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ABSTRACT

(Dis)entangling Gender Expression and Race in Antigay Discrimination:
An Intersectional Approach

by

Steph M. Anderson

Advisor: Michelle Fine

Current psychological definitions and operationalizations of antigay discrimination conceptualize negative treatment of lesbian, gay, bisexual and queer (LGBQ) individuals as a response to their same-gender sexual orientations and not other factors. Because an individual’s sexual orientation is always understood through racialized hegemonic gender ideologies, however, attention to gender expression – how one “does” gender – and dynamics of race within antigay encounters is essential. Comprised of two mixed-method studies, this dissertation examines the role of gender expression and race in antigay discriminatory encounters from two perspectives: those who are targets of discrimination (i.e., cisgender and transgender LGBQ individuals) and those who may discriminate (i.e., straight individuals).

Quantitative and qualitative findings from Study 1 revealed that presenting in ways that varied from or adhered to traditional gender expectations in relation to one’s birth-assigned gender translated into qualitatively distinct experiences of discrimination for LGBQ participants, suggesting that sexual orientation can exist as both a visible and concealable social identity. The visibility of “race” relative to normative Whiteness also produced distinctions between LGBQ participants of color and White LGBQ individuals both within intra- and interracial contexts. Demonstrating the importance of attending to covert forms of discrimination, LGBQ individuals
experienced ambiguity both in regard to if discrimination occurred and if it did as a result of which of their social identities.

Study 2 utilized an experimental design to examine the extent to which antigay discrimination as expressed among straight individuals is a function of target gender, gender expression, sexual orientation and race. Although no significant main effects or interactions were found in tests of the main hypotheses, straight participants who failed to pass one or multiple scenario manipulation checks did so disproportionately in scenarios where the target defied the gender inversion stereotype that gay men are effeminate and lesbian woman are masculine (e.g., a straight woman who was masculine in appearance). That no differences existed between eligible and non-eligible participants in terms contact with LGBQ individuals, social desirability, a priori antigay prejudice or endorsement of gender norm beliefs, points to the power of hegemonic gender ideologies above and beyond attitudinal beliefs and suggests that misrecognition constitutes an additional form of covert discrimination.

Taken together, findings across both studies demonstrate the salience of hegemonic gender ideologies in the precipitation and interpretation of antigay discriminatory encounters. The extent to which one’s sexual orientation is perceivable is always tenuous, context-dependent, and an inter-relational experience that is informed by racialized gender stereotypes. These findings carry implications for psychological research and policy work in terms of the conceptualization of antigay discrimination and work toward its eradication. If one of the primary functions of antigay discrimination is to maintain gender ideologies, violence and discrimination against LGQB individuals will continue to exist as long as White hegemonic gender norms remain intact.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction and Aims
Introduction

In 2003, Sakia Gunn, a 15-year old student was fatally stabbed after a night out at Greenwich Village piers in Manhattan, a popular spot for gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBQ) youth. While waiting for a bus in Newark, New Jersey, Sakia and her friends were approached and sexually propositioned by two men. Sakia rejected their advances, stating that she was a lesbian. The men attacked Sakia and her friends, stabbed Sakia, and fled the scene. An African American young woman, Sakia often dressed in masculine attire. Her assailants were also African American. In subsequent police reports, Sakia’s murder was declared a gay hate crime. Although Sakia’s murder led to the development of the Newark Pride Alliance and Sakia Gunn Aggressives & Femmes organization, students in her high school were not allowed to hold a vigil in her memory, as the rainbow colors – symbols of LGBTQ pride – were labeled as gang signifiers. Additionally, the African American mayor of Newark at the time denounced the crime yet failed to meet with community activists who wanted local policy changes (Collins, 2005).

Sakia Gunn’s death and its aftermath raise a number of questions about the role of gender, gender expression and race in what gets categorized as “antigay discrimination.” While her sexual orientation arguably played a role in the violent attack, Sakia’s death cannot be solely considered in relation to her sexuality. Was Sakia attacked because of an open declaration of her lesbian identity? Were her assailants uncomfortable with Sakia’s masculine presentation or perhaps their attraction to it? Were they reacting to their feelings, as heterosexual men, that Sakia was improperly representing Blackness (Moore, 2011)? Questions also surface around how Sakia understood the experience. Did she attribute the attack to her gender expression, sexual orientation, race, or some combination of her multiple social identities? While we will
never know the specific motivations of her assailants or Sakia’s interpretation of it, to categorize her murder solely as an antigay hate crime erases the complexity of this tragedy, its aftermath, and Sakia’s embodied positionality.

The need for an intersectional analysis of antigay discrimination is made evident when Sakia’s death is contrasted with the public outcry of another antigay hate crime (Collins, 2005). In 1998, Matthew Shepard, a young, White gay man, was abducted and driven to a remote area in Wyoming where he was tied to a fence, brutally beaten and left to die. His body was found 18 hours later (“Matthew Shepard Foundation » Matthew’s Story -,” 2014). Different from the outcome of Sakia’s murder, Matthew’s death elicited nation-wide protests that pushed for federal antigay hate crimes legislation. Unfortunately, as in Sakia’s murder, we will never know how Matthew made sense of the attack. Did he feel he was targeted because of his sexual orientation? His gender expression? A perceived violation of rural social norms?

Considered side-by-side, these two tragedies highlight the variability and diversity of experience that can be placed under the category, “antigay hate crime.” More specifically, the use of “antigay discrimination” as a catch-all for discrimination experienced by LGBQ individuals obfuscates the salience of social historical context and the ways in which multiple social positionalities (i.e., in regard to gender, gender expression and race) shape discriminatory encounters (Collins, 2005). These examples demonstrate the need for a more complete understanding of antigay discrimination using theoretical and analytical frameworks to identify the role of sexual orientation in relation to other social positionalities.

In this dissertation, I strive to disentangle the threads of gender identity, gender expression, and race within antigay discriminatory encounters. Using two mixed-method studies, I examine antigay discrimination from both from the perspective of those who experience
antigay discrimination (i.e., cisgender and transgender LGBQ) and from the perspective of those who enact it (i.e., straight individuals).

In this first chapter, I outline the theoretical framework and identify the three aims of the dissertation. Chapter 2 presents Study 1, which quantitatively and qualitatively explores the role of gender expression and race in cisgender and transgender LGBQ individuals’ exposure to and subjective experiences of antigay discrimination. I review the extant psychological literature related to this study and discuss the rationale, design, and results. Switching vantage points, in Chapter 3, I discuss the rationale, design, and results from Study 2, which experimentally examines enacted antigay discrimination as assessed among straight individuals and the extent to which antigay discrimination is a function of target gender, gender expression, sexual orientation and race.

In Chapter 4, I move away from discussions of antigay discrimination to examine theoretical and methodological considerations of quantitative assessments of gender expression. Although psychologists long ago documented the gender inversion stereotype that gay men are effeminate and lesbian women are masculine (Kite & Deaux, 1987) and although gender expression provides an underutilized lens for understanding LGBQ individuals’ experiences, few validated measures exist to assess gender expression. Finally, in Chapter 5 I close with concluding remarks that reflect across these empirical analyses. I also discuss the limitations of this dissertation, consider possible future directions for intersectional research on discrimination against cisgender and transgender LGBQ individuals, and discuss the implications of this work for policy interventions aimed at the eradication of antigay discrimination.
A Note on Terminology and the Use of Social Identity Categories

*Gender Identity.* Gender identity, or gender self-categorization, refers to an individual’s conception of self as being “male”, “female” or another self-identifying term (e.g., two-spirit) (Nestle, Howell, & Wilchins, 2002; Wilchins, 2004). Within the social sciences literatures, researchers have increasingly used the word *cisgender* to refer to individuals who identify with their birth-assigned gender. *Cis* is the Latin prefix for “on the same side as.” Use of the term cisgender draws attention to the ways in which cisgender identities have typically been positioned as “normal” (and thus positive), while transgender has been positioned as a deviation from the norm and thus negative (Ansara & Hegarty, 2012). ¹ *Transgender or trans*¹ are umbrella terms used to characterize individuals who do not identify with the gender category assigned to them at birth (Friedman, 2014; Tate, Youssef, & Bettergarcia, 2014). *Trans* is the Latin prefix for “across” or “beyond.” Within the transgender spectrum, *trans men* (often referred to as “FTM”) and *trans women* (often referred to as “MTF”) derive descriptive meaning for their identity from the gender binary (Tate et al., 2014).² A number of trans* individuals, however, do not identify as exclusively male or female. Stated differently, while some trans* individuals may transition from one end of the gender binary to the other, other individuals identify simultaneously as *both* male and female or as *neither* male nor female. These individuals’ identities are best described as “beyond” the gender binary (Tate et al., 2014). Following previous researchers, within this dissertation, I refer to nonbinary trans individuals as

¹ Much of the theory I engage with in this chapter was written before the rise and use of
² See Tate, Youssef, & Bettergarcia, (2014) for a discussion of the ethical problems associated with describing trans men as FTM and trans women as MTF outside of medical contexts.
genderqueer (Factor & Rothblum, 2008; Tate et al., 2014). Throughout this dissertation, I use “cis” and “trans” as modifiers to refer to cisgender and transgender men and women more generally and differentiate between binary and nonbinary trans individuals in particular where appropriate.

*Gender Expression.* Gender expression refers to the manifestation of an individual’s sense of being masculine and/or feminine through the use of names and accouterments associated with gender groups (Kessler & McKenna, 1985; Wilchins, 2004) or, simply stated, the way in which one “does” gender (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Within this dissertation I refer to gender expression as the ways in which people physically present themselves in regard to appearance (e.g., physical build, clothes), and behaviorally present in regard to mannerisms (e.g., style of speech, gestures) (Kessler & McKenna, 1985; Wylie, Corliss, Boulanger, Prokop, & Austin, 2010). Importantly, gender expression is not necessarily an identity, but rather the way in which one’s understanding of self as male, female, or other is embodied and communicated to others. For many – in particular individuals whose embodiments coincide with hegemonic gender norms – this communication is unconscious and experienced as a “natural” expression of self. For individuals who defy gender expectations, gender expression may constitute a more conscientious embodiment, as transgressing societal gender norms requires constant negotiation of the expectations and perceptions of others. When an individual assigned male at birth presents in ways that are socially and culturally associated with females or when an individual assigned female at birth presents in ways that are socially and culturally associated with males, this individual’s gender expression is considered to be *gender nonconforming* (Gordon & Meyer,

---

3 As an important limitation, I did not ask participants to indicate their preferred pronoun. Therefore, throughout this dissertation I use “they/their” as a gender-neutral pronoun for nonbinary trans individuals (i.e., genderqueer).
Using this definition, transgender and genderqueer individuals are also sometimes categorized as gender nonconforming, due to the ways in which their self-identifications and embodiments place them outside the expectations of their gender assigned at birth (e.g., assigned male at birth = embodied masculinity).

Gender nonconformity, however, is a fraught term within academic scholarship. Labeling individuals as conforming or nonconforming may impose an identity or descriptor with which they do not identify. A trans man, for example, who presents and behaves masculine is conforming to his gender identity, not opposing it. Labeling him as nonconforming not only denies recognition of his sense of self but may also reinforce perceptions of “otherness” and therefore elicit connotations of stigma. When I use the language of gender conforming and gender nonconforming within this dissertation, I aim to emphasize how individuals are perceived by others in relation to hegemonic gender expectations, not in regard to how they self-identify. Where necessary, I use the language of “being perceived as” to emphasize this distinction, as well as a means to portray gender expression as an unstable and context-dependent attribute.

*LGBTQ Acronym.* Within psychological research and public conversation, the acronym, “LGBT” of “LGBTQ” are commonly used to collectively refer to individuals who are sexual minorities (Fassinger & Arseneau, 2007). As summarized by (Lombardi, Wilchins, Priesing, & Malouf, 2001):

> There exists widespread misconception that gender and sexual orientation are inextricably linked – that is, the parallel yet contradictory assertions that gender transgressions are indicative of same-sex sexual preferences (the incorrect assumption that transgender people ‘really’ are all LG) and that lesbian and gay men want to be men and women, respectively (the misconception that LGs ‘really’ want to be the other gender) (p. 91).

The use of the “LGBT” acronym exacerbates the conflation of gender identity and sexual orientation. Whereas the “L” and “G” communicate both gender identity and sexual desire, the
“B” denotes sexual desire alone, while “T” solely depicts gender identity. Thus, the acronym creates a paradox. It reinforces the problematic conflation of gender identity and sexual orientation, at the same time that it portrays them as mutually exclusive. The separation of “T” from “LGB” implies that trans* individuals are heterosexual at the same time that all LGB individuals are cisgender. While the issues that trans* individuals confront are related to those that cis LGB individuals confront, they are not synonymous. And although the expansion of the acronym from previously referring to only gay and lesbian individuals to also include bisexual, transgender and queer people marked an effort to move away from outdated conceptualizations of homosexuality (Herek, 2009), in practice, the acronym more often characterizes the experiences of White cis gay men and lesbian women, silencing the differential experiences among White bisexual, trans* and queer and individuals (Fassinger & Arseneau, 2007). With these considerations, within this dissertation, I use the acronym “LGBQ” to refer to sexual orientation that is non-heterosexual. I intentionally remove the commonly included “T” and instead differentiate where appropriate between cis and trans* experiences (e.g., cis and trans* LGBQ individuals).

The absence of attention to trans* LGBQ experiences can in part be explained by how the “doing” of gender is thought about differently for trans* and cis people. Tate et al., (2014) note that the “doing” of gender for trans* persons involves actively changing from their birth-assigned gender categories; they are actively changing from one gender to another. The assumption is that for cis persons, there is no active experience of gender identity development; instead, it is passive. This is echoed in discourses that center upon external cues of visual presentation (attire and mannerisms) for cis persons (West & Zimmerman, 1987), but on identity in research on trans* people (Tate et al., 2014). In considering cis and trans* LGBQ experiences
of antigay discrimination concurrently, I hope to 1) better understand gender expression for all LGBQ persons in discriminatory encounters and 2) to expand psychological conceptualizations to consider similar workings of gender among cis and trans* individuals (Tate et al., 2014).

**Sexual Orientation and Sexual Identity.** Within the psychological literature, sexual orientation has been measured in various ways, most commonly as self-identification (i.e., one identifies as straight, gay, lesbian, bisexual, queer, etc.), sexual behaviors (e.g., engagement in various types of same- or other-gender sexual behaviors) and sexual attraction (i.e., sexual desire for the same gender, other gender, both, neither) (Badgett, 2009). Within this dissertation, I refer to sexual orientation through self-identified sexual identity. Specifically, I use the term “straight” to refer to individuals who identify as heterosexual and “queer” as an umbrella term to collectively refer to individuals who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, queer or another non-straight identity.

**Theoretical Background**

**Heterosexual Matrix and Antigay Discrimination**

Current definitions and operationalizations conceptualize antigay prejudice and discrimination exclusively as responses to same-gender sexual orientation (e.g., Herek, 2004). Stated differently, negative attitudes toward same-gender sexuality are attributed to a target’s violation of expectations about sexual orientation and not other factors (Blashill & Powlishta,

---

4 Whereas antigay prejudice refers to negative attitudes toward sexual minorities, antigay behaviors (i.e., discrimination) describes negative behavioral actions against LGBQ individuals. Although individuals who discriminate against LGBQs often hold antigay prejudice beliefs, negative attitudes alone do not cause discriminatory behavior. Additionally, throughout history, the language used to describe antipathy toward homosexuality or same-sex sexuality has varied. Although homophobia and heterosexism are most commonly used, I use the term “antigay prejudice” and “antigay discrimination” as inclusive terms and as a way to acknowledge that psychological concepts and terminology result from societal and cultural ideologies about sexuality.
Antigay prejudice and discrimination, however, can often be explained not only by sexual orientation but also by gender expression, as antigay behaviors may result when LGBQ people do gender “inappropriately” (Horn, 2006; Kite & Whitley, 1998; Sandfort et al., 2007). Performative and fluid, gender is not an essential attribute of “male” or “female,” but instead represents a series of symbols and practices that have been culturally, linguistically, and institutionally attached to particular gendered embodiments (Butler, 1990; Kessler & McKenna, 1985; Wilchins, 2004). That actions and behaviors can be described as “masculine” or “feminine” exposes the ways in which gender constitutes an achieved status, as opposed to an innate one (Connell, 2005; Crawford, 2003; Franklin, 1998; West & Zimmerman, 1987). Summarized by Greene (2000), although gender is “presumed to be a natural outgrowth of biological sex, [it] paradoxically must be taught to all members of society” (p. 241). Despite considerable overlap between males and females in regard to personality attributes (Deaux & Lewis, 1984; Hyde, 2005), masculinity and femininity are most commonly described in terms of opposites: whatever is male is “not female” and vice versa (Connell, 2005; Foushee, Helmreich, & Spence, 1979; Kite & Deaux, 1987).

The expectations of how individuals should look, act, and dress based upon their birth-assigned gender category is deeply embedded within United States culture and is conflated with Whiteness and socioeconomic class (Schippers, 2007). Butler (1990) describes that within Western cultures a hegemonic belief exists regarding the expected relationship between birth-assigned gender category, gender (including gender identity and expression), and sexual desire as the heterosexual matrix: to be male/female, is to be masculine/feminine, is to be heterosexual and thus desirable (Lock, 2003). Wilchins (2004) succinctly describes the imperceptibility and thus impossibility of deviation from a binary gender configuration: “Two-ness is not something ‘out
there’ but a product of the way we see. We look for that two-ness. Our categories assure that we see it. That’s why no matter what gender I do, the only question is, ‘Are you a man or a woman?’” because that exhausts all the available possibilities” (p. 43). In this configuration, gender is represented as zero-sum: one cannot be masculine and feminine, but is masculine through the absence of femininity.

As a centerpiece of the heterosexual matrix, gender expression carries societal meaning not only for how an individual’s gender assigned at birth is attributed, but also as an individual’s sexual orientation. The psychological inclination to categorize individuals is a universal tendency (Augoustinos & Walker, 1995), in particular the need to distinguish between “male” and “female” (Kessler & McKenna, 1985). Research has shown that genitals are one of the most salient features for the attribution of gender identity and birth-assigned gender (Friedman, 2014; Hegarty & Buechel, 2006; Kessler & McKenna, 1985). However, because genital knowledge is often unavailable (i.e., we often encounter individuals who are clothed), gender expression is referenced as a means to infer an individual’s gender assigned at birth. Similarly, sexual desire is often not readily visible or available to others. In the absence of behavioral or verbal evidence (e.g., kissing, holding hands, declaring same-sex identity), gender expression often serves as the basis for the perception of an individual’s sexual orientation. Thus, the way in which one embodies masculinity and/or femininity is a central component for the attribution of sexual orientation, in addition to gender assigned at birth. At first impression, this process is done unconsciously and immediately (Bornstein, 1992; Brown & Perrett, 1993) and may not come into conscious awareness unless the individual being perceived challenges the viewer’s pre-conceived notions of gender (Johnson & Ghavami, 2011; Rule, Macrae, & Ambady, 2009).
Regardless of one’s self-identified gender identity or sexual orientation, within the United States, performances of masculinity among individuals assigned male at birth and performances of femininity among individuals assigned female at birth work to establish an individual as cisgender and heterosexual. In contrast, feminine embodiments among individuals assigned male at birth and masculine embodiments among individuals assigned female at birth, disrupt the seemingly “natural” relationship between birth-assigned gender, gender identity and expression, and sexual orientation (Butler, 1990), and can lead to a questioning of an individual’s (cis)gender identity and/or (hetero)sexuality. Previous research has found, for example, that gender nonconformity is commonly interpreted as a visible indicator of homosexuality (Cohen, Hall, & Tuttle, 2009; Kite & Deaux, 1987; Kite & Whitley, 1998; Taylor, 1983). The gender inversion stereotypes that gay men are effeminate and lesbian women are masculine (Blashill & Powlishtta, 2009; Kite & Deaux, 1987; Kite & Whitley, 1998) point to how gendered embodiments serve as recognizable identifiers not only between male and female but also between straight and queer. Expanded upon below, these stereotypes not only serve as a means for distinguishing between and among individuals, but also reinforce extant gender and racial societal hierarchies (Augoustinos & Walker, 1995; Schippers, 2007).

Deviation from social gender expectations in relation to one’s gender assigned at birth is overwhelmingly perceived as negative for cis and trans* LGBQ alike (Bornstein, 1992; Horn, 2006; Kite & Whitley, 1998; Lombardi et al., 2001; Sandfort et al., 2007; Wilchins, 2004). Differentiating between perceived gender conformity and gender nonconformity provides a unique and underutilized lens for understanding antigay discriminatory encounters. Since gay men and lesbians are presumed to have higher levels of femininity and masculinity than straight men and women, respectively, it is impossible to conclude that antigay attitudes and behaviors
are responses to sexual orientation, per se, without accounting for the role of gender expression. Dislike of an effeminate man, for example, could lead to a negative reaction to perceived same-sex orientation, a negative reaction to men who are effeminate, devaluation of femininity more generally, or a combination therein (Lehavot & Lambert, 2007). Similarly, a masculine-presenting lesbian may attribute a prejudiced occurrence as a result of her being a woman, her masculine gender expression, her sexual orientation, or all of the above (e.g., Meyer, 2012). The conceptualization of sexual orientation as independent from gender expression carries little meaning in the study of LGBQ experience (Savin-Williams & Diamond, 2000). Despite this important relationship, the majority of research on antigay prejudice and discrimination has largely remained silent on the role of gender expression in antigay discourse. In addition, psychologists have overwhelmingly centered upon the experiences of cis LGBQ individuals. Due to the dual work of gender expression in the perception of gender identity and sexual orientation, however, the experiences of trans* LGBQ individuals offer unique insight into better understanding the role of gender expression in antigay encounters.

**Gender Hegemony and Antigay Discrimination**

Antigay discrimination affects all people – in particular queer individuals – and does so in gender-specific ways that implicate societal power relations between masculinity and femininity. Theories of gender hegemony delineate acceptable expressions of masculinity and femininity for men and women that result in the domination of men and the subordination of women (Butler, 2006; Connell, 2005; Tolman, 2006). Within the United States, orthodox ideals realize hegemonic masculine expectations for men (e.g., aggression, violence, dominance), whereas opposite expressions (e.g., passivity, subordination, dependence) characterize ideal expressions of hegemonic femininity for women. Importantly, all men benefit from the endowed
social power within patriarchal cultures, yet few fulfill the ideals of hegemonic masculinity (Anderson, 2005; Connell, 2005; Kimmel, 1997). Within the United States, hegemonic masculinity and femininity are defined from the social positions of cisgender White, middle-class, able-bodied, heterosexual males and females (Collins, 2005; McIntosh, 1989; Meyer, 2012; Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008). As a result, the maintenance of gender hegemony solidifies not only the superiority of masculinity over femininity but also White supremacy.

Schippers (2007) incorporates Connell’s (2005) theory of gender hegemony and the heterosexual matrix to explain that masculinity and femininity exist in a complementary and hierarchical relationship. She writes:

Both Connell [2005] and Butler [1990] agree that categories of “man” and “woman” include a whole repository of symbolic meanings. These symbolic meanings for gender difference establish the origins (e.g., biology, divine will, socialization), significance (e.g., defines subjectivity, is the foundation of society) and quality characteristics of each category (e.g., men are physically strong and authoritative/women are physical vulnerable and compliant) (italics original, p. 90).

In the maintenance of the unequal power relationship between men and women, Schippers emphasizes the complementarity of the quality characteristics of masculinity and femininity: Hegemonic femininity is constructed not necessarily as different from or inferior to hegemonic masculinity (i.e., not subordinated), but as working to produce an idealized relationship between masculinity and femininity, that is, one that perpetuates the oppression of women (italics original, p. 24). This idealized relationship is established and perceived as “natural,” as a result of heterosexual desire. So, while gender expression makes sexual orientation intelligible through a distinction between “man” and “woman” (Butler, 1990), heterosexual desire binds a hierarchical dynamic between masculinity and femininity. Hegemonic masculinity and hegemonic femininity thus curate appropriate embodiments for men and women in such a way that prescribes and regulates social relations and practices (Collins, 2005; Schippers, 2007).
Men and women who are perceived as gender nonconforming in regard to gender identity, gender expression and sexual desire challenge the hegemonic idealized relationship between masculinity and femininity required by gender hegemony. In the act of loving other men, for example, gay men fail to uphold hegemonic masculine expectations and contest the *quality characteristics* essential to hegemonic gender relations. Schippers (2007) describes these male embodiments as *male femininities*. The concept of *male femininities* acknowledges that masculinity cannot be conflated with something undesirable. As a result, male femininities are always both stigmatizing and feminizing to the men who embody them. In their sexual desire for women, on the other hand, lesbian women enact masculinity; yet they do not have access to the social power that accompanies socially dominant forms of masculinity because of their female gender. Schippers (2007) refers to these embodiments as *pariah femininities*. Both male femininities and pariah femininities expose the ways in which 1) femininity is always inferior and undesirable; and 2) masculinity must always remain superior within hegemonic gender relations.

Returning to acts of antigay discrimination, the motivations for antigay hate crimes and the consequences experienced by gay and bisexual men compared to lesbian and bisexual women reflect their positions not just as queer people but also as queer *men* and *women*. Antigay discrimination sustains hegemonic gender relations through derogation and punishment of embodiments that do not fulfill hegemonic expectations. The motivations for antigay discrimination thus stem from both a need to affirm and maintain the quality characteristics of hegemonic masculinity and femininity and the need to preserve the idealized relationship between the two. For example, in research with men who admit to assaulting gays and lesbians, Franklin (1998) explains that although these men’s crimes fell within most legal definitions of
hate crimes – and often included a considerable level of physical violence – the men insisted that they were not motivated by antigay prejudice. In fact, a number of them identified as supporters of gay rights. To understand this discrepancy, these men’s crimes must be understood within the context of hegemonic masculine ideology. Because masculine identity is predicated on what it is not (i.e., femininity and homosexuality), antigay violence serves as a reaffirmation of one’s manhood (Pascoe, 2005). Kimmel, (1997) describes masculinity as a homosocial enactment: Men seek to form, establish and affirm their masculinity in relation to other men, not necessarily in relation to women. Seen this way, in Franklin’s (1998) study, the sexual identities of gay male victims threatened the assailants’ position within the gender hegemony as men. Antigay violence, then, simultaneously polices acceptable boundaries of gender norms and derogates femininity more generally.

Perceived gender nonconformity and same-gender desire not only threaten the tenuous construction of hegemonic gender norms, but also violate the seemingly ostensible “natural” relationship between gender assigned at birth, gender identity and expression, and sexual orientation (Butler, 1990). Antigay discrimination in all of its forms is a response to the disruption of the heterosexual matrix and simultaneously represents an attempt to reinstate the dominance of masculinity over femininity and the complementary relationship between the two. Herek (2004) articulates this enmeshed power dynamic between hegemonic gender norms and sexual orientation. He writes, “Disentangling sexual prejudice from hostility based on gender conformity is a difficult task, made even more challenging by the fact that society’s valuation of heterosexuality over homosexuality is intertwined with its preference for masculinity over femininity” (p. 17). Whereas Herek (2004) argues that a focus on the interdependence of sexual orientation and gender expression can obscure the unique ways in which queerness provokes
antigay discrimination, I argue that it is precisely because of this entanglement that gender expression must be considered concurrently with sexual orientation in enactments of antigay discrimination. They cannot be understood separately due to the ways in which heterosexual desire constitutes and binds the relationship between masculinity and femininity (Butler, 1990; Schippers, 2007). As researchers, we must seek to theoretically and methodologically (dis)entangle the threads of gender identity, gender expression and sexual orientation without severing their entwined connections. We must hold their mutual constitution while examining the unique ways in which gender expression and sexual orientation can produce antigay behaviors. Such (dis)entanglement will better account for how antigay discrimination affects gay and bisexual men and lesbian and bisexual women in related, yet distinct ways, that enforces normative gender boundaries and expectations (Hill & Willoughby, 2005).

The incorporation of gender expression within antigay discrimination research will better attend to not only who is more likely to consider sexual minorities negatively, but also why. Previous research on antigay prejudice has repeatedly found, for example, that compared to straight women, straight men have stronger negative attitudes toward queer individuals, in particular toward queer men. A substantial body of literature has demonstrated that men who violate gender norms are evaluated more negatively than women who violate gender norms (Cohen et al., 2009; Horn, 2006; Lehavot & Lambert, 2007; Schope & Eliason, 2003; Taylor, 1983). Kite and Whitley (1998) argue that this trend can be understood as a result of straight men having a greater endorsement of gender role stereotypes for men and women. Subsequently, straight men view queer men more negatively because they are assumed to be gender atypical (Cohen et al., 2009; Kite & Deaux, 1987; Madon, 1997). While this logic works well to account for the observed differences between straight men and women, it does not illuminate why men
hold stricter beliefs about gender more generally. Understood through the lens of hegemonic gender norms, men’s position of power is continuously at stake within the heterosexual matrix (Butler, 1990). Antigay prejudice and discrimination are a mechanism through which the idealized relationship between and the quality characteristics of masculinity and femininity are defined, monitored and enforced (Schippers, 2007).

**An Intersectional Approach to Antigay Discrimination**

The above sections focused on the interrelationship between gender identity, gender expression and sexual orientation as a framework for understanding antigay discrimination. Yet, antigay discrimination does not operate independently from other systems of oppression. Although some research has considered gender expression and sexual orientation together in the manifestation of antigay behaviors (e.g., Blashill & Powlishta, 2009b, 2012; Horn, 2006; Laner & Laner, 1980; Lehavot & Lambert, 2007; Schope & Eliason, 2003; Storms, 1978), most research overlooks how antigay discrimination colludes with racism (see Meyer, 2012; Greene, 2000, as exceptions). Like other areas of social psychology, much of the theoretical development for antigay discrimination is based on empirical research collected from samples of college-age, White participants (e.g., Kite & Whitley, 1998; LaMar & Kite, 1998). In these studies, straight participants often evaluate hypothetical gay and lesbian targets through written vignettes (e.g., Lehavot & Lambert, 2007; Schope & Eliason, 2003). Tellingly, although target gender is identified as male or female, target race is not described. In these instances, target race can be assumed White, as Whiteness is unseen and unrecognized as relevant in the United States (Cole, 2008; McIntosh, 1989; Warner, 2008). As Helms, Jernigan, & Mascher (2005) have noted, scholars rarely operationally define race or ethnicity in the implementation of research measurements and materials. This focus on White participants evaluating White gay and lesbian
targets ignores antigay prejudice within communities of color, racism that exists among White LGBTQ individuals and overlooks how antigay prejudice and racism operate synergistically in the maintenance of White male heterosexual supremacy (Collins, 2005; Schippers, 2007).

Within interpersonal encounters, much research suggests that race – in addition to gender – is quickly encoded and used to position one’s self in relation to other individuals (Allport, 1954; Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). Antigay discrimination does not operate independently from other forms of oppression, but instead colludes to (re)produce systems of inequality. Because the quality characteristics that constitute hegemonic definitions of masculinity and femininity are predicated on the experiences of White, middle-class men and women (Collins, 2005; Connell, 2005; Schippers, 2007), how LGBQ individuals of color are perceived is informed by racialized gender stereotypes (Schippers, 2007; Goff, Thomas, & Jackson, 2008). For example, previous research has documented differences in gender stereotypes about Asian men and women and Black men and women: Whereas Asian men are likely to be perceived as gay as a result of being stereotyped as feminine, Black women are more likely to be perceived as lesbian due to being stereotyped as masculine (Johnson & Ghavami, 2011). As argued by Goff et al. (2008), the stereotypes produced at the intersection of race and gender are qualitatively unique; they are not simply the summation of stereotypes of race plus stereotypes of gender. In considering the experiences of LGBQ individuals of color within the theoretical framework of the heterosexual matrix (Butler, 1990), what constitutes a violation of hegemonic gendered expectations is refracted through these racialized gender stereotypes (Schippers, 2007). As a result, the visibility of “race” among people of color relative to normative whiteness, (Bowleg, 2013) in conjunction with gender stereotypes produce meaningful differences in how people of color and White
individuals are perceived (Ghavami & Peplau, 2013) and carry important implications for the experiential nature of antigay discriminatory encounters.

With respect to the subjective experience of antigay discrimination among LGBTQ people, most research has similarly focused on the effects of antigay violence for White LGBTQ individuals (Greene, 1994). As one example, Boehmer (2002) found in an analysis of 3,777 articles on health matters of LGBT individuals, only 15% of the articles included information on participant race/ethnicity. Such racially homogeneous participant samples serve to “whiten” the perception of sexual minorities and fall short in considering how multiple social identities constitute the experiences of LGBTQ people (Greene, 2000; Meyer, 2012). Such portrayals overlook how LGBTQ people of color experience discrimination in ways particular to their racial and ethnic identities. As a result of antigay attitudes within the African American and Latino communities, for example, African American and Latino LGBTQ people may conceal their sexual identities in ways distinct from White LGBTQ individuals (Bowleg, 2013; Greene, 2000; Harris, 2009). Queer people of color confront not only antigay prejudice from within their racial communities, but also racism from other LGBTQ individuals (Bowleg, 2008, 2013; Greene, 1994). For example, LGBTQ people of color report confronting racism within their romantic relationships (Balsam, Molina, Beadnell, Simoni, & Walters, 2011). Although some studies have sought to tease apart these intersections and examine potential qualitative differences in antigay discriminatory experiences (e.g., Gordon & Meyer, 2008; Meyer, 2012) how and with what effect antigay discrimination is experienced by LGBTQ people of color is not well known.

A meaningful inclusion of gender expression and race into inquiries on antigay discrimination requires both a methodological expansion to include more diverse participant samples and designs, as well as a theoretical broadening to incorporate and contextualize
multiple social positions (Greene, 2000). A simple inclusion, for example, of people of color into research designs that are premised on the experiences of White Americans reinforces additive models of social identity (Cole, 2008; Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008; Warner, 2008). Additive models assume that a shared subjective experience of sexual identity exists independently from an individual’s race or gender. An intersectional approach, in contrast, acknowledges that multiple forms of oppression (e.g., racism, sexism, antigay prejudice) work together to produce unjust systems (Collins, 2008; Collins, 2005; Crenshaw, 1995). As a “matrix of domination,” identities constituted by multiple social group memberships interact with one another to produce qualitatively different life circumstances (Collins, 2008). To understand any one dimension of experience, psychologists must take all into consideration (Bowleg, 2008; Cole, 2008).

In sum, an intersectional approach looks at the ways in which gender and sexual orientation and race contribute to the expression and experience of antigay discrimination, instead of looking at gender or sexual orientation or race (Meyer, 2012; Shields, 2008). For the study of experiences of antigay discrimination, intersectional frameworks and analyses are essential not only to better account for LGBQ experiences within communities of color, but also to expose the operation of White privilege within antigay discrimination. Described by Collins (2008), the matrix of domination creates both instances of privilege and oppression: Depending upon the constellation of one’s identities and the particular social context, an individual may experience advantage, disadvantage or both (Cole, 2008). For example, in a setting among cis LGBQ individuals, a Latino gay trans* man may experience privilege as a result of his gender but disadvantage with respect to his gender identity and race (Worthen, 2012). Summarized by Warner and Shields (2013), “As a construct, intersectional captures the idea that social
identities...are organizing features of social relationships, and these social identities mutually constitute, reinforce and naturalize one another (p. 804). While no intersectional approach can account for all identities participants embody, using intersectionality in research on antigay discrimination not only offers a lens to expose how antigay prejudice and racism operate synergistically in the maintenance of White male heterosexual supremacy (Schippers, 2007), but also foregrounds the importance of immediate and historical contexts of discriminatory encounters (Bowleg, 2013; Warner & Shields, 2013). An intersectional approach does not privilege one area of social experience (e.g., race, gender, sexual orientation) over another; rather it allows for analysis of these multiple systems of oppression and privilege to exist simultaneously.

