

Deelopdracht 4: Wetenschappelijk artikel

Cursus Naam: Thesis Pedagogische Wetenschappen
Cursuscode: 200600042
Docent: Ellen Reitz
Datum: 14-6-2018
Naam: Saphinah Batuusa (6096913)
Melissa Montero Fortes Dias (6310087)
Word count: 5391

Abstract

The aim of the study was to examine the relationship between both the explicit and implicit SDS-stereotypes of adolescents and their attitudes towards homosexuality as well as the possible effect of gender on this relationship. The sample comprised of seven high schools in different parts of the Netherlands, consisting of 259 students aged 16-18 years ($M = 16.88$, $SD = 0.78$) of which 53% were females. Explicit stereotypes were examined with a questionnaire. Additionally, implicit stereotypes were tested with an Implicit Association Test (IAT). Two hierarchical regression analyses were performed separately. Results showed that girls held more positive attitudes towards homosexuality than boys. In both analyses, there was no relationship found between SDS-stereotypes and attitudes towards homosexuality. There was also no moderator effect found. Implications and future directions of this research are discussed.

Keywords: explicit SDS-stereotypes, implicit SDS-stereotypes, Sexual Double Standard, homosexuality, attitudes, adolescents

Relationship between Implicit and Explicit SDS-Stereotypes and Adolescents' Attitudes towards Homosexuality

Society teaches us that there are different norms for sexual behavior for men and women. Boys and men are glorified for their heterosexual intercourse, while girls and women are degraded and stereotyped for the same behavior (Kreager & Staff, 2009). This is known as the sexual double standard (SDS). Such stereotypes can be in accordance with added controlled (explicit) processes or automated (implicit) behaviors or attitudes within a person's outings (Dosch, Belayachi, & Van Der Linden, 2016). As far as adolescents are concerned, SDS-stereotypes have had a negative toll on adolescent's attitudes towards homosexuality (Buijs, Hekma, & Duyvendak, 2011). Homosexuality is a term employed for and beyond sexual attraction towards the persons of same-sex (Sullivan, 2004). Reiter (1989) defined homosexuality as the expression of feelings of attachments, longings, desires predominantly for a person of same sex. The expression can be in form of an obvious or hidden behavior. Indeed, homophobia is regarded as one of the outings of SDS-stereotypes (Zaikman & Marks, 2017).

Implicit stereotypes can be described as an unconscious or subconscious opinion, a comment or a statement that pushes men or women in a certain category regarding sexuality (Gawronski & Bodenhausen, 2006), whereas explicit SDS-stereotypes could be self-acclaimed, deliberately and consciously made evaluations of sexuality related statements, opinions or judgements (Gawronski & Bodenhausen, 2006).

Kreager and Staff (2009) state that the criterion for adolescent popularity is the same for both genders. This is the case when speaking of attractiveness, athletics or physical aggression. Sexual behavior is an exception to this rule. The social aftermath for early romantic and sexual experiences deviates considerably by gender (Kreager & Staff, 2009). Research proposed that the affiliation between lifetime sexual partners and peer status differ significantly for men and women (Kreager & Staff, 2009) and that both have different intent (Greene & Faulkner, 2005). For example, there was a common believe that women were either clean and virgin or promiscuous and easy, whereas boys had to sow their wild oats (Crawford & Popp, 2003; Greene & Faulkner, 2005). Put differently: Men who have multiple partners and who support casual sex are expected to support a set of negative attitudes towards women and their sexual activity (Yost & Zurbriggen, 2006).

Some scholars report that SDS does not exist (Sakaluk & Milhausen, 2012), while others report that it exists in certain contexts (Zaikman & Marks, 2017). The roots of the SDS can however be traced back to Freud's psychoanalytic theory (1986). Freud's theory played a role in making the female sexuality something to be ashamed of whereas the male

sexuality became something to be proud of creating the phenomena of the SDS (Bem, 1993). Additionally the social role theory explains that boys and girls are placed in different learning contexts as they grow up. Due to the sexual division of labor, men are assigned to sexual and societal roles superior to those occupied by women creating 'the gender belief system', in which SDS are strengthened (Bem, 1993). This entails the tendencies by society to submit to gendered sexual roles and disapproves whoever does not conform to these roles (Bem, 1993). This has negative consequences to the society. In the first place it encourages unhealthy sexual habits among men whereas women are sexually exploited. For instance the normalization of casual heterosexual intercourse among men while women are expected to commit in a relationship (Greene & Faulkner, 2005).

