

Development and Validity Testing of the Homonegativity Short Form

Jason S. Wrench

The purpose of this study was to create and to provide convergent validity for a short form of the Homonegativity-16 scale created by Wrench (2001). To test convergent and predictive validity, this study examined results from previous research examining the relationship between ethnocentrism and homophobia as well as differences based on biological sex originally conducted by Wrench and McCroskey (2003). Further, this study examined the relationship among sociocommunicative orientation (assertiveness & responsiveness), ethnocentrism, and homonegativity. Results indicate that responsiveness negatively relates to both ethnocentrism and homonegativity; while assertiveness marginally relates to homonegativity but not ethnocentrism.

Since the publication of Allport's (1954) book, *The Nature of Prejudice*, attempts have been made to understand why the innate conflict between in- and out-groups leads to conflict within different cultures. Whether researching racism, sexism, ageism, nationalism, or patriotism, researchers have examined how in-groups suppress out-groups and how out-groups attempt to gain equality (Wrench, 2001). One group that has been consistently perceived as an out-group in the United States is the gay, lesbian, and bisexual co-culture. In a 2005 issue of the Southern Poverty Law Center's *Intelligence Report*, Moser reported that anti-gay hate groups have been building momentum for over 30 years. Moser likens the current barrage of hate speech against bisexual, gay, and lesbian (BGL) individuals to the hate speech used by Hitler pre-World War II to incite the Germans against the Jews. While the comparison between religious leaders in the United States to Hitler may be a stretch for some, the negative perceptions that many people hold of BGL individuals is clear in society. While there is an ongoing debate about the causes of anti-BGL attitudes, the measurement of these attitudes is currently measured by lengthy research scales (Adams, Wright, & Lohr, 1996; M. Morrison & T. Morrison, 2002). The purpose of the current study is to examine the factor structure, reliability, and validity of a shortened version of Wrench's (2001) Homonegativity Scale. To examine the construct validity of the Homonegativity Short Form, an analysis of ethnocentrism, homonegativity, and sociocommunicative orientation will occur.

Ethnocentrism

The term *ethnocentrism* is derived from two Greek words: *ethnos*, meaning nation and *kentron*, meaning center (Klopf, 1998). When *ethnos* and *kentron* are combined, they suggest that ethnocentrism is the viewing of one's nation as the center by which all others are judged. Modern conceptualizations of ethnocentrism take the concept a step further and place them not just in the world of nationalistic perspectives, but discuss ethnocentrism in terms of viewing one's culture and cultural beliefs, values, attitudes, and behaviors as the center by which all others are judged (Klopf, 1998).

The first systematic analysis of ethnocentrism was conducted by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1950) in their study examining the Authoritarian Personality. Adorno et al. (1950) argued that nationalism was highly related to ethnocentrism, ethnocentrism was an expression of authoritarianism, and authoritarianism was a personality defect. Furthermore, an individual's prejudice against a specific out-group constituted a generalized personality profile; hence, prejudices should not be studied in isolation but as a holistic concept – ethnocentrism. In reaction to this study, Allport (1954) cautioned readers to be cautious of some of Adorno et al.'s (1950) notions. Allport (1954) argued that just because the correlations between disdain for Jews, Negroes, other minorities, and patriotism were quite high (all were correlated .69 or higher), this did not mean that all of prejudice can be explained by an individual's personality. In more recent research, ethnocentrism has also been shown to be related to homophobia (Wrench & McCroskey, 2003) and racism (Greenberg & Rosenfield, 1979; Raden, 2003). However, Allport (1954) argues that:

Even a person with a highly prejudiced nature is much more likely to direct his animosity toward the Jews than toward the Quakers—though both are minority groups exerting perhaps more than their proportional share of influence in the business world and in government. The bigot does not hate all out-groups equally.... Such selective prejudice cannot be explained by fixing our attention exclusively upon the dynamics of personality. (p. 74)

Another of Allport's (1954) critiques was that Adorno et al. (1950) focused primarily on personality predictors of ethnocentrism instead of examining the symbiotic relationship of ethnocentrism and personality characteristics. A number of personality characteristics have been shown to be both related to ethnocentrism (e.g., authoritarianism Adorno et al., 1950, Allport, 1954; aggression, Wrench, 2001, 2002; dogmatism, Brusckie & Gartner, 1993; moralism, Allport, 1954; Van Izendoorn, 1990; narcissism, Bizumic & Dukitt, 2003; and nationalism, Allport, 1954; Eisinga & Felling, 1990).