Returning again to the heterosexual matrix and theories of gender hegemony, intersectionality situates race within hierarchical power structures of gender and sexuality. As noted above, cisgender White, middle-class, able-bodied heterosexual men and women constitute the quality characteristics against which racial minorities are compared. It is not so much that gendered practices of racial minorities are subordinate (Connell, 2005); rather they create a variation that is “hegemonic masculinity and femininity refracted through race and class difference” (Schippers, 2007, p. 98). The classification of gender practices of racial minorities as problematic stabilizes the ideal quality content for hegemonic masculinity and hegemonic femininity. As summarized by Schippers (2007), “By excluding members of some groups from being ‘real’ or ‘good’ women and men, white supremacy...[is]...legitimated at the same time that the idealized quality content of masculinity and femininity is reinforced in both socially dominant groups and socially subordinate groups” (p. 100). In conjunction with the heterosexual matrix and gender hegemony, intersectionality offers a more comprehensive approach to antigay
discrimination through a concurrent consideration of race, gender, gender expression, and sexual orientation.

**Summary**

In the above sections, I identified three theoretical frameworks that structure this dissertation: the heterosexual matrix (Butler, 1990), gender hegemony (Connell, 2005; Kimmel, 1997; Schippers, 2007) and intersectionality (Collins, 2005; Collins, 2008; Crenshaw, 1995).

The heterosexual matrix provides insight into the connection between gender and sexual ideologies and negative attitudes toward cis and trans* LGBQ individuals and why a disruption of the perceived “natural” relationship between birth-assigned gender, gender identity and expression, and sexual orientation is met with social discipline and violence (Butler, 1990). Theories of gender hegemony provide a conceptual framework for explicating how antigay discrimination perpetuates a hierarchical and complementary relationship between masculinity and femininity, and as a result affects LGBQ individuals differentially as queer men and queer women. Finally, the inclusion of intersectionality to theories of the heterosexual matrix and gender hegemony gives greater meaning for how antigay discrimination is situated within gendered, racialized and cisnormative hierarchies of power. Taken together, I use the heterosexual matrix (Butler, 1990), gender hegemony (Connell, 2005; Kimmel, 1997; Schippers, 2007), and intersectionality (Collins, 2005; Collins, 2008; Crenshaw, 1995) as theoretical frameworks to build upon previous research on antigay discrimination and to 1) consider the subjective experiences of antigay encounters among cis and trans* LGBQ individuals and 2) assess the contribution of various social positionalities (i.e., gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, and race) in the enactment of antigay discrimination by straight individuals.
Dissertation Aims

Aim 1: Understand the role of gender expression and race in cis and trans* LGBQ individuals’ exposure to and subjective experiences of antigay discrimination.

Previous research has demonstrated the complexity and breadth of antigay experiences among LGBQ individuals and that these experiences are informed by a combination of their subordinated and privileged identities (Greene, 2001; Sandfort et al., 2007). Few studies, however, have specifically attended to the intersectional nature of experiences of discrimination among cis and trans* LGBQ individuals (see Bowleg, 2013; Gordon & Meyer, 2008; Meyer, 2012 as exceptions). In Chapter 2, I seek to expand upon previous research and to fill extant gaps through quantitative and qualitative assessments of discriminatory encounters. Using data collected from a racially diverse sample of cis and trans* LGBQ individuals, in Study 1, I quantitatively consider the relationship between perceived gender nonconformity and exposure to sexual orientation microaggressions. Qualitatively, I analyze LGBQ individuals’ narratives of overt and covert discrimination.

Aim 2: Examine the extent to which antigay behavior among heterosexual individuals is a function of target gender, gender expression, sexual orientation and race.

In the second aim of this dissertation, I switch vantage points to consider antigay discrimination as enacted by straight individuals. To date, only a handful of studies have explored possible effects of target gender expression in the enactment of antigay prejudice by straight individuals (e.g., Blashill & Powlishta, 2012; Horn, 2006; Lehavot & Lambert, 2007; Schope & Eliason, 2003), and no studies have explored the ways in which target race interacts with target gender, gender expression, and sexual orientation. As in previous research, in Study 2 I aim to identify the relative contributions of participant gender, target gender, target sexual orientation, and target
gender expression in the elicitation of antigay behaviors. Different, however, I explore target race as well as a subtle expression of antigay discrimination. Explained in-depth in Chapter 3, previous studies have not incorporated aversive or covert forms of antigay discrimination in their designs. It is possible, for example, that gender, gender expression, sexual orientation and race differentially contribute to obvert vs. subtle manifestations of antigay prejudice enacted by heterosexual individuals (Hegarty & Massey, 2007; Massey, 2009; Nadal, 2013; Sue, 2010).

Aim 3: Theoretically and methodologically consider how researchers can assess gender expression.

Individuals who are perceived as deviating from socially-proscribed gender norms are more likely to be perceived as non-heterosexual (Cohen et al., 2009; Kite & Deaux, 1987; Kite & Whitley, 1998; Taylor, 1983). Given the centrality of gender expression to the lives of all individuals, in particular cis and trans* LGBQ people, it is surprising that few studies have sought to systematically assess gender expression. Toward that end, in Chapter 4 I consider the theoretical, methodological, and ethical issues that arise in the assessment of gender expression. Specifically, using data collected from Study 1, I conduct an analysis of inter-method reliability and compare participant self-reports on two-recently validated scales of perceived gender nonconformity (Wylie et al., 2010) with participants’ narrative descriptions of their gender expression.
CHAPTER 2

Study 1 - Disrupting Gender Binaries:

An Intersectional Analysis of Antigay Discriminatory Encounters
Introduction

At present, few studies exist that consider the effect of gender expression in personal experiences of antigay discrimination among LGBTQ individuals and even fewer that have examined how race and gender identity intersect within these experiences. Chapter 2 addresses the first aim of this dissertation: to understand the role of gender expression and race in cis and trans* LGBTQ individuals’ exposure to and subjective experiences of antigay discrimination.

Intersectional Research on Antigay Discrimination against LGBTQ Individuals

LGBTQ people’s experiences are informed by the combination of their privileged and marginalized identities. Depending upon the constellation of one’s identities and the particular social context, an individual may experience advantage, disadvantage or both (Cole, 2008). Like other areas of psychology, however, research on antigay discrimination has largely pertained to the experiences of White cis gay men and lesbian women (Greene, 1994) and has attended less to the intersectional nature of antigay discrimination (Chmielewski, Belmonte, Stoudt & Fine, forthcoming). A handful of empirical studies have examined how race, gender, and sexual orientation factor in to antigay discrimination experiences. Based upon data from a larger study, Gordon & Meyer (2008) looked at experiences of gender nonconformity-related prejudice from a sample of 396 Black, Latino, and White cisgender LGB individuals in New York City. Using qualitative and quantitative methods, these authors examined the prevalence of antigay-related discrimination in everyday experiences as well as larger life events. Participants completed a modified version of Williams, Yu, Jackson, & Anderson's (1997) Everyday Discrimination Scale, which measures chronic, routine, and subtle experiences of unfair treatment (e.g., being treated with less courtesy, receiving poor service). In responding, participants indicated if they believed their gender, sexual orientation, physical appearance, race/ethnicity, or some other form of
discrimination related to these prejudiced experiences. If participants indicated that their physical appearance precipitated the event, they were asked to explain. Participants also narrated stories about negative life experiences (e.g., job loss, separation of a partner) and through a thematic analysis these events were assessed in regard to the role of gender nonconformity in these prejudiced experiences.

Quantitative analyses revealed that discriminatory experiences attributed to gender nonconformity predominately coincided with attributions to discrimination based upon sexual orientation. Qualitatively, a thematic analysis revealed that antigay discriminatory events involving perceived gender nonconformity occurred in three broad settings: familial setting, school or work-based setting, and public space. The enactors of prejudice mostly corresponded to these locations: within familial and school or work-based settings, LGB individuals knew the perpetrator (e.g., family members, colleagues or peers), whereas discriminatory encounters in public spaces most commonly involved strangers. Gordon and Meyer (2008) describe that some of these discriminatory experiences related solely to gender nonconformity, while others pertained to multiple social identities (e.g., the use of racial slurs in addition to denigration of one’s gender presentation).

Findings from this research support for the need for attention to gender expression and highlight the importance of context in prejudiced occurrences. Although antigay hate crimes are often researched in relation to public locations, participants in this study described adverse encounters in locations presumably that are normally deemed “safer” (i.e., the home). These findings suggest that the type (e.g., overt verbal harassment, subtle mistreatment) and location (e.g., among family, with strangers) of prejudice may combine to carry diverse psychological and social outcomes. For example, prejudice experienced from known assailants like family and
friends may more adversely affect LGBTQ individuals than would such assaults from strangers. LGBTQ individuals are often not raised by other sexual-minorities, which may in turn greater affect their experiences in home environments (Comstock, 1991).

Although their sample was diverse by race, Gordon and Meyer (2008) did not observe any differences based upon race/ethnicity, age group, educational attainment or net worth, in terms of the type of discrimination or the location in which it occurred. They did find, though, that lesbian and bisexual women were more likely than gay and bisexual men to report discrimination incidents as related to gender nonconformity. This discrepancy may be related to the considerable stigma of effeminacy among men more generally as well as within LGBTQ communities (Annes & Redlin, 2012); describing antigay discriminatory experiences as a result of perceived femininity could be a source of shame or embarrassment. Of note, these authors did not describe whether participants sought to attribute negative encounters to multiple social identities, as opposed to only one. Participants were also not asked to explain how or why they thought their various social identities informed the discriminatory encounters. This study signifies the complexity and importance of gender expression within discriminatory experiences; because trans* LGBTQ individuals were not included in their study it is unclear how trans* experiences may differ from or be similar to cis LGBTQ individuals. Because trans* LGBTQ individuals’ identities and potentially embodiments challenge societal gender expectations, their experiences may better elucidate the intertwined relationship between gender expression and sexual orientation.

In a study of how LGBT individuals evaluate the severity of violent encounters, Meyer (no relation) (2012) used an intersectional framework to consider how antigay violence occurs within interlocking systems of power of race, gender, and sexual orientation. With a sample of
47 LGBT individuals in New York City, he conducted in-depth interviews and asked about participants’ experiences of violence based on various aspects of their identity (e.g., race, sexual orientation, gender). Meyer (2012) observed gendered and racial differences in how LGBT individuals understood antigay encounters. Overall, whereas White LGBT largely did not mention potential dynamics, LGBT individuals of color frequently interpreted their unjust treatment as not only related to the stigma that exists around same-gender sexuality, but also as a consequence of having negatively represented their racial communities in being a sexual minority. This was particularly true within intraracial contexts.

Cisgender butch lesbians of color, for example, recounted that their negative encounters transpired while they were with their more feminine-presenting girlfriends and explained the violence as a punishment for “converting” their girlfriends to lesbianism (Meyer, 2012). Although White, cis masculine-presenting lesbians also described experiencing violence for being a “bad influence” on feminine women, they did not express concern about their gender expression and/or sexual orientation as negatively representing the White community more generally (p. 859). In regard to men, cis gay male participants articulated the violence as an affront to their masculinity, in which heterosexual men sought to demonstrate that gay men are weak. In their interviews, cis gay men of color emphasized their emotional and physical strengths – despite the hardships they encounter – as valuable assets to their racial communities. These men interpreted the insinuation that they are weak to result not only from their sexual orientation but also from an association with whiteness and believed that their verbal and physical assaults represented disapproval of both their masculinity and a challenge to their racial authenticity. Finally, although Meyer (2012) discussed and observed similarities among lesbian
women and transgender women, he did not explicitly discuss the role of gender expression in the perception of gender identity and sexual orientation among LGBT individuals.

In Meyer’s (2012) study, the violent encounters experienced by gay men and lesbians reflect a reaction to the participant’s violation of hegemonic gender norms that was informed by their racial identities (Schippers, 2007). Participants mention doing gender “inappropriately” as a factor in their verbal and physical assaults, whether through physical presentation as in the stories of butch lesbians, or through an insinuation of weakness – and thus femininity – for having sexual desire for men among gay male participants. Yet, this “doing” carried different implications for LGBT individuals’ of color self-concept. Queer men and women of color had to negotiate assumptions about their representation of their racial communities in ways White LGBT participants did not. Evidenced here, these gendered dynamics intersect with racial hierarchies in the experience of violent encounters that displayed variations of heterosexism, racism, and sexism. So even while participants experienced many similar forms of violence, their interpretations differed in ways that reflected their positionalities within multiple systems of oppression.

Taken together, Gordon and Meyer (2008) and Meyer’s (2012) work begin to demonstrate the complexity and breadth of subjective experiences of antigay prejudice among cis and trans* LGBTQ people in relation to gender expression. Whereas Gordon and Meyer (2008) focused on everyday discriminatory encounters as well as those that happen around significant life events of cis LGB people, Meyer (2012) centered on the interpretation of violent verbal, sexual, and physical assaults among White LGBT and LGBT individuals of color. Both studies highlight the importance of attention to intersectional experiences of discrimination among LGBTQ individuals and indicate that antigay prejudice is continuously intertwined with other
systems of oppression, in particular sexism and racism (Collins, 2005; Greene, 2001; Schippers, 2007). As a limitation, however, both Gordon and Meyer (2008) and Meyer (2012) conducted their research in New York City. As a result, findings from this research may not characterize the experiences of rural LGBQ and LGBQ from other parts of the United States. Additionally, although Gordon and Meyer (2008) captured various forms of aversive discrimination through the use of the Everyday Discrimination Scale (Williams et al., 1997), additional research is needed to better understand how multiple social identities inform everyday overt and subtle discriminatory experiences.

**Sexual Orientation Microaggressions**

Approval of legal rights for gay and lesbian couples within the United States has increased considerably within recent years: 53% of Americans believe that same-gender couples should have the same marriage rights as heterosexual couples, and 54% favor allowing gay and lesbian couples to adopt children (American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 2013). As social and legal support for homosexuality continues to grow, overt expressions of antigay prejudice will continue to become less socially acceptable. Individuals who endorse heterosexist beliefs, for example, will not necessarily express categorical dislike for LGBQ individuals, but instead may express their prejudiced beliefs through more subtle means. This social, cultural, and legal shift requires not only attention to aversive forms of antigay discrimination (Massey, 2009), but also to the ways in which antigay prejudice continues unintentionally and on unconscious levels (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Nadal, 2013; Sue, 2010). Individuals who support LGBQ individuals, for example, may unknowingly commit subtle acts of discrimination, due to the effects of growing up in a prejudiced society. Described by Sue (2010), “socialization and cultural conditioning imbues within people unconscious and biased
attitudes and beliefs that are directed toward specific groups; they make their appearance in unintentional biased behaviors” (p. 48). Most recently within the literature, psychologists use the term “microaggressions” to describe the everyday verbal, behavioral, and environmental exchanges that communicate denigrating messages to individuals as a result of their group membership (Nadal, 2013; Sue, 2010).

Within his taxonomy of microaggressions, Sue (2010) differentiates between microassaults, microinsults, and microinvalidations. Sometimes described as “old-fashioned” discrimination (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986), microassaults refer to the conscious and deliberate forms of prejudice an individual may express. Examples may include name-calling (e.g., “fag” or “dyke”), displays of contempt (e.g., staring at a gay male couple with disgust) or other purposeful discriminatory behaviors (Nadal, 2013; Wright & Wegner, 2012). In contrast, microinsults and microinvalidations frequently occur outside of conscious awareness and are often committed by well-intentioned individuals who are strongly motivated by egalitarian values and believe themselves to be fair-minded people (Sue, 2005).

Despite the absence of malicious intentions among straight individuals, LGBQ individuals often perceive microinsults as denigrating (Nadal et al., 2011). Examples include interpersonal or environmental communications that express rudeness (e.g., showing discomfort with public displays of affection between two women), stereotypes (e.g., assumption that all gay men are flamboyant or into fashion), and insensitivity to an individual’s identity (e.g., asked about former boyfriends if the individual is a woman or former girlfriends if the person is a man) (Wright & Wegner, 2012). Finally, microinvalidations are interactions or environmental cues that exclude, negate, or nullify the thoughts, feelings, and experiences of LGBQ people (Sue, 2010). Examples include a denial of reality of heterosexism (e.g., arguing that heterosexism no
longer exists) or a denial of individual antigay prejudice (e.g., straight individual saying that she isn’t homophobic because she has a gay friend) (Nadal, 2013).

Recent research suggests that LGBQ individuals continue to experience forms of antigay prejudice that may be unique from other types of discrimination, in particular racism and sexism. In a focus group study with LGB individuals (Nadal et al., 2011), participants reported experiencing both overt and covert forms of discrimination, contrasting findings from studies with (straight) people of color (Sue et al., 2008; Sue, Bucceri, Lin, Nadal, & Torino, 2009) and with (straight) White women (Capodilupo et al., 2010). In these studies, participants of color and White female participants predominantly reported experiencing subtle forms of discrimination, but not necessarily overt forms (Nadal et al., 2011). It may be possible that, unlike overt racism or sexism, blatant expressions of homophobia are still relatively acceptable within Western cultures.

Within experiences of sexual orientation microaggressions, differences by participant gender and race exist. In a study by Nadal et al. (2011), only gay men described being continually accused of having HIV/AIDS, whereas lesbian and bisexual women reported feeling sexually objectified when straight men propositioned them. Microaggressions occur not only between straight and queer individuals, but also among LGBQ people as a group. LGBQ people of color, for example, report confronting racism within romantic relationships (Balsam et al., 2011), as well as feeling that LGBQ organizations focus more on the needs of White cis LGBQ people than on LGBQ people of color (Ward, 2008). As documented by a number of researchers, research on the trans* LGBQ individuals are often overshadowed by a focus on the needs of cis gay men and lesbian women (Weiss, 2004) or on straight trans* people (Factor & Rothblum, 2008). Bisexual men and women also report being discriminated against by cis gay men and
lesbian women (Mulick & Wright Jr, 2002; Ochs, 1996; Rust, 2002). In sum, straight and queer people alike can enact overt and covert expressions of antigay discrimination.

Although sexual orientation microaggressions may seem like small or less severe forms of antigay discrimination, their cumulative effect can include a range of negative psychological outcomes on the cognitive, behavior and emotional level (Sue, Torino, Capodilupo, Rivera, & Lin, 2009). For example, microaggressions can negatively affect psychological adjustment, subjective wellbeing, self-esteem and mental health (Buser, 2009; Cortina & Kubiak, 2006; Utsey & Hook, 2007). In explanation of these negative outcomes, Sue (2010) describes that microaggressions require considerable emotional and psychological energy. Responses to microaggressions include a variety of behavioral, cognitive, and affective reactions (Nadal, 2013; Nadal, Wong, Griffin, Davidoff, & Sriken, 2014; Sue, 2005). For example, behavioral reactions may include confronting the enactor of prejudice or responding passive aggressively; cognitive appraisals may lead LGBQ individuals to accept microaggressions as part of their experience or perhaps to feel empowered in their ability to respond; and affective responses may include a range of feelings from disappointment, frustration, and hopelessness to rage (Nadal et al., 2011).

Importantly, adverse mental and physical health outcomes may result regardless of how LGBQ people consciously evaluate their effects. In a study on microaggressions among LGB individuals, Wright and Wegner (2012) found a negative relationship between experiencing microaggressions while growing up and participant self-esteem. These effects held regardless of the extent to which participants reported that these experiences negatively affected them. Research on microaggressions supports other empirical findings that confronting antigay prejudice is a lifetime reality that can disrupt identity development and a healthy self-concept among LGBQ individuals (Frost & Meyer, 2009; Meyer, 2003; Meyer, 1995).
Attributional Ambiguity

Despite similar psychological outcomes for LGBQ individuals who experience overt and covert forms of discrimination (Nadal, 2013; Nadal et al., 2014; Sue, 2005), microaggressions can be difficult to interpret due to the ambiguity that surrounds subtle communication and interactions (Sue, 2010). Within the last 20 years an increasing amount of research has focused on the experiences and perceptions of discrimination (Major & Crocker, 1993), in which psychologists have sought to identify circumstances under which marginalized individuals attribute negative outcomes to discrimination (Crocker, Voelkl, Testa, & Major, 1991; Dion, 2001). Major and Crocker (1993) describe attributional ambiguity as the “uncertain[ty] as to why [marginalized individuals] are treated the way they are and why they receive the outcomes they do” (p. 346). Within these situations, marginalized individuals often do not or cannot know the “true” intentions behind an individual’s behavior, resulting in a state of attributional ambiguity. In these contexts, individuals may perceive negative outcomes or unfair treatment as the result of individual failings (i.e., dispositional attributions) or the result of prejudiced beliefs against an aspect (or more) of their social identity (Crocker et al., 1991).

In research on attributional ambiguity, psychologists have sought to identify the psychological mechanisms behind attributions to prejudice (e.g., social identification, stigma consciousness, feminist beliefs) (King, 2003; Operario & Fiske, 2001); the psychological consequences of attributions to discrimination (e.g., self-esteem, self-evaluation, affect) (Major & Crocker, 1993; Schmitt, Branscombe, Kobrynowicz, & Owen, 2002); and the differences that

5 Debate exists between the effects of attributions to prejudice on self-esteem and the role of social identity. Coined as the ‘discounting hypothesis,’ Major, Crocker and colleagues argue that attributions to prejudice serve to protect self-esteem through discounting the self as the cause of the negative event and making an external attribution (Crocker & Major, 1989; Crocker et al., 1998; Crocker & Quinn, 1998; Crocker et al., 1991). Schmitt and Branscombe (2002) counter the
may exist among various marginalized groups (e.g., African Americans, women) (Crocker, Cornwell, & Major, 1993; Schmitt et al., 2002). Findings from this body of research establish that attributions to prejudice are dependent upon factors in the immediate circumstances (e.g., the presence or absence of a social support) (Ruggiero, Taylor, & Lydon, 1997); characteristics of the alleged enactor of prejudice (e.g., member of an ingroup or outgroup) (Mendes, Major, McCoy, & Blascovich, 2008; M. T. Schmitt et al., 2002); and the group’s relative social status (e.g., privileged or marginalized) (Crocker et al., 1991; Operario & Fiske, 2001). Taken together, an attribution to prejudice is, in part, a function of a group’s position within social hierarchical structures (Schmitt & Branscombe, 2002).

Although these findings point to the deeply interpersonal and contextualized nature of how individuals perceive discrimination, this body of literature has important limitations. First, the majority of research on attributional ambiguity continues to be conducted within laboratory settings. Questions remain, for example, whether differences exist regarding locational contexts (e.g., public or private space) and the relationship to the alleged enactor of prejudice (e.g., family member, known acquaintance, stranger). Second, these studies predominately assessed attributions in relation to a singular identity (e.g., race), as opposed to examining the ways in which attributions may pertain to multiple social identities (see King, 2003 as an exception). Yet, an individual’s social identity is constituted by multiple identities at any given time, although the salience of these identities often varies by immediate and historical context. To ask a Black gay man to attribute unfair treatment either in regard to his race or his sexual orientation ignores the unique ways in which race and gender and sexual orientation create unique experiences (King, discounting hypothesis and argue that because the self is always implicated in group identity, often in ways that are uncontrollable (e.g., gender or race), attributions to prejudice are detrimental to the wellbeing of disadvantaged groups. For a full discussion and review of the literature see Schmitt and Branscombe (2002) and Operario and Fiske (2001).
Third, in discriminatory encounters, marginalized individuals negotiate not just their own positionalities, but also those of the enactors of prejudice. Antigay discrimination thus encompasses a dynamic between the enactor(s) and LGBQ individuals. So, although these previous experimental findings highlight the primacy of contextual factors, they are limited in their generalizability to real-life encounters of ambiguous discrimination. Finally – and importantly – to date, no research exists that has examined attributional ambiguity in relation to experiences of antigay discrimination. While it is possible that attributions to antigay discrimination share similar psychological processes of attributions to sexism or racism, important differences may exist depending upon differential historical perceptions of these groups.

**Study 1: Aims and Hypotheses**

Given the gender inversion stereotype that gay men are effeminate and lesbian women are masculine, Study 1 was designed to gain a better understanding of gender expression within the lives of LGBQ individuals and determine how experiences of antigay discrimination are informed by racial and gender identities. Because gender and sexual orientation are commonly conflated, yet still operate interdependently, a more thorough conceptualization of the nature of antigay discrimination in relation to gender expression and the experiential nature of discriminatory encounters will help illuminate the inner workings of systems of oppression within the lives of LGBQ people. Additionally, due to shifts in public opinion of same-gender sexuality in recent years (American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 2013), attention to both overt and subtle forms of antigay discrimination is warranted as well as how and in what ways LGBQ individuals experience attributional ambiguity. In sum, the focus of Study 1 is not to determine whether various categories of LGBQ people (White vs. people of...
color) experience a greater frequency of antigay discrimination, but to better understand the qualitative nature of antigay discriminatory encounters, specifically in relation to gender expression.

To do so, Study 1 examines LGBQ individual’s experience of antigay discrimination both quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitatively, I examined the relationship between exposure to sexual orientation microaggressions and perceived gender nonconformity and the extent to which this relationship varies by gender identity and race. Given the ways in which perceived gender nonconformity among LGBQ individuals may function to make their sexual orientation more visible to others, I hypothesized that LGBQ individuals’ exposure to sexual orientation microaggressions would be contingent upon their gender expression, such that the more consistently LGBQ individuals are perceived as gender nonconforming, the greater their exposure to microaggressions (Hypothesis 1). I predicted, however, that this relationship would vary by participant gender identity. Given the primacy of gender expression among trans* individuals in particular, regarding how their gender assigned at birth and gender identity are perceived, it is possible that experiences of discrimination among trans* LGBQ may occur predominately in relation to their gender identity and not necessarily their sexual orientation (i.e., one must be perceived as male or female in order to have their sexual orientation inferred). As such, I hypothesized that there would be a positive relationship between perceived gender nonconformity and exposure to sexual orientation microaggressions for cis LGBQ individuals, but not for trans* LGBQ participants (Hypothesis 2).

Finally, as race may constitute another visible marginalized identity among participants of color relative to normative Whiteness (Bowleg, 2013), the experiences of LGBQ participants of color are always informed by racialized gender norms. Because hegemonic gender norms are
predicated on the experiences of White, middle-class men and women (Connell, 2005; Schippers, 2007), I hypothesized that perceived gender nonconformity would be positively associated with sexual orientation microaggressions for White participants but not participants of color (Hypothesis 3). The results from these quantitative analyses paint a broader understanding of LGBQ individuals’ experiences of antigay discrimination in relation to their gender expression. Through looking at the relationship between variables as opposed to the frequency of experienced discrimination between groups (e.g., cisgender vs. transgender or White participants vs. participants of color), the intersectional relationship of gender expression and antigay discrimination is assessed differently.

Qualitatively, I sought to better understand how LGBQ individuals attribute experiences of antigay discrimination to their gender expression and the extent to which and in what ways they experience attributional ambiguity. Importantly, analyses of sexual orientation microaggressions characterize experiences in which LGBQ individuals knew they were being treated unfairly. Yet, in addition to overt expressions of discrimination (i.e., being called an antigay epithet), discrimination based upon sexual orientation can occur in situations where it may be difficult to discern if discrimination occurred (e.g., receiving poor service in a restaurant). Attention to ambiguous or uncertain discriminatory encounters may provide particular insight into the intersectional nature of antigay discriminatory encounters, more specifically, how LGBQ individuals make sense of their experiences. As such, the following two questions structure the qualitative analyses: 1) How do LGBQ individuals understand their antigay discriminatory experiences in relation to their gender expression? 2) In what ways do LGBQ individuals experience attributional ambiguity in antigay encounters?
Method

Participants

I recruited participants online through a variety of active and passive techniques. First, I contacted participants electronically through LGBTQ-related email listservs and organizations. I reached out to LGBTQ-affiliated organizations and listservs directly, describing my study and asking if they would disseminate my call for participation on their listserv, organization emails, and/or social media outlets (e.g., Facebook or Twitter) (Appendix A). To listservs I could post to directly, the email subject stated, “Diverse Group of Participants Needed for On-line Psychology Study ($10)” and contained the same call for participation as sent to moderated LGBTQ-listservs and organizations (Appendix B).

I also recruited participants via Facebook. Using Facebook for research recruitment is becoming more popular within the social sciences (Lohse, 2013) and previous researchers have found success in using the social media outlet to recruit hard-to-reach populations (Mychasiuk & Benzies, 2012). I created a public Facebook page entitled, “Psychology Research Participants Needed - $10.” This page contained a description of the research study, a link to the eligibility questionnaire and a means through which to contact me for additional information (Appendix C). Using the search feature on Facebook, I posted a link to this page on various open LGBTQ-related pages throughout the social media site. Some of these pages were from official LGBTQ organizations (e.g., SAGE), while others served as discussion forums on particular LGBTQ-related topics (e.g., “Darker Shades of Queer” – Facebook group for LGBTQ people of color). For moderated pages, I contacted the owner(s) directly to inquire if they would post the call for participation. In this way, I leveraged Facebook to recruit participants who may not directly identify with or be connected to LGBQ organizations.
In all correspondences, I described the study as focusing on, “how we perceive and think about others and ourselves,” that participation would entail completing a short eligibility questionnaire, and that participants would receive a $10 Amazon gift card for their full participation. I aimed to recruit racially diverse cis and trans* LGBQ individuals across a diverse range of life experiences and intentionally did not advertise the study as related to gender expression or sexual orientation, as I wanted to avoid participant bias for those who might specifically seek out this type of information. However, within the call for participation read the statement, “I am interested in including a diverse group of people in the study regarding age, gender, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation.”

In addition to these active forms of participation, I also used a snowballing technique. At the completion of the eligibility questionnaire and at the end of the full study, participants were encouraged to pass the survey link for the eligibility questionnaire to others they thought would be interested in participating. This technique served as an additional tool for recruiting individuals who may not be on LGBTQ listservs or who may not actively seek out information on LGBTQ issues.

**Procedure**

Potential participants who clicked on the survey link from one of the various calls for participation were brought to Qualtrics, an online survey software program, to complete the eligibility questionnaire (Appendix D). After completing the consent form for the eligibility questionnaire (Appendix E), participants were asked to provide information in regard to their age, gender, sexual orientation, gender expression, race/ethnicity, and geographical location. Participants were also asked to identify where they heard about the study (e.g., Facebook, friend,
etc.). In order to be eligible for full participation, individuals had to be at least 18 years old and identify as non-heterosexual. These eligibility criteria were not specified in the consent form.

At the end of the questionnaire, participants were asked: “If eligible, would you be willing to take part in a final study which will require you to write short stories about your experience as a sexual minority?” Participants who selected “yes” were asked to provide an email address where they could be contacted. I monitored the results of the eligibility criteria daily and sent an invitation to participate and an individual survey link (via Qualtrics) to all eligible participants within 48 hours of completing the eligibility questionnaire (Appendix F). Participants who clicked on the full study link were brought back to the Qualtrics interface where they completed the second informed consent page (Appendix G). I did not record individual’s Internet Protocol (IP) addresses. However, to ensure that individuals did not participate in the study more than once, participants could only access the full study once with the individual link provided.

Throughout the recruitment process, I sought to fulfill certain quotas in the participant sample. Specifically, out of the target sample of 150 individuals, I aimed to include 75 White participants and 75 participants of color, in addition to the overall sample being diverse in gender identity and expression. I monitored the numbers in each of these categories throughout the recruitment phase and sent out invitations for the full study based upon fulfillment of these quotas. For example, once 75 White individuals had completed the study, subsequent eligible White individuals were not invited to participate.

Overall, 861 people clicked on the link to the eligibility questionnaire. Of those, 739 completed the eligibility questionnaire, resulting in 350 who were eligible for the full study and invited to participate. Out of the 238 who started the full study, 175 completed it, resulting in a
50% completion rate of those invited to participate and a 74% completion rate of those who started the full study. As described in the consent form, in order to receive compensation for their participation, individuals had to provide thorough descriptions in their narrative accounts (i.e., they could not write a sentence or two). Narrative prompts are described below. Of the 175 participants, 28 did not provide adequate information in their narrative responses for analysis and were contacted requesting additional explication of their narratives. Only four participants added additional information. The resulting sample included 151 individuals who completed the full study and were compensated with a $10 Amazon gift card.

For analysis, three individuals were excluded: one who did not identify their gender assigned at birth and two who identified as heterosexual, although on their eligibility questionnaire they indicated they were bisexual or not sure of their sexual orientation. Of the final sample of 148, 47% indicated they read the call for participation in an email, 41% on Facebook, and 12% indicated they heard about the study from a friend or acquaintance. The majority of participants indicated that they currently live within urban settings (68%), followed by suburban (27%) and rural settings (9%). Overall the sample was relatively young, well-educated and with a middle-class household income. The sample was diverse with regard to race, with 80 participants identifying as White and 68 as people of color. Table 1 provides a full description of the participant social demographic information.

In order to determine if participants were cisgender (i.e., identified with their gender assigned at birth) or transgender (i.e., did not identify with their gender assigned at birth). I used information from two demographic questions as recommended by Sausa, Sevelius, Keatley, Iñiguez, and Reyes (2009). One item pertains to an individual’s gender assigned at birth: “What is your sex assigned at birth?” Possible answers include, “Male,” “Female,” “Decline to state.”
The second item asked, “What is your sex or current gender? (Select all that apply)” Participants selected between “Male,” “Female,” “Transman/Transmale,” “Transwoman/Transfemale,” “Genderqueer,” “Other,” “Decline to State.” Individuals who selected identities that communicated both cisgender and transgender identities were categorized in relation to their transgender identity. For example, a participant who was assigned female at birth and currently identifies as female as well as genderqueer was assigned “genderqueer.” In addition, individuals who described themselves as “agender or nonbinary” or as “male/female mix” were categorized as genderqueer. Based upon these criteria, the collapsed gender identity categories included cisgender males (N=29), cisgender females (N=62), transgender individuals (N=16) and genderqueer individuals (N=41).

In regard to sexual orientation, participants identified as gay (N=24), lesbian (N=25), bisexual (N=24), queer (N=64), and “other” (N=7). For purposes of analysis, I collapsed individuals who identified as “other” (i.e., pansexual, demisexual, male/female/both) into “Queer” (N = 71).

Measures

Demographics. Participants were asked to self-report their race/ethnicity through selecting all responses that apply (i.e. Black or African American; White; Latino/Latina or Hispanic; Afro Caribbean, Middle Eastern; Native American, American Indian, or Alaskan Native; Asian, South Asian or Pacific Islander; Other __________). Participants were also asked to indicate their age, household income, and highest level of education completed by choosing from a list ranging from “Did not graduate from high school” to “PhD/MD.” Participants characterized their geographical location by selecting the type of community they live in: city or urban community; suburban community; or rural community. Finally, participants indicated
their sexual orientation by selecting either “Gay,” “Lesbian,” “Bisexual,” “Queer,” “I’m not sure,” or “Other.” Participants who selected “Other” were asked to specify their sexual orientation.

