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ABSTRACT

Two experiments show that sexual orientation is considered when deciding to help a romantic couple in need. In Study 1, participants read four separate helping scenarios. Participants were significantly less likely to help the homosexual couple than the heterosexual couple, especially when given an excuse not to help. In Study 2, confederate romantic dyads stood on a Chicago suburb corner eliciting help in the form of completing a survey. Women followed the expected trend of being most helpful toward the heterosexual couple, least helpful toward the gay male couple, with help for the lesbian couple falling in between. Unexpectedly, men were more helpful towards homosexual couples than heterosexual couples. The findings from Studies 1 and 2 and suggestions for future research are discussed.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

For years, society has been kind to those who conform, and unkind to those who are different or “unknown”. With regards to sexual orientation, heterosexuality is the norm and anyone who deviates from that norm has been the forerunner in receiving these acts of unkindness. Prejudice and discrimination, as they pertain to homosexuality, are present in many different forms ranging from negative evaluations from others to acts of blatant and violent discrimination. In general, research on homosexuals has lagged far behind research on heterosexual populations. Further, most previous research has not taken into account the discrimination against homosexual romantic couples but rather has focused on individuals. One way in which discrimination can be displayed against homosexuals is in the (lack of) help given to them compared to heterosexuals. The purpose of the current research is to investigate helping behavior if the sexual orientation of the target is known. More specifically, the goal is to look at helping behavior biases towards homosexual romantic couples.

Intolerance, Prejudice and Discrimination.

For centuries, the United States has seen intolerance, prejudice and discrimination based on sexual orientation. Zhankun (2004) states that records of executions of black and white gay men in the Massachusetts Bay Colony and in the New Netherland Colony can be found as far back as 1646. According to Kelley (2001), the United States is significantly less tolerant of homosexuals than other Western countries, with the average opinion in the U.S. being that homosexuality is “almost always wrong” (p. 17). Other countries, like the Netherlands, Switzerland, and Denmark, are more tolerant in saying that homosexuality is only wrong on occasion or that it is not wrong at all (Kelley, 2001).
A survey conducted in January 2005 polled Americans on their beliefs about sex groups’ equality. Results showed that 29% of Americans would like to see homosexuality become a more widely accepted lifestyle, yet 36% still would like to see homosexuality less widely accepted (“Topics at a glance,” 2007). One exception to these beliefs about discriminating against homosexuals is in the area of job equality. Eighty-eight percent of Americans in a 2003 poll believed that gays and lesbians should be given equal access to employment (The Gallup Organization, 2003). Interestingly, though, opinions varied greatly by occupation with only 56% of people agreeing that equal employment access should be given when it comes to hiring gay elementary school teachers, for example.

Also, it should be noted that although Americans feel that discrimination in the workplace should be abolished, many adults nationwide still feel that the civil rights for homosexuals regarding adoption and marriage should still be restricted. Newsweek polled adults nationwide in December 2008, and 39% of respondents thought adoption rights should not be changed so that homosexuals can legally adopt children (“Same-sex marriage,” 2009). In October 2007, CNN polled Americans nationwide and 56% of the respondents believed that homosexual couples should not be allowed the same civil marriage rights as heterosexual couples (“Law and civil rights,” 2007). In December 2008, CNN polled Americans nationwide again and 55% still believed that homosexual couples should not be recognized by the law, with the same rights as heterosexual married couples (“Same-sex marriage,” 2009).

In showing that the United States is relatively intolerant of homosexuality, it must be stated that the negative attitudes mentioned above often lead to laws that discriminate against same-sex couples. As of June 2007, only “ten states and the District of Columbia provide legal relationship recognition for same-sex partners and their dependents” (Human, 2007, p. 1). These
states include California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oregon, Vermont and Washington. As of November 2008, Arkansas, Florida, Mississippi and Utah prohibit same-sex couples from adopting children (Human, 2008). On the positive side, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Oregon and Vermont allow same-sex couples to jointly petition for adoption statewide (Human, 2008). If Americans discriminate against homosexuals on such a widespread societal level (e.g., hate crimes, marriage laws, adoption laws), it is reasonable to believe that Americans would discriminate against homosexuals on a more individual level.

Helping Behavior and Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation.

There has been a fair amount of research on people’s attitudes towards homosexuals, but less research has been conducted on behavior towards homosexuals. It is reasonable to believe that one behavior that might be affected by people’s prejudice against homosexuals is helping behavior. Most of the research in this area tends to use the wrong-number technique (WNT), which has been an effective way of obtaining information since its conception, and the lost-letter technique (LLT), which, seems to be losing its effectiveness through the years.

The WNT, originated by Gaertner and Bickman (1971) to test attitudes on racism, consists of confederates making phone calls to random numbers and asking strangers to perform the task of calling his/her romantic partner as a favor. With regards to sexual orientation, in this technique, sexual orientation is established by having a male or female confederate ask the stranger to call his/her male or female romantic partner. Biases are then measured by the amount of phone calls received by the number given to the strangers/participants. This technique has shown that, in the United States at least, there is still a bias in how people help homosexuals
versus heterosexuals in that people tend to help heterosexuals more often (Ellis & Fox, 2001; Gabriel & Banse, 2006).

The LLT requires the researchers to randomly select places to drop “lost letters” with postage where people passing by will clearly see the envelope or postcard (Milgram, Mann, & Hartner, 1965). Homosexual discrimination is measured by the rate of returned letters for a clearly homosexual group/individual versus a group/individual that is not clearly homosexual.

When using the LLT to detect sexual orientation biases, the results on whether or not discrimination exists have varied since its origin depending on the location, population and return rate of letters (Bridges, Anzalone, & Ryan, 2002; Bridges & Rodriguez, 2000; Bridges, Williamson, Thompson, & Windsor, 2001; Waugh, Plake, & Rienzi, 2000) and it is possible that this technique is not as effective in today’s society. For example, in a study conducted by Levinson, Pesina, and Rienzi (1993) where 210 “lost letters” were sent out, only 5% of the postcards were returned. Of the mere 10 postcards returned, the researchers found a bias in that more postcards containing information about donations to support elderly artists were returned than the postcards containing information about donations to support gay male/lesbian artists, but the very low sample size makes this data questionable at best. Most of the studies using the lost-letter technique in the past few years have had a much lower return rate than decades ago (Bridges, Anzalone, & Ryan, 2002; Bridges, Williamson, Thompson, & Windsor, 2001; Levinson et al., 1993). With the formation of the Internet and e-mail, postal mail may not be the most effective form of communication in today’s busy world. Postal mail simply may not be as noticed as it was in the 1960s.

With the overuse of the WNT and the now unsuccessful use of the LLT, face-to-face interaction is starting to become an important way for researching discrimination. By conducting
research in face-to-face interactions, it can give researchers a more clear distinction if the biases still reside in individuals when they are put into a public setting. Gray, Russell and Blockley (1991) found through face-to-face interaction, of asking shoppers for change for a pound on a busy main street in Britain, that help was less likely to be given to person who was wearing a pro-gay slogan on his/her t-shirt relative to a person who was not obviously supporting the homosexual lifestyle in an unmarked t-shirt. The researchers also found that when justification was given for helping, the participants were more likely to help the confederates than when the confederates did not offer justification for their need of help. However, Gabriel, Banse and Hug (2007) gave male students the opportunity to sign a petition and donate money to a gay male organization in a public setting or a private setting. Their results showed that “the public social setting elicited significantly more helping behaviour than the private social setting” (p. 377). The seemingly contradictory results from the above two studies involving face-to-face interaction necessitate further investigation with face-to-face helping behavior based on sexual orientation. In looking at some of these previous methods, especially the LLT, it is possible that attitudes towards homosexuals are improving or that these methods cannot detect subtle biases that may be more prevalent today. Therefore, I hope to add to the current literature by using techniques that are better able to detect prejudice and discrimination against homosexuals.
CHAPTER TWO

OVERVIEW OF CURRENT STUDIES

The main question to be answered in these studies is if there is a difference in helping behavior when the sexual orientation of the person in need is known to be homosexual or heterosexual. More specifically, I will be investigating helping behavior towards homosexual and heterosexual couples. Using couples should cause the target individuals’ sexual orientation to be more salient. Moreover, a homosexual couple may also trigger more prejudice (than an individual) as one’s homosexual “lifestyle” is often that which is negatively viewed.

To investigate these helping behaviors, I will use two experimental methods: a questionnaire asking participants to respond to written helping scenarios and a face-to-face field experiment with confederates directly asking for help from participants.