Despite of the potential negative consequences associated with SDS-stereotypes, (Buijs et al., 2011; Zaikman & Marks, 2017), little has been investigated about how SDS-stereotypes relate to the attitudes adolescents hold towards homosexuality. Our main purpose is to examine the relationship between both explicit and implicit SDS-stereotypes and attitudes adolescents (16-18 years) hold towards homosexuality.

Explicit SDS-Stereotypes and Attitudes towards Homosexuality

Explicit SDS-stereotypes are expressed in terms of self spoken or conscious thoughts that men occupy different sexual and gender roles in the society than women. This is because the society expects individuals to be heterosexuals (Bem,1993), homosexuals end up being negatively treated and condemned. The main trigger of negative attitudes towards homosexuality is the belief in traditional norms of gender and sexuality (Buijs et al., 2011). Another study reported a link between explicit SDS-stereotypes and attitudes towards homosexuality (Zaikman & Marks, 2017).

People submit to explicit SDS-stereotypes by expecting men to be sexually active and women to be sexually submissive as dictated by traditional gender norms. Male homosexuals are regarded as violators of the dominating role while female homosexuals are perceived as deviants to female sexual submissiveness by sexually dominating other women. Individuals who adhere to explicit SDS-stereotypes by believing that every gender has a predetermined sexual role may show negative attitudes towards homosexuals (Zaikman & Marks, 2017).

In addition, homophobia is sparked off by the threatened loss of sexual power. There is widespread propaganda among perpetrators of homosexual violence that being approached by homosexual men is equivalent to having anal sex with them. This is linked to the fear of losing their traditionally perceived manhood (Buijs et al., 2011). Likewise, women who are attracted to fellow women are condemned for dropping their sexually

passive roles. However some heterosexual men evaluate lesbians positively because men derive imaginary sexual gratitude from woman to woman sexual encounters (Zaikman & Marks, 2017). For instance, Ronnen (2010) reported that woman to woman grinding on the dancefloor was judged sexy whereas a man would not dare to dance with another man regardless of their sexual orientation, due to fear of being called homosexuals. To add on, the percentage of males in Amsterdam that viewed women kissing each other filthy was lower than the percentage that thought of man to man kissing as filthy (Buijs et al., 2011).

Investigations have reported that both men and women rated women as being more acceptable to engage into homosexuality and bisexuality (Milhausen, 2008). This could be explained by the gender belief system which views women as men's possession and a man who does not fit the stereotype is not being accepted (Bem, 1993).

Explicit SDS-stereotypes regard beautification of appearances as a feminine behavior (Emmerink, van den Eijnden, ter Bogt, & Vanwesenbeeck, 2017). Most homophobic cases have been motivated by the assumed femininity of the male homosexuals. For instance the gay men wearing feminine clothes in public are condemned. However gay men who keep up to the societal perceived masculinity gain more respect than feminine heterosexual men (Buijs et al., 2011).

The above findings motivate our goal to investigate the extent to which explicit SDS-stereotypes of adolescents (16-18 years old) are related to their attitudes towards homosexuality. Based on the above mentioned research we expect that adolescents who conform to traditional explicit SDS-stereotypes have more negative attitudes towards homosexuality than adolescents who deviate from explicit SDS-stereotypes.

Implicit SDS-Stereotypes and Attitudes towards Homosexuality

The SDS research concluded that men support more traditional implicit attitudes in comparison to women. Men showed more gender-neutral implicit attitudes. Which implies that men have the same implicit attitudes regarding men and women. Whereas women had a significant opposite double standard where it is not the case that active women are not appreciated but promiscuous men (Sakaluk & Millhausen, 2011). As previously stated implicit attitudes can be automated and unconscious (implicit) which affects thoughts and beliefs. Gabriel, Banse and Hug (2007) imply that one's implicit attitudes not only predict impulsive behaviors but also intentional behaviors. As an illustration, one's implicit attitudes towards obese females predicts the distance they choose to sit from her (Gabriel et al., 2007). To move in on implicit attitudes towards homosexuality, research has found that in the recent years homosexuality seems to be more accepted in the Western society (Steffens, 2005). Steffens implies that this may be caused by the fact that people nowadays

belief in equal rights for minorities and this may affect their choices when asked about homosexuality. Actions speak louder than words and research showed that implicit attitudes towards homosexuality can be notably negative (Steffens, 2005; Jellison, McConnel, & Gabriel, 2004). This is in contrast to Breen and Karpinski (2013), who have examined these implicit attitudes by use of the Single Category IAT (SC-IAT). Their research showed that implicit attitudes in the society towards homosexuality are neutral. This implies that ones implicit attitudes do not relate to their views on homosexuality. Overall the findings on this complicated concept seems not to be consistent.