**Antigay Discrimination Narratives.** Previous research has shown that autobiographical stories provide researchers with data on the social and historical contexts in which individuals live their lives, as well as how these contexts becomes meaningful (McAdams & Pals, 2006). In research on microaggressions in particular, elicitation of personal narratives has been essential to capture the range of overt and subtle forms of discriminatory actions experienced by LGBQ people (Nadal, Personal Communication, July 3, 2013). Compelled by the idea that people depict their lives through a series of narratives (Chase, 2002), participants were asked to write four, short 1-2 paragraph stories. The first narrative prompt asked participants to describe an experience related to their gender expression, whereas the second, third, and fourth prompts directed participants to write stories about experiences related to their sexual orientation. To contextualize the first narrative prompt, participants read the following statement:

> Many people express their gender differently depending upon the context or situation they are in (e.g., the clothes they wear, their mannerisms or behaviors, their style of speech, how they move their bodies, etc.). We are interested in the variety of ways that people express their gender.

Upon reading this introduction, participants were asked to: “Think of a time when you intended to express your gender in a particular way.” Participants were asked to address the following questions in their response: what happened; who was involved, how were they involved; how did they think and feel; how did they believe society, time, or the place where the event happened affected the outcome? I designed this prompt to identify the contexts and types of conscious decisions LGBQ individuals make regarding their gender expression and determine whether these decisions reflected incidents of antigay prejudice (e.g., a woman who dresses more feminine when going with her partner to a wedding in order to appear more “normal”).
The second, third, and fourth narrative prompts asked participants about experiences centered upon their sexual orientation. Although the focus of the Study 1 is on negative occurrences, I initially asked participants to describe a positive experience as a means of providing a natural transition to negative encounters. The second prompt read, “First, think about a time when you had a positive encounter related to your sexual orientation.” In order to capture blatant experiences of antigay prejudice, the third narrative instructed participants, “Now think about a time where you had a negative encounter related to your sexual orientation.” Based upon feedback from the pilot, some expressed difficulty in recalling a negative experience. To redress this, I included a sentence in the directions that read, “If you can’t think of a recent example, think about an experience further back in time, such as when you were a child or an adolescent.” Finally, the fourth narrative was designed to capture more subtle or ambiguous experiences of antigay prejudice. The prompt instructed participants to “Think of time you were treated unfairly and were unsure if it was because of your sexual orientation.” All sexual orientation narrative prompts instructed participants to describe what happened, who was involved, how they were involved, how participants thought and felt, why they believed they were treated this way and how they reacted.

After providing each of the short narratives about encounters around their sexual orientation, participants were asked to indicate (on a separate screen), the extent to which their gender expression contributed to the discriminatory event(s) using a 4-pt Likert scale with 1 = None and 4 = A lot. Participants were also able to select, “I’m not sure.” After each numerical rating, participants were instructed to explain their response in writing. Participants completed the same items in regard to their race. Finally, participants were asked to describe any additional social identities that were a factor. Asking about the role of multiple identities helps to redress
concerns about forcing participants to choose only one identity (e.g., was the discrimination a result of your race, gender, or sexual orientation) that can elicit false data, as social identities are confounded within individuals (Cole, 2008). By asking these questions sequentially and on separate screens, I was able to analytically disentangle gender expression and race from sexual orientation and to observe where, in their narratives, participants mention (or do not mention) the salience of each of these identities. This procedure was also used as a means through which I could encourage participants to think about how their multiple identities interrelate and have them reflect upon aspects of their social selves they may normally not (e.g., White participants thinking about their Whiteness). I piloted all of the story prompts with other graduate students, acquaintances and relatives who identify as LGBQ (N=35). Based upon their feedback, I modified the prompt language slightly to clarify the instructions.

**Sexual Orientation Microaggressions.** In addition to assessing antigay prejudice through open-ended story narratives, participants completed a shortened version of the Homonegative Microaggressions Scale (HMS) (Wright & Wegner, 2012) (Appendix H). The HMS consists of 45 items and is based upon and adapted from Sue et al.’s (2007) taxonomy of racial microaggressions. On the HMS, respondents indicate the extent to which they have experienced various microaggressions: 1) within the past six months; 2) while growing up; and 3) how negatively these encounters affected them. Although the HMS mirrors Sue et al.’s (2007) taxonomy of racial microaggressions, subscales for the various types of sexual orientation microaggressions (e.g., ascription of intelligence, criminalization) have not been validated in this way (Wright, Personal Communication, May 9, 2013). To reduce potential item fatigue, participants only self-reported their experiences of sexual orientation microaggressions in regard to the last six months. Participants indicated their responses on a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 =
Hardly ever/never/not at all and 5 = Constantly/a great deal. The HMS items were found to be highly reliable (∝ .92).

**Analysis 1: Sexual Orientation Microaggressions**

**Data Preparation**

*Gender expression based upon narratives.* In order to include a measure of gender expression within quantitative analyses, I developed numerical coding scheme for gender (non)conformity that I applied to participant narratives. As described above, gender expression was a central component of the narratives LGBQ individuals completed for Study 1. Blind to participant demographic information, I read all the narratives, taking note of instances in which participants indicate how they are perceived by other people in their lives (e.g., “I am visibly queer” or “People often think I’m straight” or “I conform to pretty much what people expect women to be”). Considering narrative accounts in their entirety, I focused on how participants currently express their gender and applied a numerical score to each individual in relation to the regularity with which participants express their gender across life contexts (e.g., do they present similarly when at work, school, with friends, etc.). Using a 5-point scale, I assigned one of five values to each participant: 1 = consistently conforming; 2 = mostly gender conforming; 3 = gender conforming and gender nonconforming; 4 = mostly gender nonconforming; and 5 = consistently nonconforming.

Individuals coded as 1, consistently conforming, commonly described presenting in ways that aligned with traditional gender expectations of masculinity and femininity in relation to their

---

6 Based upon feedback from the dissertation committee, I moved the conceptual and methodological analysis of the perceived gender nonconformity scales as developed by Wylie et al. (2010) to Chapter 4. In doing so, I foreground the “heart” of the dissertation, which is on role of gender expression and race in antigay discriminatory encounters. As will become evident in Chapter 4, my reasons for not using the Wylie et al. (2010) scales within the current study relate to an analysis of inter-method reliability.
gender assigned at birth. These descriptions pertained to their appearance, mannerisms, or both. Another characteristic of individuals labeled *consistently conforming* was that they noted that straight as well as other queer individuals often perceive them as straight. In contrast, LGBQ participants coded as 5, *consistently nonconforming*, commonly describe themselves in opposite ways. They indicate that their presentation often counters traditional gender norms in relation to their gender assigned at birth and that people commonly assume that they are of a minority orientation. As described by one individual, “My queerness is highly visible because of my masculine gender presentation. I have short hair and wear men's clothing but I do not pass as a man. I am usually read as a (butch) lesbian and sometimes read as FTM/transmasculine.”

Unanticipated, all binary trans participants in this study (N = 16) indicated that they are perceived as transgender in almost all aspects of their lives, i.e., they do not “pass” or are not read as cisgender. These individuals were subsequently categorized as consistently nonconforming.

Participants coded as either a 2, *mostly gender conforming*, or a 4, *mostly gender nonconforming*, express that although they prefer to present either more masculine or more feminine, they will strategically appear and/or act in gendered ways. For example, one cis woman who was coded as *mostly gender nonconforming* describes that she tries to dress more conventionally feminine at work, yet in all contexts outside of work she prefers men’s clothes, such as ties. She describes that she does this in order to “not make her appearance an issue” within work contexts. Lastly, participants labeled a 3, *gender conforming and gender nonconforming*, report moving between and/or combining elements of masculinity and femininity in order to achieve a particular aesthetic. These fluid individuals often accentuate a masculine side or a feminine side, depending upon the context or their mood. For example, a cis
woman describes that she may “femme it up” depending upon how she feels, yet will also sport men’s attire, whereas a genderqueer individual stresses that striking a “masculine-feminine balance” was important to them. Some participants did not provide enough description within their narratives to facilitate differentiation or did not exclusively reference their gender appearance or mannerisms. These participants were classified as *uncategorizable*.

After initially developing this numerical scale and criteria for coding, I met with another graduate student to discuss the codebook and apply these numerical values to a subsample of participants from the study (N=10). I handpicked participants that 1) represented exemplars of the various codes or 2) represented individuals who may be on the borders between codes, and thus difficult to classify. After coding these participants individually, we compared our responses and discussed any differences in scoring and our rationales for applying the various values. We continued discussion until we reached an agreement (Marques & McCall, 2005), solidifying the criteria for the gender expression values, and I revised the codebook to reflect our discussion. Over the next week, we independently scored 20 randomly selected participants using the numerical scale for gender expression. I calculated interrater reliability using the Cohen’s Kappa statistic for the numerical coding schemes. Using Landis & Koch, (1977) benchmark for Kappa statistic interpretation, numerical coding scheme showed agreement across raters (κ = .63, p < .001). Having established interrater reliability, I coded the remaining 108 participants. Participants were categorized as follows: *consistently gender conforming* (N = 28); *mostly gender conforming* (N = 30); *gender conforming and gender nonconforming* (N=16); *mostly gender nonconforming* (N = 20); *mostly gender nonconforming* (N = 45); and *uncategorizable* (N = 9). For analysis, the nine individuals classified as *uncategorizable* were removed resulting in a sample size of 139.
Descriptive Analyses. Scores for sexual orientation microaggressions were normally distributed. Overall, participants reported experiencing low to moderate levels of sexual orientation microaggressions ($M = 2.07, SD = .63$). Participants of color reported experiencing slightly higher levels of sexual orientation microaggressions ($M = 2.11, SD = .63$) compared to White participants ($M = 2.04, SD = .58$); this difference was not statistically significant, $t(137) = -.693, p = .49$. Trans* participants reported experiencing slightly higher levels of sexual orientation microaggressions ($M = 2.13, SD = .57$) than cisgender participants ($M = 2.03, SD = .63$); this difference was also not statistically significant, $t(137) = -.977, p = .33$. Overall, the frequency of microaggression exposure was relatively similar across race and gender identity. Participant age was negatively correlated with exposure to microaggressions, $r(137) = -.301, p < .001$; however, it was not systematically distributed in an uneven way across the variables of interest (i.e., by participant race, gender identity, or gender expression). Therefore, in order to preserve statistical power and conceptual parsimony I did not include it within inferential analyses.

Inferential Data Analysis. The focus of Study 1 was to better understand the qualitative nature of antigay discriminatory encounters, specifically in relation to gender expression. Due to the perceived “visibility” of sexual orientation vis-a-vis gender expression, I hypothesized that greater consistency in being perceived as gender nonconforming would predict exposure to sexual orientation microaggressions among LGBQ individuals (Hypothesis 1). I hypothesized, however, that participant gender identity would moderate this relationship, given the primacy of gender expression among trans* individuals in particular regard to how their gender assigned at birth and gender identity are perceived. I hypothesized that perceived gender nonconformity would predict greater exposure to sexual orientation microaggressions for cis participants but not
trans* participants (Hypothesis 2). Finally, I predicted that racial identity would also moderate the relationship between perceived gender nonconformity and exposure to sexual orientation microaggressions. Because hegemonic gender norms are predicated on the experiences of White, middle-class men and women (Connell, 2005; Schippers, 2007), I hypothesized that perceived gender nonconformity would predict exposure to sexual orientation microaggressions for White participants but not participants of color (Hypothesis 3).

I conducted a multiple linear regression to predict exposure to sexual orientation microaggressions based upon perceived gender nonconformity, racial identity, and gender identity. Predictor variables (i.e., perceived gender nonconformity; racial identity; gender identity) and interaction terms (i.e., gender nonconformity*race; gender nonconformity*gender identity) were entered into the model simultaneously. Table 2 shows results from the full model. Perceived gender nonconformity predicted greater exposure to sexual orientation microaggressions, $b = .489, t(133) = 3.21, p < .01$. Hypothesis 1 was supported. Racial identity, $b = .450, t(133) = 2.36, p < .05$ and the interaction between racial identity and perceived gender nonconformity, $b = -.502, t(133) = -2.44, p < .05$ were also significant. To determine the nature of this interaction, I plotted slopes for low (-1 SD below the mean) and high (+1 SD above the mean) levels of gender nonconformity with separate lines for White participants and participants of color (Figure 1). As hypothesized, an increase in perceived gender nonconformity predicted an increase in exposure to sexual orientation microaggressions for White LGBQ participants, but not LGBQ participants of color. Hypothesis 3 was supported. No significant effects were found for participant identity or the interaction between gender identity and perceived gender nonconformity. Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

---

7 For conceptual clarity, I have labeled low levels of gender nonconformity as “gender conformity” in Figure 1.
Taken together, although White LGBQ participants and LGBQ participants of color experience similar levels of sexual orientation microaggressions, the role of perceived gender nonconformity within these experiences is different. Whereas being perceived as gender nonconformity increases exposure for White LGBQ participants, exposure to sexual orientation microaggressions is the same regardless of nonconforming gender expression. These findings may indicate that gender nonconformity may represent more of a visible indicator sexual orientation for White LGBQ individuals than LGBQ individuals of color. These findings also point to potential qualitative differences at the intersection of sexual orientation and racial identity. It is essential to note that “LGBQ people of color” does not constitute a monolithic group. As discussed in Chapter 1, gender stereotypes are race-specific: The experiences of a Latina woman, for example, are not synonymous to those of an Asian woman. My rationale for creating and using the group “LGBQ individuals of color” was driven largely by the need to maintain statistical power. Although, these findings from this analysis support theoretical arguments that hegemonic gender norms are refracted through racialized lenses (Collins, 2005; Schippers, 2007), they fall short from elucidating the potential qualitatively distinct experiences among LGBQ individuals of color as a group.

That no significant differences were observed between cis and trans* LGBQ participants may have resulted from differences within the trans* identity group. In contrast to binary trans, whose gendered sense of self derives from categorical distinctions between “man” and “woman,” genderqueer participants may identify as both male and female or as neither male or female. Identified above, all binary trans participants describe that they are perceived as transgender. As a result, they were categorized as gender nonconformity for analyses. Genderqueer participants who were categorized as gender nonconforming, however, describe their physical presentations
as sometimes being read as queer (i.e., non-straight) and other times as transgender. As such, perceived gender nonconformity may carry qualitatively different meanings for how others perceive binary trans compared to nonbinary trans. These differential characterizations point to the need to explore potential differences within the trans* identity category. Due to small and unequal group sizes, though (i.e., 16 trans* participants identified as binary trans and 41 as nonbinary), I was unable to explore these potential differences quantitatively.

**Analysis 2: Antigay Discriminatory Narratives**

Qualitative analyses in Study 1 were designed to answer the following questions:

1. How do LGBQ individuals understand their antigay discriminatory experiences in relation to their gender expression?
2. In what ways do LGBQ individuals experience attributional ambiguity within antigay encounters?

Using participant narratives that described negative encounters (i.e., “Think about a time you had a negative encounter related to your sexual orientation”) as well as unsure narratives (i.e., “Think about a time where you were treated unfairly and unsure if it was because of your sexual orientation”), I conducted two separate thematic analyses, one for each research question described above (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Because thematic analyses were not dependent upon categorizations based upon gender expression, the participants excluded from the above analyses due to uncategorizability of their gender expression on the gender consistency scale were included within this analysis, resulting in an overall sample size of 148 individuals.

To answer the first research question of how participants understand their gender expression within antigay discriminatory experiences, I first read negative and unsure narratives in their entirety – this included participant responses to prompts about their gender expression,
race, and other social identities – to familiarize myself with the data, noting the types and nature of discrimination that participants described. In subsequent readings, I specifically read for how and for what purposes participants reference their gender expression (e.g., clothes, mannerisms, etc.). I also read for their use of gendered adjectives of “masculine” and “feminine” to describe themselves. Within these subsequent readings, I looked for where, within their stories, participants narrated gender expression (e.g., in response to the original narrative prompt, the gender expression prompt) as a way to conceptualize to what extent and in what ways participants believed their gender expression was influential. Throughout this process, I wrote memos describing how participants believed their gender expression played a role in the discriminatory encounter (i.e., what purpose it served), as well as how they believe others perceive them more generally in relation to their gender expression and sexual orientation. From these memos, I developed the following three themes that I narrowed and refined over the course of one year:

1. Perception of sexual orientation and gender identity vis-à-vis gender expression
2. Gender conformity as a double edged sword
3. Gender nonconformity as a precipitant of discriminatory encounters

To answer the second research question regarding the ways participants experience attributional ambiguity within discriminatory encounters, I first re-read negative and unsure narratives, focusing on participants’ explanations of why they thought they were treated unfairly, specifically noting instances where they describe feeling uncertainty or confusion. I then read these stories of uncertainly more closely and identified how participants’ articulated and understood the effects of their multiple social positionalities (e.g., racial identity, gender identity, gender expression, etc.). I coded for uncertainty in regard to if they experienced antigay
discrimination, as well as to which social identities they attributed the encounter. I wrote memos regarding my observations, paying particular attention to the extent to which participants described their multiple identities as visible to others (e.g., sexual orientation vis-à-vis gender expression, racial identity) and how this visibility or perceptibility played a role in their experiences. I developed the following two themes that I narrowed and refined over the course of one year:

1. Negotiating multiple visible (marginalized) identities
2. Whiteness as a protective social identity

In what follows, I discuss these five themes sequentially.

*Perception of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity vis-à-vis Gender Expression*

Throughout their narratives, LGBQ participants characterized their gender expression as the foundation from which they interpreted how others perceived them more generally and in specific relation to their sexual orientation. They mobilized hegemonic gender norms – in particular the gender inversion stereotype that gay men are effeminate and lesbian women are masculine (Kite & Deaux, 1987) – as a paradigm through which to anticipate how others perceive and subsequently interpret their behavior. For example, when asked to describe how his gender expression contributed to a negative experience he had, Russ, a 27-year old White bisexual cis man indicates that his gender expression did not matter much. He writes, “I really think that being masculine means that I pass as heterosexual and that people therefore assume that my sexuality is irrelevant for all intents and purposes.” In Russ’ understanding, others perceive his masculinity as a signifier of heterosexuality. That he did not narrate gender expression in his original narrative and that he describes his perceived sexuality vis-à-vis gender expression as “irrelevant” suggests that the audience for whom his sexuality does not matter is
straight, as heterosexuality is the norm against which other sexualities are compared (Butler, 1990; Connell, 2005; Schippers, 2007; Tolman, 2006). To Russ, his masculine embodiments obfuscate the possibility that others perceive him as anything but straight.

Jennifer, a White 22-year old bisexual cis woman, echoes Russ’ experience. When asked to describe a time when she was treated unfairly and was unsure if it was because of her sexual orientation, she responds, “I haven’t really had an experience...This is in large part because I’m not out to most people, only to those I’m close to, those that I know.” In describing that she is “not out to most people,” Jennifer implies that being “out” entails verbal disclosure. Stated differently, her gender expression – which she describes as “pretty feminine” – does not communicate her bisexuality to others. Within her everyday life, she describes not worrying about how others are reading her sexuality because of her femininity: “I don’t typically worry about people making assumptions about my sexual orientation because I present in gender-congruent ways.” Like Russ, by “assumptions” Jennifer implies non-heterosexuality. She highlights the underlying reverse logic of the gender inversion stereotype for women: if masculinity indicates lesbianism, then femininity denotes heterosexuality. Her feminine presentation coincides with hegemonic gender formulations, and she is therefore assumed straight until disclosing otherwise.

LGBQ individuals who described that they transgress gender norms similarly narrated gender expression as important within their experiences; however, gender expression carried differential meanings for how they understood the perception of their sexual orientation. Sam, a 24-year old Asian gay cis man, tells a story about meeting someone for the first time:

They automatically said I could help them shop for clothes and fashion…I felt put-off in the context of having to deal with homophobia and gender stereotyping all my life. I just let it go to not make a big deal but then ruminated about it for awhile after. I felt that
people just assume my sexual orientation based upon my appearance (gender presentation) and it’s extremely annoying.

Different from Russ and Jennifer, Sam describes his gender presentation within his original narrative. He interprets that others read him as queer because they read him as feminine, in particular because of his voice. When asked to indicate specifically how gender expression played a role, Sam indicates, “A lot, my voice and my manner of speech… I don’t fit into the profile of being traditionally White masculine.” Sam describes his experiences as informed by the intersection of his gender expression and racial identity. He elaborates when directly asked about race and writes, “Asian guys are already seen as feminine,” articulating that hegemonic masculinity is defined by the experiences of White, middle-class cisgender men (Schippers, 2007). For Sam, the belief that gay men are effeminate (Kite & Deaux, 1987) in conjunction with the association between Asianness and femininity (Johnson & Ghavami, 2011) leads to being superficially labeled both in terms of his interests as well as his sexual orientation. He describes this pigeon-holing as “extremely annoying,” expressing frustration at the inability to define himself independent from racialized gender stereotypes.

Whereas Sam’s vocal intonations and mannerisms signaled his non-heterosexuality to others, Devin, a 25-year old biracial (Filipino/White) queer genderqueer person, indicates that their androgynous appearance cues others to their queerness. After describing a public incident in which they were “called faggot among other homophobic slurs” by a stranger, they reflect, “My queerness is highly visible because of my masculine gender presentation. I have short hair and wear men’s clothing but do not pass as a man. I am usually read as a (butch) lesbian and sometimes read as FTM/transmasculine. I don’t think he would have called me a fag had he not been able to immediately recognize my queerness.” Devin writes that others most commonly perceive their masculine/androgynous presentation as an indicator of lesbianism, not
transgenderism. In describing that they “do not pass as a man,” Devin implies that others read their body as communicating female masculinity (and therefore queerness), but not necessarily the desire to be perceived as male (and therefore transgenderism).

Other trans* participants – in particular binary trans individuals – also emphasize the significance of gender expression; however, gender expression carries greater significance, not necessarily in the perception of sexual orientation, but in their gender identity. Harper, a 25-year old, White queer trans man, for example, succinctly states: “People, myself included, always pays [sic] a ton of attention to my performance of gender, so I don’t really get attention on who I fuck.” For Harper, “performance of gender” reflects his gender identity, not his sexual orientation, and he directs much of his energy toward “passing” as male. Tellingly, he does not elaborate on how he believes others perceive his sexual orientation. This may be because he perceives it as less important or implies that when he is perceived as male he is also perceived as straight because of hegemonic gender paradigms (Butler, 1990). In their lives, though, both Devin and Harper use hegemonic formulations of the expected relationship between birth-assigned gender, gender identity, gender expression and sexual orientation to make sense of their interactions with others. Whereas Devin believes their gender expression is more readily interpreted as a signifier of queerness, Harper believes that when he is perceived as gender nonconforming his trans identity becomes salient.

While hegemonic gender norms served as a useful framework for many LGBQ participants in inferring how others perceive them, a handful of participants describe an inability to draw conclusions. Ry, a 38-year old White queer genderqueer person, for example, describes that as a result of the fluidity of their gender identity, gender expression and sexual orientation that they are perceived in a variety of ways:
There's *always* the chance that if an interaction or encounter doesn't go well, it's because the person I'm dealing with in whatever context has a problem with what they think I am. And that's often complicated by the fact that...I'm usually perceived as male, but thanks to my personal style, manner, and vocal inflection, people either assume that I'm an effeminate gay guy, or possibly a rather butch male-to-female transwoman. So if someone gives me a disapproving look or makes a rude remark, who the hell knows what part of my picture they've got a problem with? To date, nobody has ever managed to mobilize 'pansexual androgyne' into a workable slur.

Ry’s embodiment undoes multiple gender binaries that constitute the heterosexual matrix: between birth-assigned gender and gender identity, between gender identity and expression, as well as between gender expression and sexual orientation. They describe that negative encounters may reflect them being read as an effeminate cis gay man, as well as a masculine trans woman, depending upon the context. For Ry, it is difficult to interpret which perceived gender violation others find disagreeable (“who the hell knows what part of my picture they have a problem with?”). For some – like Ry – referencing gender norms does not elucidate their experiences, despite their attempts.

Within hegemonic gender formulations, multiple gendered binaries exist (Butler, 1990; Connell, year, etc): between male-female (gender assigned at birth), man-woman (gender identity), masculine-feminine (gender expression), and heterosexual-gay (sexual orientation). Cisgender LGBQ participants reference this framework predominantly to sense how others perceive their sexual orientation, not their gender identity. This implies that they are read as cisgender and therefore within the bounds of the heterosexual matrix in regard to their gender identity. In contrast, trans* LGBQ participants, like Devin, Harper and Ry, often state that gender expression contributes to both the perception of their sexual orientation and their gender identity. This difference between how cis and trans* LGBQ participants deploy gender ideologies surfaces an underlying assumption of the gender inversion stereotype: In order for gay
men to be considered effeminate and lesbian women masculine they must first be perceived as (cis) men and (cis) women.

Across their narratives, LGBQ participants characterize gender expression as a “first stop” for how others perceive them. Whereas Russ and Jennifer indicate that traditional gender presentations in relation to their gender assigned at birth work to conceal their bisexuality, Sam’s vocal intonations and Devin’s appearance work to reveal their queerness. For Harper, his gender expression is first and foremost an indicator of his gender identity, not necessarily his queer sexual orientation, while for Ry, the fluidity of his queerness makes it difficult – if not impossible – to interpret how others perceive them. Regardless of their gender presentation, hegemonic gender ideologies were central to how participants made sense of their experiences: Both cis and trans LGBQ participants often mobilize common tropes or expectations of masculine and feminine embodiments in relation to their gender assigned at birth as a way to make sense of their experiences. This “visibility” or “invisibility” of one’s sexual orientation and/or gender identity vis-à-vis gender expression resulted in qualitatively different discriminatory encounters for cis and trans LGBQ participants.

**Gender Conformity as a Double-Edged Sword**

Within their narratives, LGBQ participants who describe that they conform to hegemonic gender expectations remark that they receive certain benefits for their gender presentations. In addition to not having to worry if others read them as queer, like Russ and Jennifer describe, adherence to traditional gender expectations may attenuate overt expressions of discrimination. For example, when asked to describe a negative encounter, Jacqueline, a 25-year old biracial (Latina/White) bisexual cis woman tells a story of being called “weird and gross” by a boy in her high school. Although she does not comment on her femininity in her original narrative, when
asked she indicates that her gender expression mattered a lot: “I think if I presented in a less
feminine way, I would have been responded to in a much more hostile manner. I think in general,
people would have been more aggressive with me during that time if I weren’t high femme.” In
contrast to women who present in a more masculine way, Jacqueline believes that her femininity
protects her. In describing that “people would have been more aggressive” if she were not “high
femme,” Jacqueline implies that gender nonconformity can incite additional hostility within
antigay encounters.

Although a number of LGBQ participants, like Jacqueline, describe advantages they
receive within their daily interactions due to being perceived as gender conforming, they also
narrate discriminatory experiences that hinge upon their conforming appearances and
mannerisms. Numerous LGBQ participants who are perceived as gender conforming tell stories
about their sexual identities being ignored, denied or invalidated. Rich, a White 41-year old gay
cisgender man recalls an adverse interaction while at work:

The one time I'm thinking about happened at work a few years ago when I was casually
talking to an older woman (late 50's) colleague and mentioned my partner. Apparently
she hadn't heard that I was gay, and I hadn't told her before, so when I mentioned him she
stopped me and asked outright: "you're gay?" I had a feeling by the way she said it that
the conversation could either go bad or good from that point, and confirmed to her that
"yes, I'm gay." She said, "you can't be, you're so handsome and masculine! You can't be
gay."

To Rich’s colleague, it is inconceivable that a man can be both masculine and gay. While he did
not seek to actively hide his sexual orientation, for his colleague, Rich’s masculinity supersedes
his self-identification. In confirming to her that yes, he is gay, she retorts he is “so handsome
and masculine,” implying that gay men are neither attractive nor masculine. Although perhaps
meant initially as a compliment, Rich’s colleague in effect invalidates his self-proclaimed
identity and in doing so insults him and the gay male community more generally.
Conforming to expectations of masculinity and femininity worked to erase the potential of LGBQ individuals being recognized as queer not only by heterosexual individuals, but also by other members of the LGBQ community. Jamie, a 29-year old, White queer trans man describes being ignored while at a well-known lesbian bar:

For whatever reason, I could not get a drink, despite waiting near the bar for 15 minutes. I watched several men get served, who pretty solidly appeared to be gay. I was there with my partner, so I think I was being perceived as straight and dissed on that basis. I felt pretty conflicted since I totally advocate queer space and icing out straight assholes who are cluelessly taking up space there, but it felt pretty invalidating and shitty. I ended up hanging out for a while without a drink and then leaving.

Although initially he states that “for whatever reason,” Jamie interprets that the bartenders read him as straight because he was there with his girlfriend. In further reflection on his gender presentation he also writes that the physical changes he has experienced from taking testosterone may also have contributed, “I think hormonal changes contributed but I’m not sure.” Somewhat ironically, he describes that within “everyday straight contexts,” people question his masculinity and his gender identity: “The vast majority of the time I am read as a butch dyke.” His experience highlights the importance of context for the perception of both sexual orientation and gender identity vis-à-vis gender expression. Within the context of a lesbian bar, Jamie was likely read as a cisgender heterosexual male because of his masculinity and relationship with his girlfriend. Although he advocates for “icing out straight assholes who are cluelessly taking up space,” he feels torn when grouped as one of those “assholes.” On the one hand, being recognized as male may feel validating for Jamie; on the other hand, being perceived as outside the LGBQ community is a source of pain and alienation.

Terry’s experience exemplifies the double-edged nature of gender conformity in a different way. While being perceived as straight may mitigate antigay encounters, perceived gender conformity may also unintentionally make LGBQ individuals privy to prejudiced beliefs
that would not normally be expressed in the presence of a “known” homosexual. Terry, a 33-year old Asian queer cis woman, recalls witnessing blatant transphobia and homophobia at a previous job:

I was working at a conservative government company. A trans woman started working there and people were gossiping about her. One co-worker said that she felt uncomfortable sharing a bathroom with her. She also said she would feel uncomfortable sharing the bathroom with a lesbian. I was not out at this job...I felt angry and also ashamed. I don’t remember if I said anything to defend the trans woman. I never came out to that coworker.

Although Terry never directly references her gender presentation in this story, she states twice that she was not out at the job, implying that her femininity prevented her colleague from perceiving her as queer. Because of her gender expression she writes that she is “assumed straight” and adds that her colleague, “possible felt okay sharing her judgments with me since we were all Asian.” Terry believes that the combination of her racial identity and feminine gender expression led her colleague to believe that they hold similar beliefs. Although Terry was not the intended target of this woman’s disgust, the experience still adversely affects her. She writes that it made her feel “angry and also ashamed.” Anger at her colleague’s casual transphobia and homophobia and shame in that she did not speak up in her own or the trans woman’s defense; in her silence her colleague’s prejudice went unchallenged.

Even in instances where LGBQ participants describe being forthcoming about their sexual identities, their disclosures may not be perceived in the way they intended. Feminine cisgender women in particular narrate instances where their identities are eroticized, exposing how sexism is produced and maintained by the heterosexual matrix. Lisa, a 28-year told Black queer cis woman, describes a vexing experience she also had with a colleague:

Out of friendliness, I invited a colleague of the opposite sex out to eat. We had Vietnamese. Casual, right? We chatted casually and I made the mistake to drop a tidbit about my orientation, just to ward off any troublesome ideas about the nature of our relationship. Well, he misread that disclosure, and proceeded to make a solid pass at me.
It was as if he had interpreted the statement, "I am queer," as "I am a wanton slut." He was extremely aggressive about it too. What a dick.

Lisa’s anger is palpable. Although she attempts to use her queerness as a way to signal her unavailability to her colleague, she concludes that it was a “mistake: Her colleague reads this disclosure as a sexual invitation. As “queer” defies hegemonic expectations of femininity, Lisa’s colleague interprets that she also fails at maintaining other quality characteristics (Schippers, 2007), specifically that her queerness predicates excessive desire. As a result, Lisa’s colleague behaves “extremely aggressive,” as if he thinks she is a “wanton slut.” Feeling sexually objectified in relation to their queerness was common across feminine-presenting cis women’s narratives. Bisexual cis women, in particular, describe continually attempting to disassociate their bisexuality from beliefs about promiscuity. Like Lisa, their efforts often result in men making unpleasant and unwanted sexual advances (e.g., requests for a three-some). Although adhering to expectations of femininity may protect them at times from “worse” experiences, as Jacqueline argues, or from being the direct object of hatred in Terry’s situation, the intersection of feminine and queer is a space in which cis women participants continually fight to establish a legitimate embodiment of desire.

The visibility or invisibility of their sexual orientation vis-à-vis gender expression was not the sole indicator of queerness for LGBQ participants, nor was it consistent across all contexts. As in Jamie’s experience, participants state that negative discriminatory encounters occur when they were with their same-gendered significant other as well as with other LGBQ people. Others describe having their sexual orientation become public knowledge through wearing LGBTQ-affiliated paraphernalia or discussing LGBTQ topics. Within these instances, participants describe their “passing” as tenuous, of being acutely aware of the moment in which they were “discovered,” and of how this (un)intentional disclosure changes the course of their
interactions. Chelan, a 25-year old, biracial (White/Native American) gay cis man recalls an incident he had on public transportation:

I was riding the bus, and was wearing a rainbow bracelet. I began talking to a guy who was sitting near me. At first, he was very warm, but as our conversation progressed he became more cold and distant. We weren't talking about anything controversial, but his whole demeanor inexplicably changed halfway through our conversation. Although I perceived the change, I tried to keep the conversation going, because he was fun to talk to, but I gave up after another minute because he didn't seem to want to talk anymore. I felt like he might have looked at my bracelet and assumed that I wasn't straight. He might have been uncomfortable with homosexuality in general, but I'm not sure because we never talked about it. I did feel self-conscious after that, and put in headphones so that I'd be in my own world, free from concern for what he might think of me.

While Chelan’s encounter started out warm, he describes that it suddenly changed and attributes the shift to his rainbow bracelet. Whereas Chelan may have initially been perceived as straight, as hegemonic gender norms coupled with his masculine appearance make heterosexuality the assumed default, he interprets that his bracelet “outed” him. Embarrassed - “I did feel self-conscious after that” – Chelan retreats from the spoiled encounter and seeks solitude by putting in his headphones. As he describes, it, it is impossible to know the intention of the other man; however, he understands his experience, like other LGBQ participants understand theirs, as unlikely to be a coincidence.

For many LGBQ participants, perceived gender conformity functions as a double-edged sword. At times it grants heteronormative privilege in their interactions with others: Unless they verbally disclose their sexual identities, they describe often being assumed straight and their conventionally masculine or feminine presentations may help reduce the severity of the antigay encounters when they occur (i.e., “It would have been worse if I looked gay”). At the same time, their perceived gender conformity is also the basis upon which others negate their sexual identities (“You're so handsome and masculine! You can't be gay”). In these instances, LGBQ participants defy the expected relationship between gender presentation and sexual orientation
required by the heterosexual matrix. That they could be masculine and gay (like Rich) is unintelligible to others. For feminine-presenting cis women, in particular, they narrate overt instances of sexism due to the combination of their femininity and queerness, where they are eroticized and treated as “wanton slut[s].” Within these encounters, LGBQ participants describe feeling alienated, silenced, and enraged. Many knew the enactors of discrimination as colleagues or acquaintances or had hoped to be welcomed as part of the LGBQ community and describe negative emotional and psychological effects. “Passing” as straight is neither a monolithic privilege nor one that occurs consistently across contexts. The stability of the heterosexual matrix and one’s position within it is perpetually negotiated through interactions with others (Butler, 1990). The negotiation of one’s perceived sexual orientation does not solely belong to LGBQ individuals who transgress gender norms. As will be elaborated below, compared to LGBQ participants who transgress gender norms, gender conforming LGBQ participants experience discrimination in qualitatively distinct ways due to the alignment of their gender expression in relation to their gender identity.