Research in the field of communication studies has found that ethnocentrism is not a biologically based construct, but appears to be culturally driven (Wrench & McCroskey, 2003). One example of the notion of culturally driven ethnocentrism as described by Wrench and McCroskey (2003) is in the area of biological sex differences and ethnocentrism. In a study by Neuliep, Chadoir, and McCroskey (2001), they found that men in both Japanese and American males were significantly more ethnocentric than Japanese and American females. Other findings have consistently found that males have higher ethnocentric levels when compared to females (Lin & Rancer, 2003; Wrench & McCroskey, 2003).

Homonegativity

The development of the term *homonegativity* has gone through many unique stages and understandings. The term most people are familiar with, *homophobia*, was originally coined by Weinberg (1972) to examine an individual's irrational dread of homosexuals. Homophobia, as a term, has also been used to explain the self-hatred that many gay, lesbian, and bisexual people have (Elisason, 2000a, 200b; Wickberg, 2000). Although, the term homophobia created a field of inquiry for sociologists, psychologists, and communication researchers, the term's original conceptualization was that homophobia was a fear of BGL people. This notion that prejudice towards BGL people was based solely on fear, caused many people to question the validity of the term itself. Sears and Williams (1997) extended the concept of homophobia, which they defined as "prejudice, discrimination, harassment, or acts of violence against sexual minorities, including lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, and transgendered persons. Evidenced in a deep-seated fear or hatred of those who love and sexually desire those of the same sex" (p. 4). Other scholars have proposed that the term homonegativity be used in stead of homophobia to prevent the problem associated with the word phobia (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980; Mayfield, 2001). However, many studies have used the term homophobia when the term homonegativity was probably the most appropriate term. For example, Wrench and McCroskey (2003) found a strong relationship between ethnocentrism and homophobia using Adams, Wright, and Lohr's (1996) 25-item Homophobia Inventory in their study; however, Morrison and Morrison (2002) argued that Adams, Wright, and Lohr's (1996) scale was actually a measure of homonegativity.

Other researchers have focused more on some of the variables that may impact an individual's level of homonegativity. Mottet (2000) found that people are less likely to interact with, and have less-positive predicted outcome values for an individual they are interacting with, if they know that the other person is a BGL individual. This study demonstrates how homonegativity can impact communication with another person. Mottet's findings are similar to Jandt's (1995) findings that ethnocentrism can stunt social interaction. In another study conducted by Adams, Wright, and Lohr (1996), the researchers found that males who had seriously high levels of homonegativity experienced higher sexual arousal when they were shown videos of homosexual intercourse when compared to males with lower levels of homonegativity. The findings from this study suggest that people who suffer from high levels of homonegativity are attracted to homoerotic images; thus, people with high levels of homonegativity may be suffering from fear of their own attractions.

In yet another study, Lock and Kleis (1998) noted that homonegativity in U.S. males appears to be related to anxieties about one's gender-role expectations (perceptions of how an individual of one's sex should behave) and sex-role conformity (extent to which one's actual behavior is congruent with one's gender-role expectations), which are both culturally derived. Ultimately, while perceptions of gender-role expectations and sex-role conformity are culturally determined, actual behavioral processes tends to be biologically based. Unfortunately, the schism that exists between culturally determined stereotypes of female and male biological sex and gender-role behavior can lead to some serious problems for both females and males who do not exhibit these cultural perceptions.

Lock and Kleis (1998) found that in males, most sex-role anxiety is related to the need to express power, authority, and dependency while not exhibiting femininity and/or passivity. This position is further supported by Patel and Long' (1995) study, which found a strong relationship between traditional masculine values (sex-role expectations) and homonegativity. Patel and

Long also noted that highly homonegative men saw homosexuality as a violation of traditional masculine values, which dehumanized gay men in the eyes of these highly homonegative men.

