
	(1.472)	(1.535)	(1.409)	(1.557)
Contact Experiences		-11.995***	-9.355***	-9.771***
		(1.211)	(1.092)	(1.158)
Male			-2.197	-2.183
			(1.167)	(1.167)
Mothers' Education			.058	.066
			(.521)	(.521)
Fathers' Education			-1.622***	-1.633***
			(.487)	(.487)
Men's Role Attitudes			.703***	.697***
			(.075)	(.075)
Women's Role Attitudes			.837***	.839***
			(.094)	(.094)
Nationality * Contact				3.714
(1 = JPN)				(3.454)
Constant	47.999***	55.972***	21.491***	21.890***
	(.640)	(1.008)	(3.269)	(3.290)
R^2	.041	.140	.325	.326

Note: Numbers are unstandardized coefficients, standard errors are in parentheses.
* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests)

prejudice than those who did not. Gender was marginally significant ($p = .06$). Women had more positive attitudes toward homosexuals than men. Women's score was lower than men's by 2.2 points. Although mother's education did not affect prejudice significantly, father's education was significantly related to prejudice ($p < .001$). Respondents whose father had relatively high education showed fewer prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals than those whose father had relatively low education. Finally, the gender role attitude variables were also significant ($p < .001$). The results

suggested that respondents who had relatively traditional gender role attitudes expressed more prejudice than those who had relatively egalitarian gender role attitudes. A one point increase in attitudes toward men's and women's gender roles was worth .7 and .8 points on the ATLG scale, respectively. With all of these variables, 32.5 percent of variation was explained.

I entered the interaction effects of nationality and contact in Model 4 to determine whether contact experience affected prejudice toward homosexuals differently based on which country respondents reside. This variable was nonsignificant so that I concluded that contact experience with homosexuals had similar effects on prejudice toward homosexuals in the Japanese and American samples.

Study 2: Japanese and American Attitudes toward Homosexuals, Phase 2

In Model 2, I entered the "distant friend" and "close friend" variables, instead of the general contact variable. I present the unstandardized coefficients and standard errors in Table 8b. The results suggested that both variables had significant effects. Respondents who had at least one distant or who had at least one close homosexual friend showed fewer prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals than those who did not have such homosexual friends. Compared to the ATLG scores for respondents without distant or close homosexual friends, the scores were 5.2 and 12.2 points lower for respondents with "distant" and "close" friends, respectively. These two variables explained 15.4 percent of variation, which suggested that the two types of contact variables increased the R-squared by approximately .12 points from Model 1 (.04) to Model 2.

In Model 3, gender, parents' education and gender role attitudes were entered in the equation. After controlling for these variables, the "close friend" variable did not retain a significant effect, while the "distant friend" variable was still significant. Respondents with at least one distant homosexual friend expressed less prejudice toward homosexuals than those without such a homosexual friend. To identify which variables took away the explanatory power of "close friend," I conducted another regression analysis entering gender in Model 3, parents' education in Model 4, and gender role attitudes in Model 5. Although the "close friend" variable was consistently significant through Model 1 to 4, it became nonsignificant in Model 5. This change suggested that gender role attitudes mediated the effect for "close friend." In other words, respondents who had at least one close homosexual friend might have relatively egalitarian gender role attitudes so that they were less prejudiced than those who had no homosexual friend. I conducted a T-Test to test my argument. The results demonstrated that women's gender role attitudes were significantly different between respondents with at least one close homosexual friend and those without such a friend. However, men's gender role attitudes were not significantly different between the two groups, although it approached significance ($p = .08$). Men expressed less prejudice toward homosexuals than women. Men's ATLG score was lower than women's by 2.3 points. The significances and effect sizes of all other variables were similar to the results of Phase 1. With all of these variables, 33.4 percent of variation in attitudes toward homosexuals was explained.

Table 8b. OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Homosexuals, Japan and the United States

	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**
Japanese	-8.809***	-14.874***	-14.172***	-14.507***
	(1.470)	(1.500)	(1.382)	(1.490)
Close Friend		-5.214*	-3.051	-2.748
		(2.223)	(1.988)	(2.233)
Distant Friend		-12.192***	-9.569***	-9.828***
		(1.178)	(1.071)	(1.110)
Male			-2.271*	-2.305*
			(1.156)	(1.158)
Mothers' Education			.277	.264
			(.517)	(.518)
Fathers' Education			-1.599***	-1.596***
			(.483)	(.483)
Men's Role Attitudes			.686***	.686***
			(.075)	(.075)
Women's Role Attitudes			.829***	.832***
			(.093)	(.093)
Nationality * Close				-2.044
(1 = JPN)				(5.017)
Nationality * Distant				3.840
(1 = JPN)				(.355)
Constant	47.958***	55.439***	20.927***	21.029***
	(.639)	(.917)	(3.212)	(3.228)
R^2	.041	.157	.334	.335

Note: Numbers are unstandardized coefficients, standard errors are in parentheses.
* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests)

In Model 4, the interaction effects of nationality and two types of contact variables were entered. The results indicated that the interaction of these two variables did not have any significant effect on prejudice toward homosexuals.

Study 2: Japanese and American Attitudes toward Lesbians, Phase 1

Table 9a presents the results of the regression analysis for Japanese and American respondents' attitudes toward lesbians. In Model 1, American respondents expressed more prejudice toward lesbians than Japanese respondents. The ATL score for American respondents was higher than that of Japanese respondents by 3.9 points. The nationality variable explained 3.4 percent of variation in prejudice toward lesbians.

After controlling for contact experience, American respondents showed more prejudiced attitudes toward lesbians than Japanese respondents. The contact variable increased the explanatory power of nationality by approximately 167 percent from Model 1 (unstandardized coefficient = 3.9) to Model 2 (unstandardized coefficient = 6.5). When the amount of contact experience is similar, American respondents are more prejudiced than Japanese respondents. The American respondents scored higher on the ATL scale than the Japanese respondents by 6.5 points. Respondents who had homosexual contact expressed less prejudice toward lesbians than those who had no such contact. The former's ATL score was lower than the latter's by approximately 4.9 points. The nationality and contact variables explained 10.7 percent of variation in attitudes toward lesbians.

In Model 3, I entered gender, parents' education and gender role attitudes in the equation. Even after controlling for all of these variables, American respondents had more prejudiced attitudes toward lesbians than Japanese respondents. Consistent with the previous model, respondents with homosexual contact showed more positive attitudes toward lesbians than those without such contact. The unstandardized coefficients

Table 9a. OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Lesbians, Japan and the United States

	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**
Japanese	-3.877***	-6.469***	-6.297***	-6.641***
	(.707)	(.748)	(.704)	(.778)
Contact Experiences		-4.907***	-3.806***	-4.006***
		(.591)	(.546)	(.579)
Male			-1.876***	-1.869***
			(.583)	(.583)
Mothers' Education			.171	.175
			(.260)	(.260)
Fathers' Education			-.861***	-.866***
			(.244)	(.244)
Men's Role Attitudes			.301***	.298***
			(.037)	(.038)
Women's Role Attitudes			.390***	.391***
			(.047)	(.047)
Nationality * Contact				1.788
(1 = JPN)				(1.726)
Constant	21.499***	24.761***	9.695***	9.887***
	(.307)	(.488)	(1.635)	(1.644)
R^2	.034	.107	.264	.265

Note: Numbers are unstandardized coefficients, standard errors are in parentheses.
* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests)

for nationality and contact experience were similar to Model 2. Gender, father's education and men's and women's gender role attitudes were all significantly related to prejudice toward lesbians ($p < .001$). Compared to women, men expressed fewer prejudiced attitudes. Men scored lower in the ATL scale than women by approximately 1.9 points. Respondents whose fathers' education was relatively high expressed less prejudice than those whose fathers' education was relatively low. The ATL score of the former group was lower than that of the latter group by .9 points. Respondents who held relatively traditional gender role attitudes were more prejudiced than those who held

relatively egalitarian gender role attitudes. The scores of unstandardized coefficients for men's and women's gender role attitudes were .3 and .4, respectively. The effect size was similar between the two gender role attitude variables, which is indicated by the standardized coefficients. Mothers' education did not affect prejudice toward lesbians significantly. The independent variables in Model 3 explained 26.4 percent of variation.

In Model 4, the interaction effect of nationality and contact experience was not significantly related to prejudice toward lesbians. In other words, contact experience affected prejudice reduction similarly between Japanese and American respondents.

Study 2: Japanese and American Attitudes toward Lesbians, Phase 2

Table 9b shows the results of the regression analysis for Japanese and American respondents' attitudes toward lesbians. In Model 2, the "distant friend" variable had a significant effect on attitudes toward lesbians, but the "close friend" variable did not. Respondents with at least one distant homosexual friend expressed fewer prejudiced attitudes toward lesbians than those without such a homosexual friend. The former scored lower on the ATL scale than the latter by 5.1 points. The attitudes toward lesbians were similar between respondents with at least one close friend and those without such a homosexual friend. The contact variables explained 8.6 percent of variation in prejudice toward lesbians, and 12 percent of variation was explained by the three variables in Model 2.

Even after controlling for gender, parents' education, and gender role attitudes in Model 3, respondents who had at least one distant homosexual friend expressed less

Table 9b. OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Lesbians, Japan and the United States

	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**
Japanese	-3.856***	-6.407***	-6.274***	-6.395***
	(.707)	(.734)	(.693)	(.747)
Close Friend		-1.510	-.569	-.239
		(1.089)	(.997)	(1.120)
Distant Friend		-5.120***	-4.040***	-4.170***
		(.577)	(.537)	(.557)
Male			-1.932***	-1.959***
			(.580)	(.581)
Mothers' Education			.246	.234
			(.343)	(.260)
Fathers' Education			-.857***	-.853***
			(.242)	(.242)
Men's Role Attitudes			.293***	.294***
			(.037)	(.038)
Women's Role Attitudes			.387***	.390***
			(.047)	(.047)
Nationality * Close				-1.908
(1 = JPN)				(.449)
Nationality * Distant				2.011
(1 = JPN)				(2.080)
Constant	21.477***	24.576***	9.597***	9.609***
	(.307)	(.449)	(1.611)	(1.619)
R^2	.034	.120	.270	.271

Note: Numbers are unstandardized coefficients, standard errors are in parentheses.
* p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001 (two-tailed tests)

prejudice toward lesbians than those who had no homosexual friend. The ATL score of the former group was lower than that of the latter by 4.0 points. All variables in Model 3 explained 27.0 percent of variation. The results of all other variables were similar to the ones in Phase 1.

