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Abstract

Although confronting prejudice can be effective in reducing bias, it is potentially costly to confronters. Research on confronting racism or sexism has shown confronters from the targeted group are viewed more negatively than confronters who are not. It is unknown whether confronting antigay bias produces similar reactions, particularly since group membership is concealable. In my research, participants read two male profiles followed by a scripted conversation which included an antigay comment. Profiles varied in their depiction of the confronting individual’s sexual orientation, and conversations either included a confrontation or not. I found that confronting antigay bias is double-edged. On the positive side, confrontation increased awareness that prejudice occurred, and this awareness mediated the relation between confrontation viewing and participants’ own intention to confront. On the negative, individuals may be deterred from confronting antigay prejudice because confronters were perceived as more gay (a stigmatized identity), regardless of actual orientation.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

On October 15th 2011, Jamie Hubley took his own life after a long struggle with depression. He was the only openly gay teen attending his school in Ottawa. His family and his posts on social media describe how he was constantly harassed and bullied by his classmates about his sexual orientation. Jamie’s suicide received a great deal of media attention because of the many public figures who became involved and spoke out against antigay bullying. Unfortunately, such negative treatment of individuals because of their sexual orientation is widespread and is not limited to Jamie or his high school. Indeed, hate crimes motivated by sexual orientation happen every other day in Canada, and rose by 18% from 2008 to 2009 (Dauvergne & Brennan, 2011). Hate crimes targeting homosexuals are more likely to be violent than any other type of hate crime: 74% of these incidents were violent in nature compared to 39% of racially-driven crimes. Given the near constant threat of being ridiculed or even attacked because of their sexual orientation, it is not surprising that gay and lesbian youth have an increased risk for committing suicide. Indeed, more than one third of them report having made a suicide attempt (D’Augelli, 2002), which is four times more often than their heterosexual peers (Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2008). Even if progress has been made in Canada in terms of laws prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation and legal rights, open bias against homosexuals is still a significant problem due to the lack of a prescriptive norm against homophobia. Thus, more needs to be done to address prejudice based on sexual orientation in Canadian society.

One way to address this ongoing problem is for people to confront derogatory comments when they hear them from others. Shelton, Richeson, Salvatore, and Hill (2006) define confrontation of prejudice as: “Verbally or nonverbally expressing one’s dissatisfaction with prejudicial and discriminatory treatment to the person who is responsible for making the remark or behaviour” (p.67). To date, research on confronting prejudice has focused mainly on racism and sexism, so it is unclear what response opponents to antigay bias would receive. This remains unclear specifically because sexual orientation is a concealable identity, therefore every confronter is a potential group member. In the case of non-concealable stigmas, group membership is not a possible attribution. By focusing on obvious group memberships, previous research has ignored a
fundamental part of the process of prejudice confrontation. A primary aim of the present study, therefore, was to address this gap by examining reactions when individuals confront antigay bias.

1.1 Sexism and Racism Confrontation

Although the present research focuses on antigay prejudice, prior work on confrontations of sexism and racism still provides useful information on the potential processes underlying antigay prejudice confrontation. Czopp and Monteith (2003) investigated confrontations of sexist and racist remarks. In their first study, participants read a scenario and were asked to imagine themselves as being someone who made either a sexist or racist remark and were then confronted about it by someone else. They found that people felt guiltier when challenged in the racist remark condition than in the sexist remark condition, though both types of confrontation did result in some level of guilt within participants. Other research has shown that feelings of guilt and other negative affect are an important step in the self-regulation process and help curb future prejudiced responses, at least in low-prejudiced people (Monteith, 1993). Based on these earlier findings by Monteith (1993), Czopp and Monteith concluded that confrontations of racism were the most effective because they elicited the greatest amount of guilt. They suggested this was due to norms in society against racism being stronger than norms against sexism.

In their second study, Czopp and Monteith (2003) extended the findings from their first study by varying the group membership of the person confronting the comment. Participants had their imagined sexist comment challenged either by a woman (target of the sexist comment) or a man (non-target of the sexist comment), and those in the racist comment condition were either challenged by a black (target) or white (non-target) confronter. They replicated Study 1 and again found that racism confrontations elicited more guilt than sexism confrontations, though both were still effective. They also found that the group membership of the confronter moderated the link between confrontation and guilt, where those confronted by a target group member in both the racism and sexism conditions felt less guilt than those confronted by non-target group members. For example, those who had their sexist comment challenged by a woman felt less guilt than those confronted by a man. Also, those confronted by non-target group members felt less threatened and less negative affect towards the confronter. This suggests that non-target group members have a unique opportunity in prejudice reduction because they create a more positive, less threatening environment for the confrontation, and they also elicit more guilt in the
confronted. This research brings interesting insight on how the identity of the confronter can play an important role in determining the outcome of a confrontation. However, these findings are limited by the fact that only imagined confrontation situations were used, making extrapolation to the real world difficult.

To address this limitation, Czopp, Monteith, and Mark (2006) conducted a live chat study where participants logged in to an instant messaging service (AOL) and participated in a joint task with a “partner” (who was in fact the experimenter himself using a scripted text). Participants were recruited based on their mass testing scores on an explicit measure of racial prejudice (Brigham, 1993), and the sample included both high and low scorers on the scale. For the task, participants were shown someone’s picture matched with a sentence. They were asked to find a word fitting that pair, taking turns with their partner as to who went first. For example, they would be shown a white person paired with the sentence “This person works with numbers”, and they would have to say something like “cashier” or “accountant”. By using this method, they were able to trick participants into making stereotypic associations. They had critical pairs of images and sentences which always showed a black man and sentences such as: “You would find this person behind bars”, “You would find this person wandering in the streets”, or “This person depends on government money”. The participant would always go first on these pairs and nearly all of them responded with at least one of the obvious stereotypic answers: “criminal”, “hobo”, and “welfare recipient”. Their partner would instead respond to these pairs with: “bartender”, “traveler” and “academic”. After they made one of the stereotypic remarks, the experimenter would then immediately confront them on what they just said, either in a soft or hostile way. After this confrontation, the task would resume and more pairs would come up, including more critical pairs. In a second study, they also added a no-confrontation control condition. Results showed that all types of confronters were seen more negatively than non-confronters. Confronted participants experienced more negative self-directed affect, no matter whether they were confronted in a hostile or gentle manner. Also, after being confronted, all participants, regardless of their initial attitudes towards blacks or the approach the confronter took, showed decreased biased responses in future critical pair responses. The only difference the approach made was that participants confronted in a less threatening manner tended to evaluate their partner more favourably. This research extends prior findings by showing reactions to confrontations are similar in both imagined and live settings. However, studies up to this point have only observed
dyadic situations of confrontation. Many real-life confrontations occur in an environment with more people present than only the confronter and confronted.