Harry (1990) further explains this dehumanization when he noted that homonegative men generally see gay men as "victims worthy of punishment for having violated gender norms, the offender not only excuses himself from opprobrium but sees himself as rendering gender justice and reaffirming the natural order of gender-appropriate behavior" (p. 353). Overall, people who are highly homophobic appear to be chastising BGL people because these individuals are not conforming to the highly homonegative individual's norms for gender behavior.

Sociocommunicative Orientation and Style

In 1974, Sandra Bem began examining psychological gender orientation through two constructs she labeled masculinity and femininity, and created the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) as a tool for researchers to measure masculinity and femininity. While the BSRI was great for generating initial research, the scale was found to have some serious structural and statistical problems (Wheless & Dierks-Stewart, 1981). A revised version of the scale was needed. Realizing the potential for communication scholars, Richmond and McCroskey (1985) discarded the biological sexed biased language of masculine and feminine for a more gender neutral language of assertiveness and responsiveness in a re-visioning of the BSRI.

According to Richmond and Martin (1998), assertive communicators "are able to initiate, maintain, and terminate conversations according to their interpersonal goals" (p. 136). The ten items that are used by Richmond and McCroskey (1985) to measure assertiveness are: defends own beliefs, independent, forceful, has strong personality, assertive, dominant, willing to take a stand, acts as a leader, aggressive, and competitive. Conversely, responsiveness refers to an individual who "considers other's feelings, listens to what others have to say, and recognizes the needs of others (Richmond & Martin, 1998). The ten items that are used by Richmond and McCroskey (1985) to measure assertiveness are: helpful, responsive to others, sympathetic, compassionate, sensitive to the needs of others, sincere, gentle, warm, tender, and friendly.

Research conducted by Richmond and McCroskey (1990) found that the twenty items factored separately into two distinct factors (i.e., assertiveness & responsiveness), and the two factors are not meaningfully related to each other. McCroskey and Richmond (1996) developed two similar research measures for examining socio-communication, including (a) an individual's personal socio-communication (i.e., sociocommunicative orientation), and (b) another person's socio-communication (sociocommunicative style). Although the remainder of this discussion can be used to explain both sociocommunicative orientation and style, this section will specifically refer to sociocommunicative orientation.

In a study completed by Thompson, Klopff, and Ishii (1990) comparing American to the Japanese sociocommunicative orientations, the researchers found that U.S. females reported higher responsiveness levels than the Japanese females, but there was no difference in responsiveness between U.S. males and Japanese males. When examining assertiveness, the researchers found that U.S. females and males were more assertive than Japanese females and males. Overall, Thompson, Klopff, and Ishii (1990) found that cross-culturally females were more responsive and males were more assertive. This general pattern has also been seen in a Chinese sample (Anderson, Martin, Zhong, & West, 1997) and a Russian sample (Christophel, 1996).

Outside of the intercultural examination of sociocommunicative orientation, research has also been conducted on the influence of sociocommunicative orientation and style in the classroom.

Most of the research examining sociocommunicative orientation and style in the classroom has looked primarily at the impact that a teacher's sociocommunicative style, as perceived by her or his students, in the college classroom. In fact, a teacher's assertiveness and responsiveness positively relates to student perceptions of nonverbal immediacy (Thomas, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1994) and student perceptions of teacher trustworthiness (Wooten & McCroskey, 1996). Research by Wanzer and McCroskey (1998) found a negative relationship between a teacher's sociocommunicative style and student perceptions of teacher misbehaviors. Furthermore, Aylor and Oppliger (2003) found that students were more likely to communicate with highly responsive teachers out of class and were more satisfied with their communication with highly responsive teachers.

In the patient-physician context, Richmond, Smith, Heisel, and McCroskey (2002) found that a physician's responsiveness was positively related to patient perceptions of that physician's credibility (competence, caring/goodwill, and trustworthiness). Additionally, a physician's assertiveness was positively related to patient perceptions of that physician's credibility (competence, caring/goodwill, and trustworthiness), but to a lesser degree. Furthermore, a physician's responsiveness was positively related to patient perceptions of the quality of medical care one received and a patient's satisfaction with the physician; however, there was not a relationship between physician assertiveness and patient perceptions of the quality of medical care one received and a patient's satisfaction with the physician.