Across both studies, I expect that participants will be more helpful towards the heterosexual couples than the homosexual couples. Also, I expect that there will be gender differences in helping behavior towards heterosexuals and homosexuals. Given that past data shows that men have more negative views of homosexuality than women (Gabriel & Banse, 2006; Kite & Whitley, 1996; LaMar & Kite, 1998), I expect that the women will be more helpful towards the target couples in this study than the men.
CHAPTER 3

STUDY 1

The goal of this study will be to investigate participants’ general responses through a questionnaire of written helping scenarios. The target scenarios depict the reader in a situation where he/she must decide how much or how little help he/she will give to a homosexual or heterosexual romantic couple. I hypothesize that help will be given more to the heterosexual couple, than to the homosexual couple. I also expect helping behaviors to be lower when an excuse is provided not to help, especially for the homosexual couples.

Method

Participants

The participants were recruited from Aurora University’s student body. There were 100 students who volunteered for the study. Fifty-eight (58.0%) of the participants were female, thirty-nine (39.0%) were male and three participants chose not to indicate gender. The majority of the sample was Caucasian (76%), and 24% identified as other ethnic backgrounds (8% African Americans, 9% Hispanic/Latino/a, 1% Asian/Asian American, and 6% other or not specified). The average age of the participants was 21.5 years old ($SD = 4.04$, range = 18 to 43).

Procedure

The participants began the study by reading through and signing an informed consent (see Appendix A). Participants were asked to fill out a packet of questionnaires on helping behavior that was constructed by the researcher. First, the packet consisted of four helping scenarios; each participant saw two control scenarios and two experimental scenarios that varied the target couple’s sexual orientation (see Appendix B). The packets were randomly assigned to participants. Half of the participants received the packet that portrayed a heterosexual couple first
and a homosexual couple second. The order was reversed for the other half of participants. Following each scenario, the participant rated his/her agreement with five possible helping reactions to the scenario. After the scenarios, the participants received the second half of the packet that had general helping behavior questions (see Appendix C) and demographics (see Appendix D). When finished, the participants handed in the second half of the questionnaires to the researcher, signed another informed consent form as their own copy, and received a debriefing (see Appendix E) that further explained the purpose of the study.

Materials

Helping behavior scenarios. Following each helping scenario, the participant rated his/her agreement with five statements of helping reactions to the scenario. The five statements, used to assess the extent to which the participant would help the subjects in the scenario, were measured on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). The first statement involved the participant giving the most help to the subjects in the scenario with the least amount of bias (i.e., “I would happily give Jason and Rick the dollar they need.”) and the last statement had the participant give least amount of helping (i.e., “I would not even think about helping Amanda and Kristin; they are total strangers and it is not my problem.”); the three statements in between progressively showed less willingness to help the subjects (see Appendix B).

General helping behavior. To assess general attitudes about helping, the researcher designed a measure consisting of 44 items measured on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). The 44 items generally assessed the participant’s attitude about helping certain groups of people and general attitudes toward helping. The 12 target items were geared to find helping biases based on sexual orientation. Of the remaining 32 statements, 20
were based on helping behaviors in general (i.e., “I like to help people in need, even if I think I am not the best person for the job.”), and 12 statements were filler helping items about gender-based and race-based helping to disguise the focus of the questionnaire (the sexual orientation items). These 12 items were not included in the analysis.

Of the 12 sexual orientation items, 11 specific sexual orientation helping behavior statements were combined to make a Sexual Orientation Helping Behavior Measure (SOHBM). One item was removed from the analyses because it had a negative item to total correlation. The 11-item SOHBM was then tested for its reliability, and internal consistency was high (Cronbach’s Alpha = .81).

Of the 20 general helping items, 19 suitable general helping items (item 2 was removed from the analyses because it had a negative item to total correlation) were combined to make a General Helping Behavior Measure (GHBM). The GHBM was then tested for its reliability, and internal consistency was high (Cronbach’s Alpha = .75).

**Design**

This study was a 2 (Gender: Male, Female) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple in Scenario: Heterosexual, Homosexual) within and between-subjects design. The independent variable of this study was the sexual orientation of the couple in the target scenarios. The dependent variable in the study was the participants’ beliefs on helping behavior towards homosexual and heterosexual couples in the scenarios. Additionally, participants’ attitudes towards helping homosexual individuals were assessed by calculating the participants’ SOHBM scores.
Results

Sexual Orientation Helping Behavior Measure

All participants read 11 sexual orientation statements as part of the Sexual Orientation Helping Behavior Measure (SOHBM).

An independent-samples t test comparing the mean scores of helpfulness based on sexual orientation for men and women found a significant difference between the two groups ($t(95) = -6.602, p < .001$). The men were less helpful ($M = 4.457, SD = 1.077$) than the women ($M = 5.699, SD = .777$).

A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated for the relationship between age and helpfulness based on sexual orientation. A positive correlation was found ($r(91) = .184, p < .10$), indicating a marginally significant linear relationship between the two variables. As age increases, homosexual helping increases.

Grocery Store Helping Scenario

All participants read a scenario in which they are in line at a grocery store and they are being delayed by a couple in front of them because the couple is a dollar short on their bill. A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) was conducted predicting each of the five items that participants answered following each target scenario. The ANOVAs are presented below.

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted predicting the answers to the first statement (“I would happily give Jason and Rachel/Rick the dollar they need”). The main effect for gender was not significant ($F(1,90) = .750, p > .10$). A marginally significant main effect for sexual orientation was found ($F(1,90) = 3.178, p < .10$). Participants who saw a heterosexual couple were more helpful ($M = 5.980, SD =
than the participants who saw a homosexual couple ($M = 5.430, SD = 1.928$). The interaction was not significant ($F(1,90) = .94, p > .10$).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted predicting the answers to the second statement (“I would give Jason and Rick/Rachel the dollar, but not as a charitable offering; I just don’t want to wait while they find the money themselves.”). A significant main effect for gender was found ($F(1,90) = 6.138, p < .05$). Male participants were more helpful ($M = 3.680, SD = 2.135$) than female participants ($M = 2.670, SD = 1.704$) overall towards the homosexual and heterosexual couples. The main effect for sexual orientation was not significant ($F(1,90) = .000, p > .05$). The interaction was also not significant ($F(1,90) = .258, p > .10$).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the third statement, which stated that the participant would contemplate giving the couple the dollar, but would decide not to. No significant main effect for gender was found ($F(1,90) = .561, p > .10$). The main effect for sexual orientation was not significant ($F(1,90) = 1.547, p > .10$). The interaction was not significant ($F(1,90) = .697, p > .10$).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the fourth statement, which stated that the participant would not give the couple the dollar because he/she does not approve of the couples’ lifestyle (i.e., a non-married couple or a homosexual couple living together). A significant main effect for gender was found ($F(1,90) = 19.714, p < .001$). Male participants were less helpful ($M = 2.080, SD = 1.876$) than female participants ($M = 1.120, SD = .466$) overall towards the homosexual and heterosexual couples. A significant main effect for sexual orientation was found ($F(1,90) = 10.695, p < .01$). Participants who read about a heterosexual couple were more helpful ($M = 1.250, SD = .786$)
than the participants who read about a homosexual couple ($M = 1.760$, $SD = 1.662$). The interaction was significant ($F(1,90) = 12.046$, $p = .001$). In other words, helpfulness towards the couples in the scenario was influenced by the sexual orientation of the couple and by the gender of the participant. When reading about a heterosexual couple, there was no gender difference in helpfulness. However, when reading about a homosexual couple, male participants were significantly less helpful than female participants (see Figure 1).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the answers to the fifth statement, which stated that the participant would not give the couple the dollar because he/she does not know the couple and it is not his/her problem. The main effect for gender was marginally significant ($F(1,90) = 3.689$, $p < .10$). Male participants were less helpful ($M = 2.590$, $SD = 2.074$) than female participants ($M = 1.960$, $SD = 1.647$) overall towards the homosexual and heterosexual couples. A significant main effect for sexual orientation was found ($F(1,90) = 3.499$, $p < .10$). Participants who saw a heterosexual couple were more helpful ($M = 2.000$, $SD = 1.544$) than the participants who saw a homosexual couple ($M = 1.960$, $SD = 1.647$). The interaction was significant ($F(1,90) = 4.187$, $p < .05$). Male participants did not differ from female participants in helpfulness toward the heterosexual couple, but the female participants were significantly more helpful toward the homosexual couple than the male participants (see Figure 2).

Additionally, for a more robust measure of general helping proclivity, a composite measure of the five items answered following the Grocery Store scenario was formed. A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted predicting this composite measure. The main effect for gender was not significant ($F(1,90) = 2.145$, $p > .10$). Although the results were not significant, male participants scored lower and
were less helpful ($M = 5.638, SD = 1.455$) than the female participants ($M = 6.145, SD = 1.094$). A significant main effect for sexual orientation was found ($F(1,90) = 6.018, p < .05$). Participants who read about a heterosexual couple were more helpful ($M = 6.172, SD = 1.048$) than the participants who read about a homosexual couple ($M = 5.707, SD = 1.433$). The interaction was significant ($F(1,90) = 6.018, p < .05$). Male and female participants showed no difference in helping a heterosexual couple, but female participants were more helpful to a homosexual couple than the male participants (see Figure 3).