The interaction effects of nationality and the two types of contact variables did not affect prejudice toward lesbians significantly. Respondents with at least one close

homosexual friend or those with at least one distant homosexual friend were similar in prejudice toward lesbians between the Japanese and the American respondents.

Study 2: Japanese and Americans Attitudes toward Gay Men, Phase 1

I present the results of the regression analysis in Table 10a. In Model 1, the nationality variable had a significant effect on prejudice toward gay men ($p < .001$). American respondents expressed more prejudiced attitudes toward gay men than Japanese respondents. The ATG score of the former was higher than that of the latter by 5.0 points. This variable solely explained four percent of variation.

The contact variable was entered in Model 2. American respondents still showed more prejudiced attitudes toward gay men than Japanese respondents. The unstandardized coefficient in Model 2 (8.7) was 1.8 times larger than that in Model 1. The contact variable increased the explanatory power of nationality. Respondents with contact experience with homosexuals expressed fewer prejudiced attitudes toward gay men than those without such an experience. The former respondents' ATG score was lower than the latter respondents' by 7.1 points. These two variables explained 14.7 percent of variation in prejudice toward gay men.

I entered the gender, parents' education and gender role attitude variables in Model 3. The results demonstrated that American respondents were more prejudiced toward gay men than Japanese respondents. The unstandardized coefficient was similar to the one in Model 2. Consistent with Model 2, respondents who had contact with homosexuals were less prejudiced than those who did not have any contact. The former

Table 10a. OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Gay Men, Japan and the United States

	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**
Japanese	-4.972***	-8.715***	-8.129***	-8.499***
	(.837)	(.868)	(.797)	(.881)
Contact Experiences		-7.087***	-5.549***	-5.765***
		(.685)	(.618)	(.655)
Male			-.321	-.314
			(.660)	(.660)
Mothers' Education			-.113	-.109
			(.294)	(.295)
Fathers' Education			-.761**	-.766**
			(.275)	(.276)
Men's Role Attitudes			.402***	.399***
			(.042)	(.042)
Women's Role Attitudes			.447***	.448***
			(.053)	(.053)
Nationality * Contact				1.927
(1 = JPN)				(1.953)
Constant	26.500***	31.211***	11.796***	12.003***
	(.364)	(.570)	(1.849)	(1.861)
R^2	.040	.147	.332	.332

Note: Numbers are unstandardized coefficients, standard errors are in parentheses.
* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests)

scored lower on the ATG scale than the latter by 5.5 points. Surprisingly, gender as well as mothers' education did not affect the ATG score significantly. Father's education had a significant effect. The higher the fathers' education, the lower the ATG scale. Men's and women's gender role attitudes were significantly related to prejudiced attitudes toward gay men ($p < .001$). Respondents with relatively traditional gender role attitudes were more prejudiced than those with relatively egalitarian gender role attitudes. A one point increase on the men's and women's gender role attitudes were equivalent to .40 and .45

points increase on the ATG scale, respectively. With all the variables in Model 3, 33.2 percent of variation was explained.

In Model 4, the interaction effect of nationality and contact were entered. The results demonstrated that there was no significant effect on prejudice toward gay men. The effects of contact experience were similar between the Japanese and American respondents.

Study 2: Japanese and Americans Attitudes toward Gay Men, Phase 2

I present the unstandardized coefficients and standard errors in Table 10b. The results of Model 2 suggested that both "close friend" and "distant friend" were significantly related to prejudiced attitudes toward gay men. Respondents with at least one close homosexual friend were less prejudiced than those without such a homosexual friend. The average ATG scale of the former was lower than that of the latter by 3.7 points. Respondents who had at least one distant homosexual friend expressed less prejudice than those who had no such homosexual friend. The former scored lower on the ATG scale than the latter by 7.1 points. The nationality and the two types of contact variables explained 16.2 percent of variation in prejudice toward gay men, and the two contact variables solely explained 12.5 percent of variation.

Both the "close friend" and "distant friend" variables retained significant effects in Model 3 where gender, parents' education and gender role attitudes were entered. Although the "distant friend" variable was strongly related to prejudice ($p < .001$), the "close friend" variable had a slightly weaker relationship compared to the results of

Table 10b. OLS Regression of the Attitudes toward Gay Men, Japan and the United States

	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**
Japanese	-4.953***	-8.467***	-7.898***	-8.112***
	(.835)	(.848)	(.781)	(.843)
Close Friend		-3.704**	-2.482*	-2.509*
		(1.257)	(1.124)	(1.263)
Distant Friend		-7.072***	-5.529***	-5.658***
		(.666)	(.605)	(.628)
Male			-.339	-.346
			(.654)	(.655)
Mothers' Education			.031	.030
			(.292)	(.293)
Fathers' Education			-.742**	-.742**
			(.273)	(.273)
Men's Role Attitudes			.394***	.392***
			(.042)	(.042)
Women's Role Attitudes			.441***	.443***
			(.053)	(.053)
Nationality * Close				-.136
(1 = JPN)				(2.837)
Nationality * Distant				1.829
(1 = JPN)				(2.345)
Constant	26.481***	30.863***	11.331***	11.420***
	(.363)	(.519)	(1.816)	(1.825)
R^2	.040	.165	.341	.341

Note: Numbers are unstandardized coefficients, standard errors are in parentheses.
* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests)

Model 2 ($p < .05$). Respondents who had at least one close homosexual friend or who had at least one distant homosexual friend expressed fewer prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals than those who had no distant or close homosexual friend, respectively. From Model 2 to Model 3, 33 percent of the pure effect of "close friend" was taken away by the added variables in Model 3. The variables in Model 3 explained 34.1 percent of

variation in prejudiced attitudes toward gay men. Other results were similar to the ones of Phase 1.

The interaction effects of nationality and “close friend” and “distant friend” were not significantly related to prejudice in Model 4. Contact experience had similar effects across the two countries.

Chapter 7: Discussion

In this chapter, I verify whether my hypotheses were supported by Studies 1 and 2. I offered 13 hypotheses in Chapter 4. Of them, five were supported, one was partially supported, and seven were rejected. I present the summary of my hypotheses and whether they were supported in Table 11a for Study 1 and Table 11b for Study 2. For the eight hypotheses which were rejected or partially supported, I consider potential reasons.

Discussion: Study 1

The results demonstrated that Japanese heterosexual men expressed more prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals, lesbians, and gay men than Japanese heterosexual women. Hypothesis 1-1 and 1-2 were supported, but hypothesis 1-3, that men and women are not different in attitudes toward lesbians, was rejected. Gender became nonsignificant after controlling for gender role attitudes, and respondents who held relatively traditional gender role attitudes showed more prejudice than those who held relatively egalitarian gender role attitudes, which supported Hypothesis 2. This change demonstrates that Japanese men tend to have more traditional gender role beliefs, and then, are more prejudiced toward homosexuals. These results are consistent with Davies' (2004) and Louderback and Whitley's (2001) results. As Cullen et al. (2002) and Kite and Whitley (1996, 2003) argued, heterosexual men may be expected to follow traditional gender roles more rigidly than women, and Japanese men are not an exception. As a result, Japanese men expressed more prejudice toward gay men and lesbians, who tend to be considered violating traditional gender roles.

Consistent with the results of previous studies by Anderssen (2002), Cullen et al. (2002), and Herek and Capitanio (1996) and supporting Hypothesis 3-1, Japanese respondents with homosexual contact expressed fewer prejudiced attitudes than those without any homosexual contact. Also, supporting Hypothesis 3-3, Japanese respondents who had at least one distant homosexual friend were less prejudiced than those who had no such homosexual friend. However, there was no significant difference in the ATLG scale between Japanese respondents who had at least one close homosexual friend and those who had no such homosexual friend, which rejected Hypothesis 3-2. These results are contradictory to Herek and Capitanio's (1996) results which suggested that respondents who established close friendships with homosexuals were less prejudiced than those who had distant friendships.

One of the reasons that the "distant friend" variable was significant and the "close friend" variable was nonsignificant may lie in the generalization process. Pettigrew (1998) argued that "decategorization" is effective in the early friendship stage. Once friendship relationships are established, the high group salience contributes to the reduction of prejudice toward the whole group. Finally, the ideal is to reach "recategorization," where people pay attention to the superordinate category and consider that their friends are members of the same group as themselves. Eller and Abrams (2004) argued that people with close outgroup friends categorized their friends either in the interpersonal category (e.g. colleagues, classmates) or in the superordinate category (e.g. human beings). It is reasonable to consider "distant friendship" is in the high salience stage and "close friendship" is either in the interpersonal or in the "recategorization"

stage. Respondents who have distant homosexual friends may continuously recognize that their friends are homosexual, and then they belong to different groups. Therefore, their positive attitudes toward their distant friends were generalizable to all homosexuals. In contrast, those who have close homosexual friends may not focus on their friends' sexual orientation. Rather, they pay attention to other membership status, such as a sport team, workplace, or human beings. As a result, their positive attitudes toward their close homosexual friends may not be generalizable to all homosexuals.

Fathers' education had a marginally significant effect on prejudice toward gay men ($p < .1$), although it was not significantly related to prejudice toward homosexuals and lesbians. Mothers' education did not affect any of the dependent variables significantly. Respondents whose father attained relatively high education expressed more prejudice than those whose father attained relatively low education. The potential explanation for this result is that fathers with relatively high education may have more authoritarian characteristics, which may be passed on to their children. Japanese fathers who have relatively high education may have higher income than those who have relatively low education. Therefore, the former have more authority in the family than the latter. According to Herek (1984), respondents with more authoritarian characteristics, which include intolerance to ambiguity and controlling others, are more prejudiced toward homosexuals than those with fewer authoritarian characteristics.