With this in mind, Rasinski and Czopp (2010) examined how third party observers rate a confronter of prejudice when they witness a confrontation. Participants were asked to view a video of a black or white woman confronting a racist comment. In both conditions, the actresses used the same text and the same non-verbal communication style to confront the bigoted remark. Then, participants had to rate how they perceived the confronter and the bigot on multiple scales. In the case of the white woman confronting racism, evaluations of the confronter were more positive, she was seen as more persuasive, and the bigot was seen as more rude. Conversely, in the black woman confronter condition, evaluations of the confronter were negative, she was rated as being the rude one in the interaction, and her confrontation even increased agreement with the initial biased response! These findings are important in showing how confronters are seen negatively not only by those confronted, but also by passive bystanders to the interaction. They also confirmed that group membership is important in determining how the confronter is perceived, even by a third party. In fact, their results show that group membership is so crucial that being a target confronter could even lead to the confrontation backfiring.

Rasinski and Czopp (2010) are not the only ones to have found a backlash effect to confrontation of prejudice. Indeed, Legault, Gutsell and Inzlicht (2011) found this backlash effect when they investigated how motivation plays a role in the regulation of prejudice. In their study, participants were assigned to one of three conditions. In the autonomy condition, they read a brochure that emphasized that not being prejudiced comes from one’s own personal choice and that explained the reasons why being non-prejudiced is so important and worthwhile. In the social norms condition, they read a brochure in which they were pressured into being non-prejudiced and urged to comply with social norms. In the control condition, participants read information about prejudice and definitions of the concept. After reading the assigned document, participants completed measures assessing their motivation to be non-prejudiced (Legault et al., 2007) as well as a measure of symbolic racism (Henry & Sears, 2002). Legault et al. (2011) found that those in the autonomy condition reported having more self-determined motivation to be non-prejudiced and expressed less prejudice than participants in the other two conditions. Conversely, people in the social norms condition showed greater prejudice than those in the control condition. In their second study, these findings generalized to implicit measures of
prejudice when participants were primed with motivation cues eliciting either autonomy or pressure to conform. It appears that pressuring people into being non-prejudiced has the opposite effect and increases their levels of prejudice instead.

Considering this evidence, it may seem that there is little hope for confrontation of prejudice to be effective at all. However, confrontation is a more complex phenomenon than the social norms brochure that was given to the participants in the Legault et al. (2011) study. Confrontations can be very short and done in a tactful way, which would not necessarily elicit as much pressure as the social norms brochure. Moreover, by expressing one’s dissatisfaction with bigoted speech, confrontation could even be perceived as a call for freedom, equality and tolerance rather than a pressure to conform to a norm. If bigoted speech was to never be contested or challenged, this could lead to dire consequences (e.g. false consensus effects; Ross, Green, & House, 1977, also see Shelton et al., 2006). Worse, silence in response to prejudiced speech could even be construed as tacit agreement with the bigoted comments, thus reinforcing the behaviour. Furthermore, not confronting the prejudice could lead to negative intrapersonal consequences. Indeed, for people who believe bigoted speech is unacceptable and that they should contest it (part of their “ought self”; see Higgins, 1987), not confronting the bigot would then lead to a self-discrepancy, causing uneasiness and negative emotions directed toward the self (Higgins, 1987). Therefore, I still believe confrontation of prejudice is necessary at times. Nevertheless, Legault et al.’s (2011) findings have important implications for how to successfully confront prejudice, and it is essential to keep those in mind when examining reactions to confrontations to bigoted speech.

So far, we have seen how confrontation of prejudice is potentially costly to the confronter, who exposes him/herself to a risk of hostility and dislike, as well as possibly even failing at reducing prejudice in the confronted. Indeed, it is because of these social costs that targets of prejudice, who report a desire to confront prejudice more often, refrain from doing so (Shelton & Stewart, 2004). Woodzicka and LaFrance’s (2001) study also showed a similar effect, where 28% of their participants predicted that if a job interviewer asked sexist questions and made sexist remarks, they would confront and even leave the room, but when participants were faced with this situation, only 4% actually confronted the remarks. So what personal and interpersonal variables facilitate confrontation in the first place? Studies have shown that holding strong beliefs that people can change (Rattan & Dweck, 2010), having a communal instead of an exchange
relationship orientation (Gervais, Hillard, & Vescio, 2010), having both optimistic and egalitarian views of the world (Wellman, Czopp, & Geers, 2009), as well as being the target of the prejudice (Gervais, Hillard, & Vescio, 2010) predict whether a person will confront prejudice more often. Also, studies using more indirect and abstract ways of confronting (e.g., Gervais, Hillard, & Vescio, 2010) yield more confrontations than those which examine confrontation in a direct, face-to-face situation (Wellman, Czopp, & Geers, 2009; Woodzicka & LaFrance, 2001). While some research emphasizes how grim and daunting confrontation of prejudice can be for confronters, other research emphasizes the positive outcomes of confrontations. Mallett and Wagner (2011) have shown that social costs also apply to perpetrators of prejudice and that, although they would report more dislike towards confronters on paper, perpetrators would have a harder time expressing dislike in a harsh fashion were they presented with a live confrontation. This shows that, just like confronters who would not confront as harshly in face-to-face contact as compared to when they are asked to imagine an interaction (e.g. Woodzicka & LaFrance, 2001), the same rule would apply to the confronted and their evaluations of the confronter. Mallett and Wagner (2011) even show that it is possible to create positive intergroup relations and increase mutual liking through confrontation. Confronting prejudice may not be as negative an interaction as people might anticipate, in contrast to their erroneous affective forecasting that things in the future will be worse than they turn out to be (Wilson & Gilbert, 2003).