**Grocery Store Helping Scenario with Excuse to Not Help**

All participants again read the scenario in which they are in line at a grocery store and they are being delayed by a couple in front of them because the couple is a dollar short on their bill; but in the second scenario they are asked to imagine that they are annoyed because they are in the 10 item express lane and the couple in front of them clearly has more than 10 items. As above, 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) ANOVAs were conducted to predict each of the five attitude items following the scenario. The results are presented below.

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the first statement (“I would happily give Jason and Rachel/Rick the dollar they need”). A marginally significant main effect for gender was found ($F(1,91) = 3.333, p < .10$). Male participants were less helpful ($M = 3.920, SD = 2.409$) than female participants ($M = 4.560, SD = 1.793$) overall toward the heterosexual and homosexual couples. A significant main effect for sexual orientation was found ($F(1,91) = 8.841, p < .01$). Participants who read about a heterosexual couple were more helpful ($M = 4.810, SD = 1.841$) than the participants who read about a homosexual couple ($M = 3.790, SD = 2.186$). The interaction was marginally significant ($F(1,91) = 3.287, p < .10$). Male and female participants were equally helpful toward the
heterosexual couple, but female participants were more helpful than male participants toward the homosexual couple (see Figure 4).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the second statement, which states that the participant would give Jason and Rachel/Rick the dollar. The main effect for gender was not significant ($F(1,91) = 1.035, p > .10$). A significant main effect for sexual orientation was found ($F(1,91) = 2.796, p < .10$). Participants who read about a heterosexual couple were more helpful ($M = 4.020, SD = 1.931$) than the participants who read about a homosexual couple ($M = 3.450, SD = 1.856$). The interaction was not significant ($F(1,91) = .859, p > .10$).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the third statement, which stated that the participant would contemplate giving the couple the dollar, but would decide not to. No significant main effect for gender was found ($F(1,91) = .131, p > .10$). The main effect for sexual orientation was not significant ($F(1,91) = .000, p > .10$). The interaction was not significant ($F(1,91) = 1.853, p > .10$).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted predicting the fourth statement, which stated that the participant would not give the couple the dollar because he/she does not approve of the couples’ lifestyle (i.e., a non-married couple or a homosexual couple living together). A significant main effect for gender was found ($F(1,91) = 9.770, p < .01$). Male participants were less helpful ($M = 2.16, SD = 1.952$) than female participants ($M = 1.35, SD = .954$) overall towards the homosexual and heterosexual couples. A significant main effect for sexual orientation was found ($F(1,91) = 7.151, p < .01$). Participants who saw a heterosexual couple were more helpful ($M = 1.42, SD = .964$) than the participants who saw a homosexual couple ($M = 1.94, SD = 1.846$). The interaction was
significant \(F(1,91) = 9.311, p < .005\). Men were not less helpful than women toward the heterosexual couple, but the men were significantly less helpful than the women toward the homosexual couple (see Figure 5).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the fifth statement, which stated that the participant would not give the couple the dollar because he/she does not know the couple in front of him/her in the aisle. A significant main effect for gender was found \(F(1,91) = 7.459, p < .01\). Male participants were less helpful \((M = 3.260, SD = 2.479)\) than female participants \((M = 2.210, SD = 1.878)\) overall towards the homosexual and heterosexual couples. A significant main effect for sexual orientation was found \(F(1,91) = 7.642, p < .01\). Participants who read about a heterosexual couple were more helpful \((M = 2.190, SD = 1.864)\) than the participants who read about a homosexual couple \((M = 3.090, SD = 2.412)\). The interaction was significant \(F(1,91) = 5.403, p < .05\). Men did not differ from women in helpfulness toward the heterosexual couple, but were significantly less helpful toward the homosexual couple (see Figure 6).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the composite measure of the attitude items above. The main effect for gender was significant \(F(1,90) = 3.672, p = .059\). Male participants were significantly less helpful \((M = 4.980, SD = 1.742)\) than the female participants \((M = 5.632, SD = 1.061)\). A significant main effect for sexual orientation was found \(F(1,90) = 8.923, p < .005\). Participants who read about a heterosexual couple were more helpful \((M = 5.662, SD = 1.219)\) than the participants who read about a homosexual couple \((M = 5.075, SD = 1.525)\). The interaction was significant \(F(1,90) = 8.151, p = .005\). Men were no more helpful than women toward the heterosexual couple, but
women were significantly more helpful than the men toward the homosexual couple (see Figure 7).

*Chicago Sidewalk Helping Scenario*

All participants read the scenario in which they are walking down Michigan Avenue in downtown Chicago on their way to a lunch meeting with a friend, when a couple’s bags rip and their clothes fall all over the sidewalk. A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) ANOVA was conducted predicting each of the five items that participants answered following each target scenario. The ANOVAs are presented below.

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the first statement that stated that the participant would help the couple in front of him/her pick up their fallen clothes. The main effect for gender was significant ($F(1,90) = 4.292, p < .05$). The female participants were overall more helpful ($M = 6.300, SD = 1.113$) than the male participants ($M = 5.770, SD = 1.519$), regardless of the sexual orientation of the couple in need. A significant main effect for sexual orientation was found ($F(1,90) = 3.266, p < .10$). Participants who read about a heterosexual couple were more helpful ($M = 6.280, SD = 1.082$) than the participants who read about a homosexual couple ($M = 5.650, SD = 1.637$). Although both the main effects were significant, the interaction was not ($F(1,90) = .164, p > .10$).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the second statement (“I would stop to help Keith and Sally/Steve pick up their belongings. I do not want to, but walking behind them, I would feel obligated.”). The main effect for gender was not significant ($F(1,90) = .320, p > .10$). The main effect for sexual
orientation was not significant ($F(1, 90) = .276, p > .10$). The interaction was also not significant ($F(1, 90) = .505, p > .10$).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the third statement (“I would contemplate stopping to help Keith and Sally/Steve, but I would keep walking; hopefully someone else on this busy sidewalk will stop.”). The main effect for gender was not significant ($F(1, 90) = .473, p > .10$). A significant main effect for sexual orientation was found ($F(1, 90) = 4.666, p < .05$). Participants who read about a heterosexual couple were more helpful ($M = 1.760, SD = .899$) than the participants who read about a homosexual couple ($M = 2.230, SD = 1.292$). The interaction was not significant ($F(1, 90) = 1.350, p > .10$).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the fourth statement that stated that the participant would not help the couple in front of him/her pick up their fallen clothes because he/she does not approve of their lifestyle (i.e., a homosexual/non-married couple living together). The main effect for gender was significant ($F(1, 90) = 3.413, p < .10$). The male participants were overall less helpful ($M = 1.860, SD = 1.357$) than the female participants ($M = 1.420, SD = .823$), regardless of the sexual orientation of the couple in need. The main effect for sexual orientation was not significant ($F(1, 90) = .615, p > .10$). The interaction was not significant ($F(1, 90) = .347, p > .10$).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the fifth statement that stated that the participant would not help the couple in front of him/her pick up their fallen clothes because they are complete strangers. The main effect for gender was significant ($F(1, 90) = 8.326, p = .005$). The male participants were overall less helpful ($M = 2.030, SD = 1.740$) than the female participants ($M = 1.260, SD = .613$), regardless
of the sexual orientation of the couple in need. A significant main effect for sexual orientation was not found \( (F(1,90) = .959, p > .10) \). The interaction was significant \( (F(1,90) = 3.433, p < .10) \). The men were significantly less helpful toward the homosexual couple than toward the heterosexual couple and the women were equally helpful toward the heterosexual couple and the homosexual couple (see Figure 8).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the composite measure of the helping items following the scenario. The main effect for gender was marginally significant \( (F(1,90) = 3.643, p = .059) \). Male participants were less helpful \( (M = 5.811, SD = 1.353) \) than the female participants \( (M = 6.421, SD = .657) \). A main effect for sexual orientation approached significance \( (F(1,90) = 1.969, p = .165) \). Participants who read about a heterosexual couple were more helpful \( (M = 6.310, SD = 1.011) \) than the participants who read about a homosexual couple \( (M = 6.047, SD = 1.049) \). The interaction was not significant \( (F(1,90) = .674, p > .10) \).

*Chicago Sidewalk Helping Scenario With an Excuse to Not Help*

All participants read the scenario in which they were walking down Michigan Avenue in downtown Chicago on their way to a lunch meeting with a friend, when a couple’s bags rip and their clothes fall all over the sidewalk. In addition to reading this scenario, the participants were asked to imagine that they were running late to lunch. A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) was conducted predicting each of the five items that participants answered following each target scenario. The ANOVAs are presented below.