*Gender nonconformity as a precipitant of discriminatory encounters*

In contrast to the experiences of LGBQ individuals who are commonly perceived as gender conforming, LGBQ participants who transgress normative gender expectations narrate instances in which their non-normative presentations directly incite adverse encounters. For many, such interactions are unprovoked, occur in public and involve strangers. Morgan, an 18-year old biracial (White/Middle Eastern) queer genderqueer person describes a terrifying encounter while walking home one night:

I heard several voices shouting ‘Hey, queer!’ and “Is that a guy or a girl?” behind me. There were four men and a woman, all a little older than me…walking close behind me. They shouted insults about how I was dressed (blue hooded rainjacket, tight darkwash jeans, black converse hightops), and they called me ‘fag’ and ‘queer’ repeatedly, and
threatened me with violence. They nearly followed me home, but gave up when I turned onto a busy street frequented by cops. I was very scared and shaken…It seemed like they were frustrated by my gender expression and took it to mean something about my sexuality, and didn’t want people like me in their neighborhood.

Morgan describes their assailants as first intrigued and then frustrated in attempting to determine Morgan’s gender. They aggressively demand to know Morgan’s birth-assigned gender by asking, “Is that a guy or a girl?” and insult Morgan by calling them “fag” and “queer.” Outnumbered and afraid, Morgan interprets their experience as a direct assault to both their gender expression and sexual orientation (“It seemed like they were frustrated by my gender expression and took it to mean something about my sexuality”). Importantly, no interaction preceded this attack; Morgan was simply existing. In making sense of their experience, Morgan adds, “I think that a lot of my androgyny is a result of my race – I am very tall, have strong facial features, broad shoulders and coarse hair. If I was [sic] a tiny 100% white woman, I don’t think they would have bothered me.” Morgan understands the attack as not only a result of their stature but also their non-whiteness. Although they do not describe the race of their attackers, Morgan implies that their race further positioned them as different. As hegemonic gender norms are premised on and privilege the experiences of White, middle-class cis men and women (Connell, 2005; Schippers, 2007), Morgan’s visibility as queer and as a Middle Eastern person positions them outside the norms of “acceptable” gender embodiments, and therefore an “appropriate” target of harassment.

Many LGBQ participants characterize the negative encounters that target their gender expression as socially-sanctioned. Mel, a 23 year-old biracial (Asian/White) queer genderqueer person, describes enduring a verbal attack while on the subway with their girlfriend. They write:

…We had our arms on each other’s waist/shoulders type stance on the train. This dude gets on the train and stands behind us and starts muttering about “True love is between a man and a woman,” etc. etc…so we kind of look at him to address that, yes, we hear him. And he keeps on with his comments, so we move farther down the train He then continues with the comments in leering at us until we respond verbally like, “Can we help
you? Do you mind?” And this whole time, no one else on the train does anything, they’re just witnessing us being verbally assaulted…The message was just that who I was was just not ok. And it culminates with the guy saying, “If you were dudes, I’d beat the shit out of you.” I was feeling terrified.

In explicating the role of gender expression, Mel describes that they and their girlfriend both look “not necessarily like men, but not super girly,” implying that this man perceives them as queer in both their physical appearance and their affection toward each other. In addition to bearing this man’s homophobic attack, Mel feels abandoned by other commuters – “No one else does anything.” Mel and their girlfriend were visibly uncomfortable (i.e., they moved away from him), yet he continues to harass them and escalates to the point of overt physical threat (“If you were dudes, I’d beat the shit out of you”). Despite all of this, no one defends Mel and their girlfriend. Mel interprets this man’s behavior and the inaction from bystanders as personal condemnation. They write, “The message was just that who I was was just not ok.”

While one interpretation could be that this man’s vitriol was directed specifically toward Mel’s sexual orientation and not necessarily their gender expression, within their narratives many LGBQ participants interpret negative public encounters as intentional punishment for their gender nonconformity, not only their queerness. As Evie, a 25-year old White lesbian cis woman summarizes, “I suppose the message communicated to me was that people don’t want to get involved and don’t care…they probably thought I deserved it because of how I look.” For many LGBQ participants, bystander silence communicated approval of their discriminatory treatment, of perceived gender nonconformity constituting them as “other,” of upholding the sanctified boundaries of “acceptable” gender embodiments. As succinctly described by Sean, a 30-year old Black gay cis man, “gender transgression is a low-hanging fruit, a ripe target.”

Whether the enactor’s motivation to discriminate is perceived to be intentional or not, perceived gender nonconformity represents a condoned site to reinstate hegemonic gender
expectations not only within public spaces like Mel’s experience, but also within private settings. Alex, a 27-year old biracial (White/Latina) queer individual who identifies as both genderqueer and female, writes that she has experienced “a great deal of blatant homophobia in recent years.” She describes that she “present[s] on the androgynous/masculine spectrum” and recounts an experience she had while seeking care for a skin issue at a dermatologist:

…she suggested I go on spironolactone for its anti-androgen effects. Ok-- maybe that will fix the recurring skin problem I'm having. She looked me up and down and said "The androgens might be why you are the way you... are" and suggested spiro could "fix" that. Excuse me? I was completely shocked hearing this from a medical professional who, regardless of her personal feelings on the matter, I thought would be able to deal with me professionally. For things like dermatology…I’d never bothered to seek out queer-affirmative providers because I never thought my presentation or orientation would have any impact on my treatment. I felt uncomfortable with the idea of following her advice because what were her motivations? Would she have prescribed a different thing if she didn’t see me the way she did? Clearly, she had ideas about what a “woman” should be.

In responding “Excuse me?” Alex describes that she felt blind-sided by the dermatologist’s recommendation.” Because the medical services she was seeking involved skin, Alex had not thought to research providers who were “queer-affirmative.” When asked specifically about the role of gender expression, Alex writes, “I had not actually discussed my sexuality with this doctor – we were talking about skin! So her conclusions about me and my orientation were obviously drawn from what she could see.” Alex interprets the dermatologist’s anti-androgen medicine as a direct critique of both her sexual orientation and gender expression. In describing that she had “never discussed” her sexuality and that the dermatologist had “ideas about what a ‘woman’ should be” she implies that for this dermatologist gender nonconformity and queerness are synonymous. While the doctor may have stopped short of directly condemning Alex’s sexual orientation, the she felt free to addresses Alex’s “low-hanging fruit”: her masculine presentation. As a result of the conflation of gender expression and sexual orientation within the public imagination, individuals who are targeted because of gender nonconformity are likely
targeted as sexual minorities (Gordon & Meyer, 2008). While shifts within public opinion in recent years and the institutionalization of gay marriage grants more legal protection for LGBQ individuals, transgressing gender norms continues as a socially-acceptable site of policing. As evidenced across LGBQ participants’ narratives, a disruption of normative gender boundaries often provokes intense emotional responses from others.

Different from cisgender and genderqueer LGBQ individuals, binary trans participants do not describe the gender policing they experience as connected to their sexual orientation; rather, they attribute their encounters as attacks on their gender identity. Described above, gauging how others reacted to their gender expression was both a means through which trans* LGBQ participants made sense of how others perceive their sexual orientation as well as their gender identities. This heightened awareness of how their gender identities are perceived – and not necessarily their sexual orientation – is reflected in the types of narratives they write. Like Harper, who indicates that his gender identity is salient above and beyond his sexual orientation within his daily encounters, many binary trans LGBQ participants describe that they could not think of any negative encounters regarding their sexual orientation. A number indicate that they had “no idea” of a time they were treated unfairly because of their sexual orientation. Scott, a 28 year-old, White trans man, for example, describes his queer sexual orientation as a non-factor: “My [gender] expression has been different at different points in my life, yet the reaction to my sexuality has always been neutral.”

In instances where binary trans participants do provide discriminatory narrative accounts, their stories often describe experiences of cisgenderism, instances where they are misgendered and referred to by their birth-assigned gender. So although they were directly asked to narrate sexual orientation, many binary trans LGBQ participants narrate gender. Angel, a 43-year-old
Black trans woman who is questioning her sexual orientation, for example, recalls a general experience she had while at work:

Well, working in retail, I encounter people all the time that mistake me for a woman and I love it. I work at a dollar store so I deal with all kinds of people. Since, I've been told, that I look like a woman many people refer to me in the feminine. But there are some asshole men who insist on calling me, "man, dude, boss," and other masculine expressions. It kinda pisses me off, because I feel they are going out of their way to remind me that I'm a man and that I'm not fooling anyone. When men refer to me in the masculine, I make sure I call them "hun or sugah."

Angel states that sometimes people “mistake” her for a woman, indicating that her gender identity as a woman is often not affirmed in her interactions with strangers. Notably, she makes no mention of her sexual orientation. Instead, she emphasizes her gender expression: It is both a cause for celebration when she is read as female and a source of pain when addressed as male. That many binary trans LGBQ participants could not recall negative experiences regarding their sexual orientation but could readily identify maltreatment regarding their gender identity speaks to the primacy of gender expression within their everyday encounters in relation to their gender identity, but not their sexual orientation.

The differential experiences described by cisgender and nonbinary trans participants compared to binary trans participants are noteworthy. As Butler (1990) describes within the heterosexual matrix, in order for sexual orientation to be intelligible, distinctions between “man” and “woman” must exist. Binary trans LGBQ participants’ experiences foreground the centrality of the perception of gender identity vis-à-vis gender expression. Distinct from cisgender LGBQ participants in particular, they connect negative experiences to “passing” as man or woman, as opposed to “straight.” While the experiences described identify the qualitatively distinct nature of discrimination in regard to gender expression, the narratives exemplify how a violation of
gender norm expectations anywhere along the heterosexual matrix are met with interpersonal and societal derogation and punishment.

*Negotiating multiple visible (marginalized) identities*

Expectations around gender fused with racial stereotypes formed a social landscape in which all LGBQ participants experienced and made sense of their discriminatory encounters. Although LGBQ participants often sought to be aware of how others perceived them, as one participant describes, “…you never know what a person is feeling/perceiving, so you can only go off their behavior.” As Chelan’s narrative exemplifies, LGBQ participants often narrate uncertainty about negative experiences regarding their sexual orientation. Within these complex and at times nebulous situations, LGBQ participants relate experiencing ambiguity in multiple ways. In contrast to experiences of microaggressions, in which participants knew that they had been treated unfairly, numerous participants characterize instances in which they were uncertain if and/or why discrimination occurred. Jesse, a 27-year old biracial (White/Native American) gay cis man describes questioning an interaction he had a few years ago with another man at a bar, which he describes as a “straight-sports” bar:

> That atmosphere is something I rarely am in, and it was crowded and loud. I was there only to see a few friends and wore a green shirt. When trying to use the bathroom, an older man who was slightly intoxicated told me that "my kind" wasn't welcome in that bar. I was unsure if he meant gay, or if perhaps my shirt referred to one of the teams currently playing basketball on the televisions throughout the bar. I responded by ignoring him and continuing on. I'm still unsure if the man was just being weird, drunk, or rude.

Although competitive interactions between fans of opposing teams can often characterize the sports bar atmosphere (Anderson, 2005), to Jesse, the language this man uses to describe his “kind” raises questions about the nature of the interaction. Jesse pointedly notes the color of his shirt in his narrative, and although he offers that this man could have read his shirt as a show of
support for an opposing team, he also writes that he was not “wearing clothes like most of the men in the bar” when asked to elaborate on the role his gender expression had in the encounter. Since queer individuals have been historically referred to as a distinct and stigmatized group of people, Jesse wonders if “my kind” is a direct reference to his gay identity. As sports are a well-established site of heteronormative policing (E. Anderson, 2005; Kimmel, 1997), Jesse is acutely aware that he is the minority in such a “straight” context.

That Jesse recalls the experience in detail (i.e., he is careful to note the color of his shirt as well as the specific language the other man used), points to the nagging uncertainty of the encounter within his memory. For many LGBQ participants, wondering if they were targets of discrimination was further complicated by having multiple visible marginalized identities, raising questions about why they experienced unfair treatment. Loree, a White 28-year old queer genderqueer person describes a reoccurring experience they have while frequenting restaurants:

I've had the experience semi-frequently where people get sat or served before me in restaurants. I try to keep a pretty open mind about it, knowing that nothing happens perfectly all the time, but it's happened several times that I wait significantly longer to have wait staff come by my table or take my order...I always wonder if it's because someone has a problem with queer people and they want to subtly (maybe even subconsciously) show their disdain for me being in their restaurant... no one has ever directly said anything to me, so I'm never quite sure if I'm just being hyper sensitive.

Loree was not directly insulted but rather slighted through inattention. Such an absence of behavior can cause uncertainty regarding what, if anything, about Loree these servers may find unacceptable. Although Loree describe that gender “matters, a lot, all of the time,” other aspects of self matter too. When asked about the role of race, Loree respond, “I’m white, so that would have given me an advantage in this situation.” When asked finally if there were other aspects, however, that contributed to the experience, Loree questions whether body size matters: “I sometimes wonder if my size impacts some of my day-to-day experiences, particularly when I’m
with other fat queers.” All of the characteristics Loree considers are visible and constantly available to others in everyday life. Whereas Loree’s whiteness may give them an advantage in some situations, their perceived gender nonconformity and physical size may evoke prejudice in other situations. Aversive forms of discrimination, such as inattention like Loree describes, exemplify the complexity of interpreting discrimination and the ambiguity that can accompany multiple abject identities.

For many LGBQ participants, the difficulty of interpreting discriminatory encounters is often exacerbated by the interconnectedness of their multiple identities. Gabriel, a 21-year old, biracial (Latino/a, White) queer genderqueer person, summarizes the complexity of attribution:

The thing about being queer and being open about it is the uncertainty of everything, you never know. Job offers, snarky comments, dirty looks. When I’m out with my girlfriend are people unfriendly because we’re visibly queer? Because we cross some serious PDA boundaries? Because we’re in [city] and everyone is a jerk? When we’re holding hands and people won’t move to the side is it because they haven’t seen us, or because they have. It’s a constant feeling of questioning yourself.

For Gabriel it is difficult – if not impossible – to separate out which part of themself “sparks” discrimination. They question whether negative experiences result from an aspect of themself (their visible queerness, holding hands with their girlfriend), a violation of social norms (crossing PDA boundaries), or characteristics of other people (“everyone is a jerk,” not paying attention while walking). Their descriptions of “constantly questioning” everyday interactions are echoed by a number of LGBQ participants. For Jeremy, a 25-year old Asian queer genderqueer person, their questions relates specifically to their multiple perceivable social identities: “Every negative encounter entails going over a checklist of my visibly marginalized identities--because of my race, my presumed gender, my gender presentation, so on and so forth. I don't often react outwardly, as it takes me time to process situations and I often default to conflict avoidance.”

For Jeremy, working through their “checklist” requires considerable cognitive and emotional
energy. As a result, they are often unable to respond, as they are still trying to make sense of what happened.

*Whiteness as a Protective Identity*

Experiences of attributional ambiguity took different shapes for participants of color compared to White participants. For most of the LGBQ participants of color, the extent to which discriminatory encounters contained a racialized component was an on-going question, both within *interracial* as well as *intraracial* interactions. When in predominately all-White contexts, LGBQ participants of color are particularly aware of how their racial identities positioned them as “Other.” Nasreen, a 24-year old, Asian queer genderqueer person narrates a negative experience they had while apartment hunting with their partner who is also Indian and identifies as genderqueer:

Last weekend, I visited an apartment open house with my partner. We walked in and my partner immediately tried to greet and shake the hand of the landlord, who was an older white woman. The landlord didn't shake hands with my partner and directed us to look around the apartment. At first I thought that she was just planning to sit and not interact much. In which case, her interaction with us would have been fine. However, she proceeded to get up and interact with a young white woman in her early 20s and her father. She was very interested in speaking to them and followed them around the apartment. She did this to a few people, all white and all appeared straight. At one point, I tried to make eye contact with the landlord to see if she would interact with me. She ignored me and walked away from me. I felt very upset because the situation felt out of my control. I looked very presentable (wearing business casual!) and yet I was, in one glance, deemed unworthy of even a bit of courtesy.

Despite Nasreen’s and their partner’s attempts to interact with the landlord, they are repeatedly overlooked. While Nasreen is initially willing to conclude it was nothing personal, the landlord’s greeting and interactions with “a few people, all white and all appeared straight” suggests to them that the landlord found something objectionable about Nasreen and their partner. The more obvious the disparity of treatment becomes and their inability to remedy it, the more exasperated Nasreen describes feeling, “I felt very upset…the situation felt out of my control.”
Later in their narrative, Nasreen candidly writes that the message communicated from the realtor was, “You don’t belong here.” In seeking to articulate how gender expression and race influenced the experience, Nasreen definitively concludes that their gender expression contributed: “my gender presentation makes me almost exclusively read as gay/queer…my physical appearance has a lot to do with why I was treated so differently.” Because Nasreen describes that they are “white passing” they conclude, “it’s unlikely that the woman would have taken issue with my race.” However, in describing that their partner is “very visibly a person of color,” Nasreen suggests that the landlord may have had an issue with their partner’s race. In contrast to Loree, where they immediately ruled out her Whiteness as potentially related to their maltreatment, for Nasreen, racial dynamics constituted an on-going question. Unable to come to a definitive answer, Nasreen states, “it still bothers me to think about.”

While it is impossible to know the intentions of the realtor in Nasreen’s encounter, their interpretation that race is always a central part of experience resonates with a number of LGBQ participants of color. As Miguel, a 25-year old Latino gay queer man writes, “Race matters all of the time, in everything.” Multiple LGBQ individuals of color indicate that their minoritized racial identity may make it easier for others to treat them badly. In thinking back upon the poor service that she received in a restaurant, Ashley, a 38-year old, Black queer cis woman, comments, “my being black certainly didn’t ‘help’ the situation.” Similarly, Seneca, a 35-year old biracial (White/Native American) cis bisexual female, was verbally harassed and called a “witch” and “dyke” for alternating between “dressing as a woman and a man” while growing up in a rural area of the United States. As an explanation for being treated this way by “rednecks,” she remarks, “White privilege is omnipresent.” Already viewed as “Other” due to her
alternative gender expression, Seneca believed that her Native American heritage further contributed to or facilitated the discrimination she experienced.

When the enactor of prejudice was of the same race, many LGBQ participants of color interpret their discriminatory experience to be as much about their race as it was their sexual orientation. Michael, a 49-year old, Black cis gay male, describes, for example, that when he got married to his husband that “approximately twenty family members who kept in frequent contact were silent.” Michael describes feeling betrayed by and resentful of their silence, as he had supported these family members through “drug additions, failed marriages, teen pregnancies and other ‘colorful’ situations.” In explaining why he cut ties with them, he writes, “They, as typical black bigots who feel they’ve cornered the market on civil injustices, hide behind their understanding of the Bible in spite of any contradictions with love.” Michael’s feelings of condemnation and isolation stem from the intersection of his racial and sexual identities; his race cannot be separated from his sexual orientation and vice versa.

Although all LGBQ individuals negotiate a combination of privileged and disadvantaged identities, Whiteness carried a particular kind of protectiveness for White LGBQ participants. Discussion about the role of race – and in particular Whiteness – is notably absent within White LGBQ narratives. For example, it was common for White LGBQ participants to only describe the racial identities of the various actors within their discriminatory encounters when people of color were also involved. Liv, a 30-year old White cis lesbian woman, for example, writes about an overt homophobic experience she had while on public transportation, in which she, her girlfriend, and friend, who is a gay man, are verbally assaulted. Throughout her narrative she does not mention her race or that of the man who was verbally assaulting them. When directly asked, to reflect on how race contributed, however, she responds, “Some, I was a white woman
with a white gay man and the offending man was a large black man.” Liv does not provide an explanation beyond stating the perceived racial identities of the people involved. She does not explicate how she thinks race mattered, except to note that it was an interracial encounter. It is not clear if she intends this description to be self-explanatory. It is possible, for example, that she may feel reticent to discuss race for the fear of being perceived racist (Wise, 2010).

In instances where the enactor of discrimination was also White, many White LGBQ participants are similarly concise. Many responses simply read, “We were both White,” if they respond to the question at all. Like Liv perfunctorily states the racial demographic information of the assailant in her encounter, many White participants list the race of the involved parties with no explanation. This pattern is similar to the experiences of LGBT individuals discussed by Meyer (2012): Only LGBQ participants of color in that study describe race as salient in intraracial contexts. Within the current study, White LGBQ participants do not consider how their queerness reflects upon the White community; they do not have to because Whiteness is the standard against which other races are compared (McIntosh, 1989). Understood this way, in their narratives White participants often consider “race” important if a person of color is involved in the encounter, but not if all parties are White.

Of the White LGBQ participants who discuss race in their narratives, many commonly state that their experience “would have been worse” if they were a person of color. Jo, a 25-year old queer genderqueer person, writes about a medical emergency they and their girlfriend had while in public. Their girlfriend, who has a seizure disorder, collapsed. In this emergency, Jo was unable to hail a cab. They describe, “Four empty cabs went by, and people were walking by and staring at us and nobody in the car or on foot stopped to ask us if we needed help.” Like other LGBQ participants who transgress gender norms, Jo describes their presentation as
contributing to the encounter: “we looked gay and just general kind of edgy and weird, and that probably is not helpful when you’re trying to get someone to help you, urgently, in public.” When asked specifically about the role of race, they respond, “I don’t know what that situation would have looked like if I was not white, it makes me nervous to think about.” In reflecting back on the encounter, Jo indicates that they had never fully considered their Whiteness (“I don’t know what that situation would have looked like”) and they are uncomfortable in imagining it having been worse (“It makes me nervous to think about”).

As many theorists of systems of inequality have written, we tend to focus on those identities that are marginalized, not privileged (Collins, 1993; Johnson, 2001). The brevity and lack of substance described in the responses above may reflect White LGBQ participants not having thought about themselves as White. As Tom, a 45-year old White cis gay man describes, “It’s hard to think about how race contributed.” When asked to think, though, some White LGBQ individuals reflect on Whiteness as an unearned advantage (McIntosh, 1989). Kylie, a 27-year old White cis queer women, for example, remarks: “I'm not sure how being white may have affected this experience, never having been part of a racial minority group…White is always assumed to be the default. I am not nearly as aware as I should be of the privilege it involves in each interaction.” In describing that she has “never…been a part of a racial minority group,” Kylie offers an explanation for why she has not considered how her racial identity influences her experiences, and she expresses guilt (“I’m not nearly as aware as I should be”).

Similar to how Jacqueline describes her experiences as softened by her femininity, a number of White LGBQ participants describe Whiteness as the absence of a negative (or worse) experience, as opposed to the presence of a privilege. Different, however, from the potential advantage that LGBQ individuals describe in relation to being perceived as gender conforming,
White LGBQ individuals do not describe instances in which their Whiteness positions them at a disadvantage or contributes to other forms of discrimination. In contrast to Senaca’s explanation that her Native American heritage “facilitated” the discriminatory encounter, participants narrate whiteness as protection, as a buffer against intensified discrimination. It also operates as protection in freeing up emotional energy when evaluating discriminatory encounters. As Loree’s narrative attests, Whiteness can often be dismissed because of the privilege it grants. Understood this way, Whiteness operates as protection in not having to include race on their “checklist” of visible marginalized identities.

**Discussion**

The gender inversion stereotype that gay men are effeminate and lesbian women are masculine (Kite & Deaux, 1987) was an ever-present backdrop for the experiences of LGBQ participants in this study. In interpreting their experiences of discrimination, the quality characteristics that constitute definitions of hegemonic masculinity and femininity were pervasive. While violation of hegemonic gender norms has been discussed as a fundamental component of and underlying foundation for antigay discrimination (Herek, 2009), less research has directly attended to the role the perceptibility or visibility of one’s sexual orientation within discriminatory experiences due to one’s gender expression. Many scholars have described homosexuality as a concealable stigma, meaning that a LGBQ person can avoid the stigma of homosexuality and “pass” as straight by not verbally disclosing his or her sexual orientation (Frable, Blackstone, & Scherbaum, 1990; Goffman, 1959; Herek & Capitanio, 1996). Yet, the experiences of LGBQ participants within this study suggest that sexual orientation can exist both as a visible and concealable social identity. As evidenced in this study, the extent to which one’s
sexual orientation is perceivable is always tenuous, context-dependent, and an inter-relational experience that is informed by gendered racial stereotypes (Johnson & Ghavami, 2011).

Presenting in ways that vary from or adhere to traditional gender expectations translated into qualitatively distinct experiences of discrimination for LGBQ participants in this study. Whereas transgressing hegemonic expectations often worked to *reveal* their sexual orientation, presenting in ways that align with dominant gender norms functioned to *conceal* their sexual orientation. Evidenced above, a number of LGBQ participants attributed their mistreatment to obvious, non-traditional presentations, in particular within public settings involving strangers. Many describe their gender expression as one of the primary causes for unprovoked and emotionally inflamed discriminatory events. For them, gender – in its performance and perception by others – is an indelible factor within everyday interactions. Perceived gender nonconformity exists as a *visible* stigma and is thus a readily identifiable target for discrimination. The conflation of gender expression and sexual orientation within the public imagination means that individuals who are targeted because of gender nonconformity are likely to be targeted as sexual minorities, regardless of their actual sexual orientation (Gordon & Meyer, 2008).

LGBQ participants who were often perceived as gender conforming did not describe such unprovoked altercations. Instead, they narrated experiences of discrimination that stemmed from the *invisibility* of their sexual orientation. For many, discrimination was described in stories where their sexual identities were denied or outright invalidated (e.g., “You’re too handsome to be gay!”). Others were exposed to prejudiced attitudes that normally would have been censored among “known” sexual minorities. This is not to say that LGBQ individuals who are perceived as gender conforming do not experience overt and targeted forms of antigay discrimination, or
that they do not experience discrimination in public spaces. Because participants were not asked about discriminatory experiences in specified contexts, direct comparisons in this way are impossible. In their narrative prompts, participants were asked to write about two instances of unfair treatment related to their sexual orientation. However, the narratives LGBQ participants chose to narrate foreground the importance of sexual orientation as visible vis-à-vis gender expression.

Being vigilant – or at least aware – of how others perceive them based upon their gender presentation was fundamental to how LGBQ participants made sense of antigay discriminatory encounters. This attentiveness did not pertain solely to gender expression. Other visible social identities – in particular race and body size – intersected with gender expression in shaping participant experiences. Mindfulness of one’s visible identities across contexts and in relation to various others was not simply a cognitive tool for interpretation but rather an essential skill for navigating the prejudiced beliefs of others and anticipating their actions. These findings echo previous research indicating that individuals with a deviant “master status” are more mindful of their interactions with others in order to be on the alert for cues of discrimination and devaluation (Frable et al., 1990) and that public space is not race- and gender-neutral.

Intersectionality holds that systems of oppression do not exist independently from one another or in additive form, but instead form interlocking systems of oppression (Collins, 2005; Crenshaw, 1995). Although multiple social positionalities informed antigay encounters, the salience of one’s social identities varied across contexts. For some LGBQ participants of color, for example, their race and sexual orientation were completely intertwined and both prominent in discriminatory encounters. Others placed greater emphasis on their sexual orientation. For a number of binary trans LGBQ participants, the perception of their gender identities was
emphasized above and beyond their sexual orientation, raising questions about the extent to which discriminatory encounters are best characterized as “antigay.” Although participants were not specifically asked to rank the importance of their social identities, a number described varying degrees of importance to their various identities within discriminatory encounters. This coincides with recent research that argues for the possibility that social identities exist both as ranked and as intersectional (Bowleg, 2013). Taken together, these experiences demonstrate a dialectical negotiation of intertwined social identities, the identities of the enactor(s), and larger cultural discourses about race, gender and sexual orientation.

Finally, in contrast to previous experimental work (Crocker et al., 1991; Mendes et al., 2008; Operario & Fiske, 2001; Ruggiero et al., 1997; Schmitt et al., 2002), this study considers attributional ambiguity from the participants’ perspective. The question of whether they experienced discrimination was complicated by negotiating multiple social positionalities. Covert discriminatory encounters can be difficult to interpret due to the ambiguity that surrounds subtle communication and interactions (Sue, 2010). Even in instances where there was definitely a malicious intent to discriminate, however, ambiguity can exist in regard to why. As participants in this study narrated, they considered which aspects of themselves (e.g., gender, race, gender expression, etc.) factored significantly in their discriminatory experiences. Were the enactors of prejudice responding to their gender expression? Gender? Race? Fatness? A combination or all of the above? In reflecting on their experiences, participants engaged in emotional and cognitive labor in which many did not or could not arrive at a definitive conclusion as to 1) whether they were discriminated against, and 2) if so, which aspect(s) of themselves was targeted. As Nasreen’s experience suggests, the effects of such ambiguous encounters may continue well beyond the immediate event. However, due to the nature of this study’s design (i.e., brief
narrative stories collected over the Internet), it was impossible to ask follow-up questions in order to explicate the experiences of attributional ambiguity.

Despite this limitation, this study is the first to consider attributional ambiguity in relation to antigay discrimination and to do so within an intersectional framework, focusing on lived experiences. Previous experimental work has considered attributional ambiguity in relation to singular identities, as opposed to examining the ways in which attributions may pertain to multiple social identities (see King, 2003 as an exception). LGBQ individuals’ experiences in this study suggest that attribution to prejudice is, in part, a function of an individual’s position within social hierarchical structures as a result of their social identities (Schmitte & Branscombe, 2002). An individual’s social identity is constituted by multiple identities at any given time, although the salience of these identities often varies by immediate and historical context (Augoustinos & Walker, 1995; Bowleg, 2013; Collins, 2005). LGBQ individuals negotiate their own positionalities as well as the multiple identities of those who enact prejudice. Thus, antigay discrimination encompasses a dynamic between enactor(s) and LGBQ individuals. While previous experimental findings highlight the primacy of contextual factors, they are limited in their generalizability to real-life encounters of ambiguous discrimination – both overt and aversive. Approaching experiences of attributional ambiguity within an intersectional framework and from the lived experiences of individuals provides a window for larger contextual and power-based analyses. Expanding considerations of attributional ambiguity in this way re-imagines the experiential realities of and diversity of experience among LGBQ individuals.
CHAPTER 3

Study 2 - Antigay Discrimination as a Function of Target Gender, Gender Expression, Sexual Orientation and Race
Introduction

In Chapter 2, I considered the experience of antigay discrimination from the perspective of cisgender and transgender LGBQ individuals. Switching vantage points, the purpose of Chapter 3 is to address the second aim of this dissertation: to examine the ways in which antigay behavior enacted by straight individuals is a function of target gender, gender expression, sexual orientation and race.

Gender Expression as a Target of Antigay Discrimination

Within the experimental psychological literature, a limited number of studies\(^8\) have attempted to differentiate the evaluative influence of sexual orientation from other potential contributors to discrimination against LGBQ individuals, in particular gender expression. As three of the first studies on antigay prejudice and discrimination more generally, Laner & Laner (1979, 1980) and Storms (1978) focused on the contribution of gender roles in the assessment of homosexual targets. Specifically, participants were presented with various types of gay and lesbian targets whose attributes either adhered to or did not adhere to hegemonic gender norm expectations (e.g., masculine lesbian women vs. feminine lesbian woman) and rated their level of likeability. These studies found that male and female participants who were described as gender nonconforming were assessed as less likable than those who were described as gender

---

\(^8\) A note on language. Within the studies discussed below, antigay prejudice and antigay discrimination (the behavioral manifestation of antigay prejudice) are at times used interchangeably in ways that muddle the distinction between antigay attitudes and behaviors. For example, in much of the experimental work discussed, researchers characterize negative evaluations of hypothetical individuals (e.g., expressions of dislike or immoral evaluations) as “antigay prejudice” and not “antigay discrimination” (the term, “discrimination” is rarely mentioned within this work). In these examples, however, participants are evaluating a particular individual and not a general group. Therefore, such evaluations should be characterized as constituting a behavioral act against that individual as opposed to an attitude. In the discussion that follows, I describe the negative outcomes directed toward targets as “antigay discrimination” or as “acts/expressions/enactments of prejudice.”
conforming. Because male and female targets were not evaluated concurrently [Laner and Laner (1979) and Storms (1978) used only male targets and Laner and Laner (1980) only female], however, it cannot be stated with certainty that negative evaluations were a result of sexual orientation, per se. For example, it could be that participants showed a greater dislike for masculine lesbians as a result of (a) greater dislike for masculine behavior more generally; (b) greater dislike for individuals who violate gender roles; or (c) greater dislike for lesbians who “fit” the gender inversion stereotypic image (Lehavot & Lambert, 2007). Additionally, because these studies were conducted over 40 years ago, it is possible that these effects may be different at present, given the social and legal advancements of LGBQ individuals (American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 2013).

More recently, Schope and Eliason (2003) built upon these studies to include both male and female targets concurrently in their experimental design. Similar to studies by Laner and Laner (1979, 1980) and Storms (1978), participants read vignettes that described a masculine/feminine gay man or a masculine/feminine lesbian and then rated their anticipated behavior toward and comfort with that individual. Schope and Eliason (2003) found that same-gender sexual orientation was negatively evaluated overall. In regard to gender expression, they found that feminine gay male targets were evaluated more negatively than masculine gay male targets, and that this effect was strongest among male participants. Both male and female participants perceived the masculine lesbian target more negatively than the feminine lesbian target. These findings support other research that has documented greater aversion to gender norm transgressions in the evaluation of members of the same gender (Horn, 2006). Although Schope and Eliason (2003) conclude that sexual orientation is a central predictor of antigay
discrimination, because no straight targets were evaluated within the study, it is again impossible to know the extent to which participants were responding to sexual orientation, per se.

Seeking to address these limitations, Lehavot and Lambert (2007) examined the interaction between target gender (male or female), gender expression (majority masculine gender role or majority feminine gender role), and sexual orientation (heterosexual vs. gay/lesbian) in the evaluation of others. In this crossed experimental design, participants read a description of one of six possible targets (e.g., masculine straight female) and then rated the target’s likeability and immorality. Like previous experiments, they operationalized gender expression in regard to gender role (i.e., stereotypical gendered behaviors, hobbies, and interests). Different from aforementioned studies however, Lehavot & Lambert (2007) sought to account for individual participant variation and assessed participants’ a priori level of antigay prejudice. These authors found partial support for their prediction that feminine gay men and masculine lesbian women were evaluated more negatively in regard to immorality. Yet, this finding held only for participants high in a priori sexual prejudice. The authors suggest that their findings support the notion that exposure to stereotyped attributes of a disliked groups (i.e., effeminate gay man or a masculine lesbian) can elicit pre-stored animosity (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). That participants who are high in a priori prejudice expressed greater levels of subsequent prejudiced behavior also suggests that the traditional measures used in this study may more readily assess overt forms of discrimination (e.g., outward dislike). As will be discussed in more depth below, operationalizing antigay behaviors within experimental studies on single dimensions such as “good-bad” does not capture the subtle, unintentional, and unconscious ways in which antigay discrimination may also be expressed (Hegarty & Massey, 2007; Nadal, 2013). Additionally, because Lehavot and Lambert (2007) operationalized gender expression in regard to gender role,
left unknown is the extent to which categorical dislike of LGBQ individuals may stem from visible gender norm digressions in appearance and mannerisms.