1.2 What About Antigay Prejudice Confrontation?

Nearly all of the previous work on confronting prejudice has focused on sexism and racism. It is plausible that some mechanisms inherent to confrontation of these forms of prejudice apply to confrontation of antigay prejudice as well. However, the homosexual identity and stigma have very different characteristics when compared to gender and ethnic identities and stigmas. First, antigay bias does not have as strong a social norm against it compared to other forms of prejudice such as racism and sexism (Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995). Second, homosexuality is considered an ambiguous and concealable group membership (Freeman, Johnson, Ambady, & Rule, 2010), whereas gender and race are not (Cloutier, Mason, & Macrae, 2005). Therefore, being a target or non-target of antigay prejudice is not as clear-cut as being a target of sexism or racism. How this will affect perceptions of confronters of antigay bias is still unknown. However, at least one classic social psychological finding might give some insight as to what could happen in such cases.
The fundamental attribution error (Jones & Harris, 1967) describes an error whereby individuals will overestimate the degree to which other people’s dispositions account for their outcomes compared to how much the situation accounts for those outcomes. In their classic experiment, Jones and Harris had participants read papers that were either pro- or anti-Fidel Castro. Participants were then told that those who wrote these essays either had freedom of choice when it came to their position on the topic, or flipped a coin and had to write an essay using that position. They were then asked to rate the pro-Castro attitudes of the author. As expected, those in the freedom of choice condition rated the author’s attitudes as consistent with the view they read about (e.g., attitude being more pro-Castro in the pro-Castro text condition). Surprisingly though, those in the coin toss condition still rated the pro-Castro attitudes as being higher for those who wrote the pro-Castro essay, showing that people actually believed the text represented the author’s personal beliefs even if this position was said to be randomly assigned to the author. This fundamental attribution error may also come into play when evaluating confronters to prejudice against more ambiguous groups. If the confronter’s group membership is not evident at first glance (such as with sexual orientation), people might assume that by defending a particular group (in this case, homosexuals), confronters are dispositionally inclined towards that group. Given that ambiguous identities like sexual orientation are more difficult to recognize than more obvious identities like race or gender (Freeman, Johnson, Ambady, & Rule, 2010) people may have to rely more on contextual cues rather than physical cues to infer homosexuality. Therefore, people may use a confrontation against antigay prejudice as an indication that the confronter must also be gay, thus triggering the more negative reactions that target confronters typically receive.

This study aims to address these issues by examining people’s reactions to confrontations of antigay prejudice. Participants rated how they perceive confronters and perpetrators of antigay prejudice when reading about a confrontation. Depending on the assigned condition, the participant either read a script where there is confrontation or no confrontation of prejudiced speech. The sexual orientation of the confronter also varied across conditions, where the confronter could either be gay, straight, or have their sexual orientation undisclosed. This research extends prior work by investigating how attempts to reduce prejudice against more ambiguous groups such as homosexuals are perceived by others.
1.3 Hypotheses

As shown in Czopp and Monteith’s body of work, I expect confronters of antigay prejudice to be perceived negatively and seen in a less favourable light than those who chose not to confront the prejudice. Also, based on previous findings that showed target confronters were perceived more negatively and as less persuasive than non-target confronters (Czopp & Monteith, 2003, 2006; Rasinski, Czopp, 2010), I expect that antigay prejudice confronters who are depicted as gay would be perceived more negatively than straight confronters. Nevertheless, because confronters are usually perceived more negatively than non-confronters, even straight confronters are expected to have more negative evaluations compared to straight non-confronters. As for the non-confronters, I expect the gay targets to be evaluated more negatively than the straight targets, due to the bias observed against homosexuals in general (Remedios, Chasteen, Rule, & Plaks, 2011).

For confronters who have their sexual orientation undisclosed, because the “gay” group membership is ambiguous, I expect confronters to be viewed as more likely homosexual. This is because participants will view the targets’ confronting behavior as evidence for their sexual orientation, much like participants in the Jones and Harris (1967) study viewed a pro-Castro speech as evidence of a target’s political beliefs. Although I predict that the confronter in the undisclosed condition will be viewed as gay, I still expect for gay confronters to be rated more negatively than the undisclosed, because there could still be a “benefit of the doubt” granted to the ambiguous confronters. However, I expect the ambiguous non-confronters to be rated like the straight non-confronters because no clue would be given about their sexual orientation and people would assume the person is straight by default. (See Figure 1 for an example of these hypotheses for likeability ratings).
For the perception of group membership, I expect people will think confronters of antigay comments are less likely to be straight than those who did not confront, and that this would be true especially in the undisclosed condition. Additionally, I expect this membership attribution to mediate the relationship between confrontation/disclosure of sexual orientation and ratings of likeability. This leads me to propose that there will be a mediated moderation in my data.

Disclosure (or not) of sexual orientation would lead to a belief about a target’s group membership. This relation between disclosure and belief would be moderated by confrontation, where confrontation would lead to an increased belief that the target is gay. This would be especially true for targets whose sexual orientation is undisclosed. This belief about the target’s sexual orientation would then predict ratings of likeability, again moderated by the target’s confrontation behaviour, where confronters perceived as gay would be the most disliked of all. See Figure 2 for an illustration of this mediated moderation process.
I expect a positive correlation between negative affect experienced from viewing the situation and a participant’s predicted confrontation behaviour. Negative affect following the reading of the log may hint that participants were offended by the comment, possibly because these comments go against their beliefs. When asked to evaluate what they would do in the situation, they would more likely report that they would confront the comment since they would view the comment as inappropriate, as opposed to those who are less offended by it. Regardless of the participants’ own views on the subject, I expect that the confrontation script will elicit more negative affect overall than the no confrontation script, if only because of the tension between the characters depicted within the script.

Perceptions of those who express antigay prejudice have yet to be extensively investigated. In the current research, participants were asked to give their impressions of both the perpetrator of prejudice and the confronter following the reading of an instance of prejudiced speech. Since little work has been done concerning perceptions of perpetrators of prejudice, it is less clear what the results would be. However, I expect people to rate the bigot more negatively when he gets confronted, especially if the confrontation was made by a non-target confronter. This would be consistent with previous research that found a backlash effect to confrontation by a targeted person, where target confronters increased agreement with the bigot.
Chapter 2
Current study

2.1 Method

2.1.1 Participants

Participants were recruited from the PSY100 pool and were compensated either with partial course credit or $10 for their participation. The total sample included 157 participants, 7 of which were excluded because they declared not being straight, 3 because of technical malfunctions, 9 due to an abnormally low completion time for the task and 2 quit in the process. The average completion time was 45 minutes, and those having completed the task using less than 21 minutes were excluded. The final sample used for the following analyses included 136 participants (47 males, 89 females; Age: $M = 18.9, SD = 1.92$) from various ethnic backgrounds.

2.1.2 Procedure

Participants were brought to the lab and were told that they would participate in a study about how social media affects everyday communication. They were told that they would read a chat log chosen at random from a previous experiment’s database, and that they would also read the Facebook profiles of the conversation participants. In fact, all participants read similar profiles and log. This cover story was used to minimize suspicion in regards to the main goal of this study.

Then, participants read the “randomly chosen” profiles of two fictitious characters that were created by the research team. These profiles were pilot tested with 60 other participants prior to the experiment to obtain baseline measures of perceptions of geekiness, attractiveness, likeability, masculinity, femininity, stylishness, oldness, youthfulness, plausibility, how easy and nice it would be to converse with them and, inversely, how irritating they seemed (see Appendix B for a summary of the pilot results). The profile of the bigot depicted a man in a relationship with a woman, while the other profile varied depending on the experimental condition the participant was assigned to. The second profile either depicted: 1) a man in a relationship with a woman, 2) a man in a relationship with another man, or 3) a man in a relationship with an undisclosed partner. This manipulation was used to hint the sexual orientation of the two characters involved in the experiment. More information was available on the Facebook pages
about both characters’ hobbies and interests, but this information was identical across conditions and not stereotypically gay nor straight for the potential confronter.