Cole and McCroskey (2000) examined the communibiological influence of sociocommunicative orientations. Using Eysenck, Eysenck, and Barrett's (1985) Eysenck Personality Questionnaire - Revised (EPQ-R), Cole and McCroskey (2000) examined the relationship between the biologically based supertraits (extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism) with assertiveness and responsiveness. When examining assertiveness, the researchers found a positive relationship between assertiveness and extraversion; a negative relationship between assertiveness and neuroticism; and no relationship between assertiveness and psychoticism. Overall, extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism accounted for 57% of the variance in an individual's assertiveness. When examining responsiveness, the researchers found a positive relationship between responsiveness and extraversion; a negative relationship between responsiveness and psychoticism; and no relationship between assertiveness and neuroticism. Overall, extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism accounted for 72% of the variance in an individual's responsiveness. In essence, an individual's responsiveness and assertiveness are fairly biologically based. These results were then replicated by McCroskey, Heisel, & Richmond (2001).

Hypotheses and Research Questions

While there has been relatively little research linking the three variables being examined in this study, this paper poses a series of hypotheses. First, to examine the convergent validity of the Homonegativity Short Form, the Homonegativity Short Form should be positively related to ethnocentrism. Based on previous research by Wrench and McCroskey (2003), a strong positive relationship has been found between an individual's ethnocentrism and her or his homophobia, as measured by the 25-item Homophobia Inventory created by Adams, Wright, and Lohr (1996). If the Homonegativity Short Form is a valid tool for measuring homonegativity, then the same relationship should be seen in this study.

H₁: There will be a positive relationship between ethnocentrism and homonegativity.

To examine the predictive validity of the Homonegativity Short Form, a series of relationships with sociocommunicative orientation can be predicted. In a study conducted by Wrench, McCroskey, and Fiore (2004), the researchers found a small but positive relationship between assertiveness and ethnocentrism. Since ethnocentrism and homonegativity are highly related constructs, homonegativity should also be positively related to assertiveness in the current study. Furthermore, the Wrench, McCroskey, and Fiore (2004) study found a small but negative relationship between responsiveness and ethnocentrism, which leads to a prediction of a negative relationship between responsiveness and homonegativity. Therefore, the following hypotheses are offered:

H_{2a}: There will be a positive and significant correlation between assertiveness and ethnocentrism.

H_{2b}: There will be a positive and significant correlation between assertiveness and homonegativity.

H_{2c}: There will be a negative and significant correlation between responsiveness and ethnocentrism.

H_{2d}: There will be a negative and significant correlation between responsiveness and homonegativity.

To further analyze the convergent validity of the Homonegativity Short Form, an examination of sex differences will occur. Previous research by Wrench and McCroskey (2003) found that males reported higher ethnocentric and homophobia levels than females. To make sure the current sample is consistent with previous research, men in this study should also possess higher levels of ethnocentrism. Furthermore, if the Homonegativity Short Form scale is a valid research measure, then men will report higher levels of homonegativity in this study than women. Therefore, the following hypotheses are offered.

H_{3a}: Males will have higher ethnocentrism scores than females.

H_{3b}: Males will have higher homonegativity scores than females.

Method

Participants

Participants were students at a large Middle Atlantic public university enrolled in communication courses. The sample consisted of 275 participants, 165 (60.0 %) males, 108 (39.3 %) females, and 2 (0.7%) who did not respond to the sex question. The mean age for the entire sample was 21.36 (*SD* = 2.96).

Participants were asked to respond to a set of three survey instruments that dealt with their ethnocentrism, homonegativity, and sociocommunicative orientation. The survey took approximately fifteen minutes to complete. Data used in this study was collected during the 5th week of a 16-week semester. The participants all received extra credit for their participation in this study.

Measures

Ethnocentrism scale.

The Generalized Ethnocentrism Scale (GENE) was created by Neuliep and McCroskey (1997) to measure an individual's tendency to feel that her or his culture is the center of the universe. The revised version of the scale employed here (Neuliep & McCroskey, 2000; McCroskey, 2001) consists of 22 Likert items ranging from 1 *strongly disagree* to 5 *strongly agree*. Fifteen of the items are scored; the remaining items are used as distracters. Higher scores are designed to indicate higher levels of ethnocentrism. The Ethnocentrism Scale had an alpha reliability of .84 ($M = 35.01$, $SD = 8.42$).