Another reason may be lack of variation in education among the Japanese respondents. Because all Japanese respondents were college students, their relatively high educational attainments may mediate the effects of their parents' education. It is

Table 11a. List of Hypotheses and Results of Study 1

Hypothesis 1-1	Heterosexual men show more negative attitudes toward homosexuals than heterosexual women.	Supported
Hypothesis 1-2	Heterosexual men show more negative attitudes toward gay men than heterosexual women.	Supported
Hypothesis 1-3	Heterosexual men and women do not differ in their negative attitudes toward lesbians.	Rejected
Hypothesis 2	Heterosexuals with relatively traditional gender role attitudes have more prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals than those who hold relatively egalitarian gender role attitudes.	Supported
Hypothesis 3-1	Heterosexuals who have contact with homosexuals show fewer prejudiced attitudes than those who have no contact.	Supported
Hypothesis 3-2	Heterosexuals who have close relationships with homosexuals show fewer prejudiced attitudes than those who do not have close relationships with homosexuals.	Rejected
Hypothesis 3-3	Heterosexuals who have distant relationships with homosexuals show fewer prejudiced attitudes than those who do not have distant relationships with homosexuals.	Supported
Hypothesis 4-1	Heterosexuals whose fathers have more education are less prejudiced than those whose fathers have less education.	Partially Supported
Hypothesis 4-2	Heterosexuals whose mothers have more education are less prejudiced than those whose mothers have less education.	Rejected
Hypothesis 5-1	Heterosexuals with living experiences in Western countries are less prejudiced than those without such experiences.	Rejected
Hypothesis 5-2	Heterosexuals with living experiences in any foreign country are less prejudiced than those without such experiences.	Rejected

necessary to conduct another study using the national probability sample with variations in respondents' education.

Living experience in Western countries or in any foreign country was marginally significant in predicting Japanese respondents' attitudes toward lesbians. However, no significant relationship was observed in attitudes toward homosexuals and gay men. Surprisingly, the direction indicated that respondents with living experience were more prejudiced than those without such an experience. Therefore, Hypotheses 5-1 and 5-2 were rejected. There are two potential reasons. First, Japanese respondents may acquire prejudice toward homosexuals in the place they visit. For example, Herek et al. (2002) reported the frequent verbal abuse toward homosexuals in the United States. Japanese respondents may obtain prejudiced attitudes by seeing such behaviors. Second, Japanese respondents may not have clear images of Japanese homosexuals, but they acquire images of gay men and lesbians through exposure to foreign cultures. Those who have clear gay images may be more prejudiced than those who do not have such images.

Discussion: Study 2

I forwarded Hypothesis 6-1, which stated that Japanese respondents are more prejudiced toward homosexuals than American respondents, based on the assumption that Japanese respondents show more traditional gender role beliefs and have fewer contact experiences with homosexuals than American respondents. T-Tests demonstrated that there were no significant differences in gender role attitudes between Japanese and American respondents. Contrary to my expectations, American respondents expressed

more prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals than Japanese respondents. After controlling for contact experience, gender, parents' education, and gender role attitudes, American respondents were still more prejudiced than Japanese respondents. Both Hypotheses 6-1 and 6-2 were rejected.

One explanation for these results may be religious differences. Although I could not statistically test the effects of religious differences due to the difficulties measuring religious affiliations in Japan, approximately three quarters of American respondents practiced Christianity. Of them, more than half were Protestant, and nearly 10 percent were fundamentalists. In contrast, nearly 70 percent of Japanese respondents practiced Buddhism, and 1 percent practiced Shintoism. Approximately 24 percent reported that they did not practice any religion. Only three percent of Japanese respondents were Christians. As explained above, Christianity prohibits homosexual acts, but Buddhism, Shintoism, and Confucianism do not.

Another cultural difference may also be at work. Yasuoka (2002) found that Japanese people were more generous about various sexual practices than American people. He compared Japanese and American people's attitudes toward various sexual practices using the American data collected by Laumann et al. (1994) and the Japanese one by NHK, Japan's national television broadcaster, (1999). Japanese respondents gave two different answers to each question, one based on their individual opinion, and the other based on the societal standard. Approximately 65 percent of American respondents answered "always wrong" for the question "what is your opinion about sexual relations between two adults of the same sex?" (Laumann et al. 1994:999), while 48 percent of

Japanese respondents' individual opinion was "always wrong." The percentage dropped to 40 when Japanese respondents answered based on the societal standard. In addition, nearly 77 percent of American respondents chose "always wrong" for "a married person having sexual relations with someone other than marriage partner" and 61 percent chose "always wrong" for the question, "[w]hat if they are in their teens, say 14-16 year old? In that case, do you think sex relations before marriage are …" (Laumann et al. 1994:999). In contrast, the percentages of Japanese respondents who agreed to the first statement were 49 and 39, for the individual and societal standards, respectively. The question was phrased slightly differently, but 36 and 33 percent of Japanese respondents claimed that having sex before the age of 18 was always wrong for the individual and societal standards, respectively. Yasuoka (2002) stated that Christianity, which prohibits various sexual acts, may be a reason of these differences. As evidence, more than half of American respondents agreed to the statement, "[m]y religious beliefs have shaped and guided my sexual behavior" (Laumann et al. 1994:1000).

Finally, the active gay rights movement in the United States may produce two opposite opinions toward homosexuals among American people, while Japanese people may not take extreme positions due to lack of the movement. Cook and Hartnett (2001) found that American people were polarized as media reported homosexual issues more and more. In the United States, issues of homosexuality, such as same-sex marriage, are frequently discussed in newspapers and televisions. In other words, homosexual issues are more visible to American people. Because of this visibility, American people may take either one of positions, supporting gay rights or being against gay rights. In contrast,

there is no or are few, if any, discussions about issues of homosexuality in Japan. Therefore, Japanese people may have neutral attitudes toward homosexuals rather than extreme ones.

American respondents consistently expressed more prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals, lesbians, and gay men than Japanese respondents. After controlling for contact experiences, the effect of the nationality variable became larger. Because a large number of American respondents had either close or distant homosexual friends, and they held relatively positive attitudes toward homosexuals, the Americans' overall prejudice toward homosexuals looked less severe compared to Japanese respondents' when only the nationality variable was entered. In other words, if American respondents had fewer contact experiences with homosexuals like Japanese respondents, they could have been even far more prejudiced. However, none of the interaction effects of nationality and contact were significant. Contact experience had similar effects on prejudice for Japanese and American respondents. These results demonstrated the utility of contact theory when minority group members are homosexual, as supported by other studies (Anderssen 2002; Cullen et al. 2002; Herek and Capitanio 1996).

Table11b. List of Hypotheses and Results of Study 2

Hypothesis 6-1	Japanese university students have more negative attitudes toward homosexuals than American university students.	Rejected
Hypothesis 6-2	After controlling for gender roles and contact experiences, Japanese and American university students are not significantly different in their attitudes toward homosexuals.	Rejected

Both the “close friend” and “distant friend” variables were significantly related to prejudice toward homosexuals in Models 1 and 2. However, the effect of “close friend” was mediated by gender role attitudes, which indicates that respondents who had at least one close homosexual friend were more liberal in attitudes toward gender roles so that they were less prejudiced toward homosexuals. One possible explanation for this change is that respondents may learn more liberal gender role attitudes through close friendship with homosexuals, but not through distant friendship.

Heterosexual men expressed less prejudice toward lesbians than heterosexual women. This result is consistent with Herek’s (1998) and Kite and Whitley’s (2003). As Louderback and Whitley (2001) argue, heterosexual men may eroticize lesbian relations.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

In this section, I discuss four limitations of my research. The first limitation regards my sample. All of my Japanese respondents were university students so that there was no variation in their educational attainments and age. Furthermore, the sample was small, and the majority of respondents were female. In addition, I used my personal contact to collect these data. Although Herek and Capitanio (1996) argued that the studies using university students as respondents provided the similar results to the studies using the national probability sample in the United States, it is unknown whether Japanese university respondents can represent the whole Japanese population. Future research needs to collect data from the Japanese national sample using a nonprobability sampling method.

Second, as discussed previously, different religious beliefs between Japanese and American respondents may explain why American respondents expressed more prejudice toward homosexuals than Japanese respondents. However, I could not measure Japanese respondents' religiosity accurately. Because Japanese people have unique religious affiliations, the measures used frequently in the United States are not appropriate. To verify this assumption, researchers should generate new and different measures to accurately assess Japanese respondents' religiosity. Also, they should obtain data from a sizable number of Japanese Christians. In this way, researchers can clarify whether religious beliefs affect prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals.

Third, the process of attitudinal change of respondents with homosexual contact was unclear. I asked respondents whether they had homosexual friends. If their answer was yes, they were asked how many homosexual friends and what kinds of relationship they have. These questions did not address "*how* and *why* the change occurs" (Pettigrew 1998:70). To deal with these issues, researchers may ask respondents to answer questions about how they categorize their homosexual friends during everyday interactions. Do they regard their friends as homosexuals or do they use a different group status? These questions may clarify my assumption that respondents with distant homosexual friends are reminded of their friends' sexual orientations so that they are less prejudiced. In contrast, those with close homosexual friends are more prejudiced toward all homosexuals because they do not identify their friends as homosexuals and their positive attitudes toward their homosexual friends are not generalizable to the whole group.

Fourth, I used the revised version of Herek's (1994) Attitudes toward Lesbians and Gay Men scale. Using a back translation method, I heightened the accuracy of my translation. Although the high value of Crombach's alpha indicated high reliability of the scale, validity of the scale is as yet unknown. There are two reasons that I speculate that the scale may not have measured Japanese people's prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals accurately.

First, Japanese people use either *tatamae* or *honne* depending on situations. Citing Nakane (1970), Sugihara and Katsurada (2002:450) wrote that "[*t*]*atemae* refers to the conventional morals created based on societal consensus, whereas *honne* is the individual motives and opinions behind *tatemae.*" In other words, *tatemae* is "who one [is] supposed to be," while *honne* is "who one is" (Sugihara and Katsurada 2002:450). For example, the study about Japanese people's attitudes toward various sexual practices conducted by NHK (1999) asked their respondents to provide two answers based on their individual opinion and the societal standard. The answers based on the societal standard expressed more tolerant attitudes toward various sexual practices than those based on the individual opinion. Japanese people might have used *tatemae* in my questionnaire because the ATLG scale asked general issues about gay men and lesbians, which may be the reason that American respondents were more prejudiced than Japanese respondents.