Once they viewed the profiles, they went on to read one of two scripted chat logs between the two characters they just read about. All logs depicted a conversation about the Harry Potter books and included a derogatory antigay comment made by the straight character: “(...) what turned me off is this character, the head master… Dumbledore? You know, I heard the guy is gay and leads this school filled with kids, it’s kinda twisted …”. Conditions varied in how the other character approached the situation. The second character either confronted by saying: “What?? Gay men can’t work with little kids? (...) Just because he’s gay doesn’t mean there’s anything wrong with him!!”, or did not confront the comment with: “Oh, maybe… I don’t really have an opinion on this…” Thus, this experiment used a 3 (gay, straight or undisclosed orientation of the confronter) x 2 (confrontation or not) design. After having read the two profiles and the chat log, participants completed several measures, including a conversation evaluation, a character evaluation questionnaire, their perceptions of the characters’ group memberships, their predictions for their own behaviour in that situation, the *Positive and negative affect schedule* (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), the *Modern homonegativity scale* (Morrison & Morrison, 2002), as well as a gay-straight familiarity scale. After completing these measures, participants completed a demographics questionnaire and were then debriefed and compensated.

### 2.1.3 Measures

#### 2.1.3.1 Conversation evaluation questionnaire

This questionnaire was used to bolster the cover story by asking participants their reactions to the social media aspects of the conversation (e.g., “Social media hindered the conversation between the parties involved”, “The tone of the conversation was clear although there was use of an instant messaging service”). All 16 items included 7-point Likert scales, ranging from (1) Strongly disagree to (7) Strongly agree.

#### 2.1.3.2 Character evaluation questionnaire

This 21-item questionnaire measured the participants’ perception of the two characters involved in the chat session by asking them to rate the characters on several traits (e.g. attractive, prejudiced, complainer, likeable to me, likeable to the average Canadian). Participants responded
using 7-point Likert scales ranging from 1 (Strongly agree) to 7 (Strongly disagree). The same questionnaire was administered twice: once for the evaluation of the confronter and once for the bigot. Some of these ratings were compared to those obtained in pilot testing (e.g. attractiveness) to see if reading about the conversation changed people’s perceptions. See Appendix A for the full 21-item scale and Appendix B for pilot results.

2.1.3.3 Perception of group memberships

In this 5-item questionnaire, participants were asked to form an impression of the characters’ group memberships. The task consisted of filling out a demographic form for each character, including his ethnic group, age, gender, number of friends on Facebook, and sexual orientation. Sexual orientation is on a continuum from “Definitely gay” (1) to “Definitely straight” (7), with “Ambiguous/Unsure” as the midpoint (4). Although most of these pieces of information were not previously given to the participant (especially in the undisclosed sexual orientation condition), the goal here was to see if people’s assumptions of the target’s and bigot’s group memberships would vary as a result of those characters making, confronting, or not confronting the antigay comment. This questionnaire was also administered in the pilot testing phase of the profiles to get a baseline score on all these items so that comparison pre and post experiment would be feasible (i.e. would people see the confronter as being more straight or more gay after they confronted).

2.1.3.4 Behaviour prediction

Participants were asked two yes/no as well as three open-ended questions on how they would have approached the situation themselves, if they had been in the confronter’s circumstances (e.g. “Would you have confronted X’s remark in this situation?”, “What would you have done specifically?”).

2.1.1.5 Positive and negative affect schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988)

The PANAS’s main purpose is to assess participants’ emotions after reading the chat log. The PANAS is a validated scale and has good internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha = .89 for the Negative Affect subscale and .85 for the Positive Affect subscale, Crawford & Henry, 2004). The scale consists of 20 words that describe feelings or emotions, such as upset, scared, proud
and excited. The participant is asked to rate how they feel each of these words applies to them at present on a scale from 1 (Very slightly or not at all) to 5 (Extremely). In this research, participants were asked to respond to this questionnaire after reading the chat log and were asked to indicate to what extent they felt these emotions during and after reading that chat log.

2.1.1.6 Modern homonegativity scale (MHS; Morrison & Morrison, 2002)

The MHS is a validated 12-item scale that measures attitudes towards homosexuals (e.g. “Gay men should stop shoving their lifestyle down other people's throats”, “Gay men who are "out of the closet" should be admired for their courage”). All items are on scales ranging from 1 (Disagree) to 5 (Agree). The Cronbach’s alpha for the MHS was .91, showing good internal consistency for the scale. However, whereas the scale behaved as expected and was able to predict phenomena such as dislike for gay targets, it did not moderate or mediate other relationships between variables of interest. Therefore, it will not be discussed further.

2.1.1.7 Gay-straight familiarity scale

This short scale assesses familiarity with homosexuality by asking participants to indicate how often they have seen homosexuals, known them personally, or been to places known to be frequented by openly gay individuals. These items are on 5-point scales, from “Never” to “Often”. The participant’s own sexual orientation was also asked in this questionnaire. As with the MHS, this scale did not moderate or mediate relationships between variables of interest. Therefore, it will not be discussed further.

2.1.1.8 Demographics

Since many variables are linked to increased negative attitudes towards homosexuals like lower education and ethnicity (Schellenberg, Hirt, Sears, 1999; Walch, Orlosky, Sinkkanen, & Stevens, 2010; Waldner, Sikka, & Baig, 1999), demographic information was collected on the participants to use as potential variables for moderation and mediation analyses. No such effects were found in the data.

2.2 Results

To analyze the data collected, I conducted a series of ANOVAs and applied Tukey’s HSD post-hoc tests to find differences between groups whenever needed. To decompose significant
interactions, I conducted a t test (for 2 groups) on subsets of groups to report these differences. When appropriate, other statistical tests were also used (e.g. regression, logistic regression, Chi Square), and will be mentioned throughout this section. However, unless otherwise noted, reported results mainly consist of ANOVAs and Tukey’s HSD.