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the first statement, which indicated that the participant would gladly help the couple. The main effect for gender was significant \( (F(1,90) = 2.795, p < .10) \). The male
participants were overall less helpful ($M = 4.300, SD = 2.012$) than the female participants ($M = 5.000, SD = 1.783$), regardless of the sexual orientation of the couple in need. The main effect for sexual orientation was not significant ($F(1,90) = .633, p > .10$). The interaction was also not significant ($F(1,90) = .009, p > .10$).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the second statement (“I would stop to help Keith and Sally/Steve pick up their belongings. I do not want to, but walking behind them, I would feel obligated.”). The main effect for gender was not significant ($F(1,90) = 2.030, p > .10$). The main effect for sexual orientation was not significant ($F(1,90) = .295, p > .10$). The interaction was also not significant ($F(1,90) = .015, p > .10$).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the third statement (“I would contemplate stopping to help Keith and Sally/Steve, but I would keep walking; hopefully someone else on this busy sidewalk will stop.”). The main effect for gender was not significant ($F(1,90) = .173, p > .10$). The main effect for sexual orientation was not significant ($F(1,90) = .683, p > .10$). The interaction was also not significant ($F(1,90) = .667, p > .10$).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted fourth statement that stated that the participant would not help the couple in front of him/her pick up their fallen clothes because he/she does not approve of their lifestyle (i.e. a homosexual/non-married couple living together). The main effect for gender was significant ($F(1,90) = 4.284, p < .05$). The male participants were overall less helpful ($M = 1.840, SD = 1.344$) than the female participants ($M = 1.390, SD = .750$), regardless of the sexual orientation
of the couple in need. The main effect for sexual orientation was not significant \( (F(1,90) = .003, p > .05) \). The interaction was also not significant \( (F(1,90) = .058, p > .05) \).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the fifth statement (“I would not even think about helping Keith and Sally/Steve; they are complete strangers and it is not my problem.”). The main effect for gender was significant \( (F(1,90) = 4.247, p < .05) \). The male participants were overall less helpful \( (M = 2.220, SD = 2.002) \) than the female participants \( (M = 1.510, SD = 1.071) \), regardless of the sexual orientation of the couple in need. The main effect for sexual orientation was not significant \( (F(1,90) = 1.303, p > .05) \). The interaction was also not significant \( (F(1,90) = 1.174, p > .05) \).

A 2 (Gender) X 2 (Sexual Orientation of Couple) between-subjects factorial ANOVA was conducted for the composite measure of helping items. The main effect for gender approached significance \( (F(1,90) = 2.370, p = .127) \). Male participants were less helpful \( (M = 5.165, SD = 1.465) \) than the female participants \( (M = 5.768, SD = 1.005) \). A main effect for sexual orientation was not significant \( (F(1,90) = .489, p > .10) \). The interaction was not significant \( (F(1,90) = .127, p > .10) \).

**Controlling for General Helping and Age**

All of the composite measures from the above scenarios were submitted to the same 2 X 2 ANOVAs controlling for general helping as assessed in the 19-item measure at the end of the questionnaire packet. The researcher specifically controlled for general helping attitudes of the participants to make sure that the results were valid for the specific purposes of this study (helpfulness related to sexual orientation) and not just because people were generally helpful towards everyone in every situation. All of the above results that were significant remained significant controlling for general helping.
Because age was correlated with the SOHBM, the researcher also specifically controlled for the age of the participants to make sure that age was not confounded with gender in this study. All of the above results that were significant remained significant controlling for age.

*Within-Subject Comparisons of Excuse vs. No Excuse Scenarios*

*Grocery Store Helping Scenario.* To test whether participants were less helpful when given an excuse for not helping, a paired-samples $t$ test was conducted to compare the mean score of each of the helping statements following the Grocery Store Helping Scenario (GSH) to each of the helping statements following the Grocery Store Helping Scenario with Excuse to Not Help (EGSH). The means comparing responses to heterosexual couples in the excuse and no-excuse conditions are presented in Table 1. The means comparing responses to homosexual couples in the excuse and no-excuse conditions are presented in Table 2.

For the first helping statement, a significant decrease from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the heterosexual couple condition ($t(49) = 6.733, p < .01$). Participants were significantly less helpful when given an excuse to not help the heterosexual couple. A significant decrease from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the homosexual couple condition ($t(47) = 6.723, p < .001$). Participants were significantly less helpful when given an excuse to not help the homosexual couple.

A paired-samples $t$ test was conducted to compare the mean score of the second statement in the GSH and the second statement in the EGSH. A significant decrease from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the heterosexual couple condition ($t(49) = -3.160, p < .01$). Participants were significantly less helpful when given an excuse to not help the heterosexual couple. No significant difference from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the homosexual couple condition ($t(47) = -1.331, p > .10$).
A paired-samples \( t \) test was conducted to compare the mean score of the third statement in the GSH and the third statement in the EGSH. A significant decrease from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the heterosexual couple condition \((t(49) = -1.979, p = .053)\). Participants were significantly less helpful when given an excuse to not help the heterosexual couple. No significant decrease from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the homosexual couple condition \((t(46) = .088, p > .10)\).

A paired-samples \( t \) test was conducted to compare the mean score of the fourth statement in the GSH and the fourth statement in the EGSH. No significant decrease from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the heterosexual couple condition \((t(49) = -1.532, p > .10)\). A marginally significant decrease from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the homosexual couple condition \((t(47) = -1.704, p < .10)\). Participants were less helpful when given an excuse to not help the homosexual couple.

A paired-samples \( t \) test was conducted to compare the mean score of the fifth statement in the GSH and the fifth statement in the EGSH. No significant decrease from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse to not help was found for the heterosexual couple condition \((t(48) = -1.198, p > .10)\). A significant decrease from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the homosexual couple condition \((t(46) = -2.700, p = .01)\). Participants were significantly less helpful when given an excuse to not help the homosexual couple.

A paired-samples \( t \) test was conducted to compare the mean of the composite measure of the five statements in the Grocery Store Helping Scenario (GHELP) and the composite measure of the five statements in the Grocery Store Helping Scenario with Excuse to Not Help (GEHELP). A significant difference from GHELP to GEHELP was found for the heterosexual couple condition \((t(49) = 4.628, p < .001)\). Participants were significantly less helpful when
given an excuse to not help the heterosexual couple. A marginally significant decrease from GHELP to GEHELP was found for the homosexual couple condition ($t(46) = -1.00, p > .10$). Participants were less helpful when given an excuse to not help the homosexual couple.

The above results generally indicate that giving participants an excuse to not help lowered helping. However, are participants even less helpful to homosexual couples than they are to heterosexual couples when they have an excuse to not help? To test whether participants were significantly less likely to help homosexual couples when given an excuse than heterosexual couples when given an excuse, the researcher conducted a 2 (scenario with excuse or not) $\times$ 2 (sexual orientation of target couple) $\times$ 2 (gender of participant) Mixed-Model ANOVA predicting the composite measures GHELP and GEHELP. The results confirmed that there was a main effect for gender ($F(1,92) = 7.732, p < .01$), with female participants being more helpful than male participants overall. The results also confirmed the expected main effect for sexual orientation ($F(1,92) = 9.011, p < .01$), with heterosexual couples receiving more help than homosexual couples. There was also a main effect for excuse condition ($F(1,92) = 47.800, p < .001$), with participants providing less help when provided with an excuse to not help. Of greatest interest was the interaction between sexual orientation condition and excuse condition. The interaction was not significant, but was in the expected direction, ($F(1,92) = 1.740, p = .19$). Finally, the three-way interaction with gender was not significant ($F(1,92) = 2.470, p = .12$), but also was in the expected direction with the sexual orientation $\times$ excuse interaction being stronger for men than it was for women.

*Chicago Sidewalk Helping Scenario.* To test whether participants were less helpful when given an excuse for not helping, a paired-samples $t$ test was conducted to compare the mean score of each of the statements in the Chicago Sidewalk Helping Scenario (CSH) to each of the
statements in the Chicago Sidewalk Helping Scenario with Excuse to Not Help (ECSH). The means comparing responses to heterosexual couples in the excuse and no-excuse conditions are presented in Table 3. The means comparing responses to homosexual couples in the excuse and no-excuse conditions are presented in Table 4.

For the first condition, a significant decrease from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the heterosexual couple condition \(t(47) = 6.427, p < .001\). Participants were significantly less helpful when given an excuse to not help the heterosexual couple. A significant decrease from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the homosexual couple condition \(t(49) = 6.502, p < .001\). Participants were significantly less helpful when given an excuse to not help the homosexual couple.