Homonegativity Scale.

The Homonegativity Scale was a 16-item scale designed by Wrench (2001) to measure an individual's negative perceptions of gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals (Table 1).

Table 1 Sixteen Item Homonegativity Scale

-
1. Gay and lesbian people make me nervous.*
 2. Homosexuality is perfectly normal.*
 3. I wouldn't want to have gay or lesbian friends.*
 4. I use derogatory terms like "faggot," "dyke," or "queer" when talking about gay-lesbians.
 5. I would trust a gay or lesbian person.*
 6. I have close friendships with gay and lesbian people.
 7. I do not tease and make jokes about gay and/or lesbian people.
 8. I fear homosexual persons will make sexual advances towards me.*
 9. I would have no problem living with someone who is gay or lesbian.*
 10. Homosexual behavior should be perfectly legal.*
 11. I think all gay and lesbian people can really change if they want to.
 12. I would have a serious problem if I saw two men or women kissing in public.*
 13. I think that gay and lesbian people need civil rights protection.*
 14. When I see a gay or lesbian person I think, "What a waste."*
 15. Gay and lesbian people make me feel very anxious.
 16. Lesbians and gay people should be allowed to marry.

* Item kept in the 10 item short form for this study.

The original scale was devised as a classroom tool for measuring homonegativity. However, normalized data from the full scale has not been collected. The ten-item homonegativity short

form used in this scale was created primarily based on the M. Morrison and T. Morrison's (2002) comparison between traditional and modern homonegativity scales. The ten-items selected for the current version of scale were chosen because they tended to represent individual ideological stances ("homosexuality is perfectly normal") and not outward behavior (using homonegative slurs and taunting). Items were chosen with the intention that five were positively worded, five were negatively worded, and no two items measured the same concept on the scale itself. The version of the scale used in this study was the 10-item short form of the scale. The scale consists of ten Likert type items ranging from 1 *strongly disagree* to 5 *strongly agree*. Higher scores are designed to indicate higher levels of homonegativity. The dimensionality of the 10 items from the Homonegativity Scale was analyzed using a principal component factor analysis. Three criteria were used to determine the number of factors to rotate: sampling adequacy, the scree test, and the interpretability of the factor solution. To examine sampling adequacy, Kaiser's Measure of Sampling Adequacy was used. The Kaiser's Measure of Sampling Adequacy obtained was .91, which is considered "marvelous" for conducting a factor analysis (Kaiser, 1974). The scree plot clearly indicated that there was only one primary factor and only one factor with an eigenvalue above one counting for 53.5% of the variance. The factoring structure of the Homonegativity Scale can be seen in Table 2. The Homonegativity Scale had an alpha reliability of .90 ($M = 26.53$, $SD = 9.02$).

Table 2 Factor Structure of the Homonegativity Scale

	Factor 1
1. Gay and lesbian people make me nervous.	.74
2. Homosexuality is perfectly normal.	-.71
3. I wouldn't want to have gay or lesbian friends.	.79
4. I would trust a gay or lesbian person.	-.72
5. I fear homosexual persons will make sexual advances towards me.	.75
6. I would have no problem living with someone who is gay or lesbian.	-.75
7. Homosexual behavior should be perfectly legal.	-.72
8. I would have a serious problem if I saw two men or women kissing in public.	.71
9. I think that gay and lesbian people need civil rights protection.	-.67
10. When I see a gay or lesbian person I think, "What a waste."	.75

Items were factored using an unrotated Principle Component Analysis.

Sociocommunicative Orientation Scale.

The Sociocommunicative Orientation scale was created by Richmond and McCroskey (1985) as an instructional tool to examine the extent to which individuals use assertive or responsive communication. The instrument was first utilized in research by Thompson, Ishii, and Klopff (1990) and Ishii, Thompson, and Klopff (1990) to examine cultural differences in assertive and

responsive communication. After the publication of these two articles, Richmond and McCroskey (1990) demonstrated the reliability and factor structure of the measure itself. The sociocommunicative orientation scale consists of ten items on each factor for a total of twenty items. Participants are asked to score short descriptive phrases that range from one to five words in length that indicate ways in which they may communicate. The scoring system for the measure consists of a Likert scale from 1 *strongly disagree that it applies* to 5 *strongly agree that it applies*. The alpha reliability for assertiveness in this sample was .82 ($M = 34.29$, $SD = 6.47$), and the alpha reliability for responsiveness in this sample was .86 ($M = 34.48$, $SD = 6.11$).

