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The Effects of Media on Gender Identity/Sexual Orientation Comfort and Attitudes towards the LGBTQ+ Community

Katherine Harper, Jaylan Luvene & Tara J. Collins, Ph. D. — Winthrop University

Introduction

- LGBTQ+ media representations and their accuracies affect everyone, not just the LGBTQ+ community (Calzo & Ward, 2009).
- Greater media consumption among the men and highly religious people was correlated with more acceptance towards LGBTQ+ (Calzo & Ward, 2009). Additionally, though it is important how much media one consumes, the far more important factor was the type of media being consumed (Potter & Chang, 1990).
- Through our study, we hoped to expand on previous research on media and the LGBTQ+ community, as well as use social media profiles to examine peoples’ reactions to an LGBTQ+ profile versus a heteronormative profile.

Hypotheses

- Our main hypothesis was that of the two profile conditions, the participants who viewed the lesbian profile would want to avoid contact less and score lower on LGBTQ+ stereotypes than the participants who viewed the heterosexual profile.
- We hypothesized that the participants who viewed the lesbian profile would score higher, or more positively, on their beliefs about transgender people than their heterosexual viewed counterparts.
- We also hypothesized that the more media representation of LGBTQ+ and prevalence of LGBTQ+ role models would produce a positive correlation with positive attitudes towards the LGBTQ+ community.

Method

Participants (80)
- 16 men, 55 women and 9 participants who chose not to gender identify
- Participants’ ages ranged from 18-50+, with 62 of the participants in the age range of 18-25

Survey
- Online format through Qualtrics
- Assessed participants’ feelings towards profiles and their overall comfort with LGBTQ+ using a 7 point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree & 7 = Strongly Agree)
- Questionnaires used:
  - Gay Identity Questionnaire (Brady & Busse,1994), which measures how openly homosexual one is and how integrated one is within a heterosexual society
  - Component Measure of Homosexuality (Fisher, Davis, et al., 2011), which measures the amount of condemnation/ tolerance towards LGBTQ+ members, morality and contact with the LGBTQ+.
  - The Transgender Attitudes and Beliefs Scale (Kanamori, Cornelius-White, et al., 2015), which measures interpersonal comfort, beliefs surrounding the LGBTQ+, and the value of these members.
  - The Transgender Congruence Scale (Kozee, Tylka, et al., 2012), which measures comfort with gender identity.

Results and Discussion

- Differences between profile means (shown in bar graph)
  - beliefs about transgender people,
    t(53) = 2.33, p = .02, d = .62
  - for LGBTQ+ stereotypes,
    t(44) = -3.17, p < .01, d = 0.93
  - for neutral contact, (ex. If a member of my sex made advances towards me, I would feel angry)
    t(46) = -2.28, p = .03, d = .67
- Correlational analysis was used to analyze the majority of our hypotheses (see chart right)
- We can conclude that the manipulation of one “relationship status” photo in the profiles initiated a change in the participants’ acceptance and contact with community. This could show that the prevalence and actual visibility of LGBTQ+ members has more of an effect through social media and acceptance than previously thought

Summary of Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of self</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.92*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Model Prev.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Model Feelings</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morality</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.40*</td>
<td>-.52*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>-.54*</td>
<td>-.47*.63*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05