If gay men come across negative gay attitudes in society throughout their lives, they can create negative implicit attitudes towards homosexuality. Even when establishing their own sexual identity (Jellison et al., 2004). Research showed that there was a correspondence between one's look on their own sexuality and their attitudes toward homosexuality: A negative idea and display leads to more negative and approachable attitudes towards homosexuality (Jellison et al., 2004). Under such circumstances, it is not surprising that the word 'gay' used as a slang word may have a negative association with implicit negative attitudes towards homosexuality (Nicolas & Skinner, 2012).

Giving these points we aim to examine to what extent implicit SDS-stereotypes of adolescents (16-18 years old) are related to their attitudes towards homosexuality. Subsequently we aim to examine whether this relationship is different for boys and girls. Based on the above findings, we expect that adolescents who have more traditional implicit SDS-stereotypes, have more negative attitudes towards homosexuality than adolescents who have more neutral or even reversed SDS-stereotypes.

Gender differences

Interestingly, gender differences have been reported in the relationship between SDS-stereotypes and attitudes adolescents hold towards homosexuality (Birkett & Dorothy, 2015). The findings of Keiller (2010) revealed a high correlation between traditional SDS-stereotypes and the attitudes men held towards homosexuality. In these research men who believed in male superiority over women displayed more hostility towards homosexuality than the men with neutral attitudes. In addition, women, regardless of their submission to traditional SDS-stereotypes like the belief in traditional gender norms systems, evaluated homosexuality fairly positive compared to men. Women with neutral gender beliefs evaluated homosexuality more positively than men with the same beliefs (Steffens, 2005). This discrepancy can be explained by the social role theory in which the upbringing of girls focus on the motherly role of kindness and acceptance of all humans while boys grow up with an attitude of being more macho and less empathetic (Bem, 1993). This could

negatively affect the way women express and view themselves as sexual beings by feeling compelled to give in to the sexual advances of men (Kreager & Staff, 2009). Perhaps it would increase homophobia among males (Birkett & Dorothy, 2015). Basing on the reported findings, we aim to investigate the following;

1. To what extent are the implicit SDS-stereotypes of adolescents (16-18 years old) related to their attitudes towards homosexuality and are there differences in this relationship between boys and girls?
2. To what extent are the implicit SDS-stereotypes of adolescents (16-18 years old) related to their attitudes towards homosexuality and are there differences in this relationship between boys and girls?

Based on the gender differences found in previous studies, we hypothesize that the relationship between explicit SDS-stereotypes, implicit SDS-stereotypes and attitudes towards homosexuality is stronger for boys than for girls.

Method

Participants

The sample included 259 participants with an age range of 16-18 years ($M = 16.88$, $SD = 0.78$) of which 53% were females. All participants were enrolled in high schools in the Netherlands, 21 were attending MAVO, 113 were attending HAVO, 103 were attending VWO/atheneum and 22 were attending gymnasium. There were 201 Dutch participants, 11 Turkish, 6 Asians, 11 Surinamese, 11 Indonesians and 16 were from other backgrounds.

Procedure

Research was conducted by submitting online questionnaires about the explicit and implicit SDS stereotypes as well as the attitudes the adolescents hold towards homosexuality. Convenience sampling was employed given that sexuality is a sensitive topic at this level of development of adolescents. Participants were contacted through their schools. Schools were approached by e-mail. A follow up on participation was done by phone call. Seven schools from different regions in the Netherlands participated in the research (5 schools had 1 class participating and 2 schools had 2 classes participating). The questionnaire was classically administered in computer rooms at school. Students were required to promptly fill out the questionnaire. Participation was anonymous and voluntary and participants could freely withdraw from participation at any given point without giving a reason. Participants received a link to the survey with a login code. It was clearly explained to the participants that the survey would take at least 30 minutes. Those who did not complete the questionnaire in 30 minutes were advised on how to proceed in their free time. The research goal was clarified by the researcher prior to the beginning of the survey.