A paired-samples \(t\) test was conducted to compare the mean score of the second statement in the CSH and the second statement in the ECSH. No significant decrease from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the heterosexual couple condition \(t(47) = 1.249, p > .10\). No significant decrease from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the homosexual couple condition \(t(49) = .670, p > .10\).

A paired-samples \(t\) test was conducted to compare the mean score of the third statement in the CSH and the third statement in the ECSH. A significant decrease from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the heterosexual couple condition \(t(47) = -4.522, p < .001\). Participants were significantly less helpful when given an excuse to not help the heterosexual couple. A significant decrease from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the homosexual couple condition \(t(49) = -4.399, p < .001\). Participants were significantly less helpful when given an excuse to not help the homosexual couple.
A paired-samples $t$ test was conducted to compare the mean score of the fourth statement in the CSH and the fourth statement in the ECSH. No significant decrease from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the heterosexual couple condition ($t(47) = .488, p > .10$). No significant decrease from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the homosexual couple condition ($t(49) = 1.0, p > .10$).

A paired-samples $t$ test was conducted to compare the mean score of the fifth statement in the CSH and the fifth statement in the ECSH. No significant decrease from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the heterosexual couple condition ($t(46) = -1.00, p > .10$). A significant difference from the original scenario to the scenario with an excuse was found for the homosexual couple condition ($t(49) = -2.189, p < .05$). Participants were significantly less helpful when given an excuse to not help the homosexual couple.

A paired-samples $t$ test was conducted to compare the mean of the composite measure of the five statements in the Chicago Shopping Helping Scenario (SHELP) and the composite measure of the five statements in the Chicago Shopping Helping Scenario with Excuse to Not Help (SEHELP). A significant difference from SHELP to SEHELP was found for the heterosexual couple condition ($t(47) = 4.841, p < .001$). Participants were significantly less helpful when given an excuse to not help the heterosexual couple. A significant difference from SHELP to SEHELP was found for the homosexual couple condition ($t(49) = 6.327, p < .001$). Participants were significantly less helpful when given excuse to not help the homosexual couple.

Again, the above results generally indicate that giving participants an excuse to hot help lowered helping. To test whether participants were significantly less likely to help homosexual couples when given an excuse than heterosexual couples when given an excuse, the researcher
conducted a 2 (scenario with excuse or not) X 2 (sexual orientation of target couple) X 2 (gender of participant) Mixed-Model ANOVA predicting CSH and ECSH. The results confirmed that there was a main effect for gender ($F(1,91) = 7.157, p < .01$), with female participants being more helpful than male participants overall. There was no main effect for sexual orientation ($F(1,91) = .800, p = .38$). There was a main effect for excuse condition ($F(1,91) = 65.940, p < .001$), with participants providing less help when provided with an excuse to not help. Of greatest interest was the interaction between sexual orientation condition and excuse condition. The interaction was not significant, $F(1,91) = .000, p = .99$. Finally, the three-way interaction with gender was not significant ($F(1,91) = .191, p = .66$).
CHAPTER 4

STUDY 2

The goal of this study will be to investigate participants’ helping behavior through a face-to-face interaction with a confederate couple. Participants will be asked to fill out a benign survey on grocery store habits by a gay male, lesbian, or heterosexual couple. Helping will be measured by compliance to fill out the survey. I hypothesize that participants will be least likely to help the gay male couple, most likely to help the heterosexual couple, and help for the lesbian couple will fall in between.

Method

Participants

The participants were passers-by (N = 118) on the Southeast corner of Jefferson and Main Street in Naperville, IL. Fifty-seven (48%) of the participants were female and sixty-one (52%) were male. The majority of the sample was Caucasian (83.9%), and 16.1% identified as other ethnic backgrounds (5.1% African American, 4.2% Hispanic/Latino/a, 5.1% Asian/Asian American, and 1.7% other or not specified). The average age of the participants who took the survey was 38.5 years old (SD = 12.66, range = 20 to 66). The average age range as estimated by the researcher for the participants who did not take the survey was from 46 to 55 years old (range 18-25 to 55+).

Procedure

On separate weekends in August and September of 2008, the primary investigator and her research assistants went to Naperville, IL in couples. On two occasions two researchers posed as a heterosexual couple, on two occasions two researchers posed as a homosexual male couple, and on two other occasions two researchers posed as a homosexual female couple. The primary
investigator was across the street on a park bench watching the researchers interact with the pedestrians. The research assistants were given instructions (see Appendix F) which had a script to follow when approaching people and other directions to follow to keep other variables from impacting the consistency of the study. Generally, one of the two research assistants approached a person, mentioned his/her sexual orientation (i.e., “My boyfriend/girlfriend and I are handing out surveys for…”) and then asked the person walking by if he/she would take a Grocery Store habit survey for a Psychology class at Aurora University. If the participant agreed, the research assistants gave him/her informed consent orally and then gave the participant the survey; if the participant did not agree to take the survey, the primary investigator approximated the person’s general demographics (see Appendix G). After the participants who agreed to take the survey completed the items, the research assistants gave the participant a debriefing that further explained the purpose of the study (see Appendix H). Only passers-by who appeared to be over 18-years-old were approached to fill out the survey.

Materials

*Grocery Store Habits Survey.* The participants who agreed to take the survey for the researcher and her assistants filled out a benign questionnaire about grocery store habits (see Appendix I). This survey consisted of 11 multiple-choice items on basic grocery store preferences (i.e., “What type of bags do you use when buying groceries?”).

*Demographics.* The demographics contained questions about the participant’s gender, age, number of family members in his/her household (including him/herself), relationship status (i.e., single, married, divorced), and ethnicity.
Design

This study was a 2 (Gender: Male, Female) X 3 (Sexual Orientation of Couple: Heterosexual, Gay, Lesbian) between-subjects design. The independent variable of this study was the sexual orientation of the confederate couple asking people to stop and fill out the survey. The dependent variable in the study was the participants’ decisions to either stop to help the target couple or to keep walking and refuse to help after being asked and notified of the sexual orientation and relationship status of the confederate couples.

Results

Of the 118 participants in this study, 53 participants declined the confederates and 65 agreed to take the survey. A chi-square test of independence was conducted comparing the results of all the participants who agreed or disagreed to take the survey in the three conditions of confederate romantic couples: heterosexual, male homosexual, and lesbian (see Table 5). No significant relationship was found ($\chi^2(2) = 1.927, p > .10$). Agreeing or disagreeing to help appeared to be independent of confederate sexual orientation.

Of the 61 male participants in this study, 29 participants declined the confederates and 32 agreed to take the survey. A chi-square test of independence was conducted comparing the results of all male participants who agreed or disagreed to take the survey in the three conditions of confederate romantic couples: heterosexual, male homosexual, and lesbian (see Table 6). A significant interaction was found ($\chi^2(2) = 5.330, p < .10$). Male participants were most likely to help the male homosexual and lesbian couples, while they were least likely to help the heterosexual couple.

Of the 57 female participants in this study, 24 participants declined the confederates and 33 agreed to take the survey. A chi-square test of independence was conducted comparing the
results of all female participants who agreed or disagreed to take the survey in the three conditions of confederate romantic couples: heterosexual, male homosexual, and lesbian (see Table 7). No significant relationship was found ($\chi^2(2) = 2.572, p > .10$). Although the results were not significant, the female participants followed the expected trend with their helping occurring most frequently toward the heterosexual couple, least frequently toward the male homosexual couple, and their helpfulness for the lesbian couple falling in between.
CHAPTER 5

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The present research addressed a clear void in the area of assessing helping behavior towards homosexual couples. The purpose of Study 1 was to investigate participants’ general attitudes towards helping via responses to written scenarios. The scenarios depicted a target couple, either heterosexual or homosexual, in need of some relatively minor assistance. Participants had to decide whether or not they would give help to the target couple. Overall, participants were more likely to help the target heterosexual couple than the homosexual couple. This finding is in congruence with the results of other studies where help is given to heterosexuals more often than to homosexuals (Ellis & Fox, 2001; Gabriel & Banse, 2006). The results from this study also demonstrated that male and female participants did not differ in helping the heterosexual target couple, but that women were much more likely than men to help the homosexual couple in need. Furthermore, as predicted, when given an excuse not to help the heterosexual or homosexual couple, participants were less likely to help in general. More specifically, participants were even less helpful to the homosexual couple than the heterosexual couple when given an excuse to not help. This finding is consistent with Frey and Gaertner’s (1986) findings that White female participants were less likely to help Blacks, in relation to Whites, in a situation where failure to help would not be seen as inappropriate. The findings from Study 1 are important in that they showed that participants reported that they would be more likely to give help to a heterosexual couple than a homosexual couple and, given an excuse, the would be even less likely to help a homosexual couple.