Lim (2002) used a different measure in her study of attitudes toward homosexuals in Singapore. Her scale directly addressed personal feelings toward homosexuals, and she specified in several questions that homosexuals were someone close to respondents. For example, the questions included "I would feel disappointed if I learned that my child was

homosexual," "I would be upset if I learned that my brother or sister was homosexual," and "I would feel at ease talking with a homosexual person at a party." These questions may be able to reveal *honne* rather than *tatemae* more accurately. Future research may utilize a different scale to measure Japanese people's prejudice toward homosexuals.

Second, the type of discrimination in Japan may be different from that of the United States. Japanese people traditionally use *murahachibu* as a punishment. Japanese people stop exchanging any type of communication with those who violate rules. Although they are not abused physically, they are isolated from others and suffer psychologically. *Murahachibu* is still commonly used as bullying at school in Japan and one of the biggest problems causing suicides among teenagers. Herek's (1996) ATLG scale addresses homosexuals' rights and the appropriateness of sexual acts between same-sex people. This scale may not capture the Japanese style of covert discrimination. Researchers should consider this issue in future research.

Chapter 8: Conclusion

In this thesis, I examined Japanese university students' prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals and compared them with Americans' prejudiced attitudes. Although there are several limitations, this study has three major contributions. First, this is the first study addressing prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals among Japanese heterosexuals. Therefore, this study contributes to an understanding of Japanese heterosexuals' prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals.

Second, I can suggest ways to improve the situation for homosexuals in Japan from the results of this study. For example, my study indicated that respondents who had contact experience with homosexuals and who had relatively egalitarian gender role attitudes expressed more positive attitudes toward homosexuals. Because not many homosexuals are "out" in Japan, the majority of heterosexuals do not have homosexual friends. However, rather than asking more homosexuals to come out, as Herek and Capitanio (1996) did, I suggest that it is important to create an environment in which Japanese homosexuals can safely disclose their sexual orientations. Once the environment for homosexuals in Japan is better, more homosexuals will come out, and heterosexuals' prejudice will be reduced. It seems that Japanese heterosexuals hold stereotypes that homosexuals are gender-inverted so that traditional gender role beliefs affected prejudice negatively. Promoting egalitarian gender role beliefs and separating homosexual images from gender-inversion are two potential ways to create a better environment for homosexuals in Japan.

Finally, this study implicates the importance of cross-national study. The cross-national study makes clear where one society stands in compared to the other society. By comparing Japanese university students' prejudice toward homosexuals with American university students', I clarified the degree of prejudice in two different countries. On one hand, this study contributes to the understanding of Japanese college students' prejudice toward homosexuals as the first study addressing this issue. On the other hand, this study explains that contact experience with homosexuals and variables not used in this analysis are the important factors to consider prejudice toward homosexuals in the United States. One potential variable is religion. Christianity in the United States plays an important role to create beliefs and attitudes among American people. Researchers should pay extra attention to the effect of contact experience with homosexuals and Christianity on prejudice toward homosexuals in the United States.

In addition, this study stresses the importance of considering cultural characteristics. Specifically, the measures used in Western countries may not have accurately assessed Japanese people's prejudice toward homosexuals. The results suggested that American respondents expressed more prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals than Japanese respondents. These results are contradictory to my personal impression that the situation for homosexuals in Japan is harsher than that in the United States. Instead of concluding that Japan is more accepting homosexuals than the United States, researchers should conduct further studies taking Japanese cultural characteristics into consideration.

To create the more comfortable environment for homosexuals regardless of where they live, future research should deepen the understanding of prejudice toward homosexuals.

References

Adam, Barry D. 1998. "Theorizing Homophobia." *Sexualities* 1(4):387-404.

Aguero, Joseph E., Laura Bloch and Donn Byrne. 1984. "The Relationships among Sexual Beliefs, Attitudes, Experience, and Homophobia." *Journal of Homosexuality* 10(1/2):95-107.

Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. New York, NY: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Altemeyer, Bob. 2001. "Changes in Attitudes toward Homosexuals." *Journal of Homosexuality* 42(2):63-75.

Anderssen, Norman. 2002. "Does Contact with Lesbians and Gays Lead to Friendlier Attitudes? A Two Year Longitudinal Study." *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 12:124-136.

Baker, Janet G. and Harold D. Fishbein. 1998. "The Development of Prejudice towards Gays and Lesbians by Adolescents." *Journal of Homosexuality* 36(1):89-100.

Basow, Susan A. and Kelly Johnson. 2000. "Predictors of homophobia in female college students." *Sex Roles* 42(5/6):391-404.

Battle, Juan and Anthony J. Lemelle, Jr. 2002. "Gender Differences in African American Attitudes Toward Gay Males." *The Western Journal of Black Studies* 26(3):134-139.

Baunach, Dawn and Elisabeth O. Burgess. 2002. *Georgia State University, Social Life Survey*. Atlanta, GA: D. Baunach and E. O. Burgess [producers and distributors].

Baunach, Dawn., Elisabeth O. Burgess and Courtney Muse. n.d. "The Effects of Homosexual Contact on Heterosexual Sexual Prejudice." Department of Sociology, Georgia State University, GA.

Bernstein, M., C. Kostelac, & E. Gaarder. 2003. "Understanding 'Heterosexism:' Applying Theories of Racial Prejudice to Homophobia Using Data From a Southwestern Police Department." *Race, Gender & Class* 10(4):54-74.

Bernstein, Mary, Constance Kostelac and Emily Gaarder. 2003. "Understanding 'Heterosexism:' Applying Theories of Racial Prejudice to Homophobia Using Data from a Southwestern Police Department." *Race, Gender & Class* 10(4):54-74.

Biddle, Bruce J. 1979. *Role Theory: Expectations, Identities, and Behaviors*. New York, NY: Academic Press, Inc.

Bouton, Richard A., Peggy E. Gallagher, Paul A. Garlinghouse, Terri Leal, Leslie D. Rosenstein and Robert K. Young. 1987. "Scales for Measuring Fear of AIDS and Homophobia." *Journal of Personality Assessment* 51(4):606-614.

Bowen, Anne M. and Martin J. Bourgeois. 2001. "Attitudes toward Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual College Students: The Contribution of Pluralistic Ignorance, Dynamic Social Impact, and Contact Theories." *Journal of American College Health* 50(2):91-96.

Brewer, Marilynn B. 1984. "Beyond the Contact Hypothesis: Theoretical Perspectives on Desegregation." Pp.281-302 in *Groups in Contact: The Psychology of Desegregation,* edited by N. Miller and M. B. Brewer. New York, NY: Academic Press, Inc.

-----. 1996. "When Contact Is Not Enough: Social Identity and Intergroup Cooperation." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 20(3/4):291-303.

Brewer, Marilynn B. and Norman Miller. 1988. "Contact and Cooperation: When Do They Work?." Pp.315-326 in *Eliminating Racism: Profiles in Controversy,* edited by P. A. Katz and D. A. Taylor. New York, NY: Plenum.

Clausell, Eric and Susan T. Fiske. 2005. "When Do Subgroup Parts Add Up to the Stereotypic Whole? Mixed Stereotype Content for Gay Male Subgroups Explains Overall Ratings." *Social Cognition* 23(2):161-181.

Cook, Timothy E. and Bevin Hartnett. 2001. "Splitting Images: The Nightly Network News and the Politics of the Lesbian and Gay Movement, 1969 – 1978." Pp. 286-317 in *Sexual Identities Queer Politics*, edited by M. Blasius. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cullen, Jenifer M., Lester W. Wright, Jr. and Michael Alessandri. 2002. "The Personality Variable Openness to Experience as it Relates to Homophobia." *Journal of Homosexuality* 42(4):119-134.

Davies, James A., Tom W. Smith and Peter V. Marsden. 2005. *General Social Surveys, 1972-2004* [computer file]. 2nd ICPSR Version. Chicago, IL: National Opinion Research Center [producer], 2005. Storrs, CT: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut / Ann Arbor, Mi: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research / Berkeley, CA: Computer-assisted Survey Methods Program (http://sda.berkeley.edu), University of California [distributors].

Davies, Michelle. 2004. "Correlates of negative attitudes toward gay men: Sexism, male role norms, and male sexuality." *Journal of Sex Research* 41(3):259-266.

Eagly, A. H. 1987. *Sex Differences in Social Behavior: A Social-Role Interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Eller, Anja and Dominic Abrams. 2004. "Come Together: Longitudinal Comparison of Pettigrew's Reformulated Intergroup Contact Model and the Common Ingroup Indentity Model in Anglo-French and Mexican-American Contexts." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 34:229-256.

Feinman, Saul. 1981. "Why Is Cross-Sex-Role Behavior More Approved for Girls than for Boys? A Status Characteristic Approach." *Sex Roles* 7(3):289-300.

Fine, Gary A. 1979. "The Pinkson Settlement: An Historical and Social Psychological Investigation of the Contact Hypothesis." *Phylon* 40(3):229-242.

Franklin, Karen. 2000. "Antigay Behaviors Among Young Adults: Prevalence, Patterns, and Motivations in a Noncriminal Population." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 15(4):339-362.

Geiger, Wendy, Jake Harwood and Mary. L. Hummert. 2006. "College Students' Multiple Stereotypes of Lesbians: A Cognitive Perspective." *Journal of Homosexuality* 51(3):165-182.

Glassner, Barry and Carol Owen. 1976. "Variations in Attitudes toward Homosexuality." *Cornell Journal of Social Relations* 11(2):161-176.

Glenn, Norval D. and Charles N. Weaver. 1979. "Attitudes toward Premarital, Extramarital and Homosexual Relations in the U. S. in the 1970s." *Journal of Sex Research* 15(2):108-118.

Haaga, David A. F. 1991. "'Homophobia?'." *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality* 6(1):171-174.