Results

The first hypothesis predicted there would be a positive relationship between ethnocentrism and homonegativity. To test this hypothesis, a Pearson Product Moment correlation was calculated. A significant positive relationship was found between ethnocentrism and homonegativity, $r(275) = .57, p < .0005$ (32% of the variance is accounted for). The second hypothesis predicted a positive relationship between assertiveness and ethnocentrism, a positive relationship between assertiveness and homonegativity, a negative relationship between responsiveness and ethnocentrism, and a negative relationship between responsiveness and homonegativity. To test this hypothesis, Pearson Product Moment correlations for the study variables (assertiveness, responsiveness, ethnocentrism, and homonegativity) can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3 Correlations Among Assertiveness, Responsiveness, Ethnocentrism, & Homonegativity

	Assertiveness	Responsiveness	Ethnocentrism
Responsiveness	.20**		
Ethnocentrism	.10	-.29***	
Homonegativity	.13*	-.28***	.57***

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$, and *** $p < .0001$

The third hypothesis predicted that men would have higher ethnocentrism and homonegativity scores. To analyze this hypothesis, a series of independent t -tests were conducted. The first part of this hypothesis predicted that men ($M = 37.13$, $SD = 8.47$) would have significantly higher ethnocentrism scores when compared to women ($M = 31.77$, $SD = 7.35$). The Levene's test for equality of variances was not significant ($F = 3.66$, $p > .05$), so equality of variances can be assumed, $t(271) = 5.39$, $p < .0005$. The eta square ($\eta^2 = .10$) index indicated that 10% of the variance of an individual's level of ethnocentrism was accounted for by her or his biological sex, which is considered a medium to large effect (Green & Salkind, 2005).

The second part of this hypothesis predicted that men ($M = 29.59$, $SD = 8.76$) would have significantly higher homonegativity scores when compared to women ($M = 22.06$, $SD = 7.31$).

The Levene's test for equality of variances was not significant ($F = 1.56, p > .05$), so equality of variances can be assumed, $t(271) = 7.40, p < .0005$. The eta square ($\eta^2 = .10$) index indicated that 10% of the variance of an individual's level of ethnocentrism was accounted for by her or his biological sex, which is considered a medium to large effect (Green & Salkind, 2005).

Discussion

When writing research measures, the shorter a form can be while maintaining reliability and validity the more useful that scale can be used across various research situations (DeVillis, 1991). The purpose of this study was to pose a shortened version of the Wrench (2001) Homonegativity Scale. To examine the results from the current study, a discussion of the scale's factoring and reliability, convergent validity, and predictive validity will occur.

Factor Structure and Reliability

The ten item scale factored on one factor with only one eigenvalue above one, which accounted for 53.5% of the variance. When examining the factor loadings of the individual items, the range of factor loadings were from .67 to .79, which indicates that all of the individual items related to the overall structure of the factor itself. Furthermore, the scale maintained a reliability above .90, which is considered strongly reliable. Overall, the basic structure and reliability of the homonegativity is consistent with similar, longer scales that are longer (Adams, Wright, & Lohr, 1996; M. Morrison & T. Morrison, 2002).

Convergent Validity

According to Bryant (2000), convergent validity is "the degree to which multiple measures of the same construct demonstrate agreement or convergence" (p. 113). Previously, Wrench and McCroskey (2003) found a positive relationship between homophobia, as measured by the Homophobia Inventory created by Adams, Wright, and Lohr (1996), and ethnocentrism. Since it is suspected that the Adams, Wright, and Lohr (1996) scale is actually a measure of homonegativity and not a phobia of bisexual, gay, and lesbian (BGL) people as noted by M. Morrison and T. Morrison (2002), the Homonegativity Short Form should also have a positive relationship with ethnocentrism. The r value reported by Wrench and McCroskey (2003) was .57, and the r value reported in the current study was .57. Even though Wrench and McCroskey (2003) used the scale created by Adams, Wright, and Lohr (1996), the similarity between Wrench and McCroskey result and the result in the present study is clear.