### 2.2.1 Target’s ratings

First, I conducted a 2 (Confrontation: confront/no-confront) x 3 (Orientation: gay/straight/ambiguous) ANOVA on participants’ liking of the target (single item from the character evaluation questionnaire). Surprisingly, participants liked the target more when he confronted \( (M = 5.29, SD = 1.41) \) than when he did not \( (M = 4.82, SD = 1.43) \), \( F(1,130) = 3.77, p = .05 \). This main effect was qualified by a significant Confrontation x Orientation interaction, \( F(2,130) = 7.13, p = .03 \), indicating that the gay confronter \( (M = 5.74, SD = 1.10) \) was liked more than the gay non-confronter \( (M = 4.38, SD = 1.65) \), \( t(43) = 3.10, p = .003 \) (see Figure 3). Confronting straight targets \( (M = 5.23, SD = 1.38) \) were liked as much as the non-confronting ones \( (M = 4.96, SD = 1.23) \), and this also applied to targets with undisclosed sexual orientation (No-confront: \( M = 5.17, SD = 1.27 \); Confront: \( M = 4.95, SD = 1.63 \)), all \( ps > .49 \). It appears that liking varies only in the case when the target is portrayed as gay, perhaps because there is an expectation for him to confront such a comment.
Next, I included the baseline pilot data as an additional confrontation condition, transforming the condition from a 2-level between-subjects variable (confront/no-confront) to a 3-level between-subjects variable (baseline/confront/no-confront). This was done to compare the results to baseline ratings of likeability when the pilot subjects only read the profiles without the chat log and knowledge of the antigay comment and confrontation. Making such a comparison will tell us if liking for the target differs from seeing him confront antigay prejudice, as well as compare this difference in liking to that of a non-confronter. I hypothesized that the pilot subjects would like the target more at baseline than participants who saw him confront an anti-gay comment, but that there would be no such decrease in liking for the no-confront condition. The 3 (Confrontation: baseline, confront, no-confront) x 3 (Orientation: gay, straight, ambiguous) ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of confrontation condition on likeability, $F(2,188) = 19.38, p < .001$. Baseline liking ratings ($M = 3.84, SD = 1.19$) were lower than for both other confrontation conditions (No-Confront: $M = 4.82, SD = 1.43$; Confront: $M = 5.29, SD = 1.41$; see Figure 4). However, no difference was found between confronters and non-confronters when comparing them to baseline (Interaction $p = .11$), meaning participants liked the character better only by reading their conversation, not because of their behaviour within that conversation.
Additionally, I tested whether participants’ perceptions of the target’s sexual orientation affected likeability ratings as hypothesized. Because confronters who are members of the targeted group are generally more disliked than non-target confronters for other forms of prejudice, I expect liking to be lower for characters that are perceived as gay. However, using orientation condition as a predictor of liking failed to find this relationship (see analyses above). Using participants’ perceived orientation instead of actual orientation could reveal a link between liking and orientation because homosexuality is an ambiguous group membership and could be perceived at various degrees by the participants, especially in the undisclosed sexual orientation condition. I conducted a regression using standardized scores of perceived sexual orientation and dummy-coded confrontation conditions (No-Confront (0) and Confront (1)) as predictor variables in a first step, created an interaction term for perceived orientation and confrontation by multiplying the two variables as a second step in the regression, and used likeability (single item) as a dependent variable. Both models failed to reach significance (all ps > .08).

Hypotheses were also formulated about the perception of the confronter as being a complainer, especially in the case that the target was from the group concerned by the comment being
confronted. To evaluate this, I used the item “complainer” from the character evaluation questionnaire and tested if confrontation and orientation had an effect on this rating. Results show no significant effect of experimental conditions on this item (all $ps > .14$).

So far, I’ve only reported analyses regarding single items on the scale. To assess general positive evaluations of the target, I also computed a score averaging 12 items of the character evaluation questionnaire. The 12 items selected were liking, liking by the average Canadian, attractiveness, respectfulness, how much the target made sense, how good his personality seemed, how good of a friend the target would be, how nice it would be to have a conversation with the target, how easy it would be to get along with him, how articulate and logical the target was, as well as seeming irritating and as a complainer (reverse coded). The reliability for this positive assessment scale was good (Cronbach’s alpha = .89). I would expect for this positive assessment score to be higher for non-confronters, and for non-gay targets. However, this was not the case (all $ps > .32$). It appears that orientation and confrontation are not good predictors of this positive assessment score, where gay ($M = 5.01$, $SD = 0.91$), straight ($M = 4.98$, $SD = 0.84$), or undisclosed targets ($M = 5.09$, $SD = 0.69$) were all evaluated the same, as well as confronters ($M = 5.10$, $SD = 0.80$) and non-confronters ($M = 4.96$, $SD = 0.82$).

For persuasiveness, two items were included assessing this trait: how articulate and logical the character seemed, as well as how much sense he made ($r = .39$). I took the mean of both ratings to form a persuasiveness score and tested if experimental conditions affected this rating. Gay confronters were expected to be dismissed and viewed as less persuasive than non-gay confronters. Results show that Confrontation condition had a significant effect on persuasiveness, $F(1,130) = 4.02$, $p = .05$, but not Orientation, $F(1,130) = .58$, $p = .56$, or the Confrontation x Orientation interaction, $F(2,130) = 1.31$, $p = .27$. This result is not surprising because in the confrontation condition the target expresses an opinion about the anti-gay comment ($M = 5.23$, $SD = 0.95$) whereas in the no-confront condition he says nothing about the anti-gay comment ($M = 4.87$, $SD = 1.04$).

### 2.2.2 Bigot’s (dis)likeability

In an attempt to fully understand the dynamics involved in the confrontation of prejudice, I also examined participants’ perceptions of the bigot. Likeability of the perpetrator of prejudice (single item) did not vary between conditions (all $ps > .17$). Compared to baseline ratings ($M = 4.25$, $SD$
= 1.23), however, it appears that when participants read about the antigay comment (which occurred in both confrontation conditions), they liked the perpetrator less (No Confront: $M = 3.68, SD = 1.48$; Confront: $M = 3.63, SD = 1.51$), without regards to the condition assigned, $F(2,188) = 3.76, p = .03$. It appears that orientation and confrontation viewing are not effective at predicting liking for the bigot.

I was also able to examine other perceptions of the bigoted character as the character evaluation questionnaire included items on how respectful, prejudiced, and unacceptable the bigot was. I reverse coded the item about respectfulness, then averaged all three ratings to create a score of perceived inappropriateness (Cronbach’s alpha = .62). A 2(Confrontation Condition) x 2(Orientation) ANOVA on perceived inappropriateness revealed a main effect of confrontation condition, whereby viewing a confrontation ($M = 5.02, SD = 1.18$) increased perceived inappropriateness when compared to no confrontation viewing ($M = 4.58, SD = 1.30$), $F(1, 130) = 3.99, p = .05$. As Figure 5 shows, this effect seemed to be mainly driven by the straight (No-Confront: $M = 4.56, SD = 1.09$; Confront: $M = 5.35, SD = 1.12$, $t(44) = -2.43, p = .02$) and

**Figure 5. Bigot’s inappropriateness**
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ambiguous (No-Confront: $M = 4.36, SD = 1.57$; Confront: $M = 5.02, SD = 1.08$, $t(43) = -1.60, p = .11$) orientations, with gay confronters ($M = 4.65, SD = 1.30$) and non-confronters ($M = 4.81, SD = 1.22$) not varying as much, $t(43) = 0.42, p = .68$. Since both straight and ambiguous categories seemed to react similarly on the scale, I collapsed both orientations and reran the analysis, which revealed a significant Confrontation x Orientation condition interaction, $F(1, 132) = 3.76, p = .05$, where perceived inappropriateness was greater only when confrontation involved a non-gay target. An intervention by a non-gay target was more effective in highlighting that prejudice occurred ($M = 5.19, SD = 1.10$) when compared to a non-gay target who did not confront ($M = 4.46, SD = 1.34$; $t(89) = 2.81, p = .006$; see Figure 6). Gay responders did not affect this perception whether they confronted ($M = 4.65, SD = 1.30$) or not ($M = 4.81, SD = 1.23$), $t(43) = .42, p = .68$.