The researchers were present during the administration of the survey. Dutch was used as the language of instruction.

Measures

Attitudes towards homosexuality. To measure attitudes towards homosexuality, the following item was used: 'I think homosexuality is ...' and participants rated this item on a 5-point likert scale (ranging from 1= *totally wrong* and 5 =*totally right*). A higher score meant a positive attitude towards homosexuality.

Explicit SDS-stereotypes. The judgement of explicit SDS-stereotypes was based on the Scale for the Assessment of Sexual Standards among Youth: *SASSY Questionnaire* (Emmerink, van den Eijnden, ter Bogt, & Vanwesenbeeck, 2017). This questionnaire consists of 16 items measured on a 3-point scale for instance an item; 'who do you expect to often have sex without feelings of attachment?' and the participants would choose whether it is applicable to (1=*males*, 2=*females* or 3=*both males and females*). All the items were recoded to get a consistent outcome for the explicit SDS-stereotypes. For the stereotypes associated with male roles, every item that had scored 1 remained unchanged to mean agreeing to a stereotype, score 2 was recoded to -1 to mean contradicting the expected stereotype and score 3 to 0 to mean that the item applies to both males and females. For the items designed to agree to stereotypes applied to women, score 1 was recoded to -1 to mean contradicting the expected stereotype, score 2 to 1 to mean agreeing to the proposed stereotype and score 3 to 0 to mean that the item applies to both males and females. All the 16 items were computed on one scale using the mean. Neutral stereotypes received a mean around 0, traditional stereotypes received a positive mean and reversed stereotype received a negative mean. The instrument was found reliable ($\alpha = 0.62$). Validity is assumed since it is a pre-existing instrument already used in different studies.

Implicit SDS-stereotypes. The implicit association task (Greenwald, Nosek, & Banaji, 2003) was used to assess the adolescents' implicit SDS stereotypes. The IAT determines automatic associations relating to sexually passive and sexually active concepts on one side and female and male names on the other side. By the use of blocks an individual had to categorize male names and sexually passive concepts as well as female names and sexually active concepts. They had to sort the words on their screen as fast as possible. To decrease the likelihood of order effects the individuals were assigned randomly to one of two IAT variations. To illustrate: participants were given the incongruent version first and then the congruent version and vice versa (Nosek et al., 2003). A scoring algorithm was used to assess the individuals' levels of implicit early on stereotypes. When

an individual showed positive scores on the IAT they presented traditional implicit SDS stereotypes. A reverse SDS stereotype was present when individuals showed negative scores on the IAT. When an individual associated both males and females with sexually active and sexually passive concepts they presented an egalitarian implicit SDS stereotype. Their scores were around zero on the IAT.

Results

Both scales of explicit SDS-stereotypes, implicit SDS-stereotypes and gender were standardized so as to check the assumption of multicollinearity. Further, a bell shaped histogram confirmed the fulfilment of normality for explicit SDS-stereotypes. For implicit SDS-stereotypes, not all assumptions were kept. For example the data seemed nonlinearly related. This may indicate that our predictors, Gender, Implicit SDS-stereotypes and Gender*Implicit SDS-stereotypes, were in error. Yet we chose to continue with the analyses.

For both research questions, a hierarchical regression analysis was run using IBM SPSS statistics version 24.

Explicit SDS-stereotypes

To examine whether the explicit SDS-stereotypes are related to the attitudes towards homosexuality among adolescents and whether there is a difference in this relationship between boys and girls, a hierarchical regression analysis was performed. The independent variable was the explicit SDS-stereotypes. The dependent variable was attitudes towards homosexuality. Gender was the moderator variable. In the first step the effect of gender on the attitudes towards homosexuality was controlled. In the second step, the main effect of explicit SDS-stereotypes on the attitudes towards homosexuality was added to the model. In the third step, the interaction between explicit SDS-stereotype and gender on attitudes towards homosexuality was included in the model. The results are summarized in Table 1.