As the first study to theorize and empirically explore multiple forms of gender expression, Horn (2006) varied gender conformity in regard to appearance and activities in the evaluation of gay or lesbian targets by same-gender adolescent peers. This study importantly departed from previous research that characterized gender conforming and gender nonconforming targets as simply adhering to or not adhering to a general description of gender norms. Similar to previous research, Horn (2006) found that male participants rated gay male targets least acceptable, although both boys and girls rated gay and lesbian targets more negatively than male and female heterosexual targets. Of most interest, she found that gay and lesbian targets who transgressed gender norms in appearance were rated as less acceptable than targets who participated in gender nonconforming activities, as well as compared to targets who adhered to gender conventions in both appearance and activity. Pointedly, among boys, the straight, gender nonconforming boy in appearance was rated as less acceptable than the gay boy who was gender conforming or gender nonconforming in regard to activity. Horn’s (2006) findings suggest that more readily visible forms of gender transgression contribute to antigay behaviors as compared to gendered activities.

As the most recent investigation of gender expression and sexual orientation in antigay prejudice, Blashill and Powlista (2012) assessed the role of gender expression within three domains (i.e., activities, traits, and appearance) alongside sexual orientation on outcomes of the target’s likeability, boringness, and intelligence. Different from Horn (2006), these authors found that targets who were gender nonconforming in their appearances and behavior were less likable than gender typical targets. These effects held regardless of an individuals’ a priori level of antigay prejudice. As in past research, gay male targets were viewed more negatively than
lesbians or heterosexual targets (Kite & Whitley, 1998). Although gender nonconformity served as a part of heterosexual men’s negative reaction to gay male targets, it did not account for the finding entirely, suggesting that being gay, in and of itself, may be negatively received. Blashill and Powlista (2012) suggest that their findings imply that gender nonconformity and same-gender sexual orientation may independently contribute to the production of antigay behaviors.

**Theoretical and Methodological Limitations of Previous Experimental Work**

Taken together, the above studies provide partial support for the idea that antigay discrimination may also derive from judgments of gender nonconformity, in addition to or independent from sexual orientation among LGBQ individuals. Comparisons across studies, however, are limited due to variations in methodological designs and do not account for the intersectional nature of LGBQ experience, particularly in relation to racial identity. Like experimental work more generally, target race was not defined in these studies. In these instances, target race can be assumed White, as Whiteness is unseen and unrecognized as relevant in the United States (Cole, 2008; McIntosh, 1989; Warner, 2008). Methodologically, at the basic level, the studies discussed above vary in their operationalization of sexual orientation: Description of a target’s sexual orientation within the vignettes, for example, differed from direct disclosure (e.g., Michael is gay), implied sexual orientation (e.g., mentioning Michael’s involvement in gay pride events) or reference to the target’s romantic partner (e.g., Michael’s boyfriend). Due to this dissimilarity, it is possible that these studies more accurately assessed differential responses to individuals who are “out” about their sexuality compared to those who “pass” (i.e., perceived as straight) (Hegarty & Massey, 2007). Previous research has found that individuals who were more open about their sexual orientation experienced higher levels of hate crimes (Herek, Cogan, & Gillis, 2002). It is possible that participants may be responding to the
ways in which targets enact their sexual identity, rather than responding to his or her being a sexual minority. Related, these studies vary in their operationalization of gender expression, with some focusing on transgressions based on stereotypical gender roles, personality attributes and other transgressions of gender norms in regard to physical appearance and mannerisms. Like sexual orientation, the degree of visibility of one’s perceived gender nonconformity may be central. Finally, over the span of years that these studies were conducted, gender ideologies have shifted, resulting in a greater range of socially acceptable gender roles and attributes, in particular for women. For accurate comparisons and conclusions across studies of antigay discrimination, psychologists must acknowledge such variation and provide justification for the ways in which they operationalize not only sexual orientation but also gender expression within future research.

Of the aforementioned studies, Lehavot and Lambert (2007), measured antigay behaviors through general likeableness and ratings of immorality, while Horn (2006) measured its expression through levels of acceptability. This constriction of antigay discrimination to a continuum of “good-bad” mirrors traditional theorizations of prejudice that have emphasized the capacity of group membership to elicit global reactions along general evaluative dimensions (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). Although much research predominantly assesses antipathy toward sexual minorities as a single factor of condemnation/tolerance, (e.g., Herek, 1984; 1994), the concept was originally conceptualized as multi-faceted (i.e., condemnation/repression, personal revulsion/threat, desire to avoid contact, denial of similarities between straight and queer individuals) (Hegarty & Massey, 2007). Reducing antigay prejudice to singular axis measures along a like-dislike continuum is limited in its ability to capture the diversity of conscious, unconscious and unintentional ways antipathy toward LGBTQ people is expressed. To more
accurately attend to forms of aversive heterosexism, researchers must utilize more complex and sensitive measures. This requires additional methodologies that substitute and/or complement current experimental approaches.

Finally, while gender expression is a central feature of how LGBQ individuals are perceived (Kite & Whitley, 1998), findings from Study 1 demonstrate that racial identity importantly intersects in LGBQ experience. Like other areas of social psychology, much of the theoretical development for antigay prejudice and discrimination is based on empirical research collected from samples of college-age, White participants (e.g., Kite & Whitley, 1998; LaMar & Kite, 1998). Tellingly, within the aforementioned studies, although target gender is identified as male or female, target race is not described. In these instances, target race can be assumed White, as ethnocentrism within United States society ensures that Whiteness is unseen and unrecognized as relevant (Cole, 2008; McIntosh, 1989; Warner, 2008). This focus on White participants evaluating White gay and lesbian targets fails to consider heterosexism within communities of color and does not examine how heterosexism and racism operate synergistically in the maintenance of White male supremacy (Schippers, 2007). It may be that the intersection of gender expression and sexual orientation plays out differently in heterosexuals’ perception of targets of color.

In sum, previous experimental research on antigay prejudice has found that gay men and lesbian targets are rated negatively in comparison to heterosexual male and female targets (Herek, 2009; Herek, 1991, 2000, 2004; Kite & Whitley, 1998; LaMar & Kite, 1998). This effect is often greatest toward gay men (Greene & Herek, 1994; Herek, 1994; Herek & Capitanio, 1995; Kite & Deaux, 1987). Research on gender nonconformity as an antecedent of antigay behaviors has found that straight and gay targets who are gender nonconforming in appearances are perceived
as less acceptable (Horn, 2006), more immoral (Lehavot & Lambert, 2007), and less likeable (Blashill & Powlista, 2012). These effects are greater among male participants than female participants. Critiqued above, previous research has only measured overt forms of antigay behaviors (e.g., ratings of target likeability and morality). The incorporation of subtle measures of antigay behaviors alongside overt measures may more accurately reflect the experiences of LGBQ in everyday life and more comprehensively capture the variety of ways in which antigay prejudice is enacted. At present, no research exists that has examined potential intersections of target race that may inform how variations of gender, gender expression, and sexual orientation are perceived.

**Study 2: Design and Hypotheses**

Study 2 is designed to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent is antigay behavior a function of target gender expression?
2. To what extent do differences exist by target race?

As in previous research (e.g., Blashill & Powlishta, 2012; Horn, 2006; Lehavot & Lambert, 2007; Schope & Eliason, 2003), I aim to identify the relative contributions of target gender, sexual orientation, and gender expression in the production of antigay behaviors. Differently however, as a means to elicit more subtle forms of discrimination, I have participants complete a hypothetical scenario as opposed to simply reading a description of the target. Using subsequent experiments, I consider the potential variation in antigay behavior when evaluating a Black queer target. I chose to incorporate a Black target as opposed to other racial identities as the psychological research on LGBQ individuals of color pertains more specifically to the experiences of Black LGBQ people (e.g., Bowleg, 2008, 2012; Greene, 2000; 2001). Described above, previous studies have often operationalized antigay prejudice as a single dimension, and,
in doing so, have not incorporated how its enactment can be expressed through nuanced, unconscious, and unintentional means (Hegarty & Massey, 2007; Massey, 2009; Nadal, 2013; Sue, 2010). It is possible, for example, that gender expression differentially contributes to overt versus subtle manifestations of antigay prejudice and that these patterns exist differently in the evaluation of Black targets. Thus, in Study 2, I seek to replicate previous findings and add to the literature by examining the extent to which similar patterns exist in the evaluation of Black targets.

I conducted two experiments using a 2 X 2 X 2 crossed factorial design, in which I varied target gender (male, female), sexual orientation (heterosexual, homosexual), and gender expression (masculine appearance, feminine appearance). In the first experiment, participants evaluated a hypothetical White target and in the second a hypothetical Black target. Within the above studies, only Horn (2006) and Blashill and Powlista (2012) conceptualized gender expression as a multi-dimensional construct. Whereas Horn (2006) found more negative evaluations of gender nonconforming appearance, Blashill and Powlista (2012) found that both gender nonconforming appearance and behaviors were evaluated negatively. This discrepancy points to the need for additional research on the quality content of gender expression in relation to antigay prejudice. However, for simplicity, I limit gender expression to physical appearance, as it was found significant in both of the aforementioned studies.

Whereas past research has most often provided a description of a hypothetical queer target and then asked participants to rate this individual on a handful of closed-ended items (e.g., likeability, acceptance, intelligence), in Study 2 participants evaluate a hypothetical target for an

---

9 Initially, I had planned to have the target vary by race. However, due to complications in interpretation of a 2x2x2x2 design, I have decided instead to conduct two experiments that vary by target race.
employment position. In using a *behavioroid* measure – asking participants to make a commitment to perform an action, even if the action is not realized (Aronson, Ellsworth, Carlsmith, & Gonzales, 1990) – participants are required to make a decision about the hypothetical target, not solely indicate their opinion. As will be described in more depth below, the qualifications of the hypothetical employee are intentionally ambiguous, i.e., it is not clear whether the individual should be promoted or not. Empirical research by Dovidio and colleagues has shown that discriminatory actions are more likely to appear in ambiguous situations where a clear right or wrong decision is not available or when biased behavior can be explained by other factors (Dovidio, Kawakami, Smoak, & Gaertner, 2009). As a result, behavioroid measures may elicit enactments of antigay prejudice in ways descriptive vignettes do not.

Based upon previous research, I tested the following hypotheses within two experiments:

Hypothesis 1: A 2-way interaction between target gender and gender expression is expected, with gender nonconforming targets evaluated more negatively when the target is male.

Hypothesis 2: A 3-way interaction between target gender, gender expression, and sexual orientation is expected, with queer gender nonconforming male targets viewed the most negatively.

Hypothesis 3: Similarities and differences between Experiment 1 and Experiment 2 are explored for differential patterns of discrimination by target race.

**Method**

**Participants**

I recruited participants through Amazon’s online website Mechanical Turk (MTurk) (www.mturk.com). MTurk is a form of crowdsourcing that was initially created for outsourcing labor activities on the Internet for small amounts of monetary compensation (Behrend, Sharek,
Meade, & Wiebe, 2011). More recently, social scientists across the behavioral sciences are using MTurk to obtain research data more quickly, from a larger number of participants, and at a lower cost (Truell, Bartlett, & Alexander, 2002). Paolacci, Chandler, and Ipeirotis (2010) argue that MTurk offers advantages for conducting experimental work compared to laboratory settings. In particular, they contend that MTurk offers a lower heterogeneity of participants across labs, a low risk of a contaminated subject pool, a low risk of dishonest responses, and no risk of experimenter bias. Recent empirical research demonstrates that data from MTurk are not only reliable when compared to surveys completed in-person, but also come from more diverse samples than research conducted with college students (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011). Compared to college student samples, participant samples on MTurk are as representative of the U.S. population as traditional participant pools, and, like Internet samples more generally, MTurk samples more closely reflect gender, race, age, and education demographics (Paolacci et al., 2010).

MTurk may be particularly advantageous for research on antigay discrimination. Sue and Capodilupo (2008) write that microassaults are more likely to be expressed under conditions that afford the perpetrator a form of protection. In particular, individuals are more likely to express biased beliefs and feelings if they feel a sense of anonymity, are assured their actions will be concealed, or do not believe they will suffer any consequences. In MTurk, participants are anonymous to experimenters and their responses cannot be linked to their individual identities (Paolacci et al., 2010). In Study 2, 550 individuals fully completed Experiment 1 and 553 individuals fully completed Experiment 2. Participants were compensated $0.50 for their participation.
Procedure

Within the MTurk interface, potential participants read a short description that explained Study 2 as an “online psychology study that investigates the ways in which we evaluate and make decisions about other people.” Participants were informed that the task would take them 15-20 minutes to complete and that they would receive $0.50 in compensation. Interested participants clicked on the survey link that took them to a Qualtrics interface for full participation. To ensure that participants were straight and over the age of 18, they first completed a series of demographic items. Based upon their responses, participants who identified as not heterosexual (e.g., gay, lesbian, bisexual, queer or other) or who were under the age of 18 were taken to an end-of-survey screen. Eligible participants continued with the experiment. Those who completed the study were presented with the following order of measures: hypothetical scenario, antigay behavior measures, manipulation check items, social desirability scale, a priori antigay prejudice scale, gender norm beliefs scale, items assessing contact with LGBTQ individuals, and finally, debriefing information on the nature of the study.

Measures

Hypothetical Scenario. Instead of using a brief description of a hypothetical target as in previous research (Blashill & Powlishta, 2012; Horn, 2006; Lehavot & Lambert, 2007; Schope & Eliason, 2003), participants were asked to engage in a hypothetical situation. In this scenario, they are the owner of a restaurant who needs to hire a new restaurant manager and read a short description of an employee who is a candidate for the position. To avoid gender bias, I selected service work within the food industry, as it is a more gender-neutral occupation (Davison & Burke, 2000). Service work within the food industry is also more generally considered as a common type of employment among working and middle-class individuals. Thus, this
hypothetical scenario was designed to be more relatable to a wider demographic than more upper class positions (e.g., consultant). Within the candidate’s description, the potential employee (target) was characterized as possessing gender-neutral strengths and weaknesses for the employment position (i.e., being smart and dedicated) (Eagly & Sczesny, 2009).

Participants read one of eight possible scenarios, in which the hypothetical target varied by gender (male/female), sexual orientation (straight/queer), and gender expression (gender conforming appearance/gender nonconforming appearance). Like previous research, target gender was implied through the individual’s name. Sexual orientation was operationalized through mention of the target’s significant other (i.e., boyfriend, Michael or girlfriend, Maya). In contrast to other operationalizations, such as wearing LGBQ pride buttons or activism, reference to a significant other is more politically neutral and helps redress concerns about the extent to which participants are responding to sexual orientation per se or the degree to which the hypothetical target is “out” (Hegarty & Massey, 2007). Gender expression varied through a description of physical appearance (masculine or feminine). Like previous research, target race will not be defined, however, target names for both experiments were selected based upon Internet lists of current popular baby names by race from the 1990 US Census data (i.e., in Experiment 1 the White target names were Ryan and Jessica and in Experiment 2 the Black target names were DeAndre and LaToya). All scenarios are listed in Appendix I. A sample scenario of a Black feminine queer female target is provided below:

You are the owner of a restaurant and need to hire a new manager. The new manager will oversee all servers and work closely with the head chef in menu selection. LaToya has worked as a server in your restaurant for the last 2 years. Customers describe her as friendly and attentive and a few of them come regularly to request being seated in her section. LaToya has a particular style: she has soft facial features and long hair and often wears colorful tops that complement her slight build. LaToya describes that it’s important for her to “put her best face forward” when working and applies makeup before starting her shift. Although she sometimes has tense interactions with the kitchen
staff, overall LaToya is liked by most employees at the restaurant. You have a cordial relationship with LaToya and have gotten to know her well. Outside of work, she likes to take pictures and travel with her girlfriend, Maya. Lately, LaToya has taken a number of sick days and you heard a rumor that she and Maya may be having some relationship problems.

As a means to enhance the cover story and persuade participants to think more thoroughly about the target, participants were asked to create three interview questions they would use in considering the target for the position. Participants were also required to list what they believed to be three strengths and weaknesses of the target. Finally, participants were asked to indicate if they would hire the target or not and asked to explain their response.

**Pilot Study.** Because the current study is one of the first to implement behavioroid measures where references to the target’s social identity groups are implied, as opposed to stated outright as in previous research (Blashill & Powlishta, 2009, 2012; Laner & Laner, 1979, 1980; Lehavot & Lambert, 2007; Schope & Eliason, 2003), I ran a pilot study to examine the effectiveness of the sexual orientation and gender expression manipulations with 47 cisgender heterosexual individuals recruited through my personal contacts. Results from the pilot study are as follows:

**Sexual Orientation.** Through random assignment participants read a scenario that described a hypothetical target as either straight (N= 23) or queer (N =24). Target sexual orientation was operationalized through reference to the target’s significant other (e.g., “Outside of work, LaToya likes to take pictures and travel with her girlfriend, Maya”). After completing a number of questions regarding the target’s employment evaluation, participants indicated target sexual orientation by selecting from a list of possible orientations (i.e., “heterosexual”, “gay”, “lesbian”, “bisexual”, “I’m not sure”). For purposes of analysis, I collapsed sexual orientation responses into straight (N = 18), queer (including “gay”, “lesbian” or “bisexual”, N = 23) and
unsure (N=6). To test the effectiveness of target sexual orientation manipulation within the scenarios, I conducted a chi-square test of independence and found a significant relationship between scenario target sexual orientation by response target sexual orientation, $\chi^2 (2, N = 47) = 36.06, p < .001$. Importantly, of the participants who read a scenario that described a queer target, 92% were able to accurately identify the target’s sexual orientation. While 74% of participants who read a scenario describing a straight target were able to accurately identify target sexual orientation, 22% of participants indicated that they were unsure of the target’s sexual orientation. This is not surprising considering that heterosexuality is often the norm against which other sexualities are compared. As follows, deviation from this norm (i.e., having a same-gender significant other) would strongly direct participant attention in making subsequent recall more likely. These results support reference to a significant other as an effective manipulation of sexual orientation.

*Gender Expression.* Through random assignment, participants read a scenario that described either a gender conforming male (N = 11), gender nonconforming male (N = 11), gender conforming female (N = 11), or gender nonconforming female (N = 11). The gender expression was operationalized using a description of the target in regard to his or her style of dress, haircut, and physical build in ways stereotypically feminine or masculine. Participants subsequently indicated how they perceived the target in relation to femininity and masculinity using a 7-pt Likert sliding scale with 1 = *Very Feminine* and 7 = *Very Masculine*. Although the descriptions of gender nonconforming women portrayed them as more masculine, they were not equivalent to the gender conforming descriptions used with male targets. The same is true of gender nonconforming men and gender conforming women. Because of this, I assessed the effectiveness of the gender expression manipulation for male and female targets separately. Two
independent sample $t$-tests were performed comparing the means of gender expression between gender conforming and gender nonconforming male targets and between gender conforming and gender nonconforming female targets. As predicted, gender conforming male targets ($M = 5.1$, $SD = .89$) were perceived as more masculine than gender nonconforming male targets ($M = 3.9$, $SD = 1.13$) $t(20) = 2.65$, $p < .05$. Similarly, gender conforming female targets ($M = 2$, $SD = .89$) were perceived as more feminine than gender nonconforming female targets ($M = 4.1$, $SD = 1.51$) $t(20) = -3.94$, $p = .001$. The manipulation of gender expression through physical descriptors was effective.

**Antigay Prejudice Behaviors.** As in past research (Blashill & Powlishta, 2012; Horn, 2006; Lehavot & Lambert, 2007; Schope & Eliason, 2003), participants also responded to a number of close-ended items. For target likeability, trustworthiness, and reliability, participants recorded their responses on a 5-pt Likert scale with $1 = \text{Very Likeable/Very Trustworthy/Very Reliable}$ and $5 = \text{Very Unlikeable/Very Untrustworthy/Very Unreliable}$.

**A Priori Antigay Prejudice.** Previous studies have most commonly measured individual attitudes toward homosexuality through an adoption of Herek’s (1994) Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men (ATLG) scale. This scale conceptualizes antigay prejudice on a single continuum of condemnation/tolerance for homosexuality (Hegarty & Massey, 2007). In his critique of measurements of antigay prejudice, Massey (2009) argues that ATGL mirrors liberal approaches to social change, which emphasize assimilation of LGBQ individuals into mainstream culture. Yet, tolerance does not equate acceptance. Measuring whether individuals think homosexuality is wrong or sinful is not the same as measuring if it is desirable or good. As Massey (2009) identifies, a critical approach to measuring antigay prejudice would attend to the positive aspects and contributions of sexual minority experiences, account for differing responses
to male vs. female homosexuality, and consider the ways in which antigay prejudice is bound within hierarchical power relations of gender and sexuality.

To more comprehensively assess *a priori* antigay prejudice, participants completed a modified version of the Polymorphous Prejudice Scale (PPS) (Massey, 2009) (Appendix J). As a measure of modern heterosexism, the complete PPS is comprised of 70 items across seven subscales and assesses both “old-fashioned” forms of antigay prejudice as well as modern forms of heterosexism. The measure also differentiates between antigay prejudice directed toward male and female homosexuals, assesses positive attitudes toward homosexuals, and attends to endorsements of cultural ideologies of gender and sexuality. In order to avoid item fatigue, participants completed five shortened subscales based upon theoretical relevance. Each subscale item was selected based on the reported strength of the factor loaded for the model Massey (2009). The five selected subscales included: 1) traditional heterosexism (e.g., “Homosexual behavior between two men is just plain wrong”); 2) denial of continued discrimination (e.g., “It is easy to understand the anger of lesbian and gay rights groups in America”); 3) aversion toward gay men (e.g., “Gay men aren’t real men”); 4) aversion toward lesbians (e.g., “I try to avoid contact with lesbians”); and 5) resisting heteronormativity (e.g., “I feel restricted by the gender label people attach to me”). For the subscale of traditional heterosexism, three items were modified to balance the number of statements that referred to gay men, lesbians or both. For example, instead of the statement, “Male homosexuality is merely a different kind of lifestyle that should not be condemned” I removed the word, “male” from the sentence to make it a statement about homosexuality more generally. The modified scale is comprised of 31 items. Participants indicated their level of agreement using a 5-pt Likert scale with 1 = *Strongly*
Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree. The modified Polymorphous Prejudice Scale showed strong reliability for Experiment 1 ($\alpha .95$) and Experiment 2 ($\alpha .96$).

**Gender Norm Beliefs.** To measure the extent to which participants endorse hegemonic gender norms, participants completed a partial version of the Genderism and Transphobia Scale (GTS) (Hill & Willoughby, 2005) (Appendix K). This scale was initially developed for assessment of anti-trans prejudice; however, its capacity to assess beliefs about gender conformity more generally makes it applicable to the current study. Example items include, “I have teased a man because of his feminine appearance and behavior” and “Individuals should be allowed to express their gender freely.” Participants indicate their level of agreement using a 7-pt. Likert scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree and 7 = Strongly Agree. This scale departs from previous research, which has more generally assessed beliefs about proper gender roles. The Genderism Scale, in contrast, more pointedly attends to physical appearance (i.e., how one looks) as opposed to behavioral manifestations (i.e., how one acts). This distinction is important for three reasons. First, physical appearance is one of the first sources of information an individual uses when making judgments about others (Schilt, 2010). Second, behaviors that transgress gender expressions may be more socially acceptable than physical expressions (see Horn, 2006). Third, within this study, gender expression is strictly operationalized through physical appearance and not gendered traits or behaviors. The Genderism and Transphobia scale showed high reliability in Experiment 1 ($\alpha .90$) and satisfactory reliability in Experiment 2 ($\alpha .78$)

**Contact with LGBQ individuals.** Previous research has suggested that contact with LGBQ individuals is associated with lower prevalence of antigay prejudice attitudes among straight individuals (Baunach, Burgess, & Muse, 2009; Collier et al., 2012; Herek & Capitanio, 1996). Contact was assessed through a series of items. Participants were asked to indicate if
they had any male friends, acquaintances or relatives who are gay, lesbian or bisexual. If they responded “yes,” they were asked to select how many (i.e., 1, 2, 3-5, 5-10, more than 10). Participants repeated the same items regarding female friends, acquaintances or relatives.

Social Desirability. To assess whether questionnaire responses were biased due to social desirability, participants completed the Social Desirability Scale (SDS-17) (Stöber, 2001). As a shorter version of the Marlowe-Crowne Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960), the SDS-17 consists of 17 items that describe behaviors considered socially desirable but infrequent and also behaviors that are socially undesirable but frequent (Appendix L). Participants indicate whether each statement is true or false for them. Sample items include, “In traffic I am always polite and considerate of others” and “Sometimes I help because I expect something in return” (reverse coded). Item 4, “I have tried illegal drugs (for example, marijuana, cocaine, etc.)” was not included, as it has been found to have low total item correlation (see Stöber, 2001). The SDS-17 has a Cronbach’s α of .72 and a correlation of .74 with the Marlowe-Crowne Scale (Crowne & Marlow, 1960), demonstrating convergent validity (Stöber, 2001). Within the current study, the SDS-17 showed satisfactory reliability in Experiment 1 (α .78), although lower reliability in Experiment 2 (α .62).

Manipulation Checks. To verify that the participants noticed and remembered the manipulations, after completing the evaluation questions, participants were asked to identify the target’s sexual orientation from a list of possible orientations (i.e., “straight,” “gay,” “lesbian,” “bisexual,” “I’m not sure”) and to indicate how masculine and feminine they perceived the target to be using a 7 pt. Likert scale with 1 = Very Feminine and 7 = Very Masculine.

Quality checks. Because this study was conducted online with little control over the quality of the data that participants provided, several questions were inserted into the measures
described above to ensure that participants were paying attention to each item and the responses they made. Two items were included in the Genderism Scale: “People can get tired while filling out surveys, but if you’re paying attention choose 'somewhat disagree' for this question” and “If you’re reading this, please select ‘Disagree’”

**Demographics.** Participants self-reported their gender (male/female/other) and sexual orientation (straight/gay/lesbian/bisexual/I’m not sure). They indicated their race/ethnicity by selecting all responses that applied (i.e., Black or African American; White; Latino/Latina or Hispanic; Afro Caribbean; Middle Eastern; Native American, American Indian, or Alaskan Native; Asian, South Asian or Pacific Islander; Other ________) and indicated their age and highest level of education completed by choosing from a list ranging from “Did not graduate from high school” to “PhD/MD.” Finally, participants selected the type of community they currently live in: city or urban community; suburban community; or rural community.

**Results**

**Manipulation Check Items.** In order to be eligible for inclusion within data analysis, participants had to correctly answer the two quality checks (e.g., “If you’re reading this, please select ‘Disagree’”), as well as correctly identify the hypothetical target’s gender (male/female), sexual orientation (straight/queer), and gender expression (masculine/feminine). Five hundred and fifty individuals fully completed Experiment 1 (White Target). Of those 550, 30 were excluded for failing the quality checks and five participants for not selecting the correct target gender. Of the remaining 515, 84 did not correctly identify the target’s gender expression, 83 did not correctly identify the target’s sexual orientation, and 21 did not correctly identify the target’s gender expression or sexual orientation, resulting in the exclusion of an additional 188 participants. Table 3 compares participant demographics for those who were eligible versus non-
eligible for inferential data analysis for Experiment 1. I conducted a series of chi-square analyses of independence and t-tests to determine statistically significant differences between eligible and non-eligible groups in regard to demographics and other variables of interest. Differences between eligible and non-eligible participants were not statistically significant in regard to participant gender, race, education, geographical location, or having a friend, relative or close acquaintance who is LGBQ. Eligible participants ($M = 38.5, SD = 13.6$) were slightly older than non-eligible participants ($M = 35.8, SD = 12.6$) $t(511) = -2.16, p < .05$. Table 4 shows mean comparisons between eligible and non-eligible groups for a priori antigay prejudice, gender norm beliefs and social desirability. No statistically significant differences were found.

Of the participants who failed to pass one or multiple scenario manipulation checks, they did so disproportionately in the scenarios where the target had counter-stereotypical relationships between gender expression and sexual orientation (i.e., a straight women who was masculine in appearance; a queer woman who was feminine in appearance; a straight man who was feminine in appearance; a queer man who was masculine in appearance). Participants were less likely to correctly identify target sexual orientation and gender expression if the relationship between the target’s sexual orientation and gender expression was counter-stereotypical to the gender inversion stereotype, $\chi^2 (1, N = 515) = 29.432, p < 0.001$, which holds that gay men are effeminate and lesbian women are masculine.

Similar patterns between eligible and non-eligible participants were observed in Experiment 2 where participants were evaluating a hypothetical Black target. Of the 553 participants who fully completed the experiment, 33 were excluded for failing the quality checks and nine for incorrectly identifying hypothetical target gender. Of the remaining, 511, 79 did not correctly identify target gender expression, 79 did not correctly identify target sexual orientation,
and 19 did not correctly identify target gender expression and sexual orientation, resulting in exclusion of an additional 177 participants. Table 5 compares participant demographics for eligible and non-eligible participants in Experiment 2. Table 6 shows mean comparisons between eligible and non-eligible groups for a priori antigay prejudice, gender norm beliefs and social desirability. Consistent with Experiment 1, no statistically significant differences were found between eligible and non-eligible participants in Experiment 2 for these variables. Non-eligible participants ($M = 39.4, SD = 13.6$) were slightly older than eligible participants ($M = 38, SD = 13.8$), however, this difference was not significant $t(508) = -1.02, p = .58$. Different from Experiment 1, however, a significant difference was observed in Experiment 2, with regard to participant gender by eligibility, $\chi^2 (1, N = 511) = 4.579, p < 0.05$. Female participants were more likely to correctly identify target sexual orientation and gender expression than male participants. Similar to Experiment 1, in Experiment 2 participants were less likely to correctly identify target sexual orientation and gender expression if the relationship between the target’s sexual orientation and gender expression was counter-stereotypical to the gender inversion stereotype, $\chi^2 (1, N = 511) = 38.45, p < 0.001.$

**Experiment 1: White Target**

**Descriptive Analyses.** Participants who correctly identified target sexual orientation and gender expression in Experiment 1 ($N = 327$) were included in the analyses for Experiment 1. Percentages of missing data across variables were quite low, with social desirability having the highest percentage (4%). Individuals with missing data were excluded from analyses with pairwise deletion. Overall, participant scores for a priori antigay prejudice ($M = 2.2, SD = .78$) and negative beliefs about gender nonconformity ($M = 1.8, SD = .69$) were low. As found in previous research however (Herek, 2009), male participants had higher scores of a priori antigay
prejudice ($M = 2.4, SD = .76$) compared to female participants ($M = 2.1, SD = .77$), $t(312) = -2.59, p < .05$). Men also had higher scores on gender norm beliefs, indicating greater negative attitudes about gender nonconformity ($M = 2.1, SD = .70$), compared to women ($M = 1.7, SD = .64$), $t(314) = 4.95, p < .001$. These gender differences can be explained in part by women being more likely to have a friend, relative or acquaintance who is LGBQ compared to men, $\chi^2 (1, N = 326) = 11.09, p < 0.01$, and that, as found in previous research (Herek & Capitanio, 1996), knowing individuals who are LGBQ was negatively correlated with endorsing antigay prejudice beliefs, $r(312) = -.36 p < .001$. No differences were found between male and female participants in regard to scores of social desirability or age. Higher antigay prejudice beliefs were also positively correlated with participant age, $r(314) = .21 p < .01$.

Three separate items were used in target evaluation. Overall, mean scores for likeability ($M = 4.2, SD = 1$), trustworthiness ($M = 4.1, SD = .82$) and reliability ($M = 3.5, SD = 1$) indicate that hypothetical targets were perceived favorably. I conducted preliminary analyses examining the relationships among demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, ethnicity, education, income, geographic location), possible covariates (i.e., social desirability, a priori antigay prejudice, gender norm beliefs, LGBQ contact) and dependent variables (i.e., likeability, trustworthiness, reliability) (Table 7). In regard to likeability, trustworthiness and reliability, the findings revealed no significant relationships between participant gender and participant race. Significant relationships existed, however, for participant age, a priori antigay prejudice and gender norm beliefs on at least one of the three Likert scale items (likeability, trustworthiness, reliability) and were included within subsequent analyses.

**Tests of Main Hypotheses.** To test Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 regarding the evaluative influence of target gender (male/female), gender expression (gender
conforming/gender nonconforming) and sexual orientation (straight/queer), I performed a 2X2X2 multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) on the three dependent Likert-items (likeability, trustworthiness, reliability), controlling for participant age, a priori antigay prejudice, and gender norm beliefs. No significant effects or interactions were found (Table 8). Given this outcome, I did not conduct any subsequent ANOVAs for the three dependent variables. Hypotheses 1 and 2 were not supported for Experiment 1.

**Experiment 2: Black Target**

**Descriptive Analyses.** Participants who correctly identified target sexual orientation and gender expression in Experiment 2 (N = 334) were included in analyses testing the main hypotheses. Percentages of missing data across variables were also quite low, with a priori antigay prejudice having the highest percentage (4%). As before, individuals with missing data were excluded from analyses with pair-wise deletion. Like Experiment 1, participants scores for a priori antigay prejudice (M = 2.2, SD = .81) and negative beliefs about gender nonconformity (M = 2, SD = .51) were low, and male participants had higher scores of a priori antigay prejudice (M = 2.4, SD = .84) compared to female participants (M = 2.1, SD = .77), t(318) = -3.1, p < .01. Men also more strongly endorsed negative beliefs about gender nonconformity (M = 2.1, SD = .57), compared to women (M = 1.9, SD = .46), t(3124) = -3.7, p < .001. Female participants were also more likely to have a friend, relative or acquaintance who is LGBQ compared to men, χ² (1, N = 334) = 8.2, p < 0.01, and, as in Experiment 1, knowing individuals who are LGBQ was negatively correlated with a priori antigay prejudice beliefs, r(320) = -.24, p < .001. No differences were found between male and female participants in regard to scores of social desirability or age. Lastly, as previously observed, higher a priori antigay beliefs were also positively correlated with participant age r(314) = .21 p < .01.
Overall, mean scores for likeability ($M = 4.3, SD = .98$), trustworthiness ($M = 4.1, SD = .85$) and reliability ($M = 3.5, SD = .99$) indicate that hypothetical targets were perceived quite favorably. I conducted preliminary analyses examining the relationships among demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, ethnicity, education, income, geographic location), possible covariates (i.e., social desirability, a priori antigay prejudice, gender norm beliefs, LGBQ contact) and dependent variables (i.e., likeability, trustworthiness, reliability) (Table 9). Findings revealed no relationships between participant gender and participant race and the dependent variables. Significant relationships existed, however, for participant age, a priori antigay prejudice and gender norm beliefs for at least one of the three Likert scale items (likeability, trustworthiness, reliability) and were included within subsequent analyses.

**Tests of Main Hypotheses.** To test Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 regarding the evaluative influence of target gender (male/female), gender expression (gender conforming/gender nonconforming) and sexual orientation (straight/queer) in Experiment 2, I performed a 2X2X2 multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) on the three dependent Likert-item measures (likeability, trustworthiness, reliability), controlling for participant age, a priori antigay prejudice, and gender norm beliefs. Although an effect for scenario gender approached significance, there were no significant effects or interactions found (Table 10). Like Experiment 1, I did not conduct any subsequent ANOVAs for the three dependent variables. Hypotheses 1 and 2 were not supported for Experiment 2. Because neither Experiment 1 nor Experiment 2 had any significant findings, I was unable to test Hypothesis 3.