Herek, Gregory M. 1984. "Beyond 'homophobia': A social psychological perspective on attitudes toward lesbians and gay men." *Journal of Homosexuality* 10(1):121-129.

-----. 1988. "Heterosexuals' Attitudes toward Lesbians and Gay Men: Correlates and Gender Differences." *Journal of Sex Research* 25(4):451-477.

-----. 2000. "Sexual Prejudice and Gender: Do Heterosexuals' Attitudes toward Lesbians and Gay Men Differ?." *Journal of Social Issues* 56(2):251-266.

-----. 2002. "Gender Gaps in Public Opinion about Lesbians and Gay Men." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 66:40-66.

-----. 2004. "Beyond 'Homophobia': Thinking about Sexual Prejudice and Stigma in the Twenty-First Century. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy* 1:6-24.

Herek, Gregory M. and Eric K. Glunt. 1993. "Interpersonal Contact and Heterosexuals' Attitudes toward Gay Men: Results from a National Survey." *The Journal of Sex Research* 30(3):239-244.

Herek, Gregory M. and John P. Capitanio. 1995. "Black Heterosexuals' Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men in the United States." *Journal of Sex Research* 32(2).

-----. 1996. "'Some of my best friends': Intergroup contact, concealable stigma, and heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men and lesbians." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 22(4):412-424.

-----. 1999. "Sex Differences in How Heterosexuals Think about Lesbians and Gay Men: Evidence from Survey Context Effects." *Journal of Sex Research* 36(4):348-360.

Herek, Gregory M., Jeanine C. Cogan and J. Roy Gillis. 2002. "Victim Experiences in Hate Crimes Based on Sexual Orientation." *Journal of Social Issues* 58(2):319-339.

Hewstone, Miles and Rupert Brown. 1986. "Contact is not Enough: An Intergroup Perspective on the 'Contact Hypothesis'." Pp.1-44 in *Contact and Conflict in Intergroup Encounters*, edited by M. Hewstone and R. Brown. New York, NY: Basil Blackwell.

Hirao, Keiko. 2001. "Mothers as the Best Teachers: Japanese Motherhood and Early Childhood Education." Pp. 180-203 in *Women's Working Lives in East Asia,* edited by Mary C. Brinton. California: Stanford University Press.

Hopwood, Max. and John Connors. 2002. "Heterosexual Attitudes to Homosexuality: Homophobia at a Rural Australian University." *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services* 14(2):79-94.

Human Development Report. 2006. *The Gender Empowerment Measure*. The United Nations Development Programme [producer]. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan [distributor]. Retrieved May 4, 2007. (http://hdr.undp.org/hdr2006/pdfs/report/HDR06-complete.pdf)

Ichikawa, Seiichi. 2005. *Gei, Bai Sekusyaru Dansei no HIV Kansen Yobou Koudou to Shinri, Shakai teki Youin ni Kansuru Kenkyuu*. (A Study of Gay and Bisexual Men's HIV Prevention, Psychology, and Social Factors). Japan, Nagoya: Hasegawa Insatsu.

Ishida, Hitoshi and Takanori Murakami. 2006. "The Process of Divergence between 'Men Who Love Men' and 'Feminised Men' in Postwar Japanese Media." Translated by W. Lunsing. *Intersections: Gender, History and Culture in Asian Context* 12. Retrieved May 15, 2007. (http://wwwsshe.murdoch.edu.au/intersections/default.htm).

Iwama, Akiko. 2005. "Social Stratification and the Division of Household Labor in Japan: The Effect of Wives' Work on the Division of Labor among Dual-earner Families." *International Journal of Japanese Sociology* 14:15-31.

Kite, Mary E. and Bernard E. Whitley, Jr. 2003. "Do Heterosexual Women and Men Differ in Their Attitudes toward Homosexuality?: A Conceptual and Methodological Analysis." Pp. 165-187 in *Psychological Perspectives on Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Experiences* (2nd Ed.), edited by L. D. Garnets and D. C. Kimmel. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kite, Mary E. and Kay Deaux. 1986. "Attitudes toward Homosexuality: Assessment and Behavioral Cconsequences." *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 7(2):137-162.

Kite, Mary E. and Kay Deaux. 1987. "Gender Belief Systems: Homosexuality and the Implicit Inversion Theory." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 11:83-96.

Kobayashi, Hiroaki. 2005. "Religion in the Public Sphere: Challenges and Opportunities in Japan." *Brigham Young University Law Review* 3:683-710.

LaMar, Lisa. and Mary Kite. 1998. "Sex Differences in Attitudes toward Gay Men and Lesbians: A Multidimentional Perspective." *Journal of Sex Research* 35(2).

Lance, Larry M. 1987. "The Effects of Interaction with Gay Persons on Attitudes toward Homosexuality." *Human Relations* 40(6):329-336.

Larsen, Knud S., Michael Reed and Susan Hoffman. 1980. "Attitudes of Heterosexuals toward Homosexuality: A Likert-Type Scale and Construct Validity." *Journal of Sex Research* 16(3):245-257.

Larsen, Knud S., Rodney Cate. and Michael Reed. 1983. "Anti-Black Attitudes, Religious Orthodoxy, Permissiveness, and Sexual Information: A Study of the Attitudes of Heterosexuals toward Homosexuality." *Journal of Sex Research* 19(2):105-118.

Laumann, Edward O., John H. Gagnon, Robert T. Michael and Stuart Michaels. 1994. *The Social Organization of Sexuality: Sexual Practices in the United States*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Lee, Barrett. A., Chad R. Farrell and Bruce G. Link. 2004. "Revisiting the Contact Hypothesis: The Case of Public Exposure to Homelessness." *American Sociological Review* 69:40-63.

Leonard, Arthur S. 1991. "From Law: Homophobia, Heterosexism and Judicial Decision Making." *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psychotherapy* 1(4):65-91.

Leupp, Gary P. 1995. *Male Colors: The Construction of Homosexuality in Tokugawa Japan*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Levitt, Eugene E. and Albert D. Klassen, Jr. 1974. "Public Attitudes toward Homosexuality: Part of the 1970 National Survey by the Institute for Sex Research." *Journal of Homosexuality* 1(1):29-43.

Lim, Vivien K. G. 2002. "Gender differences and attitudes toward homosexuality." *Journal of Homosexuality* 43(1):85-97.

Lippa, Richard A. and Francisco D. Tan. 2001. "Does Culture Moderate the Relationship between Sexual Orientation and Gender-Related Personality Traits?" *Cross-Cultural Research* 35(1):65-87.

Logan, Colleen R. 1996. "Homophobia? No, Homoprejudice." *Journal of Homosexuality* 31(3):31-53.

Long, Daniel. 1996. "Formation Processes of Some Japanese Gay Argot Terms." *American Speech* 71(2):215-224.

Lorde, Audre. 1984. "*Sister Outsider*." California, CA: The Crossing Press.

Louderback, Laura A. and Bernard E. Whitley, Jr. 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." *Journal of Sex Research* 34(2):175-182.

MacDonald, A. P., Jr. and Richard G. Games. 1974. "Some characteristics of those who hold positive and negative attitudes toward homosexuals." *Journal of Homosexuality* 1(1):9-27.

Marsiglio, William. 1993. "Attitudes toward Homosexual Activity and Gays as Friends: A National Survey of Heterosexual 15- to 19-Year-Old Males." *Journal of Sex Research* 30(1):12-17.

McLelland, Mark J. 2000. *Male Homosexuality in Modern Japan: Cultural Myth and Social Realities*. Richmond: Curzon Press.

Millham, J., Christopher L. San Miguel and Richard Kellogg. 1976. "A Factor-Analytic Conceptualization of Attitudes toward Male and Female Homosexuals." *Journal of Homosexuality* 2(1):3-10.

Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport. 2005. *Chiiki Repooto*. (A Regional Report.) Retrieved March 27, 2007 (http://wwwsr.mlit.go.jp/).

Mohr, Jonathan J. and William E. Sedlacek. 2000. "Perceived Barriers to Friendship with Lesbians and Gay Men Among University Students." *Journal of College Student Development* 41(1):70-79.

Morin, Stephen F. and Ellen M. Garfinkle. 1978. "Male Homophobia." *Journal of Social Issues* 34(1):29-47.

Moulton III, John L. and Carolyn E. Adams-Price. 1997. "Homosexuality, Heterosexuality, and Cross-Dressing: Perceptions of Gender Discordant Behavior." *Sex Roles* 37(5/6):441-450.

National Institute of Population and Social Security Research, Japan. 2002. *The Second National Survey on Family in Japan*. Retrieved March 27, 2006 (http://www.ipss.go.jp/index-e.html).

Neisen, Joseph H. 1990. "Heterosexism: Redefining Homophobia for the1990s." *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psychotherapy* 1(3):21-35.

NHK 2002. *Deeta Bukku Nihonjin no Seikoudou/Seiishiki*. (Data Book of Japanese People's Sexual Practices and Attitudes toward Sexuality). Japan: Nihon Housou Shuppan Kyoukai.

Overby, L. Marvin and Jay Barth. 2002. "Contact, Community Context, and Public Attitudes toward Gay Men and Lesbians." *Polity* 34(3):432-456.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. 1998. "Intergroup Contact Theory." *Annual Review of Psychology* 49:65-85.

Pratte, Trish. 1993. "A Comparative Study of Attitudes toward Homosexuality: 1986 and 1991." *Journal of Homosexuality* 26(1):77-83.

Rich, Adrienne. 1980. "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 5:631-660.

Roberson, James. 2005. "Fight!! *Ippatsu*!!: 'Genki' Energy Drinks and the Marketing of Masculine Ideology in Japan." *Men and Masculinities* 7(4):365-384.

Rothbart, Myron and Oliver P. John. 1985. "Social Categorization and Behavioral Episodes: A Cognitive Analysis of the Effects of Intergroup Contact." *Journal of Social Issues* 41(3):81-104.

Rubin, Gayle S. 1984. "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality. Pp. 267-319 in *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality,* edited by Carole S. Vance. New York: Routledge.

Sakalli, Nuray and Ozanser Uğurlu. 2002. "The Effects of Social Contact with a Lesbian Person on the Attitudes Change toward Homosexuality in Turkey." *Journal of Homosexuality* 44(1):111-119.