Figure 6. Perceived Bigot's inappropriateness, orientation collapsed
Gay/Non-Gay
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**Error Bars: +/- 1 SE**

### 2.2.3 Perceived group memberships

Though some information was given in the Facebook profiles participants read, the character’s age, his ethnicity, the number of friends he has and, in some cases, his sexual orientation were missing. Still, we asked participants to fill a demographics questionnaire for each character to see
if confrontation and orientation affects any of these perceived memberships. Chi Square tests and ANOVAs were used. None of the demographic questions were affected by the experimental condition participants were assigned to (all $p$ values > .10), except for perceived sexual orientation.

Indeed, perceived sexual orientation was affected by both the orientation and confrontation conditions participants were assigned. For orientation, the gay character was perceived as more gay ($M = 2.69$, $SD = 1.58$), the straight character as more straight ($M = 6.17$, $SD = 1.22$), and the ambiguous character fell between the two ($M = 5.33$, $SD = 1.46$), significantly different from both other categories, $F(2, 130) = 76.31$, $p < .001$ (see Figure 7). This confirms that the manipulation worked and participants were attentive to the profiles they were handed. Interestingly, a main effect was also found for confrontation condition, $F(1, 130) = 5.96$, $p = .02$, whereby the target was viewed as more gay when he confronted ($M = 4.50$, $SD = 2.14$) than when he did not ($M = 4.95$, $SD = 1.97$) (see Figure 7). No interaction effect was found ($F < 1$), showing that all targets were viewed as gayer for confronting, even the one who declared being in a relationship with a woman.

**Figure 7. Perceived sexual orientation**

![Graph showing perceived sexual orientation](image)
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Sexual orientation is on a continuum from “Definitely gay” (1) to “Definitely straight” (7), with “Ambiguous/Unsure” as the midpoint (4)
2.2.4 Intentions to confront

I explored the data to debunk factors that could affect the participant’s desire to confront. I investigated how perceptions of the bigot could affect this intention to confront. If someone perceives something as being wrong and someone as being inappropriate, I thought this could serve as a motivator to confront that wrongdoing. To test this, I conducted a logistic regression predicting the participants’ intention to confront (yes/no) from the perceived inappropriateness of the bigot. This analysis yielded significant results, where an increase in perceived inappropriateness predicts greater intent to confront, $b = .20, SE = .06, z(135) = 13.38, p < .001$, Odds Ratio = 1.23:1. This means that for each increase of 1 in perceived inappropriateness, odds of having the intention to confront are multiplied by 1.23. As I have discussed before, confrontation by non-gay targets increased that perceived inappropriateness. Testing for moderated mediation using Hayes’ (2012) *Process* bootstrapping macro (Confidence interval of 95%, 10,000 resamples), it appears that this increase in perceived inappropriateness mediates the relation between confrontation viewing and an increased desire to confront, where viewing a confrontation by a non-gay confronter increases inappropriateness perception, which in turn predicts increased intent to confront (see Figure 8 for the conceptual display of this process, and Table 1 for results). Though tests for mediation yielded statistical significance, confrontation condition was not directly correlated with the participants’ intention to confront.

![Diagram](image-url)
Table 1. Conditional indirect effect of Confrontation on Intention to confront through Perceived bigot’s inappropriateness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Point Estimate of Indirect Effect</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>-.0965</td>
<td>.2499</td>
<td>-.6324</td>
<td>.3691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Gay</td>
<td>.4428</td>
<td>.2168</td>
<td>.1135</td>
<td>.9690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: BCa: bias corrected and accelerated, 10000 bootstrap samples. Confidence intervals containing zero are interpreted as not significant.

Intentions to confront were collected with a close-ended, yes/no question and an open-ended question. For the open-ended question, participants were asked: “What would you have done specifically if you had been part of this chat session with Kevin and Mark?” I coded these answers based on their recurring content and created 5 categories: would confront about antigay comment (57), would not confront (11), would question the perpetrator before making assumptions (29), would defend the movies and Dumbledore (30), and unclassifiable (9). After dropping those who made unclassifiable comments, I conducted a Chi Square test using the confrontation condition assigned and the coded intention to confront. Results show a significant influence of the confrontation condition on the participants’ intention to confront, $\chi^2(3) = 11.48$, $p = .009$, where viewing a confrontation increased the proportion of people confronting about the antigay comment and reduced the number of people confronting about the movies and Dumbledore (see Table 2). It appears that viewing someone confronting the antigay comment made participants more aware of the issue at stake and had them focus more on it rather than defending the movie. Whereas previous analyses failed to find a direct link between confrontation condition and the intention to confront when the latter was used in its dichotomous format (moderated mediation model), these analyses show that confrontation condition affects the quality of the intention to confront and makes it more focused on the antigay issue.
When examining the impact of viewing a gay or non-gay target on the coded intention to confront (collapsing across confrontation condition), Chi Square tests revealed that the respondent’s sexual orientation affects the intention to confront as well, $\chi^2(3) = 7.76$, $p = .05$ (See Table 2). Viewing a gay target decreased the number of participants who would confront about the movies. This possibly made gay issues salient from the beginning, making participants focus more on the antigay portion of the remark and forget about the movies and Dumbledore.

I hypothesized that negative affect would predict greater intent to confront. Many of the items included in the PANAS were not relevant to assessing participants’ affective state following this kind of task, such as “irritable”, “jittery” and “afraid”. Instead of adding all of the items, I only selected negative items on the scale that would be relevant to Monteith’s (1993) Self-Regulation of Prejudiced Responses theory (i.e. distressed, upset, guilty, and ashamed) and computed a negative affect score (Cronbach’s alpha = .59). I entered this score as an independent variable predicting intent to confront (yes/no) in a logistic regression. This analysis yields a significant result, $b = .18$, $SE = .08$, $z(135) = 4.88$, $p = .03$, Odds Ratio = 1.20:1, where an increase in negative affect predicts greater intent to confront. A separate linear regression predicting negative affect revealed no effect of confrontation and orientation conditions or their interaction, however (all $p$s > .24).