**Discussion**

Study 2 was designed to replicate previous findings, as well as to add to the literature through an examination of the extent to which similar patterns exist in the evaluation of Black
targets. In contrast to previous research, which has used descriptive vignettes to describe targets, participants were asked to participate in a hypothetical scenario. This study was one of the first to implement behavioroid measures in the elicitation of antigay prejudice as enacted by cisgender straight individuals. I did not find any significant results within or across the two experiments, resulting in all hypotheses not being supported. This “no finding” outcome may be due to design limitations and unintentional introduction of confounding factors within the hypothetical scenario. As I discuss below, experimental design more generally and the use of hypothetical scenarios in particular may not represent an ideal method for assessing the complexity of how prejudices are enacted (Rudman & Glick, 2009). Despite these limitations, results from Study 2 revealed unanticipated findings between eligible and non-eligible participants in the accuracy of attending to counter-stereotypical information related to gender expression and sexual orientation. These findings raise methodological questions for the study of gender expression as well as suggest the power of the gender inversion stereotype within gender norm ideologies.

**Design Limitations.** Different from previous research (e.g., Blashill & Powlishta, 2012; Lehavot & Lambert, 2007; Schope & Eliason, 2003) participants from this sample were older and not currently college students. Although age was positively correlated with a priori antigay prejudice, overall levels of antigay prejudice and negative beliefs about gender conformity were relatively low. Previous research has found that conscious gender egalitarian beliefs moderate the expression of antigay prejudice (Dasgupta & Rivera, 2006). Because heterosexuality and gender conformity are often the norm against which other sexualities and gender expressions are compared, it may be that descriptions of individuals who deviate from this norm (i.e., are queer or perceived as gender nonconforming) may activate self-censorship of actions that could be
perceived as discriminatory (e.g., indicating they do not like them). This may help explain the overall favorable ratings of the hypothetical targets more generally in regard to likeability, trustworthiness and reliability.

Another explanation may lie in the range of the Likert-item scaling and use of close-ended items to capture subtle enactments of prejudice. Overall scores of the three Likert-scale items (likeability, trustworthiness, reliability) were high and negatively skewed. This may be a function of implementing a 5-pt. Likert scale (as opposed to 7-pt. or 11-pt. range) and a summative scale, as opposed to single Likert items that might have helped to achieve a more normal distribution (Clason & Dormody, 1994). More broadly, although I asked participants to indicate if they would hire the hypothetical target or not, I did not include these analyses within the current study. An analysis of participants’ decisions to hire as well as a content analysis of their written explanations of these decisions may better depict subtle enactments of prejudice. Analysis of other qualitative data collected could further reveal forms of subtle discrimination. For example, participants were asked to list interview questions they would ask the target and to provide justification for their hiring decision. A content analysis of the presence of references to some aspect of the target’s identity (e.g., gender, gender expression or sexual orientation), while perhaps not malicious intent, would denote bias in relation to these aspects of social identity.

Third, the current study may be limited by the content of the hypothetical scenario itself and the use of written descriptions more generally. While I intended to portray the target as possessing gender-neutral strengths and weaknesses (Eagly & Sczesny, 2009), I did not pilot the

\footnote{As suggested, in order to address the negative skewedness of the individual outcome variables, I created a composite evaluation variable, combining and averaging scores of likeability, trustworthiness and reliability. In doing so, I was also able to examine the extent to which the no findings result of the MANCOVA was due to multicollinearity between the three dependent variables. Using this composite evaluation variable, I conducted a 2X2X2 univariate analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). Results revealed no significant findings.}
scenario to test and confirm that the target’s qualifications were indeed perceived as ambiguous. It is unknown, for example, if the scenario had a sufficient amount of negative information about the hypothetical target. More generally, while hypothetical scenarios compared to vignettes better align to lived experience (Dovidio et al., 2009), a hypothetical scenario in and of itself does not mimic or require the same personal involvement or investment of a real-world scenario. While this is a limitation of experimental work more generally, it may be particularly relevant to studies that incorporate gender expression. I chose to operationalize gender expression in regard to appearance, as previous research has demonstrated that perceived gender nonconformity in relation to appearance is negatively perceived (Blashill & Powlishta, 2012; Horn, 2006). Yet, appearance is an inherently visual component of interpersonal communication. In lived experience, how others are perceived is determined by multiple factors that are encoded simultaneously (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). Stated differently, perceiving the individual in-person compared to reading a description about them may elicit different reactions.

In person, how we perceive others directly relates to which aspects of that person we attend to, how we interpret their behavior and how our own positionalities influence the behaviors of others (Rudman & Glick, 2008). As the narratives from LGBQ individuals in Chapter 2 suggest, negative encounters with straight individuals were often described as emotionally charged moments in which straight individuals were reacting to or provoked by LGBQ individuals’ visual embodiments. Written descriptions may not sufficiently capture this aspect of human experience that is inherently visual and embodied. Given this, future experimental work could implement pictures or videos as a means to represent more believable and realistic responses. In addition, findings from Chapter 2 also highlight the importance of the perceiver’s positionality, not only the LGBQ individual being perceived. Although not the focus
of the current analyses, attention to straight participants’ positionalities (e.g., in relation to
gender identity, race, gender expression), is needed in order to account for antigay discriminatory
encounters in their entirety.

**Gender Ideologies as Social Representations.** Although there were no significant
findings regarding the main hypotheses, in both Experiment 1 and Experiment 2, significant
patterns existed between the group of participants who were eligible for full participation and
those who incorrectly answered one or multiple manipulation checks. As an extension of
normative gender ideologies (Connell, 2005; Schippers, 2007; Tolman, 2006) and the foundation
of the heterosexuual matrix (Butler, 1990), the gender inversion stereotype holds that gay men are
effeminate and lesbian women are masculine (Kite & Deaux, 1987). Of the participants who
failed to pass one or multiple scenario manipulation checks, they did so disproportionately in the
scenarios where the target defied the stereotypical relationship between gender expression and
sexual orientation (i.e., a straight women who was masculine in appearance; a queer woman who
was feminine in appearance; a straight man who was feminine in appearance; a queer man who
was masculine in appearance). That no differences were observed between eligible and non-
eligible participants in regard to having contact with LGBQ individuals, social desirability, a
priori antigay prejudice and endorsement of gender norm beliefs is noteworthy. It would be
expected, for example, that individuals who hold more prejudiced beliefs in regard to non-
heterosexuality or non-normative gender expressions would endorse the gender inversion
stereotype more strongly and therefore have greater difficulty conceptualizing (and
subsequently reporting on) counter-stereotypical information. These findings point to the power
of hegemonic gender ideologies above and beyond attitudinal beliefs. Research on stereotypes
has shown that when perceivers encounter stereotype inconsistent information individuals
attempt to explain away the unexpected behavior in order to preserve the stereotype (Rudman & Glick, 2008) and/or focus their attention on the information that confirms their stereotype rather than contradicts it (Darley & Gross, 1983; Hoffman & Hurst, 1990). For participants who had the scenarios with targets who were counter to the gender inversion stereotype (e.g., masculine presenting straight woman), they may have focused on either her sexual orientation or her gender expression – but not both – in responding to the manipulation check items.

Originally formulated by Moscovici (1981, 1984, 1988), social representations refer to “the stock of common-sense theories and knowledge people have of the social world” (Augoustinos & Walker, 1995, p. 7). Social representations are comprised of collectively shared knowledge, thoughts, and images that are socially created, communicated, maintained and modified. Dynamic and changing, Moscovici (1981) described social representations as emblematic of a ‘thinking society’: They structure beliefs about given phenomena at the same time that they construct our reality. Summarized by Deaux and Philogène (2001), social representations are “products of interconnectedness between people and processes of reference through which we conceive of the world around us” (p. 5). Moscovici (1984) describes that despite their malleability and specificity to historical time and place, social representations within a given society have a ‘consensual universe’: All individuals are aware of their general defining features, even if they do not agree on their specific content. Due to their ubiquity, social representations become common public knowledge, so much so that people often act and remain unaware of them. As a result, difficulty arises in the perception of the social nature of individual cognition and affect (Augoustinos & Walker, 1995).

On the individual level, like social schemas and social representations facilitate comparison, categorization and classification of social information, persons, and events
Organized and stored in memory, both social schemas and social representations guide the selection, meaning, and evaluation of social knowledge and information. Different, however, social representations do not exist simply “in the head,” nor can they be reduced to a set of individualized processes that fulfill a cognitive need to simplify reality (Augoustinos, 2001, p. 222). Instead, social representations extend beyond cognitive heuristics within the individual and provide an account of human cognition that is deeply social and historically contingent (Jost & Ignatow, 2001). As a context for cognitive activity (as opposed to being cognitive activity in and of itself), social representations encompass the content and nature of cognitive processes and provide the substance for processes like social schemas, stereotypes and attributions (Rateau, Moliner, Abric, & Moliner, 2012).

Understanding social phenomena from a social representations approach importantly implicates hierarchical structures of power. Social schemas, stereotypes and attributions do not occur in a vacuum but rather position individual social psychological functioning within collective societal processes (Augoustinos & Walker, 1995). Although potentially conceptualized as cognitive confusion, the impossibility of counter-stereotypical embodiments constitutes antigay discrimination in the form of misrecognition. Stated differently, homophobia and the recapitulation of the heterosexual matrix does not result solely in response to an individual person, but may surface as an implicit bias of not seeing, remembering, or recognizing individuals who defy hegemonic gender ideals and the stereotypes that constitute them. As argued in Chapter 2, the societally-established relationship between gender assigned at birth, gender (including identity and expression) and sexual orientation exist within hierarchical social processes (Butler, 1990), and antigay discrimination – in all of its forms – functions to maintain these structures. To fulfill the expectations of a “man” or “woman” one must abide by a
particular set of characteristics, particularly in regard to gender expression and sexual orientation. The gender inversion stereotype functions to maintain normative boundaries of gender; it positions gay men and lesbian women as “other” by describing them as failing to adhere to expectations of masculinity and femininity. The misrecognition of embodiments that counter this stereotype (e.g., a masculine presenting gay man or a masculine presenting straight woman) also solidifies hegemonic gender expectations. In not recognizing counter stereotypical embodiments, participants inadvertently perpetuate the rigidity of gender norm ideologies, regardless of their non-prejudiced attitudes.
CHAPTER 4

Assessment of Gender Expression: Considering Concepts, Methods and Analysis
Introduction

Chapter 4 addresses the final aim of this dissertation: to theoretically and methodologically consider how researchers can assess gender expression among LGBQ individuals. Articulated in Chapter 1 and empirically explored in Chapter 2, gender expression is an external cue used to judge an individual, not only for the purposes of inferring one’s gender assigned at birth but also one’s sexual orientation. Despite the centrality of this visual—in regard to clothes, accouterment, and mannerisms—few validated measures exist to assess gender expression. In this third empirical chapter, I take a closer look at two recently validated scales developed by Wylie et al. (2010), which operationalize gender expression in regard to appearance and mannerisms on binary scales of masculinity-femininity. Performing an analysis of inter-method reliability, I compare how participant self-reports on these scales align with written descriptions of their gender expression. If Wylie et al.’s (2010) scales accurately capture how LGBQ individuals believe they are perceived by others, it should follow that participants’ written accounts align with their self-reports on these measures.

The Performative and Intersectional Nature of Gender Expression

As a result of its performative and multi-faceted nature, gender is methodologically difficult to capture, much less assess quantitatively. Described in Chapter 1, gender represents a series of cultural, linguistic and institutional symbols and practices that are attached to particular sexed embodiments (Butler, 1990; Kessler & McKenna, 1985; Wilchins, 2004). Arguably, all identities are performative and contextually defined (Nestle et al., 2002). The “doing” of gender—how gender is expressed—is context-dependent and results from intra-individual variation, historical societal gender norms and is also informed by one’s multiple social positionalities. Intra-individual variation refers to diverse gender expressions across context. A gay cis man, for
example, may “butch up” his mannerisms while at work, but express himself with a more feminine demeanor when in the company of friends. A person may also have intra-individual differential feelings as masculine or feminine. A genderqueer person, for example, may choose to accentuate masculine aspects of themself one day and feminine aspects the next.

Additionally, definitions of societal gender norms – and thus “appropriate” expressions of masculinity and femininity for individuals assigned male and female at birth, respectively – vary across time in addition to across context (Connell, 2005). As one example, within the first half of the twentieth century, women who wore pants were considered “mannish” (Cahn, 1998). At present, however, although constraints still exist in terms of what constitutes “feminine” pants (i.e., related to the style, cut, and color), in general, women who wear pants are not viewed “mannish” to the extent they were in times past. Gender norms are also context-specific: What is considered normative in urban settings may be quite distinct from the gendered expectations within suburban or rural settings. A metrosexual man\(^{11}\) (i.e., a heterosexual man who attends closely to his appearance and style), for example, may be perceived as straight on the streets of New York City but as gay in rural areas of South Dakota. Although presumed to be a natural outgrowth of birth-assigned gender, gender expression is best characterized as a learned (re)enactment of familiar gender stereotypes that vary across time and space (Butler, 1990; Greene, 2000).

The variation of gender norms within and between racial and ethnic communities adds further complexity to the fluidity of gender and its embodied expression. Within Western cultures, the societal barometer for how individuals should look, act, and dress based upon their gender assigned at birth is based upon the masculinity and femininity norms of cis White,

\(^{11}\) See Coad (2008) for a discussion on the rise of “the metrosexual.”
middle-class men and women (Schippers, 2007). Gender norms among minoritized racial groups may differ from these White hegemonic ideals. Mannerisms that transgress hegemonic frameworks (and therefore considered gender nonconforming) may be viewed as gender conforming within racial minority communities (and vice versa). How individuals of color understand their own gender expression and how others perceive them is thus always shaded by racial stereotypes about men and women of color (Collins, 2005). Stereotypes produced at the intersection of gender and race are qualitatively unique (Goff et al., 2008). For example, as Sam’s experience in Chapter 2 attests, Asian men are likely to be perceived as gay as a result of being stereotyped as feminine (Chen, 1999; Johnson & Ghavami, 2011). Thus, unlike White individuals, people of color negotiate negative and distorted racialized stereotypes of masculinity and femininity that affect their presentation of self and how others perceive them (Moore, 2006).

If gender expression is perpetually related to one’s sense of self, the immediate context, and societal expectations that are infused with hierarchical racial dynamics, questions arise regarding the reliability and validity of its assessment. For example, does the malleability of gender expression ultimately predispose its assessment to inaccuracy? Despite these theoretical and methodological concerns, adherence to or deviation from hegemonic gender norms is central to how individuals are perceived by others (Butler, 1990). Demonstrated in Chapter 2, being perceived as nonconforming or conforming results in qualitatively distinct experiences due to the gender inversion stereotype of sexual orientation (Kite & Deaux, 1987). Previous research, for example, has also documented a link between perceived gender nonconformity and a number of negative outcomes: verbal and physical victimization (Pilkington & D’Augelli, 1995); childhood bullying (D’Augelli, Grossman, & Starks, 2005); substance abuse (Roberts, Rosario, Corliss, Koenen, & Austin, 2012; Rosario, Schrimshaw, & Hunter, 2008); psychological distress
(Skidmore, Linsenmeier, & Bailey, 2006); and suicide (Plöderl & Fartacek, 2009). Considering gender expression as an additional point for intersectional analysis holds potential for better understanding of LGBQ experience more generally. A standardized measure that reliably assesses perceived gender conformity would help to tease apart the entangled relationship between gender expression and sexual orientation that has long been under-theorized and conflated within psychological research.

Wylie et al.'s (2010) Measure of Socially Assigned Gender Nonconformity

One such measure recently developed is Wylie et al.’s (2010) measure of socially assigned gender nonconformity. This measure centers on visible and perceptible indicators of gender expression in relation to hegemonic masculine and feminine gendered expectations. Using two 7-point Likert scales with 1 = Very Feminine and 7 = Very Masculine, participants self-report how they believe they are perceived on average in relation to their appearance (i.e., style and dress) and their mannerisms (i.e., movement and speech). An individual is considered “gender nonconforming” to the extent his or her appearance and mannerisms are perceived as aligning with the other gender, compared to his or her gender assigned at birth. A cis woman, for example, is characterized as gender nonconforming if she indicates she is perceived as very

---

12 Within the discipline of psychology, gender expression has been most commonly operationalized as a personality trait (Bem, 1974; Berzins, Welling, & Wetter, 1978; Heilbrun, 1976; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975) and as a type of gender identity within cis LGBQ subcultures (e.g., “butch,” “femme,” “bears”) (Hiestand, Horne, & Levitt, 2008; Levitt & Hiestand, 2005; Levitt & Horne, 2002; Levitt, Puckett, Ippolito, & Horne, 2012; Moskowitz, Turrubiates, Lozano, & Hajek, 2013; Roberts et al., 2012; Rosario et al., 2008). Although such operationalizations reflect the history of psychology as a discipline and the evolution of its theoretical conceptualizations of gender as a social psychological concept, many researchers have questioned their current-day applicability (e.g., Ballard-Reisch & Elton, 1992), as well as challenged their ethnocentric focus on the experiences of White, middle-class individuals (see Moore, 2006).
masculine in appearance. As such, interpretation of Wylie et al.’s (2010) scales pertains to one’s gender assigned at birth, not gender identity.

Wylie et al.’s (2010) scales place masculinity and femininity as binary opposites. This configuration positions gender expression as zero-sum (i.e., the expression of femininity comes at the expense of the expression of masculinity), and in doing so does not allow individuals to place themselves as high on masculinity and femininity simultaneously. However, dichotomous gender norms are the dominant lens within Western culture. If the goal is to best assess how individuals are perceived by others, using the dominant social framework may best accomplish this. Characterized by Wilchins (2002), hegemonic gender norms provide two – and only two – options for viewing the world. Even though we are looking at a “Technicolor world,” these two options ensure that we only see in “black and white” (p. 31).

In development of these two scales, Wylie et al. (2010) used a cognitive interviewing technique to gain insight into participants’ understanding and interpretation of their appearance and mannerisms on gender expression items (Groves, Fultz, & Martin, 1992). Although overall participants interpreted these scales as the researchers intended, group differences existed. Specifically, in responding to these items sexual-minority participants considered how their gender expression varied across contexts more often than heterosexual participants. Heterosexual participants also had greater concordance rates between their self-reports on the appearance and mannerisms items than did LGBQ participants. Of note, Wylie et al. (2010) were unable to conduct in-depth analyses based upon race/ethnicity due to a limited number of people of color in their sample. It is unknown, for example, if individuals of color interpret these scales differently than White individuals.
In addition, Wylie et al.’s (2010) measures assess perceived gender expression on average and as a result may not be representative of the intra-individual variation that exists (e.g., a woman may dress more sporty while participating in athletics with baggy shorts and shirt but may wear more traditionally feminine clothing when going on a date). Research has yet to uncover if the ways in which individuals self-report their appearances and mannerisms on average are representative of how they move through the various contexts in their lives. Finally, although Wylie et al. (2010) included trans* individuals within their study, in basing gender conformity and gender nonconformity in relation to gender assigned at birth, they did not empirically examine the potential that trans* individuals may be read as cisgender by others. It is conceivable that a trans man, for example, could be perceived as cis male and thus read as gender conforming and not gender nonconforming.

Overall, the Wylie et al. (2010) scales are advantageous in their operationalization of gender expression in regard to appearance, mannerisms and use of hegemonic gender norms as a conceptual framework. Questions remain unanswered, however, in regard to how individuals of color self-report on these scales, the extent to which participant self-reports align with their everyday gendered embodiments, and how to characterize trans* individuals using the Wylie et al. (2010) scales. Taken together, the goal of this analysis is to help fill these gaps. The following research questions guide this analysis:

1. Do participants’ self-reports of gender expression for appearance and mannerisms on Wylie et al.’s (2010) scales align with how they describe their gender expression in their written accounts?

2. Do differences exist by participant race?
Method

As described in Chapter 2, part of the eligibility questionnaire for Study 1, cisgender and transgender LGBQ participants completed the Wylie et al. (2010) binary scales of gender expression in regard to appearance and mannerisms. On these items participants self-reported their gender expression on a 7-point Likert score with 1 = Very Feminine and 7 = Very Masculine. Also described in Chapter 2, in Study 1 participants were asked to write a series of narratives related to their gender expression and sexual orientation. In order to compare self-reports on the Wylie et al. (2010) scales with how participants qualitatively describe their gender expression, I used the numerical codes created for the quantitative analyses in Chapter 2. This coding scheme aimed to capture the regularity in which participants described they adhered to or diverged from gender norm expectations in relation to their gender assigned at birth. I compared these two methods using an analysis of inter-method reliability, identifying whether participant categorizations as gender conforming and gender nonconforming on the Wylie et al. (2010) scales aligned with gender expression categorizations based upon their narrative descriptions.

Analysis

Data Preparation

On the original Wylie et al. (2010) measures (with 1 = Very Feminine and 7 = Very Masculine), higher scores indicate a greater degree of gender conformity for participants who were assigned male at birth, whereas higher scores indicate greater gender nonconformity for participants who were assigned female at birth. For analysis, I reverse coded the appearance and mannerisms scores for individuals who were assigned male at birth. This way, higher scores indicated a greater degree of perceived gender nonconformity for all participants. Participant
scores on the mannerisms and appearance scales were highly positively correlated, \( r(142) = .588, \ p < .001. \)

In their original publication, Wylie et al. (2010) did not offer guidelines for analysis using these scales. Based upon individual scores on appearance and mannerisms, I categorized participants within one of two global gender expression categories: gender conforming or gender nonconforming. Participants who placed themselves as a 3 or lower on both the appearance and mannerisms scales were labeled gender conforming. Participants who placed themselves as 4 or higher on both scales were labeled gender nonconforming. I used this method as opposed to a medium split on these scales as a score of 4 indicates an equal degree of masculinity and femininity. Described above, socially assigned gender norms exist as a zero-sum: one is masculine at the expense of femininity and vice versa. As such, an individual who indicates an equal degree of femininity and masculinity is considered gender nonconforming within this paradigm. Lastly, participants who scored a score of 4 or higher on one of the scales but less than 3 on the other were also labeled gender nonconforming. For example, participants who described themselves as a 3 on gender appearance but a 4 on mannerisms were categorized as gender nonconforming. The rationale follows that if a participant indicates nonconformity on one scale, then the individual is nonconforming overall. Arguably, a dichotomous classification does not account for the fluidity that may exist among individuals or the degree to which they conform to conventional masculinity and femininity norms. However, in everyday life, “fluid” is not a viable category: One is either read as male or female (Wilchins, 2004), and consequently as “straight” or “gay.” Stated differently, to the average person, “fluid” would likely be perceived as nonconforming.
Gender expression based upon narratives. Described in Chapter 2, unaware of participant demographic information, I read all participant narratives, taking note of instances in which they indicated how they were perceived by other people in their lives (e.g., “I am visibly queer” or “People often think I’m straight” or “I conform to pretty much what people expect women to be”). Taking these narrative accounts in their entirety, I focused on how participants currently expressed their gender and applied a numerical score to each individual in relation to the regularity with which they expressed their gender across life contexts (e.g., do they present similarly when at work, school, with friends, etc.). Using a 5-point scale, I applied one of five values for each participant: 1 = consistently conforming; 2 = mostly gender conforming; 3 = gender conforming and gender nonconforming; 4 = mostly gender nonconforming; and 5 = consistently nonconforming.

Results

Five participants had missing data on the Wylie et al. (2010) items and as a result could not be categorized as either gender conforming or nonconforming. Applying the numerical coding scheme to participant narratives, I labeled 9 as uncategorizable. Taken together, a total of 14 participants could not be categorized either using the Wylie et al. (2010) measures or with the coding scheme developed from the narratives. I excluded these participants from subsequent analyses, resulting in a sample size of 134 participants for the present analysis.

Concordance between Wylie et al. (2010) and Participant Narratives.

To compare the extent to which participant scores on the Wylie et al. (2010) scales aligned with gender expressions in their narrative accounts, I conducted cross tabulations for labels of gender conforming and gender nonconforming. Table 11 shows the frequency and percentage of participants whose categorizations aligned on the Wylie et al. (2010) scales and
their narrative accounts, differentiated by participant race and gender identity. Out of the 134 participants, 101 were similarly categorized across these measures. Specifically, 29 participants were categorized on both as gender conforming, 72 as gender nonconforming, and 33 of participants were variably categorized (e.g., categorized as gender conforming on the Wylie et al. (2010) scales but as gender nonconforming based upon their narrative accounts). Looking at concordance in gender expression classification by race, White participants (83%) were more likely to be consistently categorized compared to participants of color (66%), $X^2 (1, N = 134) = 5.31, p < .05$. Unexpectedly, transgender (100%) and genderqueer participants (87%) had greater alignment across measures than cisgender participants (65%), $X^2 (1, N = 134) = 11.5, p < .01$. This is somewhat unexpected considering that Wylie et al. (2010) found greater concordance between the appearance and mannerism scores among cis men and cis women than among trans individuals.

Differences by race and gender identity. To better understand racial and gender identity differences in gender expression categorization across these measures, I looked at coding concordance stratified by race and gender identity. Figure 2 shows the proportion of cis men and cis women who were consistently categorized as gender conforming or gender nonconforming, differentiated by participant race. Overall, cis participants of color were categorized more variably (46%) across measures compared to White cis participants (24%), $X^2 (1, N = 80) = 4.16, p < .05$. Given the larger number of cis women of color in the sample overall, this difference largely resulted from variability among cis women of color compared to White cis men and women. It is important to note that the category, “cis women of color” did not constitute a racially homogenous group but were diverse by racial identity: 5 were Black, 2 Latina, 3 Asian,
and 4 were of mixed race. Because of the small number of participants within each racial category, however, it was not meaningful to do comparisons between these racial groups.

Of the 33 participants who were variably coded, a closer examination revealed that the majority (79%) had been categorized as gender *nonconforming* based upon their self-reports on the Wylie et al. (2010) appearance and mannerisms scales, but as gender *conforming* based upon their narrative descriptions. This pattern was particularly prominent among cis women of color, as 13 out of 14 who were variably coded showed this trend. In looking at their individual numerical scores on the appearance and mannerisms scales, these 13 women self-reported their appearance as 3 or below (criterion for *gender conforming* categorization), but for mannerisms as either a 4 or 5 (criterion for *gender nonconforming* categorization). As a result, they were overall categorized as gender nonconforming on the Wylie et al. (2010) items.

In their written narratives, however, these women unambiguously described being perceived as gender conforming in their lives. Jackie is a 32-year old cis Black woman who wrote about an experience she had preparing to go to a music festival. Jackie describes herself as “fairly stereotypically feminine” and that she doesn’t “code” [i.e., she is not perceived as nonheterosexual]. In going to the festival, however, she wanted to be read differently. Jackie writes:

> I wanted it to be known that I like women…I found a white t-shirt that said “I [recycle] girls” with the green recycle arrows instead of the word recycle. It was in the men’s section at some cheap store or something. I thought it was so boss! I took it home and cut a cowl neck in it so it showed more of my neck and shoulders. I wore it to the concert with some tight jeans and cute green sandals and green accessories.

Because Jackie is often read as gender conforming, she describes her bisexuality as often “invisible.” How she characterized her gender expression mirrored the accounts of other cis women of color who were categorized as gender nonconforming on the Wylie et al. (2010) scales but as gender conforming based upon their narrative accounts. Other examples included: “I
expressed my gender with clothing and movement in a feminine manner”; and “I think my gender expression is rather normative, so it’s probably usually overlooked because of its normalcy.” From these women’s written accounts, it is clear that these women did not believe they are perceived as gender nonconforming in their lives.

**Differentiating between appearance and mannerisms.** Given the discrepancies between participant scores in regard to appearance and mannerisms on the Wylie et al. (2010), I examined how the Wylie et al. (2010) scales aligned with participant narratives in regard to 1) *only* appearance scores and 2) *only* mannerism scores. Table 12 shows the alignment of gender expression categorization using the appearance and mannerism scales separately. Overall, participant self-reports in regard to appearance (78%) aligned more with their narrative descriptions compared to their self-report in regard to mannerisms (68%). This improvement is small, however, when considered in relation to categorization alignment when both appearance and mannerism scores are used concurrently (75%).

The overall slight increase in concordance frequencies can be understood as a result of greater categorization concordance observed among participants of color. Categorization as gender conforming or gender nonconforming based upon appearance scores alone showed the greatest alignment (74%) with self-described narratives, compared with mannerisms scores used alone (61%), and appearance and mannerisms scores used concurrently (66%). Specifically, when gender expression is categorized using only appearance responses, cis women of color (75%) are categorized as consistently as White women (74%). Table 13 shows the frequency and percentage of participants who were consistently coded across measures by race and gender identity. Cis women of color were coded as variably when categorized solely in relation to mannerisms (56%) as they were in relation to both mannerisms and appearance scores (56%).
This is not surprising considering that cis women of color’s higher scores on the mannerisms scale led to categorization as gender nonconforming on Wylie et al. (2010) scales. Taken together, cis women of color’s self-reports for appearance better aligned with their narrative descriptions of their gender expression. This same pattern did not characterize White cis male and female participants.

**Discussion**

Within psychological research, few measures exist to assess gender expression. Wylie et al.’s (2010) socially assigned gender nonconformity scales operationalize gender expression as appearance and mannerisms. This study is the first to implement these scales with a sample diverse by race and gender identity and examine the extent to which these items demonstrate inter-method reliability with participant qualitative descriptions of their gender expression.

Overall, approximately three-fourths of the sample gender expression categorizations based on mannerisms and appearance scores on the Wylie et al. (2010) scales aligned with participants’ written accounts. When appearance responses were the only basis for gender expression categorization, this percentage increased slightly. While the increase might suggest that appearance is a better operationalization for the assessment of gender expression, discrepancies by racial identity persist. Specifically, participant scores aligned on the Wylie et al. (2010) scales with their narrative accounts to a greater extent for White participants than for participants of color, with the greatest discordance observed among cis women of color. While cis men of color were also categorized variably, due to the small number of cis men of color in the sample overall it was not possible to know if this was a robust trend. Regardless, these racial discrepancies raise questions about participant interpretation of the Wylie et al.
(2010) items, their epistemological utility among individuals of color, and more generally the criteria that constitute categorizing an individual as gender nonconforming.

Of the cis women of color who were variably coded across the Wylie et al. (2010) items and narrative descriptions, almost all indicated greater degrees of masculinity than femininity on the Wylie et al. (2010) mannerisms scale. As a result, they were categorized as gender nonconforming overall. Yet, in their narratives, these women were clear that they are perceived as gender conforming in their lives. For them, having masculine mannerisms was not indicative of gender nonconformity. That this trend was not observed among White women suggests that differential interpretations may exist in regard to the relationship between perceived masculine mannerisms among women and gender nonconformity. For White women, behaviors that are perceived as masculine (e.g., the way one talks) may indicate gender nonconformity, whereas for women of color such behaviors are not outside the realm of acceptable gender expressions for women. Of note, the women of color who were categorized as gender nonconforming on the Wylie et al. (2010) items but as gender conforming in their narrative accounts were not a racially monolithic group. That these cis women of color showed similar trends in how they were categorized on the Wylie appearance and mannerisms scales suggests that racialized gender norms about non-Whiteness may be operating in similar yet distinct ways in informing how cis women of color self-report.

In the creation of gender expression measures, the intersection of race and gender both inform assumed reference groups for comparison. On the Wylie et al. (2010) appearance scale, the item reads, “On average, how do you think people would describe your appearance, style or dress?” From participant self-reports, it is impossible to know how participants envision the “people” in this item. In considering the extent to which they present as “masculine” or
“feminine,” African American women, for example, negotiate the stereotype of Black women as “mannish” (Moore, 2006), whereas an Asian man contends with a desexualized and feminized stereotype of Asian masculinity (Chen, 1999). As a result, self-reports of gender expression may involve multiple reference groups. When a cis Native American woman, for example, self-reports her gender expression, to whom is she comparing herself? Other Native American women? White hegemonic ideals? On the one hand, due to the ubiquity of White gender ideology, all participant responses are informed by hegemonic ideals, including participants of color. Yet, responses are not shaped only by White hegemonic gender ideals. Although they provide the framework for definitions of femininity and masculinity, hegemonic gender norms are still refracted through cultural and ethnic lenses (Schippers, 2007). Participants are likely to position themselves differently depending upon the envisioned reference group.

Additionally, the qualitative meanings participants associate with various degrees of masculinity and femininity on the Wylie et al. (2010) scales are unknown. If a biracial cis man indicates his mannerisms are equally feminine and equally masculine what movements or manners of speech exemplify this categorization? Does his criteria match those of a Latino genderqueer person? Without asking participants to explain their self-reports, it is impossible to know how values on these scales differ from one another (e.g., how somewhat masculine differs qualitatively from mostly masculine). Taken together, questions remain unanswered as to how the values on the Wylie et al. (2010) scales are interpreted, as well as how these values differ qualitatively from one another in their degrees of masculinity and femininity and the ways in which racialized gender norms shape participant self-reports.

In their validation of the scale, Wylie et al. (2010) conducted in-depth cognitive interviews and found that, in general, participants understood the general intention of these
scales. However, these researchers did not ask questions pertaining to participant understanding of the individual meanings attached to scale values nor was their sample diverse by participant race. Considering that the difference between categorizing an individual as gender conforming versus gender nonconforming is predicated on a meaningful distinction between individuals who self report as somewhat feminine and equally feminine/equally masculine, additional research is needed to explore possible interpretational differences that may exist and how these understandings are shaped by racial identity.

Although definitions of hegemonic gender norms continually shift and are perceived and enacted differently within minoritized racial communities (Shippers, 2007), masculinity and femininity may still constitute useful concepts in the discussion of gender conformity. Within their narrative accounts, participants often utilized binary gender terminology to explain how others perceive them. Participants commonly referenced stereotypes, for example, as explanations for why gender expression was or was not a factor within their discriminatory encounters (e.g., “I express myself as a girl so I suppose that gives the impression to others that I should be with a man”), highlighting the ways in which LGBQ individuals continuously engage with masculine and feminine hegemonic ideals. At the same time, a number acknowledged their socially constructed nature of masculinity and femininity through the use of quotation marks (e.g., “I dress alternatively in what would be considered mostly ‘feminine’ in mainstream culture”) and expressed frustration with hegemonic gender norms (e.g., “How I express my gender shouldn’t matter but it always does”). Given this, it seems that “masculinity” and “femininity” exist as useful frameworks, but not necessarily as anchors on gender conformity measures.
The relationship between gender identity and perceived gender nonconformity

Compared to cisgender participants, gender expression categorizations across measures aligned to a greater extent for trans* participants, in particular for binary trans individuals. While this might seem to suggest that scales of masculinity and femininity work better for trans* individuals compared to cisgender individuals, this finding should be interpreted with caution. As noted above, the use of gender assigned at birth as an anchor for categorizing an individual as gender conforming or gender nonconforming poses unique challenges when assessing perceived gender expression among trans* people. Arguably gender (encompassing gender assigned at birth, gender identity, gender expression) and sexual orientation are intricately linked. In any social encounter, gender expression is the first means through which another person’s gender assigned at birth is assumed and subsequently his/her/their sexual orientation (i.e., one has to be read as “male” or “female” in order to be perceived as “gay” or “straight”). In conversations about gender nonconformity among cis LGBQ individuals, the first part of this two-step impression formation is implied. The assumption is that cis individuals are read as cisgender. In regard to perceived gender nonconformity, the question is not necessarily if they are read as cis male or cis female but as straight or queer. Understood this way, the gender stereotype that gay men are effeminate and lesbian woman masculine largely pertains to cis gay men and cis lesbian women, not necessarily trans* LGBQ individuals.