On step 1, there was a negative significant relationship between gender and the attitudes towards homosexuality, $F(1,257) = 24.30, p < .001$. This indicates that girls have a more positive attitude towards homosexuality than boys. Gender accounted for a significant 9% of the variance in the attitudes towards homosexuality. On step 2, there appeared a non-significant relationship between explicit SDS-stereotypes and attitudes towards homosexuality, $F(1,255) = 12.19$. This indicates, in contrast to the hypothesis, that a high score on the explicit SDS-stereotypes does not relate to a high score on the attitudes towards homosexuality. This means that there is no relationship between SDS-stereotypes and attitudes towards homosexuality. On step 3, adding the interaction term

explicit SDS-stereotypes*gender to the model displayed a non-significant moderating effect of gender in relationship between explicit SDS-stereotypes and attitudes towards homosexuality, $F(1,255) = 8.22$. This indicates that the relationship between explicit SDS-stereotypes and attitudes towards homosexuality does not differ between boys and girls. Overall adolescents had a positive score on the explicit SDS-stereotypes questionnaire thus most adolescents believed in traditional explicit SDS-stereotypes.

Table 1

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Attitudes towards Homosexuality with SDS-Stereotypes

Predictors	Attitudes towards homosexuality			
	Explicit SDS-stereotypes		Implicit SDS-stereotypes	
	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β
Step 1	.09	-.29*	.09	-.30*
Control variable				
Gender				
Step 2				
SDS-stereotypes	.00	.02	.00	.16
Step 3				
Gender X SDS-stereotypes	.00	-.04	.01	.09
Total R^2	.09		.10	

Note. $n = 259$. * $p < .001$.

Implicit SDS-stereotypes

We expected to find that adolescents who adhere to traditional implicit SDS-stereotypes have more negative attitudes towards homosexuality. And that this would be different for both genders.

Attitudes towards homosexuality was the dependent variable and gender, implicit SDS-stereotypes and the interaction between these two variables as independent variables.

In the first step the variable gender was included as a control variable. Subsequently the implicit SDS-stereotypes was included to test the main effect. Lastly the interaction between gender and implicit SDS-stereotypes was entered in step 3. The results of the analyses are found in Table 1.

Just like in the first analysis, girls held a more positive attitude towards homosexuality than boys ($F(1, 253) = 25.95, p < .001$). Gender explains 9% of the total variance in attitudes towards homosexuality. In the second step implicit SDS-stereotypes did not show a significant relationship with attitudes towards homosexuality. This indicates that implicit SDS-stereotypes do not relate to the attitudes of adolescents towards homosexuality. Results from the third step showed no significant moderating effect of gender. This indicates that the relationship between implicit SDS-stereotypes and attitudes towards homosexuality does not differ between boys and girls.

Discussion

The aim of the present research was to investigate the extent to which explicit and implicit SDS-stereotypes of adolescents (16-18 years old) are related to their attitudes towards homosexuality, and whether this relationship is different between boys and girls. We expected adolescents who conformed to traditional explicit and implicit SDS-stereotypes to have more negative attitudes towards homosexuality than adolescents who deviate from the SDS-stereotypes. We hypothesized that the relationship between explicit SDS-stereotypes and implicit SDS-stereotypes, on one hand, and attitudes towards homosexuality, on the other hand, is stronger for boys than for girls. Contrary to our expectations, there was no relationship found between explicit SDS-stereotypes and attitudes towards homosexuality, even though adolescents scored high on the explicit SDS-stereotypes. Our second analysis did not reveal any relationship between implicit SDS-stereotypes and attitudes towards homosexuality either. This contradicts previous research reporting that traditional explicit SDS-stereotypes and implicit SDS-stereotypes may relate to negative attitudes towards homosexuality (Buijs et al., 2011; Mark & Zaikman, 2017).

A possible explanation for this contrast might be our narrow operationalization and measurement of homosexuality judged by only one item. Yet homosexuality is a complex term that includes emotional desires, physical longings, abstract and concrete attraction to a person of the same sex (Reiter, 1989). For that matter, attitudes towards homosexuality become complex to measure especially by one item. From different studies, negative attitudes towards homosexuality were outed in different forms. For instance in the research of Buijs et al. (2011), it was reported that all perpetrators of homosexual violence expressed that homosexuality is not wrong to them, but they further expressed hatred for

homosexuals who display their affection in public, behave like women or approach the perpetrators with sexual intentions. Such responses exhibit the complexity of the attitudes towards homosexuality. Judging the attitudes towards homosexuality by asking plainly what the participants thought about homosexuality rated on a 5 point scale would not give enough insight in the attitudes towards homosexuality. Adolescents could be tempted to answer positively about what they thought of homosexuality due to the increased awareness that it is not 'politically correct' to show negativity towards minorities (Steffens, 2005). It should be noted that implicit negativity towards homosexuality is rampant in the modern society (Steffens, 2005). Future research should therefore widen the operationalization of the attitudes towards homosexuality. We also recommend that in future research the IAT should be used to measure the concept homosexuality. This could be an efficient way to detect one's implicit thoughts and beliefs towards homosexuality.