I also examined what intentions to confront predict in my data. I tested to see if intending to confront predicts different target ratings. Of course, the nature of these relationships could be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Confront about antigay comment</th>
<th>Would not confront</th>
<th>Question further</th>
<th>Confront about movie</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confront</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-Confront</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Confront about antigay comment</th>
<th>Would not confront</th>
<th>Question further</th>
<th>Confront about movie</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Gay</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bidirectional, or unidirectional in any of two ways. It could be that perceiving the characters in a particular way leads to increased desire to confront, and/or that being prone to confront leads to these perceptions. To test these relations between variables, I used independent samples t tests with intention to confront (yes (1), no (0)) as the grouping variable on the global positive assessment score I created (12-item score from the character evaluation questionnaire) The analysis revealed that participants who had an intention to confront had more positive evaluations of the target ($M = 5.29$, $SD = 0.67$) compared to those not having the intention to confront ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 0.83$), $t(134) = -5.73$, $p < .001$. I also found that participants who intended to confront rated the target as more persuasive ($M = 5.24$, $SD = 0.98$; $t(134) = -3.22$, $p = .002$) and as less of a complainer ($M = 2.17$, $SD = 1.15$; $t(134) = 4.38$, $p < .001$) than those not intending to confront (persuasiveness $M = 4.68$, $SD = 0.99$; complainer $M = 3.06$, $SD = 1.11$). These results will be further discussed in the following section.
Chapter 3
Discussion

This study aimed to investigate the perception of confronters to antigay prejudice. It is a first attempt to ascertain how group membership plays a role in the perception of ambiguous confronters. It also expands on previous research by investigating a different form of prejudice confrontation.

I found that likeability for confronters of antigay prejudice may not be affected the same way as with other types of prejudice such as sexism and racism. Whereas sexism and racism confronters were viewed more negatively for making the confrontation, it was not the case for antigay prejudice confronters. If anything, confronters of antigay prejudice were viewed more positively, especially if they were gay themselves. Moreover, gay non-confronters were disliked for not confronting the prejudiced comment. This is contrary to previous findings for other prejudices where target confronters were viewed as complainers and disliked for confronting. Many reasons could explain this unexpected result. First, several campaigns recently targeted younger audiences on the negative impact of bullying, enforcing the norm that hate speech and bullying were unacceptable. Many influential public figures sided with these campaigns and served as role models against antigay behaviour. Since most of our participants were young, maybe they viewed the action of standing up against such speech as noble and the right thing to do. Also, since homosexuality is a concealable identity and participants had privileged access to that information via Facebook profiles, perhaps they viewed a failure to confront by the gay target as a form of betrayal against his stigmatized group. It is also possible that the method used to introduce the characters to the participants led to greater liking for the confronters. By adding more information in the Facebook profiles such as music and movie preferences, participants were better able to relate to the characters involved and individuate them. They had access to more information about the confronter than they normally would were it a real-life situation. This limitation of the present paradigm is something that future experiments should improve upon.

By investigating how the perpetrator of prejudice was perceived across conditions, I found that non-gay confronters have a unique opportunity for highlighting the inappropriateness of antigay comments. Indeed, gay confronters left participants’ view of the antigay comment unchanged.
Their intervention did not increase perceptions of inappropriateness. However, non-gay confronters significantly boosted this inappropriateness perception, and this heightened perception was important in predicting the participants’ own intention to confront. Indeed, this perception mediated the link between viewing a confrontation and intent to confront. For this mediation model, confrontation viewing and intention to confront were not directly but were instead indirectly related through perceptions of inappropriateness. When viewing a confrontation by a non-gay target, people have an increased awareness that prejudice occurred and are more likely to intend to confront if they had been in that situation themselves. A lack of a direct relation here suggests that there may be multiple mediators to this relation, some of which could have a negative effect on the outcome variable (Hayes, 2009). One possibility is that, while confrontation highlights wrongdoing, it also takes care of the problem. In that case, people may not feel the responsibility to confront and supplement the intervention that has already been made. This would be an interesting factor to explore in future work and add to the mediation model proposed in the current study.

Confrontation viewing had an indirect effect on the number of people who reported wanting to confront, but had a direct impact on the quality of these intentions. Indeed, more people reported wanting to confront the comment for its antigay properties following the viewing of a confrontation rather than for its slandering of the Harry Potter series. It appears that confrontation underlined the antigay portion of the comment and made it salient to participants. Confrontation of antigay prejudice is therefore effective in raising awareness that there was wrongdoing and that something unacceptable has been said. As stated previously, this heightened awareness is essential to increase personal intent to confront.

Notwithstanding these positive elements to confrontation of antigay prejudice, confronting antigay prejudice comes at a certain cost. Confronters were viewed as potentially gayer than non-confronters for making a confrontation. This shift in sexual orientation scores applied to all confronters, regardless of the fact they were in a relationship with a man, a woman or with an undisclosed partner. Obviously, there is nothing wrong with appearing more or less gay to others. However, some people may be less comfortable with this, and most would not appreciate having others building a false impression about them. Homosexuality is stigmatized, and some people would prefer dissociating with such identities to not risk being tagged and treated with the stigma. Even if all liking ratings were not affected by confrontation or sexual orientation in this
study, participants reported the belief that an average Canadian would dislike homosexuals more than heterosexuals. This belief would be enough for people to want to avoid such stigma and try to maintain a heterosexual identity. Risking being tagged as homosexual is risking dislike from average Canadians, hence these beliefs could deter anybody from confronting antigay prejudice, particularly heterosexuals. This is unfortunate considering that non-gay confrontations were the most effective.

As with most studies, however, the proposed experiment has its limitations. First, reading a scripted chat log and fake profiles in a lab setting might not be representative of real-life situations and, although great precautions have been taken to make this situation as plausible as possible, poor external validity might still be a concern. Experiments in a live chat environment are planned as a follow-up to this research, where we will examine how participants interact in a live situation when they are faced with such a comment. Second, by using an undergraduate sample living in Toronto, we expose ourselves to an important sample bias, especially when studying antigay bias. Education, younger age and exposure to homosexuals have been linked to reduced bias towards gays, thus this sample may not be representative of all views on the subject. Therefore, studies using a larger, more diverse sample would be preferable for studying such topics. Third, the comment included may have been too subtle for some people to understand. Most people would have defended Dumbledore instead of the gay cause when asked about their motives for confronting. Using a more in-your-face, direct comment could be an interesting follow-up to this study. Nevertheless, using this more subtle comment helped to show that confrontation is useful in such situations to highlight the comment’s inappropriateness.