Although Study 1 was important for investigating people’s attitudes towards helping couples based on their sexual orientation, attitudes and behaviors are often inconsistent (e.g.,
LaPiere, 1934) and what people do privately is often inconsistent with what people do publicly (e.g., Asch, 1956). The purpose of Study 2 was to investigate helping behavior and sexual orientation in a face-to-face situation. On a corner in a Western suburb of Chicago, confederates depicted romantic couples (gay male, heterosexual, or lesbian) and solicited assistance from passers-by in the form of filling out a brief survey for a Psychology class. The results showed that women followed the expected trend of being most helpful toward the heterosexual couple, least helpful toward the homosexual male couple, with their helpfulness toward the lesbian couple falling in between (although these differences did not reach significance). Unexpectedly, men were most likely to help the gay male and lesbian couples, while they were least likely to help the heterosexual couple.

The data in Study 1 suggested that male participants would give lower levels of helping to homosexual couples than heterosexual couples and would be less likely to help homosexual couples than female participants. Further, past research has supported that men have higher levels of homophobia than women. To reconcile the contradictory findings from Studies 1 and 2, it is possible that participants with higher levels of homophobia may have exhibited a trend known as “reverse discrimination” where they give more help to the homosexual target than the heterosexual target. Masser and Moffat (2006) found that participants who displayed higher levels of homophobia, tended to discriminate against heterosexuals more harshly than homosexuals. Some previous research has also shown other instances of reverse discrimination in regards to sexism and racism (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1996; Swim, Aiken, Hall, & Hunter, 1995). A related explanation for men’s higher level of helping towards the gay and lesbian couples could be their behavior differences in a public versus a private setting. Gabriel, Banse, and Hug (2007) found that men displayed more help towards a homosexual organization in a
public setting rather than a private setting. For fear of looking unhelpful and discriminatory, men tended to help more in a public arena than in private where they did not have to face the consequences of looking bigoted. Therefore, it is possible that the findings from Study 2 are explained by men’s higher homophobia leading to reverse discrimination in a public setting. Finally, it is possible that gender is not a strong enough predictor of attitudes and behavior towards homosexual couples (in a public setting). Although much past research has shown that men have more negative attitudes about homosexuals than women, more recent research has revealed that adherence to gender roles is a better predictor of attitudes towards homosexuality than gender alone (Brown & Henriquez, 2008; Parrot, Adams, & Zeichner, 2002). Future research on helping behavior and sexual orientation should not only address public/private differences but should also take into account participants’ gender roles.

An alternative explanation for the findings in Study 2 would be the lack of control the researcher had in the field experiment. On one of the days when the gay male couple was recruiting help, there was a street fair a block away from their location. With this in mind, people could have been more friendly or happier because of the fair, and therefore more likely to help (Baron, 1997). Another limitation of this study was the time at which it was conducted. Although the researcher took care in making sure the weather and the location were the same each day the experiment was conducted, one day the gay male couple started later than the other days and that may have affected how helpful people were at that particular hour. Because it had become increasingly darker as the experiment took place, more people may have not wanted to complete a survey under a lamppost, women may have felt unsafe to stop and help two men in the dark, or they may have been in more of a hurry because it was closer to dinnertime.
Lack of control is a common tradeoff for the rich data provided by a field experiment. Although the above limitations are noteworthy, by researching in the field one is given a larger range of participants to draw from, which helps address a limitation in demographics in Study 1. This research addressed this limitation partially in Study 2 by getting a more age-diverse sample; however, ethnically, the sample in Study 2 was less diverse and less representative of the general population than the college sample. The demographic differences between the samples in Studies 1 and 2 could be an additional explanation for the discrepant findings for male participants across studies [although this is unlikely as far as age is concerned, as young men would be expected to be more accepting of homosexuality than older men (e.g., Miller & Nakamura, 1997)]. Experimenters rarely conduct field research because of issues of control, time constraints, and pragmatic limitations, but by using this data, the real-world setting gives more credibility to the research. Further, field research is essential in this area if public and private attitudes are inconsistent.

It is also important to note the limitations from Study 1. A limitation in Study 1 was poor phrasing on the researcher’s part in one of the items on the Sexual Orientation Helping Behavior Measure (SOHBM). While compiling the 12 items for the SOHBM, the researcher dropped item 15 from the analyses because the awkward phrasing gave this item a negative item-to-total correlation in the internal reliability analysis. This negative correlation indicated that participants were not interpreting this item as intended. By removing this item, the SOHBM became stronger. Also, in regards to awkwardly phrased items, in the helping behavior scenarios, items 2 and 3 were not as strong as items 1, 4, and 5. Items 2 and 3 were awkwardly phrased in the sense that they included two parts. Therefore, some participants may have been responding to one part of the item while other participants responded to the other part of the item. It is unclear how
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participants interpreted these items. It is possible that items 2 and 3 would have shown significance if this poor wording had been addressed.

Future studies should consider the lack of research on homosexual romantic couples and begin to study how people react to them. It is interesting to research others’ reactions to homosexual couples because seeing a couple, rather than an individual, makes sexual orientation more salient and, possibly even more likely to trigger prejudice and discrimination. The presence of a homosexual couple may trigger thoughts of the homosexual lifestyle that contradict traditional sexual beliefs. It is this homosexual “lifestyle” that likely triggers thoughts of disgust that are key predictors of the negative attitudes towards homosexuality (Olatunji, 2008). Therefore, one explanation for why people are less likely to help homosexual couples is because of the feeling of disgust that they elicit. This is just speculation, however, as the current research did not assess why individuals are less likely to help homosexual couples.

Also, more field research needs to take place. As this current research demonstrates, private and public attitudes on homosexuals are possibly inconsistent. Although people may seem more accepting of homosexual couples in a public setting, as in the male participants Study 2, people are still discriminatory towards homosexual couples in a more private setting, like Study 1. People’s decisions on same-sex laws are typically made on paper and privately, and since people tend to be more honest in private situations, the results from Study 1 suggest that voters will continue to discriminate against homosexual candidates and policies supporting homosexual rights. It is not unreasonable to speculate that negative attitudes towards helping homosexuals, as found in the current studies, are related to discrimination against homosexuals in employment, marriage, adoption, healthcare, etc. More research is needed to understand why
people are reluctant to help homosexual couples and what is needed to help change laws to be more accepting of everyone.
**TABLES**

*Table 1*

Within-Subject Comparison of Heterosexual Excuse vs. No Excuse: Grocery Store

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Heterosexual: No Excuse</th>
<th>Heterosexual: Excuse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Questions were answered on a 1-7 scale. Higher means indicate more helping behavior would occur in statements 1, 2, and the Composite; lower means also indicate more helping behavior would occur in statements 3, 4, and 5 because of the wording of the options.

*Table 2*

Within-Subject Comparison of Homosexual Excuse vs. No Excuse: Grocery Store

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Homosexual: No Excuse</th>
<th>Homosexual: Excuse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Questions were answered on a 1-7 scale. Higher means indicate more helping behavior would occur in statements 1, 2, and the Composite; lower means also indicate more helping behavior would occur in statements 3, 4, and 5 because of the wording of the options.
Table 3

*Within-Subject Comparison of Heterosexual Excuse vs. No Excuse: Chicago Sidewalk*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Heterosexual: No Excuse</th>
<th>Heterosexual: Excuse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Questions were answered on a 1-7 scale. Higher means indicate more helping behavior would occur in statements 1, 2, and the Composite; lower means also indicate more helping behavior would occur in statements 3, 4, and 5 because of the wording of the options.

Table 4

*Within-Subject Comparison of Homosexual Excuse vs. No Excuse: Chicago Sidewalk*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Homosexual: No Excuse</th>
<th>Homosexual: Excuse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Questions were answered on a 1-7 scale. Higher means indicate more helping behavior would occur in statements 1, 2, and the Composite; lower means also indicate more helping behavior would occur in statements 3, 4, and 5 because of the wording of the options.
### Table 5

**Participants’ Helpfulness Toward Three Confederate Romantic Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confederate Orientation</th>
<th>Took Survey</th>
<th>Denied Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Homosexual</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6

**Males’ Helpfulness Toward Three Confederate Romantic Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confederate Orientation</th>
<th>Took Survey</th>
<th>Denied Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Homosexual</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7

**Females’ Helpfulness Toward Three Confederate Romantic Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confederate Orientation</th>
<th>Took Survey</th>
<th>Denied Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Homosexual</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Kelly Hoppensteadt, psychology student at Aurora University, is conducting a study investigating helping behavior, surveying approximately 200 students at Aurora University. You will be asked to read several brief scenarios describing a helping situation, and then you will be asked to rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with several statements based on the information you have read. There are no known risks involved in being in this study beyond those of everyday life. Participation is beneficial to you for increasing your knowledge in the area of helping behavior and allowing you to gain experience about the procedures involved in a research study. The entire study will take less than an hour.