Furthermore, there is controversy in the previous literature about the existence of the SDS-stereotypes (Zaikman & Marks, 2017; Marks & Fraley, 2005), some scholars did not find clear evidence about the existence of SDS-stereotypes while others demonstrated its existence in certain contexts (Sakaluk & Milhausen, 2012). Perhaps SDS-stereotypes do not exist or do not relate to the context of the attitudes towards homosexuality. Despite that we ran two separate analyses i.e. explicit SDS-stereotypes and attitudes towards homosexuality and implicit SDS-stereotypes and attitudes towards homosexuality, there was no difference in both our investigations. Perhaps there are other variables like cultural background, gender, religious beliefs, race which might have a relationship with the attitudes towards homosexuality. Besides, the measurement of SDS-stereotypes could have been broader. Or the selection of items could have been more directed to attitudes towards homosexuality.

We expected gender differences in the relationship between explicit and implicit SDS-stereotypes and attitudes towards homosexuality. However, our findings were contrary to our expectation given that there was no difference found between boys and girls, in the relationship between explicit SDS-stereotypes one hand, implicit SDS-stereotypes on the other hand and attitudes towards homosexuality.

Interesting about our findings is, even though it was not hypothesized, that girls rated homosexuality more positively than boys. If the SDS-stereotypes did not exist, why would such a difference appear in both analyses? It is noteworthy that the positive attitudes that females hold towards homosexuality are attributed to the social role theory in which women have learned to be more accepting and loving as part of the female responsibility while men are expected to be less empathetic (Bem, 1993). Moreover, research has

suggested that endorsement to traditional-gender roles as one of the outings of traditional SDS-stereotypes related highly to the sex differences in the attitudes towards homosexuality (Whitley, 2002). In addition, Steffen (2005) reported that German female university students judged homosexuality more positively than their male counterparts. For that matter therefore, it would be expected that a difference could be found in the relationship between explicit and implicit SDS-stereotypes on one hand and attitudes towards homosexuality on the other hand. Extensive research should be done to firstly explain if there are substantial differences between boys and girls and also their attitudes towards homosexuality.

There are some limitations to the present study. First and foremost, the sample size was relatively small compared to the general population of adolescents attending Dutch high schools ($N=259$). However, the investigation targeted a population of all high school students in the Netherlands. The findings of this research should therefore be cautiously interpreted. In addition, the sample included highly educated adolescents (16-18 years) from the upper classes of high school. Schooling can be a sculptor of attitudes towards homosexuality which can encourage open-mindedness towards same-sex relations (Ohlander, Batalova, & Treas, 2005). Secondly, schooling may advance cognitive abilities like complex reasoning, this may enable individuals to assess new ideas better.

In the same way there seems to be a positive relation between people who have firm religious beliefs and negative attitudes as far as homosexuality is concerned (Barnes & Meyer, 2012; Rowat, Tsang, Kelly, LaMartina, McCullers, & McKinley, 2006). This may imply that there are different factors to take into account when researching the relationship between SDS-stereotypes and (explicit and implicit) attitudes towards homosexuality.

Also some participants reported that some questions were highly personal given their age. This could have led to filling in different answers that do not reflect their perception of SDS-stereotypes and attitudes towards homosexuality.

Additionally, all the information gathered was through self reports by the adolescents themselves. Even though this could capture the way adolescents view their behavior, it does not ensure over reliance on the information to declare a relationship between the SDS-stereotypes and attitudes towards homosexuality. It is recommended that a longitudinal research should be carried out to capture the existence of this relationship over time since attitudes and stereotypes can change over time.

Despite these limitations, the current study had some strength.

For instance it employed self reports to measure the SDS-stereotypes. It is agreed that in order to gain insights in sensitive topics like sexual behavior and thoughts of youth, self reports are not only more efficient but also more cost effective than observations.