Sakalli, Nuray. 2002. "The Relationship between Sexism and Attitudes toward Homosexuality in a Sample of Turkish College Students." *Journal of Homosexuality* 42(3):53-64.

Schneider, Beth E. and Meredith Gould. 1987. "Female Sexuality: Looking Back Into the Future." Pp. 120-153 in *Analyzing Gender: A Handbook of Social Science Research,* edited by Beth B. Hess and Myra M. Ferree. California, CA: Sage Publication, Inc.

Schope, Robert D. and Michele J. Eliason. 2000. "Thinking Versus Acting: Assessing the Relationship between Heterosexual Attitudes and Behaviors toward Homosexuals." *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services* 11(4):69-92.

-----. 2004. "Sissies and Tomboys: Gender Role Behaviors and Homophobia." *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services* 16(2):73-97.

Schulte, Lisa J. 2002. "Similarities and Differences in Homophobia among African Americans Versus Caucasians." *Race, Gender & Class* 9(4):71.

Seidman, Steve, Chet Meeks and Francie Traschen. 1999. "Beyond the Closet? The Changing Social Meaning of Homosexuality in the United States." *Sexualities* 2(1):9-34.

Steffens, Melanie C. and Christof Wagner. 2004. "Attitudes toward Lesbian, Gay Men, Bisexual Women, and Bisexual Men in Germany." *Journal of Sex Research* 41(2).

Sugihara, Yoko and Emiko Katsurada. 2000. "Gender-Role Personality Traits in Japanese Culture." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 24:309-318.

-----. 2002. "Gender Role Development in Japanese Culture: Diminishing Gender Role Differences in a Contemporary Society." *Sex Roles* 47(9/10):443-452.

Sunagawa, Hideki. 2006. "Japan's Gay History." Translated by M. McLelland. *Intersections: Gender, History and Culture in Asian Context* 12. Retrieved May 15, 2007. (http://wwwsshe.murdoch.edu.au/intersections/default.htm).

Takeda, John M. 1997. "The Spirits of the Dead: Christianity, Buddhism and Traditional Belief in Japan." *Anglican Theological Review* 79(1):27-37.

Theodore, Peter S. and Susan A. Basow. 2000. "Heterosexual Masculinity and Homophobia: A Reaction to the Self?" *Journal of Homosexuality* 40(2):31-48.

Thompson, Edward H., Jr. and Joseph H. Pleck. 1986. "The Structure of Male Role Norms." *American Behavioral Scientist* 29:531-543.

Tropp, Linda R. and Thomas F. Pettigrew. 2005. "Differential Relationships between Intergroup Contact and Affective and Cognitive Dimensions of Prejudice." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 31(8):1145-1158.

Tsuya, Noriko O. and Larry L. Bumpass. "Gender and Housework." Pp.114-133 in *Marriage, Work & Family Life in Comparative Perspective* edited by N. O. Tsuya and L. L. Bumpass. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Twenge, Jean M. 1997. "Changes in Masculine and Feminine Traits Over Time: A Meta-Analysis." *Sex Roles* 36(5/6):305-325.

Van Dick, R., Wagner, Rlrich, Thomas F., Pettigrew, Oliver Christ, Carina Wolf, Thomas Petzel, Vanessa S. Castro and James S. Jackson. 2004. "Role of Perceived Importance in Intergroup Contact." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 87(2):211-227.

Watanabe, Tsuneo and Jun'ichi Iwata. 1989. *The Love of the Samurai: A Thousand Years of Japanese Homosexuality*. Translated by D. R. Roberts. Boston, MA: Alyson Publications Inc.

Weinberg, George. 1972. *Society and the Healthy Homosexual*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Whitley, Bernard, Jr. E. 1987. "The Relationship of Sex-Role Orientation to Heterosexuals' Attitudes toward Homosexuals." *Sex Roles* 17(1/2):103-113.

-----. 1988. "Sex Differences in Heterosexuals' Attitudes toward Homosexuals: It Depends on What You Ask." *Journal of Sex Research* 24:287-291.

Wickberg, Daniel. 2000. "Homophobia: On the Cultural History of an Idea." *Critical Inquiry* 27(1):42-57.

Women's International Network News. 2003. "Japan: Gender Gap in Family Responsibilities Still Great." Retrieved May 3, 2007. (http://web.ebscohost.com)

Wright, Erik O, Janeen Baxter, and Gunn E. Birkelund. 1995. "The Gender Gap in Workplace Authority: A Cross-National Study." *American Sociological Review* 60(3):407-435.

Yasuoka, Masaharu. 2002. *Amerika Shakai Gairon: Kawaru Kazoku, Danjo Kankei*. (An Introduction to American Society: Changing Family and Male-Female Relationship). Retrieved May 25, 2007 (http://ccs.cla.kobe-u.ac.jp/staff/yasuoka/WWW/amesha20021121.htm).

Appendices

Appendix A

研究参加承諾書
ジョージア州立大学　社会学科
日本人大学生の同性愛、エイズ患者に対する考えに関する研究

この研究ではあなたについての基本的な事柄、あなたの他者との関係、そしてあなたの信条や考えについてお聞きします。これらの情報は日本人大学生が同性愛者やエイズ患者に対し、どのような考えを持っているかを知る上でとても大切なものです。この研究は直接個人に利益はないかもしれませんが、人々の行動や考えを理解するのに役立つものです。答えづらい部分もあるとは重いますが、できるかぎり答えてくださるようお願いいたします。アンケートの所要時間は約 25 分間です。

アンケートに答えるにあたり生じると思われる危険性がいくつかあります。このアンケートではあなたのセクシャリティや同性愛者、エイズ患者に対する考えをお聞きする部分があります。これらの私的な質問を聞かれることに対して、不快感を感じる方もいると思われます。もしこのアンケートによって感情的、精神的な問題が生じた場合は、代表研究者である伊藤大将に連絡をおとりください。あなたと話をしたり、もし必要であればカウンセラーを紹介することもできます。（カウンセリングにかかる費用は研究の参加者に払っていただくこととなります。）

あなたからいただいた回答とアンケートは法の下で管理されます。アンケートはあなたの名前ではなくアンケート番号が使用されます。個人の名前やその他あなた個人だと判断されるような情報は結果報告時に開示されることはありません。データは団体単位で分析、要約されます。個人情報の秘密は厳守されます。

この研究に関して質問や懸念がある場合、代表研究者の伊藤大将(thaishowow@hotmail.com、または+1-404-644-7011)に連絡をおとりください。またあなたのこの研究における参加者としての権利に質問や懸念がある場合、人間を対象とした研究においてその参加者の権利を防護する役割を果たすジョージア州立大学の Institutional Review Board へ連絡をおとりください。連絡先はスーザン・ヴォトナー(+1-404-463-0674)です。

この研究への参加はあなたの自主性にゆだねられています。あなたはこの研究への参加を拒否する権利を有します。また参加すると承諾した後でも、研究への参加をいつでも取りやめる権利を有します。質問をとばすことも可能です。しかしあなたが参加意志を取り消す前までにすでに使われた情報が削除されることはありません。どのような結論を下した場合でも、そのことにより罰則を受けることや利益を失うことは一切ありません。

このアンケートの質問に答えることは上の文章を読み理解したうえでこの研究に参加することを意味します。

次の質問に答えてください。選択肢のある質問は質問の隣にあるカッコ内の指示に従ってください。

あなたは現在何年生ですか。（一つだけに○をつけてください。）

1. 1年生
2. 2年生
3. 3年生
4. 4年生

2. あなたは現在何歳ですか。 _____ 歳

3. あなたの性別はどちらですか。
   1. 男性
   2. 女性

4. 兄弟、姉妹はいますか。
   1. はい （5番の質問へ）
   2. いいえ （6番の質問へ）

5. a）妹は何人いますか。 _____ 人

   b）姉は何人いますか。 _____ 人

   c) 弟は何人いますか。 _____ 人

   d) 兄は何人いますか。 _____ 人

6. あなたは中学1年生の時にどの県、市町村に住んでいましたか。

   _____ 県 _____ 市・町・村 (一つに○を)

7. 海外に住んだ経験がありますか。
   1. はい (8番の質問へ)
   2. いいえ (9番の質問へ)

8. どの国に住んでいましたか。また、どれくらいの期間住んでいましたか。すべて書き出してください。

1. _____ _____ 年 _____ ヶ月

2. _____ _____ 年 _____ ヶ月

3. _____ _____ 年 _____ ヶ月

4. _____ _____ 年 _____ ヶ月

この後の質問ではあなたの母親と父親についてお聞きします。このアンケートは、母親はあなたを育てた女性(継母やおばあさんなど)、父親はあなたを育てた男性(継父やおじいさんなど)、を意味します。

9. あなたの母親と父親の最終学歴はどれですか。

	母親	父親
中学卒業	1	1
高校卒業	2	2
専門学校卒業	3	3
短期大学卒業	4	4
4 年大学卒業	5	5
大学院修士号	6	6
大学院博士号	7	7

10. あなたのセクシャリティは以下のどれですか。

1. 異性愛者 (13 番の質問へ)
2. 両性愛者 (バイセクシャル) (11 番 12 番の質問へ)
3. 男性同性愛者(ゲイ) (11 番 12 番の質問へ)
4. 女性同性愛者(レズビアン) (11 番 12 番の質問へ)
5. その他 (11 番 12 番の質問へ)

その他を選んだ人は具体的に書いてください。

_____

11. あなたのセクシャリティを誰に伝えたこと、あるいはカミングアウトしたことがありますか。当てはまるものすべてに○をつけてください。
    1. 父親
    2. 母親
    3. 兄弟、姉妹
    4. おじいさん、おばあさん
    5. その他の家族
    6. 仲のいい両性愛者、同性愛者の友達
    7. 仲のいい異性愛者の友達
    8. その他の両性愛者、同性愛者の友達
    9. その他の異性愛者の友達
    10. 両性愛者、同性愛者の知り合い
    11. 異性愛者の知り合い
    12. 仕事場の同僚
    13. 近所の人
    14. その他