For trans* individuals, the perception of their gender assigned at birth (and thus gender identity) may take primacy over sexual orientation in how others perceive them. As shown in Chapter 2, this was true for many binary trans participants, yet not necessarily for nonbinary trans participants. If a trans woman is perceived as transgender as opposed to cisgender, for example, ensuing interactions may focus on her gender identity, as opposed to her sexual
orientation. At the same time, it is possible that trans* individuals may also be read as cisgender. A trans man could be perceived as *cis* male. As such, he may be read as gender *conforming*. As a result, it is possible that the association between gender nonconformity (in regard to gender assigned at birth) and discrimination for binary trans individuals could be nonlinear (e.g., an inverted U shape) (Wylie et al., 2010). Within the current study, it is impossible to pursue this line of analysis as all binary trans participants indicated that they are often read as transgender, as opposed to cisgender. In regard to nonbinary trans individuals, little research exists on genderqueer individuals more generally and in particular on how they are perceived by others (see Factor & Rothblum, 2008 for an exception). In the current analysis, all but one genderqueer participant indicated that they were commonly perceived as gender nonconforming in their narrative accounts. Whether this is a unique attribute of the current sample or characteristic of individuals who identify as genderqueer more generally is unknown. While gender identity and gender expression are related, they are not synonymous and one does not determine the other.

As a result, using gender assigned at birth as an anchor for which to classify trans* individuals as gender nonconforming may be inaccurate for the empirical examination of the relationship between gender expression and discrimination, as well as disaffirming of their gender identities. As they stand now, scales of masculinity and femininity as used by Wylie et al. (2010) do not empirically differentiate between the dual function of gender expression. Being perceived as unfeminine, for example, is qualitatively different than being perceived as not-woman. Researchers must be cognizant of gender expression’s dual function; serving as the basis upon which others perceive an individual’s gender assigned at birth as well as an individual’s sexual orientation. As suggested in the narrative results from Study 1, it is possible
that for trans* individuals – in particular binary trans – gender expression is more central for the perception of their gender assigned at birth than their sexual orientation.
CHAPTER 5

General Discussion and Conclusion
Summary

In this dissertation, I sought to accomplish three primary aims. The first aim was to better understand the role of gender expression and race in cis and trans* LGBQ individual’s exposure to and subjective experience of antigay discrimination. In Study 1, I examined both overt experiences of discrimination (i.e., instances in which LGBQ individuals are certain antigay discrimination occurred), as well as covert or ambiguous experiences of discrimination (i.e., instances in which LGBQ participants are uncertain if antigay discrimination occurred). Findings indicate that qualitative differences exist at the intersection of sexual orientation, gender expression and racial identity within discriminatory encounters.

Quantitative results from Study 1 revealed similarities across racial and gender identity groups in regard to the frequency of experiencing sexual orientation microaggressions. Stated differently, all comparisons (between White LGBQ participants and LGBQ participants of color and cis LGBQ and trans* participants) found similar levels of sexual orientation microaggressions. The role of gender expression in relation to these microaggressions however, varied by racial identity. Whereas perceived gender nonconformity increased exposure for White LGBQ participants, exposure to sexual orientation microaggressions was the same regardless of nonconforming gender expression among LGBQ participants of color. That violations of hegemonic gendered expectations are always refracted through racialized gender stereotypes (Schippers, 2007) may help explain the differential relationship between perceived gender nonconformity and exposure to sexual orientation microaggressions. Gender nonconformity may constitute a more “visible” indicator of sexual orientation among White LGBQ individuals than among LGBQ individuals of color.
Qualitative analyses of participant narratives from Study 1 identified the importance of multiple social positionalities – in particular gender expression – in the subjective experience and interpretation of discriminatory encounters. Regardless of their gender presentation, LGBQ individuals commonly and repeatedly referenced hegemonic gender norms to describe their experiences. They interpreted gender expression as a “first stop” for how others perceived them. Specifically, many referred to the gender inversion stereotype that gay men are effeminate and lesbian women are masculine (Kite & Deaux, 1987). Differences existed by gender identity, however. Cisgender LGBQ participants referenced this framework to predominantly define how others perceived their sexual orientation, not their gender identity. In contrast, trans* LGBQ participants often stated that their gender expression contributed to both the perception of their sexual orientation and their gender identity. This difference between how cis and trans* LGBQ participants deployed gender ideologies identifies that an underlying logic to the gender inversion stereotype: gay men and lesbian women must first be perceived as (cis) men and (cis) women (Butler, 1990).

Presenting in ways that varied from or adhered to traditional gender expectations translated into qualitatively distinct experiences of discrimination for LGBQ participants. Presentations that aligned with prevailing gender norms functioned to conceal their sexual orientation among LGBQ participants while transgressing hegemonic expectations often worked to reveal their sexual orientation. This “invisibility” or “visibility” of one’s sexual orientation and/or gender identity vis-à-vis gender expression resulted in distinct discriminatory encounters for cis and trans* LGBQ participants. Participants with gender expressions that concealed their sexual orientation wrote stories where their sexual identities were denied or invalidated. The invisibility of sexual orientation vis-à-vis gender expression was also the reason they were
exposed to unmonitored prejudiced attitudes. For many feminine cisgender women, the intersection of their sexual identity and femininity was often eroticized, resulting in uninvited sexual advances from men. In contrast, a number of LGBQ participants attributed their mistreatment to perceptible non-traditional presentations, in particular within public settings involving strangers. They attributed gender nonconformity as the precipitant to such unprovoked and emotionally charged altercations and, to their distress, characterized gender transgression as a socially sanctioned target of surveillance. Distinct from the experiences of cisgender and genderqueer participants, binary trans LGBQ participants described an inability to think of negative experiences related to their sexual orientation; instead, the perception of their gender identities vis-à-vis gender expression was both a source of celebration or pain when socially recognized or denied.

Finally, other visible social identities – in particular race and body size – intersected with gender expression in shaping participant experiences. Having multiple visible marginalized identities often contributed to attributional ambiguity regarding if discrimination occurred, as well as which aspects of themselves (e.g., gender, race, gender expression, etc.) factored significantly in their discriminatory experiences. “Marginal” and “mindful” (Frable et al., 1990), LGBQ participants – in particular LGBQ participants of color – narrated the necessity of reflecting upon one’s visible social identities, of going through their “checklist.” As found in previous research (Meyer, 2012), whether race factored into their experiences was a constant consideration both within interracial contexts as well as intraracial contexts for LGBQ participants of color. Such visibility also led to questioning whether their racial identities “facilitated” antigay encounters (e.g., “Being Black certainly didn’t help”). In contrast, White participants were largely silent on the role of race within antigay encounters. Where they did
articulate race, Whiteness was considered a type of “protection” from more severe encounters, characterizing White privilege as the absence of a negative.

Taken together, quantitative and qualitative findings from Study 1 identified a diversity of experience within antigay discriminatory encounters. The visibility of gender expression as well as race, relative to normative Whiteness (Bowleg, 2013), resulted in distinct experiences and interpretations among LGBQ individuals. Whether they were commonly perceived as gender conforming or gender nonconforming in relation to their gender assigned at birth, many LGBQ participants expressed frustration in having to manage the expectations of others. They felt they never had the chance to define themselves, that other people in their lives and strangers continually imposed rigid and stereotypical ideas, beliefs, and categorizations on their bodies. While dominant gender ideologies provided participants with a paradigm for making sense of occurrences of unfair treatment, they also narrowly defined their ability to establish themselves outside of those frameworks. For both gender conforming and gender nonconforming LGBQ individuals, gender expression mattered; yet, it mattered in distinct ways. Although social positionalities are often discussed as more salient among individuals within subordinate group categories (i.e., gender as a women’s issue; race as an issue among people of color, etc.) the experiences of LGBQ participants in Study 1 demonstrate a dialectical negotiation of intertwined social identities, the identities of the enactor(s), and larger cultural discourses about race, gender and sexual orientation.

Shifting vantage points to the “flip side” of antigay discriminatory encounters, the second aim of this dissertation was to evaluate the extent to which heterosexual individuals enact antigay discrimination as a function of target gender, gender expression, sexual orientation and race. As a replication of and expansion upon previous experimental work, in Study 2 I sought to account
for subtle expressions of antigay discrimination and consider differences and similarities that may exist by target race. That no significant main effects or interactions were found may point to limitations within the study design; however, the “no-findings” result may also point to the inability of experimental designs to capture the complexity and nuance of antigay discriminatory encounters. In contrast to the “high drama” of experiments (e.g., an individual is either liked or disliked; hired or not), LGBQ narratives in Study 1 foregrounded the centrality of ordinary interactions in experiences of discrimination. Experiments seek to control for social context; yet, it is within everyday interactions where the complexity of social psychological dynamics are visible. Understood this way, the “no findings” of the main hypotheses may point to a greater need for attention to the banal, as opposed to the exceptional (Billig, 1995) within research on antigay discrimination.

Results from Study 2 did reveal unanticipated findings between eligible and non-eligible participants. Participants who failed to pass one or multiple scenario manipulation checks did so disproportionately in the scenarios where the target defied the stereotypical relationship between gender expression and sexual orientation (i.e., a straight woman who was masculine in appearance; a queer woman who was feminine in appearance; a straight man who was feminine in appearance; a queer man who was masculine in appearance). That no differences existed between eligible and non-eligible participants in terms of previous contact with LGBQ individuals, levels of social desirability, levels of a priori antigay prejudice or endorsement of gender norm beliefs, points to the power of hegemonic gender ideologies above and beyond attitudinal beliefs.

One function of the gender inversion stereotype is the maintenance of hegemonic gender norms. In defying the heterosexual matrix, the gender inversion stereotype positions gay men
and lesbian women as “other,” as they fail to adhere to expectations of masculinity and femininity. Through *not* recognizing embodiments that disrupt this stereotype (e.g., a masculine presenting gay man or a masculine presenting straight woman) hegemonic gender expectations are also maintained. They too are abject and unintelligible (Butler, 1990). As a result, the quality characteristics that define hegemonic masculinity and femininity remain unchallenged (Schippers, 2007). As such, regardless of their non-prejudiced attitudes, participants inadvertently perpetuate the rigidity of gender norm ideologies. Stated differently, *misrecognition* of feminine straight men or masculine straight women constitutes another form of covert discrimination, of policing the boundaries of the heterosexual matrix (Butler, 1990).

Given the centrality of gender expression not only in the subjective experiences of LGBQ participants, as demonstrated in Study 1, but also in the constitution of intelligible embodiments, as evidenced in Study 2, the third and final aim of the dissertation was to theoretically and methodologically consider how researchers can assess gender expression. Arguably, if gender expression is central to all experiences – in particular those of LGBQ individuals, quantitative assessments would provide utility in social psychological research. Using participant data collected as a part of Study 1, I performed an analysis of inter-method reliability, in which I compared participant self-reports on two recently developed scales by Wylie et al. (2010) with participants’ written descriptions of their gender expression. Although concordance between these measures showed a concordant relationship for three-fourths of the sample, differential patterns emerged by racial identity. For White participants, self-reports of being perceived as “feminine” or “masculine” in regard to appearance and mannerisms coincided with their narrative descriptions to a greater extent than for participants of color, in particular cisgender women of color.
Notably, almost all cis women of color were categorized as gender *nonconforming* based upon their self-reports on the Wylie et al. (2010) appearance and mannerisms scales, but as gender *conforming* based upon their narrative descriptions. In their written narratives, these women unambiguously described being perceived as gender conforming in their lives, suggesting that for them presenting in masculine ways is not synonymous with gender nonconformity. It is important to note that the category “cis women of color” was not a racially homogenous group. As such, these findings raise questions about the racialized nature of the terms, “masculinity” and “femininity” in the assessment of gender expression. Although seemingly simple, they are in fact racially loaded (Schippers, 2007). Left unanswered are questions regarding to whom participants compare themselves when completing these items, the qualitative meanings attached to various degrees of masculinity and femininity, and importantly, how racialized gender norms shape participant self-reports. More generally, unaddressed within this dissertation, but a question that has been raised by others (e.g., Gordon & Meyer, 2008) is the extent to which gender expression assessment should be based upon participant self-report alone as opposed to others’ observations.

Considered as a whole, this dissertation challenges the theoretical primacy of sexual orientation within research on antigay discrimination. Although current definitions and operationalizations of antigay discrimination conceptualize negative treatment of LGBQ individuals as a response to their same-gender sexual orientations (e.g., Herek, 2004), findings from this dissertation suggest that antigay discrimination is also a response to and is intertwined with violations of racialized hegemonic gender expectations (Gordon & Meyer, 2008; Meyer, 2012). Depending upon the nature of the gender violation – through sexual identity, physical appearance, behavioral mannerisms and/or same-gender desire – LGBQ individuals experienced
qualitative distinct forms of discrimination. Although same-gender sexuality has been described as a concealable stigma (Frable et al., 1990; Goffman, 1959; Herek & Capitanio, 1996), implying that unless one verbally discloses, she is assumed heterosexual, findings from this dissertation suggest that sexual orientation can exist both as a visible and concealable social identity. The extent to which one’s sexual orientation is perceivable is always tenuous, context-dependent, and an inter-relational experience that is informed by racialized gender stereotypes (Johnson & Ghavami, 2011).

**Implications for Psychological Research on Antigay Discrimination**

In this dissertation, I used the heterosexual matrix (Butler, 1990) as a theoretical framework for situating queer experiences of discrimination, understanding that hegemonic relationships between masculinity and femininity within the heterosexual matrix are premised on gender inequity (Connell, 2005; Schippers, 2007; Tolman, 2006) and that the quality characteristics that constitute expectations of masculinity and femininity are based upon the experiences of White, middle-class cisgender men and women (Collins, 2005; Schippers, 2007). Findings from this dissertation foreground the theoretical utility of the heterosexual matrix in articulating the motivations for, and the subjective interpretations of, antigay encounters. Conceptually, the heterosexual matrix helps articulate how, despite the location of the gender transgression — through identity, physical appearance, behavioral mannerisms and/or same-gender desire – cis and trans* LGBQ individuals challenge the stability of gender binaries and essentialist beliefs regarding the relationship between gender assigned at birth, gender identity and expression, and sexual orientation. Antigay discrimination in all of its forms can be understood as a response to the disruption of hegemonic gender norms established within the heterosexual matrix. Stated differently, violating any nexus of the heterosexual matrix is always
a gendered experience. Through derogating and punishing embodiments that do not fulfill gender norm expectations, antigay discrimination sustains hegemonic gender relations. Understood this way, same-gender sexuality is objectionable specifically because it violates hegemonic gendered expectations.

Findings from this dissertation also support previous claims that queer experiences must be approached from an intersectional perspective (Bowleg, 2013; Goff et al., 2008; Greene, 2000; 2001; Nadal et al., 2011). Because social identities reflect social processes (Nash, 2008; Warner, 2008), experiences of discrimination neither exist in isolation nor can be compartmentalized by, or limited to, any one identity category. As evidenced in findings from Study 1, participants were asked to specifically narrate antigay discriminatory experiences. In their responses, however, many narrated gender and race, in addition to sexual orientation. For some LGBQ participants of color, their racial identities and sexual orientation were completely intertwined and both prominent in discriminatory encounters. For others, the salience of their racial and sexual identities varied across context. For binary trans LGBQ participants, the perception of their gender identities was emphasized above and beyond their sexual orientation. While I do not assert that participants’ interpretation of their discriminatory encounters are reflective of how they understand their identities more generally, these findings highlight the need for analytical frameworks that can attend to this complexity, one that honors the multifaceted nature of social experience, and appreciates the interconnected relationship of multiple positionalities.

As argued in this dissertation, an examination of antigay discrimination as solely a response to same-gender sexuality obfuscates the ways in which systems of privilege and inequality work dynamically and are interconnected. In considering the experiences of LGBQ
individuals, researchers must not only attend to the interrelationship between multiple marginalized identities, but also examine how they intersect with privileged social positionalities. Methodologically, I sought to do this by asking participants to reflect on their various positionalities (e.g., asking about the role of gender expression, followed by asking about the role of race). In doing so, I was able to analytically disentangle but not sever participants’ social positionalities and see connections across and within privileged and marginalized social identity categories. For example, in asking White participants to reflect on their racial identities, I saw how the “protective” nature of Whiteness narrated in discriminatory encounters was a counterpoint to the “facilitative” quality of perceived racial identity narrated by LGBQ participants of color. This complementary finding highlights the utility and necessity of attending to the unearned benefits associated with privileged positionalities, not only perceived disadvantages from subordinate group membership. As described by Shields, (2008), “there is no one category that satisfactorily describes how we respond to our social environment or are responded to by others” (p. 304). Failure to attend to the mutual constitution of social categories results in an incomplete knowledge of any one of them (Cole, 2008).

Finally, findings from this dissertation highlight the importance of attending to covert as well as overt experiences of antigay discrimination. Like in other research (e.g., Gordon & Meyer, 2008; Meyer, 2012), findings document the emotional and cognitive labor required to anticipate and react to the prejudiced beliefs and attitudes of others. This was particularly evident in ambiguous experiences of discrimination: For LGBQ participants, the question of whether discrimination occurred was often exacerbated by confusion regarding the visible social identity to which the enactor was responding. For many, the lingering questions stayed with them years after the events occurred, suggesting strong emotional effects. As one of the first
studies to consider attributional ambiguity outside of laboratory settings, additional research is needed to better understand the social and psychological effects of ambiguous discriminatory encounters. Expanding considerations of attributional ambiguity in this way re-imagines the experiential realities and diversity of experience among LGBQ individuals.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

*Theoretical and Empirical Attention to Trans* LGBQ Experience

Described in Chapter 1, research teasing out the intersections of gender expression and sexual orientation as it pertains to the experiences of trans* LGBQ individuals is limited, with examination of trans* LGBQ individuals’ experiences of antigay discrimination fairly non-existent. Research on antigay discrimination focuses, almost exclusively, on the experiences of White cisgender LGBQ individuals (Meyer, 2012; Greene, 2000). With the incorporation of trans* LGBQ individuals alongside cis LGBQ individuals in this dissertation, I hoped to 1) better understand gender expression for all LGBQ persons in discriminatory encounters and 2) expand psychological conceptualizations to consider similar workings of gender among cis and trans* individuals (Tate et al., 2014). Evidenced in Study 1, differential experiences existed both *between* cis and trans* LGBQ participants, as well as *within* trans* LGBQ participants as a group. Whereas cis LGBQ participants mobilized hegemonic gender expectations predominantly to anticipate how others perceived their sexual orientations, genderqueer LGBQ participants discussed the perception of their sexual orientations and their gender identities vis-à-vis their gender expression. Binary trans LGBQ participants, in contrast, emphasized the perception of their gender identity above and beyond their sexual orientation. Related, binary trans LGBQ participants were also more likely to express difficulty in recounting negative antigay encounters.
Instead, many describe maltreatment pertaining to their gender identities (e.g., being misgendered).

These findings scratch the surface of the entangled relationship among gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation within antigay discriminatory encounters and suggest that there may be important differences between the experiences of binary trans individuals and nonbinary trans individuals. Because Study 1 was conducted online and participants wrote narratives as opposed to being interviewed, I was not able ask follow-up questions that would help explicate differential observations. For example, questions remain in regard to how trans* participants experience their queer sexual orientations more generally, as well as navigate others’ reactions to it. It is possible that differences between binary and nonbinary trans LGBQ participants may relate to the distinct relationship of their identities to the gender binary. Whereas binary trans individuals’ gendered sense of self is directly related to categorical distinctions between male and female, nonbinary trans people’s identities exist beyond the binary. While identity does not predicate gender expression, it is possible that greater fluidity of identity translates into unique everyday experiences. Future research should examine the phenomenology of nonbinary gender identities (e.g., genderqueer, genderfluid, agender) and consider how individuals who identify outside of male-female distinctions negotiate living in a society predicated on binary gendered differentiations. Although trans* issues have received more public and scholarly attention within recent years (Cameron, 2012; Dudley, 2013; Meyer, 2012; Nadal, 2013; Schilt, 2010; Tate et al., 2014), extant research primarily focuses on the experiences of trans men or trans women and less on the experiences of genderqueer individuals. To date, only a handful of studies exist on nonbinary trans individuals (e.g., Factor & Rothblum,
2008), and this study marks one of the first to consider genderqueer LGBQ experiences of antigay discrimination.

*Operationalization and Assessment of Gender Expression*

Although findings from this dissertation demonstrate the centrality of gender expression and its importance in the perception of gender identity and sexual orientation, questions remain in terms of how to best operationalize and incorporate its assessment within psychological research. In Study 2, within the experimental designs, I operationalized gender expression in regard to appearance, as previous research has demonstrated that perceived gender nonconformity in relation to appearance is negatively perceived (Blashill & Powlishta, 2012; Horn, 2006). Yet, appearance is an inherently visual component of interpersonal communication. In lived experience, how others are perceived is determined by multiple factors that are encoded simultaneously (Allport, 1954; Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). Stated differently, perceiving the individual in-person compared to reading a description about them may elicit different reactions. In person, how we perceive others directly relates to which aspects of that person we attend to, how we interpret their behavior and how our own positionalities influence the behaviors of others (Rudman & Glick, 2008). As the narratives from LGBQ individuals in Study 1 suggest, negative encounters with straight individuals were often described as emotionally charged moments in which straight individuals were reacting to or provoked by LGBQ individuals’ visual embodiments. Written descriptions may not sufficiently capture the aspect of human experience that is inherently visual and embodied. Given this, future experimental work could implement pictures or videos as a means to represent more believable and realistic responses.

In regard to the assessment of gender expression as it is embodied, findings discussed here raise questions about the validity and generalizability of categorizing such an inherently
fluid aspect of human experience using *masculinity* and *femininity* as quantitative anchors, as done by Wylie et al. (2010). Shown in Chapter 4, results from the analysis of inter-method reliability demonstrate the terms, *masculinity* and *femininity* as racially infused concepts (Schippers, 2007). At the same time, many participants use this gendered language to characterize and communicate how they are perceived by others. Demonstrated in their experiences, being perceived as transgressing from hegemonic gender norms carries considerable importance within LGQB individuals’ day-to-day experiences. Moving forward, challenges remain for researchers in terms of how and in what ways to use the masculine and feminine terminology in the assessment of gender expression, given the continually shifting and multifaceted interpretation of such language.

Findings from this dissertation also surface questions regarding the ethics and political consequences of gender expression categorization as *gender conforming* and *gender nonconforming*. Described within Chapter 1, gender nonconformity is a fraught term within academic scholarship and throughout this dissertation I have sought to use the language of gender conforming and gender nonconforming to emphasize how individuals are perceived in relation to hegemonic gender expectations, not in regard to how they self-identify. Classifying bodies as conforming or nonconforming is particularly concerning when used in relation to trans* individuals, as it may impose descriptors with which they do not identify (e.g., A trans man, for example, who presents and behaves masculine is *conforming* to his gender identity, not opposing it). Indeed, demonstrated in this dissertation, many LGBQ participants feel that they never had the chance to define themselves, as other people in their lives and strangers continually imposed rigid and stereotypical ideas, beliefs, and categorizations on to their bodies. As researchers, we must take care and be cognizant of the extent to which the terminology and
labels we use enact forms of epistemological violence on the communities with whom we work (Teo, 2010).

As researchers, we confront a perpetual tension between a practical need to categorize experience in advocacy for social justice yet remain accountable to the lived and complex realities of experience (Anderson & Fine, in press). How to resolve the methodological and ethical considerations identified in this dissertation carries particular importance given the increased public awareness of queer and trans* experience and the increase of research around gender identity and expression. Taken together and moving forward, additional research is needed to understand the phenomenology of gender expression in relation to racialized hegemonic gender norms and determine how to best measure gender expression in relation to its dual reference to gender identity and sexual orientation.

Implications for Intervention & Social Policy Reform

In this dissertation, I have argued that in conceptualizing and measuring “antigay discrimination” researchers must try to disentangle the threads of gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation and race, even as we recognize that within bodies, lives and subjectivities these strands are woven together. Although disentanglement is essential in clarifying the factors that contribute to antigay discrimination, re-entanglement is also necessary for a larger consideration of the function of antigay discrimination and importantly working toward its eradication. Understood within the context of the heterosexual matrix, same-gender sexuality is objectionable to many – and provokes discrimination and violence – specifically because it violates hegemonic gender expectations. Positioning antigay discrimination as an arm of gender norm enforcement carries important implications for seeing the interconnectedness of violence that can result from various types of gender transgressions. Although advocacy efforts
for queer individuals and transgender individuals have often been addressed separately (Allen, 2015; Boen, 2011; Curry, 2015), findings from this dissertation foreground the interrelated gendered nature of sexual orientation and gender identity and expression. As such, advocacy efforts aimed at improving the lives of LGBQ individuals must devote greater attention to challenging hegemonic gender formulations, in particular gender binaries.

Practically, as argued by many others (Bell, Özbilgin, Beauregard, & Sürgevil, 2011; Davis & Wertz, 2009; Dunson, 2001; Koch & Bales, 2008; Lloyd, 2005; Vade, 2004; Witten & Whittle, 2004), social and legal policies are needed that prohibit harassment and discrimination based upon gender identity and gender expression. Workplace settings should avoid the use of binary gender segregation and instead work toward gender inclusivity and flexibility (e.g., gender-neutral school uniforms; the installation of gender-inclusive bathrooms) (e.g., Toomey, Ryan, Diaz, Card, & Russell, 2010). Educational efforts are needed on diverse and fluid gender identities and expressions, as well as on the nature of and adverse consequences of gender-related bullying. Importantly, these efforts must highlight how strict gender expectations affect all individuals - straight, queer, cis and trans* alike (Bornstein 1992; Wilchins, 2004). Of note, such approaches contrast cultural awareness or tolerance campaigns, which champion the “normalcy” of trans* and /or LGBQ individuals. In arguing that LGBQ individuals are “just like everyone else” such campaigns reinstate and prioritize existent hegemonic social relations and ideologies and stigmatize “difference.” As has been argued by critical queer scholars (Spade & Willse, 2013; Warner, 1999), assimilation into extant gendered paradigms and legal institutions will do little to undo systemic oppression. Instead of seeking to help LGBQ individuals “fit in” to school or workplace settings, the goal should be to expand and thus break constraining gender expectations. Ultimately, intervention efforts should seek to establish a more gender expansive
environment, where diverse gender experiences and expressions are affirmed and celebrated (Baum et al., 2012). Tolerance is not the point; transformation is.

Findings from this dissertation may also prove useful within clinical or counseling interventions. An important challenge and opportunity for practitioners is to help their clients make sense of their discriminatory encounters in relation to racialized gender ideologies, understanding that their clients’ experiences are informed by their multiple privileged and marginalized identities. In particular for counselors and clinicians working with trans* and LGBQ individuals perceived as gender nonconforming, preventing gender-based discrimination from becoming internalized is essential. Stated differently, practitioners can help their clients understand that it is not so much than their non-normative identities and embodiments are problematic; rather it is the rigid social norms and gender expectations others’ hold that need change. Due to the considerable social stigma that exists around embodied gender transgressions, practitioners can importantly help counter internalized discourses of damage.

**Statement on Reflexivity**

In contrast to notions of scientific neutrality (Fine, 1998), the research and writing of this dissertation has been a deeply political and deeply personal project. As a white masculine-presenting queer cisgender woman, many of the experiences LGBQ participants describe echo my own and many people in my queer communities. Although I do not identify as trans*, others’ questioning of my gender identity due to my gender expression is a daily experience, in particular in harshly gendered spaces such as bathrooms and locker rooms. I know all too well the emotional and psychological stress that comes from feeling like I have to continuously calm strangers’ fears, to account for my embodied “difference”, to place their anxiety above my own. Part of my desire to undertake this research was to document and name these types of
experiences and to draw attention to the particular sense of social anxiety provoked by gender transgressions. At the same time, in immersing and analyzing the experiences of LGBQ individuals who are often perceived as gender conforming, I saw that gender norm expectations constrain and suffocate many if not all LGBQ, not just those of us whose embodiments defy the gender binary.

Although I am visibly queer, as a White person, my experiences have been the primary narrative within sexuality research: Research on same-gender sexual orientation has historically and is predominately still dominated by the voices of White researchers and participants (Balsam et al., 2011; Bowleg, 2008, 2013; Greene, 1994, 2000, 2001). Researching and writing this dissertation has been an intensive study of how to listen and reveal (Fine, 1998), to try and seek a balance between amplifying the voices and experiences of queer individuals of color but not unintentionally supplant their narrations with my own. My decision to include questions in Study 1 about the role of race in antigay encounters was motivated by a desire to explicitly analyze race within antigay encounters. Perhaps a consequence of my own Whiteness, I did not anticipate the effect this question would have on interrupting or calling attention to participants’ White privilege. In analyzing the role of race in White participant narratives, I confronted the challenge of how to analyze and interpret White participants’ silence and the extent to which my own silence about Whiteness has colluded in the racialized gendered dynamics I advocate for undoing. White silence is a way of talking about/around race – it is not an exclusion of racial dynamics. Considering White participants narratives and the narratives of participants of color side-by-side, though, foregrounds the necessity of analyze dynamics of privilege and oppression together, that the racial oppression experienced by people of color is always in conversation with the privilege experienced by White individuals (Johnson, 2001). In interpreting the role of race
in producing the “absence of a privilege” for many White LGBQ participants describe, I continually reflected on and engaged with my own Whiteness.

In addition, in the quantitative analyses within Study 1, I struggled with the decision to create the category of “queer participants of color.” Establishing a quantitative distinction between White participants and participants of color was theoretically driven by the desire to explore the extent to which hegemonic gender ideologies implicate discourses of Whiteness and the practical need to maintain statistical power. Yet, in differentiating between the experiences of White participants and participants of color in this way I risked flattening the complexity I sought to understand. Results from the regression analyses in Study 1 identify that gender ideologies are racialized; yet, these findings do not elucidate how such racialized gender ideologies exist differentially among various types of racial and ethnic positionalities.

Although gender expression and race constitute two of the first means by which others read us (Bornstein, 1992; Fiske & Neuberg, 1990), the desire to be perceived in our entirety, to not be stereotyped or stuffed into boxes extends beyond categorizations of conforming and nonconforming, beyond categorizations of one’s perceived racial identity. Within research, we researchers confront the practical need to categorize, yet at the same time desire to honor fluidity and plasticity of our participants’ experiences (Anderson & Fine, in press). My intent with this dissertation has been to recognize and hold the complexity of queer experiences, to not impose another master narrative onto those who have been historically disenfranchised (Spivak, 1988). Researching and writing this dissertation has been a validating, enraging, provocative and humbling process.
Concluding Thoughts

During the writing of this dissertation, 2015 marked one of the most historic years on record for the LGBTQ community within the United States. The Supreme Court ruled gay marriage legal across all 50 states, and many queer and straight-identified people alike celebrated its passage as the culmination of years of efforts to eradicate the stigma that exists around same-gender sexuality (Chappell, 2015). Yet, by the year’s end, more transgender people had been murdered than any year on record (Michaels, 2015). Of the 22 trans* people killed in 2015, most were trans women of color. Although these murders were not necessarily classified as antigay hate crimes, the juxtaposition of these two events highlights how political movements have made some transgressions of hegemonic gender norms more socially acceptable but not others.

Essentially, the passage of gay marriage institutionally granted the right for men to have “feminine” desire (i.e., desire for other men) and for women to have “masculine” desire (i.e., desire for other women), but not the right for men to actually be feminine or for women to be masculine (Wilchins, 2004). As the high murder rate of trans* people – in particular trans* women – and overwhelming absence of laws prohibiting discrimination based upon gender identity attests, gender has largely been excluded from mainstream gay rights movements. If the function of antigay discrimination works to maintain gender ideologies, gendered violence will continue to exist as long as White hegemonic gender norms remain intact (Wilchins, 2004). Until then, bodies and experiences that do not fit within socially-mandated racialized gender norms will continue to constitute “low-hanging fruit,” ripe targets for social surveillance.
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Subject for listserv: Post to [name of listserv]
Subject for organizations: Help from [organization name]

Hi,

My name is Stephanie Anderson and I'm a PhD Candidate in Social Psychology at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. I'm conducting an online research project looking at how we perceive and think about others and ourselves.

I'm interested in including a diverse group of people in the study regarding age, gender expression and identity, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation.

I'm contacting you to see if you would be willing to distribute the call for participation below to the [name of listserv/organization], participate in the study yourself, or to forward this to anyone you think may be interested. The text for an email distribution - including the study link - is pasted below.

Thank you for your consideration and I look forward to hearing from you!

Warmly,
Stephanie

--
Stephanie M. Anderson
PhD Candidate, Social-Personality Psychology
Graduate Center, City University of New York (CUNY)
sanderson1@gc.cuny.edu

Videographer
Purple Shoelaces - Documentary portrait of NYC's Women's Gay Basketball League
Subject: Diverse Group of Participants Needed for On-line Psychology Study ($10)

Hello,

My name is Stephanie Anderson, and I am a psychology student pursuing a PhD at the City University of New York. I am conducting an online research project looking at how we perceive and think about others and ourselves. The study would involve completing a short eligibility questionnaire, and if eligible, the final study will ask you to write short stories about how you are perceived by other people in your life.

I am interested in including a diverse group of people in the study regarding age, gender, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation.

The final study will be conducted online and take approximately 30-45 minutes of your time. You will receive a $10 gift certificate to Amazon.com.

To find out if you are eligible for the study, please visit the link below:

[survey link]

Please feel free to forward this message to anyone else you think would be interested in participating.

This study has been approved by the CUNY Graduate Center Institutional Review Board. If you have questions about me or my study, you can contact me via email at sanderson1@gc.cuny.edu or my advisor, Dr. Michelle Fine (mfine@gc.cuny.edu). If you have any questions about your rights as a study participant you may also contact the IRB administrator for the Graduate Center, Kay Powell, (kpowell@gc.cuny.edu).

Thank you for your help with this project.

Sincerely,
Stephanie M. Anderson
Graduate Center of the City University of New York
sanderson1@gc.cuny.edu
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Diverse group of participants needed for online psych study. This project examines how we perceive and think about ourselves and others.

https://gccunyep.qualtrics.com/SE/

My name is Stephanie Anderson, and I'm a psychology student pursuing a PhD at the City University of New York. I am conducting an online research project looking at how we perceive and think about ourselves and others. The study would involve completing a short eligibility questionnaire, and if eligible, the first study will require you to write about issues about yourself.
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Self Expression and Perception by Others Questionnaire

The following section will ask you some questions about how you describe yourself.