It appears that there is no relationship between explicit SDS-stereotypes on one hand, implicit SDS-stereotypes on the other hand and attitudes towards homosexuality. Nonetheless, the inclusion of gender does not bring about any differences. However girls judge homosexuality more positively than boys. Generally, adolescents scored high on both explicit and implicit SDS-stereotypes tests. Basing on these findings, it is confusing to rule out the existence of the relationship between SDS-stereotypes and attitudes towards homosexuality. It is recommended that further research should be done with a broader operationalization of attitudes towards homosexuality to include both implicit and explicit attitudes. In addition demographic variables like gender identity, sexual orientation, and ethnicity, religious beliefs should be included in the future studies. Perhaps, these demographic variables relate more to the attitudes towards homosexuality than the explicit and implicit SDS-stereotypes.

It is also relevant to explore the specific effects of gender on the attitudes towards homosexuality. And the underlying factors that bring about this gender difference in the attitudes towards homosexuality. Future research should as well explore potential solutions to the negative attitudes of males towards homosexuality.

References

- Barnes, D. M., & Meyer, I. (2012). Religious affiliation, internalized homophobia, and mental health in lesbians, gay men and bisexuals. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *82*, 505–515. doi:10.1111/j.1939
- Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: Transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Bernard, E., & Whitley, J. (2002). Gender-role variables and attitudes towards Homosexuality. *Sex Roles*, *45*, 691-721. doi:10.1023/A:1015640318045S
- Birkett, M., & Espelage, D. L. (2015). Homophobic name-calling, peer-groups, and masculinity: *The socialization of homophobic behavior in adolescents*. *Social Development*, *24*, 184-205. doi:10.1111/sode.12085
- Breen, A. B., & Karpinski, A. (2012). Implicit and explicit attitudes toward gay Males and lesbians among heterosexual males and females. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *153*, 351-374. doi:10.1080/00224545.2012.739581
- Buijs, L., Hekma, G., & Duyvendak, J. W. (2011). As long as they keep away from me': The paradox of antigay violence in a gay-friendly country. *Sexualities*, *14*, 632-652. doi:10.1177/1363460711422304
- Chambers, D., Tincknell, E., & Van Loon, J. (2007). Peer regulation of teenage sexual identities. *Gender and Education*, *16*, 397-415. doi:10.1080/09540250042000251515
- Cochran, B. N., Peavy, K. M., & Cauce, A. M. (2007). Substance abuse treatment providers' explicit and implicit attitudes regarding sexual minorities. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *53*, 181-207. doi:10.1300/J082v53n03_10
- Cox, N., Dewaele, A., Van Houtte, M., & Vincke, J. (2010). Stress-related growth, coming out, and internalized homonegativity in lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth. An examination of stress-related growth within the minority stress model. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *58*, 117-137. doi:10.1080/00918369.2011.533631
- Crawford, M. & Popp, D. (2003). Sexual double standards: A review and methodological critique of two decades of research. *Journal of Sex Research*, *40*, 13-26. doi:10.1080/00224490309552163
- Dosch, A., Belayachi, S., & Van der Linden, M. (2016). Implicit and explicit sexual attitudes: How are they related to sexual desire and sexual satisfaction in men and women?. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *53*, 251-264. doi:10.1080/00224499.2014.1003361