        その他を選んだ人は具体的に書いてください。

        _____

    15. 誰にもしたことがない

12. 誰にあなたのセクシャリティを伝える、あるいはカミングアウトする事を避けましたか。当てはまるものすべてに○をつけてください。
    1. 父親
    2. 母親
    3. 兄弟、姉妹
    4. おじいさん、おばあさん
    5. その他の家族
    6. 仲のいい両性愛者、同性愛者の友達
    7. 仲のいい異性愛者の友達
    8. その他の両性愛者、同性愛者の友達
    9. その他の異性愛者の友達
    10. 両性愛者、同性愛者の知り合い
    11. 異性愛者の知り合い
    12. 仕事場の同僚
    13. 近所の人
    14. その他

        その他を選んだ人は具体的に書いてください。

        _____

13. あなたには現在同性愛者の友達、あるいは家族がいますか。
    1. はい　　(14 番、15 番の質問へ）)
    2. いいえ　　(16 番の質問へ)

14. 現在何人の同性愛者の友達、あるいは家族を知っていますか。　_____　人

15. 現在の同性愛者の友達、あるいは家族はあなたとどのような関係ですか。当てはまるものすべてに○をつけてください。
    1. 父親
    2. 母親
    3. 兄弟、姉妹
    4. おじいさん、おばあさん
    5. その他の家族
    6. 仲のいい友達
    7. その他の友達
    8. 仕事場の同僚
    9. 近所の人
    10. その他

        その他を選んだ人は具体的に書いてください。

        _____

16. あなたには現在エイズに感染している友達、あるいは家族がいますか。
    11. いる　　(17 番、18 番の質問へ)
    12. いない　　(19 番の質問へ)

17. 現在何人のエイズに感染している友達、あるいは家族を知っていますか。

    _____　人

18. 現在のエイズに感染している友達、あるいは家族はあなたとどのような関係ですか。
    1. 父親
    2. 母親
    3. 兄弟、姉妹
    4. おじいさん、おばあさん
    5. その他の家族
    6. 仲のいい両性愛者、同性愛者の友達
    7. 仲のいい異性愛者の友達
    8. その他の両性愛者、同性愛者の友達
    9. その他の異性愛者の友達
    10. 両性愛者、同性愛者の知り合い
    11. 異性愛者の知り合い
    12. 仕事場の同僚
    13. 近所の人
    14. その他

    その他を選んだ人は具体的に書いてください。

    _____

19. あなたの宗教は何ですか。
    1. 仏教
    2. プロテスタント
    3. カソリック
    4. ユダヤ教
    5. イスラム教
    6. ヒンズー教
    7. その他

    その他を選んだ人は具体的に書いてください。

    _____

この後のアンケートでは、男性、女性、健康、人間関係に対するあなたの意見や信条をお聞きします。それぞれの文章に対して 1)強く同意する、2)同意する、3) どちらともいえない、4)同意しない、5)強く同意しないの内一つだけを選んで番号に○をつけてください。

	強く同意する	同意する	どちらともいえない	同意しない	強く同意しない
1. もし、あなたのとっている授業の教授がエイズに感染していたら授業を落とす。	1	2	3	4	5
2. エイズに感染している子供の子守をする。	1	2	3	4	5
3. エイズ感染者は、もし十分に仕事をすることができるならばそのまま仕事を続けるべきである。	1	2	3	4	5
4. 家族にエイズ感染者がいた場合、世話をする。	1	2	3	4	5
5. 知人のエイズ感染者に人工呼吸をする。	1	2	3	4	5
6. 同僚がエイズだと知ったら、上司に首にするように圧力をかける。	1	2	3	4	5
7. あなたにエイズに感染している仲のいい友達がいる事を他人に知られても気にならない。	1	2	3	4	5
8. エイズに感染している子供が公立の学校へ行くことを禁止されるのは当然である。	1	2	3	4	5
9. エイズ感染者の治療記録を雇用者に公開することは適切である。	1	2	3	4	5
10. 病院は、エイズ感染者の患者を断る権利を有するべきである。	1	2	3	4	5
11. 病院は、エイズ感染者の患者用に隔離病棟を設置すべきである。	1	2	3	4	5
12. エイズ感染者は社会から隔離されるべきである。	1	2	3	4	5
13. 首相がエイズだとわかった場合には辞職させられるべきである。	1	2	3	4	5
14. レズビアンは社会に適合しない。	1	2	3	4	5

	強く同意する	同意する	どちらともいえない	同意しない	強く同意しない
15. いかなる場合でも女性を同性愛者だという理由で仕事において差別してはならない。	1	2	3	4	5
16. 男性と女性の自然な区分を壊すので、女性の同性愛はよくない。	1	2	3	4	5
17. 同意の上での成人女性間の私的な性行為を禁止する法律は、廃止されるべきである。	1	2	3	4	5
18. 女性の同性愛は罪である。	1	2	3	4	5
19. レズビアンが増えることは、日本のモラルの低下を意味する。	1	2	3	4	5
20. 女性の同性愛自体は、社会が問題視しない限り何も問題ではない。	1	2	3	4	5
21. 女性の同性愛は、基本的な社会制度にとって脅威である。	1	2	3	4	5
22. 女性の同性愛は、異性愛と比べて劣っている。	1	2	3	4	5
23. レズビアンは病気である。	1	2	3	4	5
24. 男性同性愛者のカップルは、異性愛者の夫婦と同じように子供を育ててもよい。	1	2	3	4	5
25. 男性同性愛者は気持ち悪いと思う。	1	2	3	4	5
26. 男性同性愛者は学校で教師をしてはならない。	1	2	3	4	5
27. 男性の同性愛は、性の倒錯である。	1	2	3	4	5
28. 男性の同性愛は自然な性の表現である。	1	2	3	4	5
29. もし、男性が他の男性に魅力を感じている場合は、何をしてでもその感情を克服しなければならない	1	2	3	4	5

	強く同意する	同意する	どちらともいえない	同意しない	強く同意しない
30. 自分の息子が同性愛者だと知っても、それほど取り乱したりはしない。	1	2	3	4	5
31. 2 人の男性間の性行為は単純に間違っている。	1	2	3	4	5
32. 男性同性愛者が結婚することは、ばかげたことだと思う。	1	2	3	4	5
33. 男性の同性愛は、単に異なった種類の生き方であって、非難されるべきものではない。	1	2	3	4	5
34. 仕事で成功することは、男性にとっての主な目標である。	1	2	3	4	5
35. 若い男性にとって他人から尊敬されるためには、仕事を見つけ、真剣に取り組み、業績を上げることが最善の方法である。	1	2	3	4	5
36. 男性は、できるだけ給料のいい仕事について働くという恩義が育ててくれた家族に対してある。	1	2	3	4	5
37. 男性にとって知人から常に尊敬の念や賞賛を浴びることは必要不可欠なことである。	1	2	3	4	5
38. 男性は常にすべての事柄において冷静そして論理的に考え、何をするにも合理的な理由に基づいて行動するべきである。	1	2	3	4	5
39. 男性にとっての座右の銘は、雨降って地固まるである。(困難な状況に陥ったら、その困難に打ち勝つ)	1	2	3	4	5
40. 若い男性はたとえ体格的に大きくなくても身体的に頑丈でなければならない。	1	2	3	4	5

	強く同意する	同意する	どちらともいえない	同意しない	強く同意しない
41. 暴力は時において最悪の状況を切り抜ける唯一の切り札である。	1	2	3	4	5
42. 本当の男は、時々は少しくらいの危険を楽しむべきだ。	1	2	3	4	5
43. 時と場合によって、男は暴力を使う心構えをしておくべきである。	1	2	3	4	5
44. たとえ夫が十分に妻を養える給料を稼いでいても、妻は仕事をしてお金を稼いでもよい。	1	2	3	4	5
45. 仕事をしている母親は、仕事をしていない母親と同じように暖かくて親密な関係を子供と築きあげることができる。	1	2	3	4	5
46. 男性が家の外で功績を挙げ、女性は家と家族の世話をするのが、すべての人にとってよい。	1	2	3	4	5
47. 夫が子供をほしがり、妻がこどもをほしがっていない場合、妻が夫の意思に反して子供を生むことを拒否してもよい。	1	2	3	4	5
48. 女性は家庭をうまく営む事に専念し、国のことは男性に任せておけばよい。	1	2	3	4	5
49. 女性は感情の面から言って政治に向いていない。	1	2	3	4	5
50. 十分に能力のある女性が首相に立候補した場合、女性が首相になることを支持する。	1	2	3	4	5
51. 雇用者は能力のある女性を雇い昇進させるために特別な措置をとるべきである。	1	2	3	4	5

	強く同意しない	同意しない	どちらともいえない	同意する	強く同意する
52. 小学校へ行く前の子供は、母親が働いている場合つらい思いをする。	1	2	3	4	5
53. 女性が仕事を持っている場合(パートタイムを除く)、家族の生活はほったらかしにされる。	1	2	3	4	5
54. 仕事をすることが女性にとって自立する最良な方法である。	1	2	3	4	5

ご協力ありがとうございました。回答は他の人のアンケートとともに日本人大学生の性的な事柄に対する意見や信条をより深く理解するために使われます。少しお時間をとってもう一度アンケートを見てください。何か私と共有したい経験などはございませんか。何かコメント、質問などありませんか。もしありましたら下の余白にお書きください。

Appendix B

Informed Consent
Georgia State University
Department of Sociology

Prejudiced Attitudes toward Homosexuals and HIV-positive People
among Japanese University Students

This research is about your background, your relationships, and some of your attitudes. This information is very important to know the opinions of Japanese university students. The study will not benefit you directly, but it may lead to a better understanding of people's beliefs and behaviors. It may be difficult to answer some questions, but I appreciate it if you answer them. The survey should take approximately 25 minutes to complete.

There is minimal risk associated with completing this questionnaire. You will be asked to answer questions about your sexual orientation and your attitudes toward homosexuals and HIV-positive people in this study. These personal questions could result in discomfort. If participating in this study causes any emotional or psychological problems, contact the lead researcher (Daisuke Ito) who can talk to you and if needed refer you to a professional counselor. (The participant is responsible for any cost of any professional treatment.)