1. How old are you?

2. What type of community do you live in?
   ○ City or urban community
   ○ Suburban community
   ○ Rural community

3. What is your race and/or ethnicity? (check all that apply).
   ○ Black or African American
   ○ White
   ○ Latino/Latina or Hispanic
   ○ Afro Caribbean
   ○ Middle Eastern
   ○ Native American, American Indian or Alaskan Native
   ○ Asian, South Asian or Pacific Islander
   ○ Other (please specify)________________

4. What is your yearly household income? (This includes your income and the incomes of others who live with you).
   ○ Less than $10,000
   ○ $10,000-$19,999
   ○ $20,000-$29,999
   ○ $30,000-$39,999
   ○ $40,000-$49,999
   ○ $50,000-$59,999
   ○ $60,000-$69,999
   ○ $70,000-$79,999
   ○ $80,000-$89,999
   ○ $90,000-$99,999
   ○ $100,000-$150,000
   ○ Greater than $150,000

5. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   ○ Less than high school
   ○ High school diploma/GED
   ○ 2-year college degree (Associates or Vocational)
   ○ 4-year college degree (BA, BS)
   ○ Master’s degree
   ○ Doctoral degree
6. What is your current gender? (click all that apply)
   - Male
   - Female
   - TransMale/Transman
   - TransFemale/Transwoman
   - Genderqueer
   - Additional Category (please specify)_______________
   - Decline to state

7. What sex were you assigned at birth?
   - Male
   - Female
   - Decline to state

8. What is your sexual orientation?
   - Gay
   - Lesbian
   - Bisexual
   - Heterosexual
   - Other _______________

The following are some questions about how you express your gender. You may prefer to use labels other than “masculine” or “feminine” to describe your gender. We use these terms on this survey for convenience because they are commonly used to describe physical appearance and mannerisms.

9. A person’s appearance, style or dress may affect the way people think about them. On average, how do you think people would describe your appearance?
   - Very feminine
   - Mostly feminine
   - Somewhat feminine
   - Equally feminine and masculine
   - Somewhat masculine
   - Mostly masculine
   - Very masculine

10. A person’s mannerisms (such as the way they walk to talk) may affect the way people think about them. On average, how do you think people would describe your mannerisms?
    - Very feminine
    - Mostly feminine
    - Somewhat feminine
    - Equally feminine and masculine
    - Somewhat masculine
    - Mostly masculine
    - Very masculine
11. How did you hear about this study?
   - E-mail announcement
   - Twitter
   - Facebook
   - Friend
   - Other _______________

12. If eligible, would you be willing to take part in a final study which will require you to write stories about how you are perceived by other people in your life?
   - Yes
   - No

(if ‘yes’) Please provide your e-mail address below.

Thank you for participating in this study! Your participation is extremely important to our research. Please feel free to forward the link below to anyone else you think would be interested in participating.

[eligibility questionnaire link]
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Please read the following information.

Introduction and Purpose

You are being asked to participate in a study investigating how you perceive and think about yourself and others. The study involves completing a short eligibility questionnaire, and if eligible, the final study will require you to write short stories about how you are perceived by other people in your life. The study will include a diverse group of people regarding age, sexual orientation, and race/ethnicity.

Before you can participate in this study, you need to answer a few questions to determine your eligibility.

Please read the information on this page carefully before deciding whether or not to complete this eligibility questionnaire. This study is being conducted by Stephanie M. Anderson, a PhD Candidate in Social Personality Psychology at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. One hundred and fifty participants are expected to be included in this study.

What to Expect

This eligibility questionnaire asks you to answer some questions about yourself. It will take approximately 3-5 minutes to complete. If, based upon your answers to these questions, you are determined eligible for the study, you will be contacted via e-mail to participate.

Confidentiality

Your participation in this study is completely confidential. Only the investigator and her advisor will have access to your responses. Your e-mail address will be kept separate from your answers and will only be used to contact you if you are eligible to participate in the final study and to send you your $10 Amazon.com gift certificate if you chose to complete the study. Your e-mail address will not be disclosed in any publications or presentations of the study.

Risks and Benefits

There are no foreseeable risks participating in this study. If a question makes you feel uncomfortable, you may skip it. Although you will not receive any direct benefits, your participation will further knowledge in the field of psychology. Your participation in this survey is voluntary and you can discontinue your participation at any time.

Contact

If you have further questions about the study, you can contact Stephanie M. Anderson at 248-895-6291 (e-mail: sanderson1@gc.cuny.edu) or her advisor, Dr. Michelle Fine at 212-817-8710 (e-mail: mfine@gc.cuny.edu). If you have questions about your rights as a study participant you may also contact the IRB administrator for the Graduate Center, Kay Powell, at 212-817-7525 (e-mail: kpowell@gc.cuny.edu). Thank you for your participation in this study! Please feel free to print this page by selecting the "print" button below or copying the text and placing it into a
Consent
By checking "I Agree" below, you confirm that you have read this document and understand what it says. You understand that participation in this study is voluntary and that you may withdraw from the study at any time with no consequences. You understand that you have the option of printing or saving this text to a word document for your own records. You consent to take part of this research study and understand that by checking "I Agree" you are not waiving any of your legal rights.

( ) I agree to participate
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Hello,

My name is Stephanie Anderson, and I am a psychology student pursuing a PhD at the City University of New York. You recently completed an eligibility questionnaire for my study on how we perceive and think about others and ourselves.

**You are eligible to participate in the study.**

It will take approximately 30-45 minutes of your time and you will receive a $10 gift certificate from Amazon.com. If you are still interested in participating, please visit the link below to get started.

[survey link generated by Qualtrics]

If you have any questions about me or my study, you can contact me via email at sanderson1@gc.cuny.edu.

Thank you for your help with this project.
Appendix G

Self Expression and Perception by Others

Introduction
You are being asked to participate in a research study investigating how you are perceived and treated by other people in your life. We are particularly interested in your experiences around gender expression and sexual orientation. Based upon information you provided in the eligibility questionnaire, you have been determined eligible to participate in this study. Please read this information page carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. This study is being conducted by Stephanie M. Anderson, a PhD Candidate in Social Personality Psychology at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. Feel free to contact the investigator with any questions you may have.

What to Expect
1. This online questionnaire will take approximately 30-45 minutes to complete. You will be asked to answer questions about experiences related to your sexual orientation and gender expression and in some instances to writes stories about your experiences. Full participation and compensation require that you provide complete and valid responses to questions. For example, when asked to write a story, please provide a complete response. Responses consisting of only a few words or responses such as “n/a” are not valid.
2. As a part of the survey process, you will be asked to create a code name. This code name will help ensure that your responses are kept confidential.
3. Upon full completion of the study, you will receive a $10 Amazon.com gift certificate redeemable online. You will receive an email from the principal investigator within approximately 1 week of completing the study with instructions on how to redeem your gift certificate.
4. You will be asked whether or not you are interested in being contacted in the future for an in-person or on-line video interview. If you indicate you are interested, you will be asked to provide your e-mail address.

Confidentiality
Your participation in this study is completely confidential. Only the investigator and her advisor will have access to your responses. As described above, at the end of the survey you will have the option to provide your e-mail address to receive a $10 Amazon gift card and asked if you want to participant in a future study. This contact information will be stored separately from your responses to the rest of the survey. This will ensure that the only people who are able to link your e-mail addresses to your survey responses will be the primary investigator and her advisor. Your survey responses will be downloaded from Qualtrics, the host of this survey, onto a personal unsecured http server and will be stored on a password-protected computer. Qualtrics stores all data in a secure database until it is deleted by the investigator. The results from this study may be published, but no identifying information will be used in any of the publications.

Risks/Benefits
You may feel uncomfortable thinking about personal information related to your sexual orientation and gender expression, how others perceive you, and/or relaying this information in a survey. This risk is similar to that experienced when telling personal information to an
acquaintance or to other people. You are free to skip any question that makes you uncomfortable or to end your participation entirely by closing out of the survey at any time.

If you feel upset by this experience, you may wish to talk to The Trevor Project (866-488-7386). The Trevor Project can help with psychological distress and is there if you need someone to talk to 24/7. TrevorChat (http://www.thetrevorproject.org) also has live online representatives you can talk to or you can text a representative with your concerns through TrevorText (text the word, “Trevor” to 1-202-304-1200). TrevorChat is available 7 days a week from 3pm-9pm EST and TrevorText is available on Fridays from 4pm-8pm EST. Although you will not receive any direct benefits, your participation will further knowledge in the field of psychology.

Contact
If you have further questions about the study, you can contact Stephanie M. Anderson at 248-895-6291 (e-mail: sanderson1@gc.cuny.edu) or her advisor, Dr. Michelle Fine at 212-817-8710 (e-mail: mfine@gc.cuny.edu). If you have questions about your rights as a study participant you may contact the IRB administrator for the Graduate Center, Kay Powell, at 212-817-7525 (e-mail: kpowell@gc.cuny.edu).

Thank you for your participation in this study! Please feel free to print this page or copy the text and placing it into a word document to keep for your records.

Consent
By checking "I Agree" below, you confirm that you have read this document and understand what it says. You understand that participation in this study is voluntary and that you may withdraw from the study at any time with no consequences. You understand that you have the option of printing or saving this text to a word document for your own records. You consent to take part of this research study and understand that by checking "I Agree" you are not waiving any of your legal rights.

( ) I agree to participate
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Homonegative Microaggressions Scale (Wright & Wegner, 2012)

Response scale:
1 – Hardly ever/never/not at all
2 – Occasionally, but rarely/a little bit
3 – Occasionally/from time to time/somewhat
4 – Consistently/often/a good deal
5 – Constantly/a great deal
6 – Not applicable

Items:

In the past 6 months how often…
1. …have people conveyed it’s your choice to be gay?
2. …have people acted as if you have not come out?
3. … have people asked about former boyfriends (if you are a woman) or girlfriends (if you are a man)?
4. … have people assumed you were straight?
5. … have people used the phrase “sexual preference” instead of “sexual orientation”?
6. … have people assumed you were more sensitive (if you are a man) or less sensitive (if you are a woman) than you are?
7. …have people assumed you were skilled in stereotypically gay tasks (like interior design for men and carpentry for women)?
8. …have people assumed you knew a lot about stereotypical LGB interests like wine (if you are a man) or sports (if you are a woman)?
9. …have people assumed you were knowledgeable about women’s clothing (if you are a man) or men’s clothing (if you are a woman)?
10. …people of the same sex assumed you were attracted to them simply because of your sexual orientation?
11. …have people told you they see you as a person, regardless of your sexual orientation?
12. …have people said blanket statements about how society is full of diversity, minimizing your experiences of being different?
13. …have family members simply ignored the fact that you are a LGB individual?
14. …have people changed the subject/topic when reference to your sexual orientation comes up?
15. …have people assumed you were a pervert or deviant?
16. …have people assumed you were a pedophile?
17. …have people assumed you have HIV/AIDS because of your sexual orientation?
18. …have people assumed you were sexually promiscuous because of your sexual orientation?
19. …have people physically shielded their child/children from you?
20. …have people avoided proximity, like crossing the street to walk to waiting for the next elevator?
21. …have people said things like “I watch Will & Grace” to show you that they know about gay culture?
22. …have people equated themselves and their experience to yours as a minority?
23. …have people indicated they know other LGB individuals by saying things like “My hairdresser is gay” or “I have a gay friend”?
24. …have people showed surprise at how not effeminate (if you are a man) or not masculine (if you are a woman) you are?
25. …have people assumed you like to wear clothing of the opposite sex?
26. …have people made statements that you are “more normal” than they expected?
27. …have people addressed you with the pronoun of the opposite sex?
28. …have people told you to “calm down” or be “less dramatic”?
29. …have people told you to be especially careful regarding safe sex because of your sexual orientation or told you that you don’t have to worry about safe sex because of your sexual orientation?
30. …have people dismissed you for bringing up the issue of your sexual orientation at school or work?
31. …have people stared at you or given you a dirty look when expressing affecting toward someone of the same sex?
32. …have people made statements about LGB individuals using phrases like “you people” or “you know how gay people are”?
33. …have people said it would bother them if someone thought they were gay?
34. …have people made statements about why gay marriage should not be allowed?
35. …have people made statements against LGB individuals adopting?
36. …have people (directly or indirectly) called you a derogatory name like “fag”, “queer”, “homo”, or “dyke”?
37. …have people told you to act differently at work or school in order to hide your sexual orientation?
38. …have people made offensive remarks about LGB individuals in your presence, not realizing your sexual orientation?
39. …have people used the phrase “that’s so gay” in your presence?
40. …have people told you its wrong to be gay or said that you were going to hell because of your sexual orientation?
41. …have people told you to dress differently at work or school in order to hide your sexual orientation?
42. …have people told you not to disclose your sexual orientation in some context (like work or school)?
43. …have you felt that TV characters have portrayed stereotypes of LGB individuals?
44. …have you felt like your rights (like marriage) are denied?
45. …have religious leaders spoken out against homosexuality?
## Appendix I

### PILOT STUDY & STUDY 2 – EXPERIMENT 1

Target Gender Expression Descriptions (manipulation). Each participant will only read ONE of these scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender, Gender Expression &amp; Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender conforming, straight male</td>
<td>You are the owner of a restaurant and need to hire a new manager. The new manager will oversee all servers and work closely with the head chef in menu selection. Ryan has worked as a server in your restaurant for the last 2 years. Customers describe him as friendly and attentive and a handful of them come regularly to request being seated in his section. Ryan has a particular style: he has sharp facial features and a buzz cut and often wears ties and neatly pressed shirts that complement his muscular build. Ryan describes that it’s important for him to “put his best face forward” when working. Although he sometimes has tense interactions with the kitchen staff, overall Ryan is liked by most employees at the restaurant. You have a cordial relationship with Ryan and have gotten to know him well: outside of work, he likes to take pictures and travel with his girlfriend, Maya. Lately, Ryan has taken a number of sick days and you suspect that he and Maya might be having some relationship problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender nonconforming, straight male</td>
<td>You are the owner of a restaurant and need to hire a new manager. The new manager will oversee all servers and work closely with the head chef in menu selection. Ryan has worked as a server in your restaurant for the last 2 years. Customers describe him as friendly and attentive and a handful of them come regularly to request being seated in his section. Ryan has a particular style: he has soft facial features and styled hair and often wears colorful tops with matching bracelets and earrings that complement his slight build. Ryan describes that it’s important for him to “put his best face forward” when working. Although he sometimes has tense interactions with the kitchen staff, overall Ryan is liked by most employees at the restaurant. You have a cordial relationship with Ryan and have gotten to know him well: outside of work, he likes to take pictures and travel with his girlfriend, Maya. Lately, Ryan has taken a number of sick days and you suspect that he and Maya might be having some relationship problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender conforming, queer male</td>
<td>You are the owner of a restaurant and need to hire a new manager. The new manager will oversee all servers and work closely with the head chef in menu selection. Ryan has worked as a server in your restaurant for the last 2 years. Customers describe him as friendly and attentive and a handful of them come regularly to request being seated in his section. Ryan has a particular style: he has sharp facial features and a buzz cut and often wears ties and neatly pressed shirts that complement his muscular build. Ryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender nonconforming, queer male</td>
<td>describes that it’s important for <strong>him</strong> to “put his best face forward” when working. Although <strong>he</strong> sometimes has tense interactions with the kitchen staff, overall <strong>Ryan</strong> is liked by most employees at the restaurant. You have a cordial relationship with <strong>Ryan</strong> and have gotten to know <strong>him</strong> well: outside of work, <strong>he</strong> likes to take pictures and travel with <strong>his boyfriend, Michael</strong>. Lately, <strong>Ryan</strong> has taken a number of sick days and you suspect that <strong>he and Michael</strong> might be having some relationship problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender conforming, straight female</td>
<td>You are the owner of a restaurant and need to hire a new manager. The new manager will oversee all servers and work closely with the head chef in menu selection. <strong>Jessica</strong> has worked as a server in your restaurant for the last 2 years. Customers describe <strong>her</strong> as friendly and attentive and a handful of them come regularly to request being seated in <strong>her section. Jessica</strong> has a particular style: <strong>she has soft facial features and long hair and often wears colorful tops that complement her slight build. Jessica</strong> describes that it’s important for <strong>her</strong> to “put her best face forward” when working and will reapply makeup during her shift. Although <strong>she</strong> sometimes has tense interactions with the kitchen staff, overall <strong>Jessica</strong> is liked by most employees at the restaurant. You have a cordial relationship with <strong>Jessica</strong> and have gotten to know <strong>her</strong> well: outside of work, <strong>she</strong> likes to take pictures and travel with <strong>her boyfriend, Michael</strong>. Lately, <strong>Jessica</strong> has taken a number of sick days and you suspect that <strong>she and Michael</strong> might be having some relationship problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender nonconforming, straight female</td>
<td>You are the owner of a restaurant and need to hire a new manager. The new manager will oversee all servers and work closely with the head chef in menu selection. <strong>Jessica</strong> has worked as a server in your restaurant for the last 2 years. Customers describe <strong>her</strong> as friendly and attentive and a handful of them come regularly to request being seated in <strong>her section. Jessica</strong> has a particular style: <strong>she has sharp facial features and short hair and often wears ties and neatly pressed shirts that complement her muscular build. Jessica</strong> describes that it’s important for <strong>her</strong> to “put her best face forward” when working and will reapply makeup during her shift. Although <strong>she</strong> sometimes has tense interactions with the kitchen staff, overall <strong>Jessica</strong> is liked by most employees at the restaurant. You have a cordial relationship with <strong>Jessica</strong> and have gotten to know <strong>her</strong> well: outside of work, <strong>she</strong> likes to take pictures and travel with <strong>her boyfriend, Michael</strong>. Lately, <strong>Jessica</strong> has taken a number of sick days and you suspect that <strong>she and Michael</strong> might be having some relationship problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
describes that it’s important for her to “put her best face forward” when working. **Different from other female servers, Jessica doesn’t wear make-up.** Although she sometimes has tense interactions with the kitchen staff, overall Jessica is liked by most employees at the restaurant. You have a cordial relationship with Jessica and have gotten to know her well: outside of work, she likes to take pictures and travel with her boyfriend, Michael. Lately, Jessica has taken a number of sick days and you suspect that she and Michael might be having some relationship problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender conforming, queer female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are the owner of a restaurant and need to hire a new manager. The new manager will oversee all servers and work closely with the head chef in menu selection. Jessica has worked as a server in your restaurant for the last 2 years. Customers describe her as friendly and attentive and a handful of them come regularly to request being seated in her section. Jessica has a particular style: she has soft facial features and long hair and often wears colorful tops that complement her slight build. Jessica describes that it’s important for her to “put her best face forward” when working and will reapply makeup during her shift. Although she sometimes has tense interactions with the kitchen staff, overall Jessica is liked by most employees at the restaurant. You have a cordial relationship with Jessica and have gotten to know her well: outside of work, she likes to take pictures and travel with her girlfriend, Maya. Lately, Jessica has taken a number of sick days and you suspect that she and Maya might be having some relationship problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender nonconforming, queer female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are the owner of a restaurant and need to hire a new manager. The new manager will oversee all servers and work closely with the head chef in menu selection. Jessica has worked as a server in your restaurant for the last year. Customers describe her as friendly and attentive and a handful of them come regularly to request being seated in her section. Jessica has a particular style: she has sharp facial features and short hair and often wears ties and neatly pressed shirts that complement her muscular build. Jessica describes that it’s important for her to “put her best face forward” when working. <strong>Different from other female servers, Jessica doesn’t wear make-up.</strong> Although she sometimes has tense interactions with the kitchen staff, overall Jessica is liked by most employees at the restaurant. You have a cordial relationship with Jessica and have gotten to know her well: outside of work, she likes to take pictures and travel with her girlfriend, Maya. Lately, Jessica has taken a number of sick days and you suspect that she and Maya might be having some relationship problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, Gender Expression &amp; Sexual Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender conforming, straight male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender nonconforming, straight male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender conforming, queer male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
outside of work, he likes to take pictures and travel with his boyfriend, Michael. Lately, DeAndre has taken a number of sick days and you suspect that he and Michael might be having some relationship problems.

| Gender nonconforming, queer male | You are the owner of a restaurant and need to hire a new manager. The new manager will oversee all servers and work closely with the head chef in menu selection. DeAndre has worked as a server in your restaurant for the last 2 years. Customers describe him as friendly and attentive and a handful of them come regularly to request being seated in his section. DeAndre has a particular style: he has soft facial features and styled hair and often wears colorful tops with matching bracelets and earrings that complement his slight build. DeAndre describes that it’s important for him to “put his best face forward” when working. Although he sometimes has tense interactions with the kitchen staff, overall DeAndre is liked by most employees at the restaurant. You have a cordial relationship with DeAndre and have gotten to know him well: outside of work, he likes to take pictures travel with his boyfriend, Michael. Lately, DeAndre has taken a number of sick days and you suspect that he and Michael might be having some relationship problems. |
| Gender conforming, straight female | You are the owner of a restaurant and need to hire a new manager. The new manager will oversee all servers and work closely with the head chef in menu selection. LaToya has worked as a server in your restaurant for the last 2 years. Customers describe her as friendly and attentive and a handful of them come regularly to request being seated in her section. LaToya has a particular style: she has soft facial features and long hair and often wears colorful tops that complement her slight build. LaToya describes that it’s important for her to “put her best face forward” when working and will reapply makeup during her shift. Although she sometimes has tense interactions with the kitchen staff, overall LaToya is liked by most employees at the restaurant. You have a cordial relationship with LaToya and have gotten to know her well: outside of work, she likes to take pictures and travel with her boyfriend, Michael. Lately, LaToya has taken a number of sick days and you suspect that she and Michael might be having some relationship problems. |
| Gender nonconforming, straight female | You are the owner of a restaurant and need to hire a new manager. The new manager will oversee all servers and work closely with the head chef in menu selection. LaToya has worked as a server in your restaurant for the last 2 years. Customers describe her as friendly and attentive and a handful of them come regularly to request being seated in her section. LaToya has a particular style: she has sharp facial features and short hair and often wears ties and neatly pressed shirts that complement her muscular build. LaToya describes that it’s important for her to “put her best face forward” when working. Different from other female servers, LaToya doesn’t wear make-up. Although she sometimes has tense interactions with the kitchen staff, overall LaToya is liked by most employees at the restaurant. You have a
cordial relationship with LaToya and have gotten to know her well: outside of work, she likes to take pictures and travel with her boyfriend, Michael. Lately, LaToya has taken a number of sick days and you suspect that she and Michael might be having some relationship problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender conforming, queer female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are the owner of a restaurant and need to hire a new manager. The new manager will oversee all servers and work closely with the head chef in menu selection. LaToya has worked as a server in your restaurant for the last 2 years. Customers describe her as friendly and attentive and a handful of them come regularly to request being seated in her section. LaToya has a particular style: she has soft facial features and long hair and often wears colorful tops that complement her slight build. LaToya describes that it’s important for her to “put her best face forward” when working and will reapply makeup during her shift. Although she sometimes has tense interactions with the kitchen staff, overall LaToya is liked by most employees at the restaurant. You have a cordial relationship with LaToya and have gotten to know her well: outside of work, she likes to take pictures and travel with her girlfriend, Maya. Lately, LaToya has taken a number of sick days and you suspect that she and Maya might be having some relationship problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender nonconforming, queer female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are the owner of a restaurant and need to hire a new manager. The new manager will oversee all servers and work closely with the head chef in menu selection. LaToya has worked as a server in your restaurant for the last year. Customers describe her as friendly and attentive and a handful of them come regularly to request being seated in her section. LaToya has a particular style: she has sharp facial features and short hair and often wears ties and neatly pressed shirts that complement her muscular build. LaToya describes that it’s important for her to “put her best face forward” when working. Different from other female servers, LaToya doesn’t wear make-up. Although she sometimes has tense interactions with the kitchen staff, overall LaToya is liked by most employees at the restaurant. You have a cordial relationship with LaToya and have gotten to know her well: outside of work, she likes to take pictures and travel with her girlfriend, Maya. Lately, LaToya has taken a number of sick days and you suspect that she and Maya might be having some relationship problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J

Polymorphous Prejudice Scale (Massey, 2009)

Response Items:
1 – Strongly disagree
2 – Disagree
3 – Neither agree nor disagree
4 – Agree
5 – Strongly Agree

Items:
Traditional Heterosexism
1. Female homosexuality is a sin.
2. Homosexuality is just as moral a way of life as heterosexuality. (R)
3. If two people really love each other, then it shouldn’t matter whether they are a woman and a man, two women, or two men. (R)
4. Male homosexuality is a perversion.
5. Just as other species, homosexuality is a natural expression in men and women (R)
6. Homosexuality is merely a different kind of lifestyle that should not be condemned. (R)
7. The idea of homosexual marriage seems ridiculous to me.
8. Homosexuality between two men is just plain wrong.
9. The growing number of lesbians indicates a decline in American morals.

Denial of Disadvantage
10. On average, people in our society treat gay people and straight people equally.
11. Most lesbians and gay men are no longer discriminated against.
12. Society has reached a point where gay people and straight people have equal opportunities for advancement.
13. Discrimination against gay men and lesbians is no longer a problem in the United States.
14. It is easy to understand why gay men and lesbian rights groups are still concerned about societal limitations of homosexuals’ opportunities. (R)

Aversion of gay men
15. It would be upsetting to find that I was alone with a gay man.
16. I’m uncomfortable when gay men act feminine.
17. I think male homosexuals are disgusting.
18. I try to avoid contact with gay men.

Aversion of lesbians
20. Lesbians aren’t real women.
21. I try to avoid contact with lesbians.
22. I think female homosexuals are disgusting.
23. Lesbians can’t act feminine.
24. It would be upsetting to me to find that I was alone with a lesbian.
Resist Heterosexuality
25. I feel restricted by the sexual rules and norms of society. (R)
26. I feel restricted by the expectations people have of me because of my gender. (R)
27. I worry about the privileges I get from society because of my sexual orientation. (R)
Appendix K

Genderism and Transphobia Scale (Hill & Willoughby, 2005)

Response Items:
1 – Strongly disagree
2 – Disagree
3 – Neither agree nor disagree
4 – Agree
5 – Strongly Agree

Items:
1. I have beat up men who act like sissies.
2. I have behaved violently toward a woman because she was too masculine.
3. I have teased a man because of his feminine appearance or behavior.
4. Children should be encouraged to explore their masculinity and femininity (R)
5. Men who act like women should be ashamed of themselves.
6. Men who shave their legs are weird.
7. I cannot understand why a woman would act masculine.
8. Children should play with toys appropriate for their own sex.
9. Feminine boys should be cured of their problem.
10. I have behaved violently toward a man because he was too feminine.
11. Passive men are weak.
12. Masculine women make me uncomfortable.
13. Feminine men make me unconformable.
Appendix L

Social Desirability Scale (Stöber, 2001)

Response items:
1 – True
2 – False

Items:
1. Sometimes I litter.
2. I always admit my mistakes and face the potential negative consequences.
3. In traffic I am always polite and considerate of others.
4. I have tried illegal drugs (for example, marijuana, cocaine, etc.).
5. I always accept others’ opinions, even when they don’t agree with my own.
6. I take out my bad moods on others now and then.
7. There has been an occasion when I took advantage of someone else.
8. In conversations I always listen attentively and let others finish their sentences.
9. I never hesitate to help someone in the case of emergency.
10. When I have made a promise, I keep it – no ifs ands or buts.
11. I occasionally speak badly of others behind their back (R)
12. I would never live off other people.
13. I always stay friendly and courteous with other people, even when I am stressed out.
14. During arguments I always stay objective and matter-of-fact.
15. There has been at least one occasion when I failed to return an item that I borrowed.
16. I always eat a healthy diet. (R)
17. Sometimes I help because I expect something in return (R)
Table 1. Participant demographics for Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Overall (N=148)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>$M = 30.5$ ($SD = 10.5$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>$Md = $30,000-$39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>$Md = 4$ yr college degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>80 (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>20 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>9 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>12 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Race</td>
<td>27 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cismale</td>
<td>29 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisfemale</td>
<td>62 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transman</td>
<td>11 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transwoman</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer</td>
<td>19 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/female mix</td>
<td>9 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agender/nonbinary</td>
<td>13 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>24 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>25 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>24 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>71 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Urban</td>
<td>100 (68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>35 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>13 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Summary of multiple linear regression analysis for predicting exposure to sexual orientation microaggressions (N = 139)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE\ B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for $B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGNC</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.489**</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.450*</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Identity</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>-.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race*PGNC</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.502*</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Identity*PGNC</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>-.578</td>
<td>-.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.547*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * = $p<.05$, ** = $p<.001$.

Abbreviations: PGNC = perceived gender nonconformity; Race = racial identity (0 = White; 1 = People of Color); Gender Identity (0 = cisgender; 1 = transgender)
Table 3. Participant demographics for Study 2, Experiment 1, differentiated by eligibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Eligible (N = 327)</th>
<th>Non-Eligible (N = 188)</th>
<th>Total (N = 515)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= High School Diploma</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or 4-yr College Degree</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Urban</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend, relative or close acquaintance who is LGBQ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Mean scores for a priori antigay prejudice, gender norm beliefs and social desirability, differentiated by eligibility for Experiment 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Eligible (N=327)</th>
<th>Non-eligible (N=188)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A priori antigay prejudice</td>
<td>2.2 (.77)</td>
<td>2.1 (.82)</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender norm beliefs</td>
<td>1.8 (.69)</td>
<td>1.8 (.77)</td>
<td>-9.08</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social desirability</td>
<td>11.3 (1.8)</td>
<td>11.5 (1.9)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *= p<.05, **=p<.001. Standard deviations appear in parentheses next to means. Higher scores on gender norm beliefs indicate greater negative attitudes toward gender nonconformity.
Table 5. Participant demographics for Study 2, Experiment 2, differentiated by eligibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Eligible (N = 334)</th>
<th>Non-Eligible (N = 177)</th>
<th>Total (N = 511)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= High School Diploma</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or 4-yr College Degree</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Urban</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend, relative or close acquaintance who is LGBQ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Mean scores for a priori antigay prejudice, gender norm beliefs and social desirability, differentiated by eligibility for Experiment 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eligible (N=327)</th>
<th>Non-eligible (N=188)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A priori antigay prejudice</td>
<td>2.2 (.81)</td>
<td>2.2 (.84)</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender norm beliefs</td>
<td>2 (.52)</td>
<td>2 (.53)</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social desirability</td>
<td>11.2 (1.4)</td>
<td>11.3 (1.45)</td>
<td>-3.07</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *= p<.05, **=p<.01. Standard deviations appear in parentheses next to means. Higher scores on gender norm beliefs indicate greater negative attitudes toward gender nonconformity.
Table 7. Correlations between participant demographics, prejudice covariates and target evaluation questions for Experiment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Educ</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>GenBelief</th>
<th>AntiPrej</th>
<th>LGBQ</th>
<th>Likeability</th>
<th>Trustworthy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ</td>
<td>.349**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.127*</td>
<td>-.141*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenBelief</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.141*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AntiPrej</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.213*</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBQ</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.363**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.112*</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.112*</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.159*</td>
<td>-.141*</td>
<td>.156*</td>
<td>.318**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.113*</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.193**</td>
<td>.480**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *= p<.05, **=p<.01.

Abbreviations: Educ = education level; SD = average social desirability score; GenBelief = average scores for negative beliefs about gender nonconformity; AntiPrej = a priori antigay prejudice; LGBQ = friend, family, acquaintance who is LGBQ (no = 0, yes = 1); Likeability = target likeability; Trustworthy = target trustworthiness; Reliability = target reliability.
Table 8. MANCOVA results for Experiment 1: Target gender, target gender expression and target sexual orientation, controlling for participant age, a priori antigay prejudice and gender norm beliefs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Effect/Interaction of Target Scenario</th>
<th>Wilk’s $\lambda$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>(3, 288)</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Expression</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>(3, 288)</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>(3, 288)</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Gender Expression</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>(3, 288)</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>(3, 288)</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Expression*Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>(3, 288)</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender<em>Gender Expression</em>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>(3, 288)</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. Correlations between participant demographics, prejudice covariates and target evaluation questions for Experiment 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Educ</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>GenBelief</th>
<th>AntiPrej</th>
<th>LGBQ</th>
<th>Likeability</th>
<th>Trustworthy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ</td>
<td>.283**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.114*</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenBelief</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.116*</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AntiPrej</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.175*</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.718**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBQ</td>
<td>.153**</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.191**</td>
<td>-.244**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.118*</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.195**</td>
<td>-.196**</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.397**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.128*</td>
<td>-.181**</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.198**</td>
<td>.418**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *= p<.05, **=p<.01.

Abbreviations: Educ = education level; SD = average social desirability score; GenBelief = average scores for negative beliefs about gender nonconformity; AntiPrej = a priori antigay prejudice; LGBQ = friend, family, acquaintance who is LGBQ (no = 0, yes = 1); Likeability = target likeability; Trustworthy = target trustworthiness; Reliability = target reliability.
Table 10. MANCOVA results for Experiment 2: Target gender, target gender expression and target sexual orientation, controlling for participant age, a priori antigay prejudice and gender norm beliefs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Effect/Interaction of Target Scenario</th>
<th>Wilk’s λ</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>(3, 299)</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Expression</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>(3, 299)</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>(3, 299)</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Gender Expression</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>(3, 299)</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>(3, 299)</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Expression*Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>(3, 299)</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender<em>Gender Expression</em>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>(3, 299)</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Frequency and percentage of participants who were categorized as “gender conforming” or “gender nonconforming” using self-reports on the Wylie et al. (2010) items and based upon narrative descriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Overall N=134</th>
<th>Concordant Across Measures N=101 (75%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNC</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Concordant Across Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Race</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18 (72%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Concordant Across Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cismale</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17 (68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisfemale</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33 (87%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. Frequency and percentage of participants who were consistently coded across as “gender conforming” or “gender nonconforming,” differentiated by appearance and mannerisms scales on Wylie et al. (2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Overall (N=134)</th>
<th>Appearance and Mannerisms Concordant across measures (N=100)</th>
<th>Appearance Only Concordant across measures (N=105)</th>
<th>Mannerisms Only Concordant across measures (N=91)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appearance Only Concordant across measures (N=105)</td>
<td>Mannerisms Only Concordant across measures (N=91)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNC</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60 (83%)</td>
<td>59 (82%)</td>
<td>53 (74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>41 (66%)</td>
<td>46 (74%)</td>
<td>38 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cismale</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17 (68%)</td>
<td>18 (72%)</td>
<td>17 (68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisfemale</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35 (64%)</td>
<td>41 (75%)</td>
<td>34 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binary Trans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16 (100%)</td>
<td>16 (100%)</td>
<td>13 (81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33 (87%)</td>
<td>30 (79%)</td>
<td>27 (71%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13. Frequency and percentage of participants who were consistently coded differentiated by race, gender identity and Wylie et al. (2010) appearance and mannerisms scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
<th>Appearance &amp; Mannerisms</th>
<th>Appearance only</th>
<th>Mannerisms only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consistently Categorized</td>
<td>Consistently Categorized</td>
<td>Consistently Categorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Cismale</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14 (78%)</td>
<td>14 (78%)</td>
<td>14 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cisfemale</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17 (74%)</td>
<td>17 (74%)</td>
<td>16 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Binary Trans</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14 (100%)</td>
<td>14 (100%)</td>
<td>11 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>Cismale</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
<td>4 (57%)</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cisfemale</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18 (56%)</td>
<td>24 (75%)</td>
<td>18 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Binary Trans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genderqueer</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18 (86%)</td>
<td>16 (76%)</td>
<td>15 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>Genderqueer</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18 (86%)</td>
<td>16 (76%)</td>
<td>15 (71%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Interaction between perceived gender nonconformity and racial identity in predicting exposure to sexual orientation microaggressions.
Figure 2. Frequency of cisgender participants whose gender expression categorizations aligned vs. did not align between the Wylie et al. (2010) scales and their narrative descriptions, differentiated by race and gender identity.
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