The information that you give me on the questionnaire will be kept anonymous and confidential. All completed surveys will not be available to anyone not directly involved in this study, unless you specifically give permission in writing to do otherwise. I will not release information that could identify you. No reference will be made in oral or written reports that could link you to the study. Only the researchers directly involved with this project will have access to the data printed on the surveys (which will be kept in the primary investigator’s locked office).

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide not to participate, you may withdraw from the study at anytime without penalty. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed your data will be returned or destroyed.

If you have any questions at any time about the study or procedures (or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study), you may contact the researcher, Kelly Hoppensteadt at khoppensteadt01@aurora.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, contact Chair, Institutional Review Board, Aurora University, 630-892-6431.

I have read the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study.

Participant’s signature ____________________________ Date ___________

Investigator’s signature ____________________________ Date ___________
APPENDIX B

Scenario One:
You are driving down the road and you notice further up that there is a car pulled over with a flat tire. Standing by the car, you notice there is an elderly woman. You think that the elderly woman seems too frail to change a tire, or that she doesn’t know how.

Directions:
Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

____ 1. I would not hesitate to pull over and help the elderly woman change the tire.

____ 2. I would pull over and help the elderly woman change the tire. I do not want to, but it doesn’t seem like anyone else is going to stop.

____ 3. I would drive by slowly, contemplate pulling over and helping the elderly woman, but I would keep driving and just call for help on my cell phone.

____ 4. I would drive by and not think about pulling over to help the elderly woman; I do not know how to change a tire so I would not be of any help.

____ 5. I would drive by and not even think about pulling over to help the elderly woman; they are total strangers and it is not my problem. I do not want to pull over to change their tire.
You are driving down the road and you notice further up that there is a car pulled over with a flat tire. Standing by the car, you notice there is an elderly woman. You think that the elderly woman seems too frail to change a tire, or that she doesn’t know how.

Directions: Consider “Scenario One” above again, but this time, you are driving along a rural road at night. Now, please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____1. I would not hesitate to pull over and help the elderly woman change the tire.

_____2. I would pull over and help the elderly woman change the tire. I do not want to, but it doesn’t seem like anyone else is going to stop.

_____3. I would drive by slowly, contemplate pulling over and helping the elderly woman, but I would keep driving and just call for help on my cell phone.

_____4. I would drive by and not think about pulling over to help the elderly woman; I do not know how to change a tire so I would not be of any help.

_____5. I would drive by and not even think about pulling over to help the elderly woman; they are total strangers and it is not my problem. I do not want to pull over to change their tire.
Scenario Two:
You are in the checkout line at a grocery store. You overhear the couple in front of you, Jason and Rachel, talking about their plans about hosting a party at their house for their one-year anniversary while they take their items out of their cart. When they go to pay, you notice that they are a dollar short.

Directions:
Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____1. I would happily give Jason and Rachel the dollar they need.

_____2. I would give Jason and Rachel the dollar, but not as a charitable offering; I just don’t want to wait while they find the money themselves.

_____3. I would contemplate giving Jason and Rachel the dollar, but I would decide not to give my help. Even though I would feel bad that they are in this situation someone else will help them.

_____4. I would not give Jason and Rachel a dollar, since I do not approve of their lifestyle (a non-married couple living together).

_____5. I would not even think about giving Jason and Rachel the dollar; they are complete strangers, and it is not my problem.
You are in the checkout line at a grocery store. You overhear the couple in front of you, Jason and Rachel, talking about their plans about hosting a party at their house for their one-year anniversary while they take their items out of their cart. When they go to pay, you notice that they are a dollar short.

**Directions:** Consider “Scenario Two” above again, but this time, you are annoyed because the couple is in the 10-item Express lane and have well over 10 items. Now, please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____1. I would happily give Jason and Rachel the dollar they need.

_____2. I would give Jason and Rachel the dollar, but not as a charitable offering; I just don’t want to wait while they find the money themselves.

_____3. I would contemplate giving Jason and Rachel the dollar, but I would decide not to give my help. Even though I would feel bad that they are in this situation someone else will help them.

_____4. I would not give Jason and Rachel a dollar, since I do not approve of their lifestyle (a non-married couple living together).

_____5. I would not even think about giving Jason and Rachel the dollar; they are complete strangers, and it is not my problem.
Scenario Three:
You are walking down Michigan Avenue in windy, downtown Chicago on a Saturday afternoon on your way to grab lunch with a friend. You are behind a couple, Keith and Steve, and they are walking hand in hand while Steve is carrying a bag filled to the rim with clothes. On your way, the bottom of Steve’s bag breaks and all of her clothes fall out onto the sidewalk. As Keith and Steve try to pick up all the clothes, you notice that they are missing some pieces along the way.

Directions:
Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I would happily help Keith and Steve pick up their belongings.

2. I would stop to help Keith and Steve pick up their belongings. I do not want to, but walking behind them, I would feel obligated.

3. I would contemplate stopping to help Keith and Steve, but I would keep walking; hopefully someone else on this busy sidewalk will stop.

4. I would not think about helping Keith and Steve; their public displays of affection bothered me, and I do not want to help them.

5. I would not help Keith and Steve; they are total strangers and it is not my problem.
You are walking down Michigan Avenue in windy, downtown Chicago on a Saturday afternoon on your way to grab lunch with a friend. You are behind a couple, Keith and Steve, and they are walking hand in hand while Steve is carrying a bag filled to the rim with clothes. On your way, the bottom of Steve’s bag breaks and all of her clothes fall out onto the sidewalk. As Keith and Steve try to pick up all the clothes, you notice that they are missing some pieces along the way.

Directions: Consider “Scenario Three” above again, but this time, you are running late to your lunch meeting with a friend. Now, please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____1. I would happily help Keith and Steve pick up their belongings.

_____2. I would stop to help Keith and Steve pick up their belongings. I do not want to, but walking behind them, I would feel obligated.

_____3. I would contemplate stopping to help Keith and Steve, but I would keep walking; hopefully someone else on this busy sidewalk will stop.

_____4. I would not think about helping Keith and Steve; their public displays of affection bothered me, and I do not want to help them.

_____5. I would not help Keith and Steve; they are total strangers and it is not my problem.
Scenario Four:
There are two girls, Amanda and Kristin, who are walking around the River Walk in Naperville and they are clearly lost. They have a map in their hands, but it does not seem to be helping. You are a resident of Naperville, but you do not know Amanda or Kristin.

Directions:
Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I would walk over to Amanda and Kristin, introduce myself, and offer directions; it’s the least I can do.

2. I would walk over to Amanda and Kristin and offer directions; I do not want to help, but I would feel obligated.

3. I would contemplate walking over to help Amanda and Kristin, but I would not go over; hopefully someone else in town will notice they are lost and stop to help.

4. I would not think about helping Amanda and Kristin; the two teenage friends will find their own way.

5. I would not even think about helping Amanda and Kristin; they are total strangers and it is not my problem.
There are two girls, Amanda and Kristin, who are walking around the River Walk in Naperville and they are clearly lost. They have a map in their hands, but it does not seem to be helping. You are a resident of Naperville, but you do not know Amanda or Kristin.

Directions: Consider “Scenario Four” above again, but this time, it is raining outside. Now, please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____1. I would walk over to Amanda and Kristin, introduce myself, and offer directions; it’s the least I can do.

_____2. I would walk over to Amanda and Kristin and offer directions; I do not want to help, but I would feel obligated.

_____3. I would contemplate walking over to help Amanda and Kristin, but I would not go over; hopefully someone else in town will notice they are lost and stop to help.