I will keep your answers and questionnaire private to the extent allowed by law. I will use a questionnaire number rather than your name on study records. Your name and other information that might identify you will not appear when I present this study or publish its results. The findings will be summarized and reported in group form only. You will not be identified personally.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this research, you can contact Daisuke Ito (thaishowow@hotmail.com or +1-404-644-7011). If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a participant in this research study, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Georgia State University which oversees the protection of human research participants. Susan Vogtner in the office of research compliance can be reached at (+1-404-463-0674).

Your participation in this research is voluntary. You have the right to refuse to be in this study. If you decide to be in the study and change your mind, you have the right to drop out at any time. You may skip questions. However, any information already used to the point when you withdraw consent will not be removed. Whatever you decide, you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

By filling out this survey, you attest that you have read and understand the above and agree to participate in this study.

Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge. When a question has choices, please follow the instructions in the parenthesis next to each question.

1. Are you a (circle one number)
    1. First year or Freshman
    2. Sophomore
    3. Junior
    4. Senior

2. How old were you on your last birthday? _____

3. Are you
    1. Male
    2. Female

4. Do you have any siblings (brothers and sisters)?
    1. Yes (go to Question 5)
    2. No (go to Question 6)

5. a) How many younger sisters do you have? _____

   b) How many older sisters do you have? _____

   c) How many younger brothers do you have? _____

   d) How many older brothers do you have? _____

6. What prefecture and what city, town or village were you living when you were 12 years old?

    _____ prefecture _____ town/city/village (circle one)

7. Have you ever lived in any foreign country?
    1. Yes (go to Question 8)
    2. No (go to Question 9)

8. Which country and how long have you lived? Please list them all.

1. _____ _____ year(s) _____ month(s)

2. _____ _____ year(s) _____ month(s)

3. _____ _____ year(s) _____ month(s)

4. _____ _____ year(s) _____ month(s)

The next question asks you about your "mother and father." Throughout this survey, we use the term "mother" to refer to the primary female who raised you (which may be a stepmother or grandmother). We use the term "father" to refer to the primary male who raised you (which may be a stepfather or grandfather).

9. What is your highest level of education attained by your mother and your father (please circle one number for each)?

	Mother	Father
Completed grade school	1	1
Completed high school	2	2
Completed high school and Technical training school (not college)	3	3
Completed a junior college	4	4
Completed 4-year college	5	5
MA degree	6	6
Ph.D. degree	7	7

10. Do you consider yourself

1. Heterosexual (go to Question 13)
2. Bisexual (go to Question11 and Question 12)
3. Gay (go to Question 11 and Question 12)
4. Lesbian (go to Question 11 and Question 12)
5. Other (go to Question 11 and Question 12)

If other, (please specify) _____

11. To whom have you told of your sexual preference/ orientation or have "come out" (circle all that apply)

1. Father
2. Mother
3. Sibling(s)
4. Grandparent(s)
5. Other family member(s)
6. Best friend(s) who are gay/lesbian/bisexual
7. Best friend(s) who are **NOT** gay/lesbian/bisexual
8. Other friend(s) who are gay/lesbian/bisexual
9. Other friend(s) who are **NOT** gay/lesbian/bisexual
10. Acquaintance(s) who are gay/lesbian/bisexual
11. Acquaintance(s) who are **NOT** gay/lesbian/bisexual
12. Co-worker(s)
13. Neighbor(s)
14. Other
    Please specify _____
15. None/ no one

12. To whom have you avoided telling your sexual preference/orientation or "coming out" (circle all that apply)?

1. Father
2. Mother
3. Sibling(s)
4. Grandparent(s)
5. Other family member(s)
6. Best friend(s) who are gay/lesbian/bisexual
7. Best friend(s) who are **NOT** gay/lesbian/bisexual
8. Other friend(s) who are gay/lesbian/bisexual
9. Other friend(s) who are **NOT** gay/lesbian/bisexual
10. Acquaintance(s) who are gay/lesbian/bisexual
11. Acquaintance(s) who are **NOT** gay/lesbian/bisexual
12. Co-worker(s)
13. Neighbor(s)
14. Other
    Please specify _____
15. None/ no one

13. Do you currently have any friends and/or family members that are gay or lesbian?

1. Yes (go to Question 14 and Question 15)
2. No (go to Question 16)

14. How many of your current friends and/or family members are gay or lesbian? _____

15. What is your relationship to your friends and/or family members that are gay or lesbian? Is the person(s) your (circle all that apply)

1. Father
2. Mother
3. Sibling(s)
4. Grandparent(s)
5. Other family member(s)
6. Best friend(s)
7. Other friend(s)
8. Co-worker(s)
9. Neighbors(s)
10. Other (please specify) _____

16. Do you currently have any friends and/or family members that are HIV-positive or have AIDS?

1. Yes (please go to Question 17 and Question 18)
2. No (please go to Question 19)

17. How many of your current friends and/or family members are HIV-positive or have AIDS?

_____

18. What is your relationship to your friends and/or family members that are HIV-positive or have AIDS? Is the person(s) your (circle all that apply)

1. Father
2. Mother
3. Sibling(s)
4. Grandparent(s)
5. Other family member(s)
6. Best friend(s) who are gay/lesbian/bisexual
7. Best friend(s) who are **NOT** gay/lesbian/bisexual
8. Other friend(s) who are gay/lesbian/bisexual
9. Other friend(s) who are **NOT** gay/lesbian/bisexual
10. Acquaintance(s) who are gay/lesbian/bisexual
11. Acquaintance(s) who are **NOT** gay/lesbian/bisexual
12. Co-worker(s)
13. Neighbor(s)
14. Other

    Please specify _____

19. What is your religious preference?
    1. Buddhist
    2. Protestant
    3. Catholic
    4. Jewish
    5. Muslim
    6. Hindu
    7. Other (Please specify) _____

The next few sections ask you about your attitudes and beliefs regarding men, women, health and relationships. For each statement please circle a number to indicate whether you **1) Strongly Agree, 2) Agree, 3) Unsure, 4) Disagree, or 5) Strongly Disagree.**

	Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Unsure**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
1. If one of my professors had AIDS, I would drop the course.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I would babysit for a child who had AIDS.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Persons with AIDS should be able to hold jobs if they are well enough to do so.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I would care for an immediate family member who had AIDS.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I would perform mouth-to-mouth resuscitation if necessary on a known AIDS victim.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I would pressure my boss to fire a co-worker with AIDS.	1	2	3	4	5
7. It would not bother me if people knew that a close friend of mine had AIDS.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
8. It's appropriate for children with AIDS to be banned from public schools.	1	2	3	4	5
9. It's appropriate to release medical records of persons with AIDS to employers.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Hospitals should have the right to turn away AIDS patients.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Hospitals should have isolatioin wards for AIDS patients.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Persons with AIDS should be excommunicated from society.	1	2	3	4	5
13. The President should be impeached if it becomes known that he has AIDS.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Lesbians just can't fit into our society.	1	2	3	4	5
15. A woman's homosexuality should not be a cause for job discrimination in any situation.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Female homosexuality is bad for society because it breaks down the natural divisions between the sexes.	1	2	3	4	5
17. State laws against private sexual behavior between consenting adult women should be abolished.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Female homosexuality is a sin.	1	2	3	4	5
19. The growing number of lesbians indicates a decline in Japanese moral.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
20. Female homosexuality itself is no problem unless society makes it a problem.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Female homosexuality is a threat to many of our basic social institutions.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Female homosexuality is an inferior form of sexuality.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Lesbians are sick.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Male homosexual couples should be allowed to adopt children the same as heterosexual couples.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I think male homosexuals are disgusting.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Male homosexuals should not be allowed to teach school.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Male homosexuality is a perversion.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Male homosexuality is a natural expression of sexuality in men.	1	2	3	4	5
29. If a man has homosexual feelings, he should do everything he can do to overcome them.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I would not be too upset if I learned that my son were a homosexual.	1	2	3	4	5
31. Sex between two men is just plain wrong.	1	2	3	4	5
32. The idea of male homosexual marriages seems ridiculous to me.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
33. Male homosexuality is merely a different kind of lifestyle that should not be condemned.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Success in his work has to be man's central goal in this life.	1	2	3	4	5
35. The best way for a young man to get the respect of other people is to get a job, take it seriously, and do it well.	1	2	3	4	5
36. A man owes it to his family to work at the best-paying job he can get.	1	2	3	4	5
37. It is essential for a man to always have the respect and admiration of everyone who knows him.	1	2	3	4	5
38. A man should always think everything out coolly and logically, and have rational reasons for everything he does.	1	2	3	4	5
39. A good motto for a man would be "When the going gets tough, the tough get going."	1	2	3	4	5
40. I think a young man should try to become physically tough, even if he's not big.	1	2	3	4	5
41. Fists are sometimes the only way to get out of a bad situation.	1	2	3	4	5
42. A real man enjoys a bit of danger now and then.	1	2	3	4	5
43. In some kinds of situations a man should be ready to use his fists.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
44. It is okay if a married woman earns money in business or industry if she has a husband capable of supporting her.	1	2	3	4	5
45. A working mother can establish just as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work.	1	2	3	4	5
46. It is much better for everyone involved if the man is the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care of the home and family.	1	2	3	4	5
47. If the husband in a family wants children, but the wife decides that she does not want any children, it is all right for the wife to refuse to have children.	1	2	3	4	5
48. Women should take care of running their homes and leave running the country up to men.	1	2	3	4	5
49. Women are not emotionally suited for politics.	1	2	3	4	5
50. If my party nominated a woman for prime minister, I would vote for her if she were qualified for the job.	1	2	3	4	5
51. Employers should make special efforts to hire and promote qualified women.	1	2	3	4	5
52. A preschool child is likely to suffer if his or her mother works.	1	2	3	4	5
53. All in all, family life suffers when the women has a full-time job.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
54. Having a job is the best way for a woman to be an independent person.	1	2	3	4	5

Finally, I would like to thank you for participating in this survey. Your answers will be pooled with others to gain better understanding of various sexual attitudes. Please take a moment to review your answers. Is their anything else you would like to share with us about your experience? Do you have any questions or comments about the survey? If so, please feel free to write your questions and/or comments below.