The next test used in this study to examine the convergent validity of the Homonegativity Short Form was a series of t -tests examining sex differences. Previous research by Wrench and McCroskey (2003) found that male participants reported more homophobic attitudes than female participants. The current study found the same result pattern. Since the Homonegativity Short Form and Adams, Wright, and Lohr's (1996) Homophobia Inventory both have men scoring higher on the measures than women, the Homonegativity Short Form is further validated.

Predictive Validity

The second type of validity examined in this study was predictive or prospective validity. Predictive validity is the degree to which scores on one test can predict scores on another test (Bryant, 2000). Since Wrench, McCroskey, and Fiore (2004) had found a positive relationship between ethnocentrism and assertiveness and a negative relationship between ethnocentrism and responsiveness, the prediction was made that homonegativity would follow the same pattern. First, it was predicted that there would again be a positive relationship between ethnocentrism and assertiveness and a negative relationship between ethnocentrism and responsiveness. This finding was only partially replicated. In the current study, a significant negative relationship between ethnocentrism and responsiveness was found, but there was not a significant correlation between ethnocentrism and assertiveness. However, the predicted relationships between homonegativity and assertiveness (positive) and homonegativity and responsiveness (negative) were accurate. While the homonegativity relationship with assertiveness was significant unlike the relationship between ethnocentrism and assertiveness, the relationship between homonegativity and assertiveness is very small. However, both homonegativity and ethnocentrism related negatively (-.28 and -.29 respectively) to responsiveness. In essence, the Homonegativity Short Form fairly accurately predicts relationships in similar patterns to that of Neuliep and McCroskey's (1997) Ethnocentrism Scale.

One last aspect of this study should also be noted at this point. As discussed previously in this article, Cole and McCroskey (2001) found that 57% of an individual's assertiveness and 72% of an individual's responsiveness is biologically based. While normally small correlations like that found between ethnocentrism and responsiveness ($r = -.29$) would not be that interesting, since Cole and McCroskey (2001) found that 72% of an individual's responsiveness is biologically based and since Wrench & McCroskey (2003) did not find a biological basis for ethnocentrism, this small correlation becomes more important. While the correlation only accounts for 8% of the variance in responsiveness, this is 8% of an available 28% that is left unexplained by biology. All-in-all, this seemingly small correlation takes on new meaning when viewed in this manner. Ultimately, this finding helps illustrate that responsiveness is in part culturally derived (albeit small) even if it is primarily biologically based.

Conclusion

DeVillis (1991) noted that the shorter a scale is the more useful the scale can be for researchers to utilize in research projects. For this reason, the current study sought to pair down a scale for homonegativity to make it more research friendly. Hopefully, with the creation of a valid and reliable short form for measuring homonegativity, other communication researchers will begin examining the impact of homonegativity on other communication variables.