_____4. I would not think about helping Amanda and Kristin; the two teenage friends will find their own way.

_____5. I would not even think about helping Amanda and Kristin; they are total strangers and it is not my problem.
APPENDIX C

Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I like to help people in need, even if I think I am not the best person for the job.
2. I feel like I am obligated to help anyone who asks me face-to-face.
3. I am more likely to help someone who is of the same sex as me, rather than someone of a different sex.
4. If I am not knowledgeable in a certain area, I will refuse to help if I am asked.
5. I am more likely to help someone who is the same sexual orientation as I am than to help someone of a different sexual orientation.
6. If someone is hurt, I will go to help him/her regardless if I know him/her or not.
7. If a couple in a relationship is fighting, I will get in the middle and break it up.
8. If I hear a racial slur, I will let it slide, even if I am offended.
9. When I hear homosexual jokes, I do not laugh at them.
10. When I offer my help, it is only to my friends; I do not like to help strangers.
11. If I knew how to perform CPR, it would not matter to me if the person in need were gay or straight.
12. If I knew how to perform CPR, it would not matter to me if the person in need were a man or a woman.
13. If I knew how to perform CPR, it would not matter to me if the person in need were a different race than I was.
15. I am more likely to help an overtly homosexual person than if I didn’t know the sexual orientation of that person.
16. I am less likely to help someone of a different race than I am.
17. After helping someone, I feel better about myself.
18. I never go out of my way to help anyone.
19. I am more likely to help children over adults.
20. I do not think that homosexual jokes are offensive.
21. I do think that racial jokes are offensive.
22. I do not think that ethnic jokes (Polish, Mexican, etc.) are offensive.
23. I do think that blonde jokes are offensive.
24. I stand up for my beliefs, regardless of what my friends and peers think.
25. I believe you can help certain groups by just standing up for their particular ideas (e.g. putting a “Support the Troops” ribbon on your car, passing out flyers to raise awareness for alcohol abuse, etc.)
26. I would be more likely to deny help if I wasn’t in a face-to-face encounter.
27. It is easy for me to deny my help to someone.
28. If a stranger asked me for my help, I would refuse before listening to his/her problem.
29. I would never give money to homeless people on the street.
30. I would give monetary charity to an AIDS foundation.
31. I would give money to a breast cancer charity.
32. I do not like to donate blood.
33. I do not like my inner circle of friends to consist of anyone of a different sexual orientation than myself.
34. I do not like to be around others of a different race than myself.
35. I think homosexuality is wrong.
36. I believe interracial dating is wrong.
37. I believe that homosexual marriages should be legal.
38. I believe you should not be denied a job based on your sexual orientation.
39. I believe that women need help from men more often than men need help from women.
40. I believe that I would help anyone I could, regardless of sexual orientation.
41. I believe that I would help anyone I could, regardless of race.
42. I believe that I would help anyone I could, regardless of gender or sex.
43. I would more comfortable helping a heterosexual couple rather than a homosexual couple.
44. I believe that any form of helping is wrong.
APPENDIX D

Demographics:

MALE      FEMALE

AGE_____  

Year in School: (Please check one.)

____FRESHMAN
____SOPHOMORE
____JUNIOR
____SENIOR
____OTHER

Sexual Orientation: (Please check one.)

____HETEROSEXUAL
____HOMOSEXUAL
____BISEXUAL
____OTHER

Nationality: (Please check one.)

____CAUCASIAN
____AFRICAN AMERICAN
____HISPANIC/LATINO/A
____ASIAN/ ASIAN AMERICAN
____OTHER
Debriefing

In this study, you read several scenarios about certain helping situations. I was most interested in your evaluations of the target scenarios in which the couple in need of assistance was actually homosexual. The study that you just participated in was about helping behaviors towards individuals and couples when the sexual orientation of the victim(s) is/are known.

Most research in this area has restricted itself to only conducting questionnaires in the form of self-assessment through a long list of “have you ever…?” questions without the use of scenarios depicting helping situations. From the little research that exists in this area it seems that helping behavior began with a bias towards homosexuals, but as more recent research is being conducted, the bias seems to be diminishing. In other words, more recently, the people seem to be just as likely to help a person regardless of his/her sexual orientation; the individual’s sexual orientation does not seem to be as much of a deciding factor anymore.

In the present study, I was interested in investigating 1) people’s helping behavior towards homosexual and heterosexual individuals, and 2) individuals’ helping behavior towards homosexual and heterosexual couples.

Non-conforming sexual orientation still seems to be a limiting factor in an individual’s daily life. Whether it is getting a job or just having someone help him/her with changing a tire, sexual orientation can still make other individuals uncomfortable enough to not hire the person or to just not associate with him/her at all.

I appreciate your participation in this study and I am welcome any comments, questions, or suggestions that you might have about this research. Please feel free to talk to me about your concerns or ideas by contacting Kelly Hoppensteadt at khoppensteadt01@aurora.edu.
APPENDIX F

Actor Instructions

Procedure:
1. Stop a person walking alone and stick to the script provided
2. Give him/her a survey on a clipboard
3. Hand him/her the debriefing
   a. My email address will be highlighted. Make sure they know to email me with any questions/concerns
4. After the participant is gone, number the survey and place in “done” pile

Script:
“Hi. My name is _____________. My boyfriend/girlfriend and I are handing out surveys for our Psychology class at Aurora University. It is a survey about grocery store habits and it should only take about 5 minutes of your time. We would really appreciate your participation.” [The volunteer agrees.] “Thank you. By filling out the survey you are giving your informed consent to participate in our study.”

People to Approach:
Ask people walking alone. If that becomes too difficult, I’ll talk it over with you, because I’ll be there every time, and we can start approaching people in pairs. If this does occur, you must indicate after they leave on the survey if they were alone or in a group.

PDA allowed:
Holding hands   Resting head on shoulder   Arm around shoulder
Talking close   Arms around waist   Hugging

PDA **NOT** allowed:
NO kissing   No petting   No over the top “baby talk”

**None of allowed PDA while participants are present**

**BE RESPECTFUL OF PEOPLES’ BOUNDARIES!**
### APPENDIX G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number: ______</th>
<th>Age range:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 18 – 25</td>
<td>___ 18 – 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 26 – 35</td>
<td>___ 26 – 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 36 – 44</td>
<td>___ 36 – 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 46 – 54</td>
<td>___ 46 – 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 55+</td>
<td>___ 55+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Caucasian</td>
<td>___ Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ African American</td>
<td>___ African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Hispanic</td>
<td>___ Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Asian</td>
<td>___ Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Other:</td>
<td>___ Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______________</td>
<td>______________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number: ______</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 18 – 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 26 – 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 36 – 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 46 – 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 55+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number: ______</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 18 – 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 26 – 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 36 – 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 46 – 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 55+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

Debriefing

In this study, you completed a survey about grocery shopping or television viewing habits. I was not interested in your answers in the survey, but more so in your cooperation to participate in the study. The study that you just participated in was about helping behaviors towards couples when the sexual orientation of the couple is known.

Most research in this area has found differences based on unobtrusive techniques such as the Wrong Number Technique and the Lost Letter Technique, but no one seems to have actually tested helping behavior in face-to-face interactions. From the little research that exists in this area it seems that the bias against helping a homosexual couples may be diminishing. In other words, more recently, the couple’s sexual orientation does not seem to be as much of a deciding factor in helping behavior as it was in the past.

In the present study, I was interested in investigating individuals’ helping behavior towards homosexual and heterosexual couples.

Non-conforming sexual orientation still seems to be a limiting factor in an individual’s daily life. Whether it is getting a job or just having someone help him/her with changing a tire, sexual orientation can still affect others’ interactions with that person.

I appreciate your participation in this study and I am welcome any comments, questions, or suggestions that you might have about this research. Please feel free to talk to me about your concerns or ideas by contacting Kelly Hoppensteadt at khoppensteadt01@aurora.edu.
APPENDIX I

GROCERIES SURVEY

MALE      FEMALE

Age: _____

Number of family members in your household (including yourself): ______

Relationship Status (Please check one):
___ Single
___ Married
___ Divorced

Ethnicity (Please check the one most relevant):
___ Caucasian
___ African American
___ Hispanic/Latino/a
___ Asian/Asian American
___ Other: ______________________

Please answer all of the questions as honestly as you can. Circle the answer that best describes you and your family.

1. Are you the primary person in your household that buys groceries?
   a. Yes
   b. No

2. Where do you buy your groceries?
   a. Dominic’s
   b. Jewel
   c. Meyer
   d. Woodman’s
   e. Aldi’s
   f. Whole Foods
   g. Other: ______________________

3. On average, how much money do you spend on groceries a week?
   a. $0.00 to $25.00
   b. $25.01 to $50.00
   c. $50.01 to $75.00
   d. $75.01 to $100.00
   e. $100.01 or more
4. Do you feel that you pay too much for your groceries?
   a. Yes
   b. No

5. On average, how many nights a week do you and your family go out to dinner at a restaurant?
   a. 0 to 1
   b. 2 to 3
   c. 4 or more

6. One average, how many nights a week do you make microwave dinners for yourself?
   a. 0 to 1
   b. 2 to 3
   c. 4 or more

7. Do you prefer the self check out isle or the normal isles?
   a. Self Check Out
   b. Service Check Out
   c. No preference

8. When you buy your groceries, do you prefer name brand or generic products?
   a. Name brand
   b. Generic (i.e. Dominic’s brand, Jewell brand)
   c. No preference

9. When you go grocery shopping, do you use as many coupons as possible?
   a. I do not use coupons
   b. I use from 1 to 5 coupons, but not every time I shop
   c. I use from 1 to 5 coupons every time I go shopping
   d. I always use more than 5 coupons every time I go

10. When shopping, do you purchase in bulk, or just what you will need in the immediate future?
    a. Bulk buyer
    b. Non-bulk buyer
    c. It doesn’t matter to me

11. What type of bags do you use when buying groceries?
    a. Paper
    b. Plastic
    c. Reusable (eco-friendly)