- Gabriel, U., Banse, R., & Hug, F. (2007). Predicting private and public helping behavior by implicit attitudes and the motivation to control prejudiced reactions. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 46*, 365–382.
doi:10.1348/014466606X120400
- Gawronski, B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2006). Associative and propositional processes in evaluation: an integrative review of implicit and explicit attitude change. *Psychological Bulletin, 132*, 692–731. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.132.5.692
- Greene, K. & Faulkner, S. L. (2005). Gender, belief in the sexual double standard, and sexual talk in heterosexual dating relationships. *Sex Roles, 53*, 239–251. doi:10.1007/s11199-005-5682-6
- Greenwald, A. G., Banaji, M. R., Rudman, L. A., Farnham, S. D., Nosek, B. A., & Mellott, D. S. (2002). A unified theory of implicit attitudes, stereotypes, self-esteem, and self-concept. *Psychological Review, 109*, 3–25.
doi:10.1037/0033-295X.109.1.3
- Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2003). Understanding and using the implicit association test: I. An improved scoring algorithm. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 85*, 197–216.
- Jellison, W. A., McConnell, A. R., & Gabriel, S. (2004) Implicit and explicit measures of sexual orientation attitudes: In group preferences and related behaviors and beliefs among gay and straight Men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 629–642.
doi:10.1177/0146167203262076
- Keiller, S.W. (2010). Masculine norms as correlates of heterosexual men's attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women. *Psychology of men and Masculinity, 11*, 38–52. doi:10.1037/a0017540
- Kreager, D. A., & Staff, J. (2009). The sexual double standard and adolescent peer acceptance. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 72*, 143–164.
doi:10.1177/019027250907200205
- Milhausen, R. R., & Herold, E. S. (2002). Reconceptualizing the sexual double standard. *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality, 13*, 63–83.
doi:10.1300/J056v13n02_05
- Mora, R. (2013). 'Dicks are for chicks': Latino boys, masculinity, and the abjection of homosexuality. *Gender & Education, 25*, 340–356.
doi:10.1080/09540253.2012.757298
- Nicolas, G., & Skinner, A. L. (2012). "That's so say!" priming the general

- negative usage of the word *gay* increases implicit anti-gay bias. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *142*, 654-658.
doi:10.1080/00224545.2012.661803
- Nosek, B.A., Banaji, M.R., & Greenwald, A.G. (2002). Harvesting implicit group attitudes and beliefs from a demonstration web site. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *6*, 101-115.
- O'Higgins-Norman, J. (2009). Straight talking: explorations on homosexuality and homophobia in secondary schools in Ireland. *Sex Education*, *9*, 381-393. doi:10.1080/14681810903265295
- Ohlander, J., Batalova, J., & Treas, J. (2005). Explaining educational influences on attitudes toward homosexual relations. *Social Science Research*, *34*, 781-799. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2004.12.004
- Pascoe, C. J. (2005). 'Dude, you're a Fag': adolescent masculinity and the fag discourse. *Sexualities*, *8*, 329-346. doi:10.1177/1363460705053337
- Rees- Turyn, A. M., Doyle, C., Holland, A., & Root, S. (2008). Sexism and sexual prejudice (homophobia): the impact of the gender belief system and inversion theory on sexual orientation research and attitudes toward sexual minorities. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling*, *2*, 2-25.
doi:10.1080/15538600802077467
- Reiter, L. (1989). Sexual orientation, sexual identity, and the question of choice. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, *17*, 138-150.
doi.org/10.1007/BF00756141
- Ronnen, S. (2010). Grinding on the dance floor: Gendered scripts and sexualized dancing at college parties. *Gender & Society*, *24*, 355-377.
doi:10.1177/0891243210369894
- Rowatt, W. C., Tsang, J., Kelly, J., LaMartina, B., McCullers, M., & McKinley, A. (2006). Associations between religious personality dimensions and implicit homosexual prejudice. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *45*, 397-406. doi:10.1111/j.1468- 5906.2006.00314.
- Sabin, J. A., Riskind, R. G., & Nosek, B. A. (2015). Health care providers' implicit and explicit attitudes toward lesbian women and gay men. *American Journal of Public Health*, *105*, 1831-1841.

doi:10.2105/AJPH.2015.302631

Sakaluk, J. K., & Millhausen, R. R. (2011). Factor influencing university students' explicit and implicit sexual double standards. *The Journal of Sex Research, 49*, 464-476. doi:10.1080/00224499.2011.569976

Steffens, M. C. (2005). Implicit and explicit attitudes towards lesbians and gay men, *Journal of homosexualities, 49*, 39-66.

doi:10.1300/J082v49n02_03

Sullivan, M. K. (2004). Homophobia, history and homosexuality. *Journal of human behavior in the social environment, 8*, 1-13.

doi:10.1300/J137v08n02_01

Yost, M. R., & Zurbruggen, E. L. (2006). Gender differences in the enactment of sociosexuality: An examination of implicit social motives, sexual fantasies, coercive sexual attitudes, and aggressive sexual behavior. *Journal of Sex Research, 43*, 163-173. doi:10.1080/002244906095523

Zaikman, Y., Marks, M. J., Young, T. M., & Zeiber, J. A. (2016). Gender role violations and the sexual double standard. *Journal of homosexuality, 63*, 1608-1629. doi:10.1080/00918369.2016.1158007