Going forward, I foresee multiple directions for building this program of research. First, it would be interesting to vary the intensity and the content of the comment. Testing how more blatant comments, possibly using offensive language such as “faggot”, or even more accepted forms of antigay speech such as the expression “that’s gay”, would probably yield very different results. I think that confrontation would be viewed as more of a complaint when confronting a seemingly benign comment such as “that’s gay”, where confrontation would be viewed as more nitpicky and even uncalled for. Because people rationalize that expression by justifying how not bigoted they are even if they say it, I think that we would replicate more closely Czopp and Monteith’s findings where target confronters would be tagged as complainers. This would be explained by my finding about how increased perceived inappropriateness predicts greater intention to
confront. I also linked these intentions to confront to a decrease in seeing the target as a complainer. Therefore, if the comment is not seen as inappropriate but rather as a rationalized expression, perceived inappropriateness would be at its lowest. This would be linked to lower intentions to confront, and as people have less desire to confront, they perceive the confronter as more of a complainer. Thus, people would need to perceive such language as being inappropriate so that confronters would not be tagged as complainers, and non-target confronters have the unique opportunity to increase that perception of inappropriateness. It would take a non-target’s intervention to be perceived as logical and bring about a questioning of the rationalized behaviour.

In the case of more blatant comments such as those containing very inappropriate language such as “faggot”, I think people would not rate confronters as complainers because, in that case, perceived inappropriateness would be at its highest. In other words, people would need to feel that there is a good reason for a confronter to confront in order to not tag them as complainers. Because non-target confronters increase the perceived inappropriateness of a prejudicial situation, and this alone is reason enough to confront, it could very well be the key as to why they are often perceived less as complainers themselves.

I would also like to see how confrontation of antigay prejudice happens in a natural environment. A follow up study is planned to assess this and will be conducted shortly. We will create a chat environment where participants will be logged in and where this similar chat script will occur between two characters. The participant will be able to interact with the characters and their reactions will be assessed from the chat log and from the different measures administered in the current study. I expect reactions to be very different from what participants hypothesized having in the present study. First, I expect people to confront less than when they were asked to imagine what they would do in such a situation. Perhaps because of social desirability, poor forecasting skills, or just “stage fright”, more angered people will probably internalize rather than externalize their negative feelings. The social costs associated with the confrontation would become real, and this threat to one’s reputation would dissuade many people from confronting. Yet, I expect people to be as offended by the comments made as those in the current experiment. For these reasons, this live situation will elicit more intense affect than a written chat log, and so I expect like and dislike for the characters to be stronger, as well as different ratings on the PANAS to be higher following the chat. I expect affect will play a larger role in a live chat in predicting other
variables than in a scripted conversation. By having participants be a part of the on-line chat, it will be possible to see if they join the target when he confronts, if they stand back and let the confrontation occur while not providing support, as well as seeing if they take the lead and confront when the target does not. In this live situation, I hope the confronting target would serve as a role model of sorts, and indicate that confronting antigay prejudice is an okay thing to do. It would then show that confrontation is not made in vain, and that it can help to reduce antigay prejudice.

**Conclusion**

By increasing our understanding of the dynamics involved in confrontation of antigay speech, the proposed research aims to improve the quality of life of gays and lesbians in Canada. Through investigating people’s reactions to those who confront antigay speech, we will be better able to develop effective interventions aimed at creating tolerant and accepting spaces for the LGBT community in Canada and prevent situations like Jamie Hubley faced.
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Appendices

Appendix A

*Character evaluation questionnaire*

Now we will ask you about the participants who were involved in the conversation.

Remember that you still have the Facebook profiles in your possession so you may refer to those as needed.

Was KEVIN* part of the conversation you just read?
Kevin is LIKEABLE to the average Canadian
Kevin is LIKEABLE to me
Kevin is ATTRACTIVE
Kevin was RESPECTFUL
Kevin MADE SENSE
Kevin was PREJUDICED
Kevin was FUNNY
Kevin seemed to have a GOOD PERSONALITY
Kevin seemed IRRITATING
Kevin would be GOOD to have as a FRIEND
Kevin seemed like a COMPLAINER
What Kevin said was UNACCEPTABLE
Kevin believes that being TRUE TO HIMSELF is important
It would be NICE to have a CONVERSATION with Kevin
It seems like Kevin would be EASY TO GET ALONG with
Kevin FELT JUDGED or ATTACKED in the conversation
Kevin FELT HAPPY about the conversation
Kevin was ARTICULATE and LOGICAL
Kevin's profile (Facebook) helped me to know him better
Kevin and I have SIMILAR VIEWS on the topic that was discussed

* The name varied according to the character evaluated. All items were on 7-point Likert scales ranging from “Strongly Disagree” (1) to “Strongly Agree” (7).
Appendix B

Means and standard deviations on the Character Evaluation Questionnaire, pilot results ($N = 60$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Undiscl. ($n = 18$)</th>
<th>Gay ($n = 21$)</th>
<th>Straight ($n = 21$)</th>
<th>Bigot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geeky</td>
<td>$M$ 3.11$^a$</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$ 1.53</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>$M$ 3.72</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$ 1.36</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeable</td>
<td>$M$ 5.06</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$ 1.47</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>$M$ 4.28</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$ 1.67</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>$M$ 2.44$^*$</td>
<td>4.00$^*$</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$ 1.14</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good personnality</td>
<td>$M$ 5.06</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$ 0.94</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylish/Trendy</td>
<td>$M$ 4.83</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$ 1.58</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old</td>
<td>$M$ 1.83</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$ 1.20</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youthful</td>
<td>$M$ 5.39</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$ 1.29</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritating</td>
<td>$M$ 3.00</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$ 1.19</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice to converse with</td>
<td>$M$ 4.83</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$ 1.47</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to get along with</td>
<td>$M$ 5.00</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$ 1.09</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His profile helped me</td>
<td>$M$ 4.83$^*$</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know him better</td>
<td>$SD$ 1.72</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar tastes to mine</td>
<td>$M$ 4.22</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$ 1.90</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plausible profile</td>
<td>$M$ 4.61</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$ 1.15</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There could be someone</td>
<td>$M$ 6.39</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like him in the real</td>
<td>$SD$ 0.78</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guess Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>$M$ 5.33</td>
<td>2.38$^{**}$</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>$SD$ 1.28</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Higher scores represent higher agreement with the trait being representative of the character
$^b$ Scale ranged from Definitely gay (1) to Definitely straight (7), with Ambiguous/Unsure as the midpoint (4)
$^*$ Significantly different ($p < 0.05$)
$^{**}$ Significantly different from both other target conditions ($p < 0.001$)