References

- Adams, H. E., Wright, L. W., & Lohr, B. (1996). Is homophobia associated with homosexual arousal? *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 105*, 337-347.
- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (Eds.). (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Anderson, C. M., Martin, M. M., Zhong, M., & West, D. (1997). Reliability, separation of factors, and sex differences on the assertiveness-responsiveness measure: A Chinese sample. *Communication Research Reports*, 14, 58-64.
- Aylor, B., & Oppliger, P. (2003). Out-of-class communication and student perceptions of instructor humor orientation and socio-communicative style. *Communication Education*, 52, 122-134.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 47, 155-162.
- Bizumic, B., & Dukitt, J. (2003). Narcissism and ethnocentrism: A study. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 55, 33.
- Bruschke, J. S., & Gartner, C. (1993). Student ethnocentrism, dogmatism, and motivation: A study of BAFA BAFA. *Simulation & Gaming*, 24, 9-21.
- Bryant, F. B. (2000). Assessing the validity of measurement. In L. G. Grimm & P. R. Yarnold (Eds.), *Reading and understanding more multivariate statistics* (pp. 99-146). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Christophel, D. M. (1996). Russian communication orientations: A cross-cultural examination. *Communication Research Reports*, 13, 43-51.
- Cole, J. G., & McCroskey, J. C. (2000). Temperament and socio-communicative orientation. *Communication Research Reports*, 17, 105-114.
- DeVellis, R. F. (1991). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Eisinga, R., & Felling, A. (1990). Religious belief, church involvement, and ethnocentrism in the Netherlands. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 29, 54-75.
- Eliason, M. (2000a). Homophobia. In T. F. Murphey (Ed.) *Reader's guide to lesbian and gay studies* (pp. 286-288). Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn.
- Eliason, M. (2000b). Internalized homophobia. In T. F. Murphey (Ed.) *Reader's guide to lesbian and gay studies* (pp. 286-288). Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn.
- Eysenck, S. B. G., Eysenck, H. J., & Barrett, P. (1985). A revised version of the psychoticism scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6, 21-29.
- Green, S. B., & Salkind, N. J. (2005). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and understanding data* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson – Prentice Hall.
- Greenberg, J., & Rosenfield, D. (1979). Whites' ethnocentrism and their attributions for the behavior of blacks: A motivational bias. *Journal of Personality*, 47, 643-657.
- Harry, J. (1990). Conceptualizing anti-gay violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5, 350-358.
- Herek, G. M. (1998). *Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hudson, W., & Ricketts, W. A. (1980). A strategy for measurement of homophobia. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 5, 357-371.
- Ishii, S., Thompson, C. A., & Klopf, D. W. (1990). A comparison of assertiveness/responsiveness construct between Japanese and Americans. *Otsuna Review*, 23, 63-71.
- Jandt, F. E. (1995). *Intercultural communication: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39, 401-415.
- Klopf, D. W. (1998). *Intercultural communication: The fundamentals of intercultural communication*. Englewood, CO: Morton.
- Lin, Y., & Rancer, A. S. (2003). Sex difference in intercultural communication apprehension, ethnocentrism, and intercultural willingness to communicate. *Psychological Reports*, 92, 195-200.

- Lock, J., & Kleis, B. (1998). Origins of homophobia in males: Psychosexual vulnerabilities and defuse development. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 52*, 425-437.
- Mayfield, W. (2001). The development of an internalized homonegativity inventory of gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality, 41*, 53-76.
- McCroskey, J. C., Heisel, A. D., & Richmond, V. P. (2001). Eysenck's BIG THREE and communication traits: Three correlational studies. *Communication Monographs, 68*, 360-366.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1996). *Fundamentals of human communication: An interpersonal perspective*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Morrison, M. A., & Morrison, T. G. (2002). Development and validation of a scale measuring modern prejudice toward gay men and lesbian women. *Journal of Homosexuality, 43*, 15-38.
- Moser, B. (2005). Holy war: The religious crusade against gays has been building for 30 years. Now the movement is reaching truly Biblical proportions. *Intelligence Report, 117* (2), 8-26.
- Mottet, T. P. (2000). The role of sexual orientation in predicting outcome value and anticipated communication. *Communication Quarterly, 48*, 223-249.
- Neuliep, J. W., Chaudoir, M., & McCroskey, J. C. (2001). A cross-cultural comparison of ethnocentrism among Japanese and United States college students. *Communication Research Reports, 18*, 137-146.
- Neuliep, J. W., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997). The development of a U.S. and generalized ethnocentrism scale. *Communication Research Reports, 14*, 385-398.
- Neuliep, J. W., & McCroskey, J. S. (2000, April). *Ethnocentrism*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Communication Association. Pittsburgh, PA.
- Patel, S., & Long, T. E. (1995). Personality and emotional correlates of self-reported antigay behaviors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10*, 354-367.
- Raden, D. (2003). Ingroup bias, classic ethnocentrism, and non-ethnocentrism among American whites. *Political Psychology, 24*, 803-828.
- Richmond, V. P., & Martin, M. M. (1998). Sociocommunicative style and sociocommunicative orientation. In J. C. McCroskey, J. A. Daly, M. M. Martin, & M. J. Beatty (Eds.), *Communication and personality: Trait perspectives* (pp. 133-148). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1985). *Communication: Apprehension, avoidance, and effectiveness*. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.
- Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1990). Reliability and separation of factors on the assertiveness-responsiveness measure. *Psychological Reports, 67*, 449-450.
- Richmond, V. P., Smith, R. S., Jr., Heisel, A. D., & McCroskey, J. C. (2002). The association of physician communicative style with physician credibility and patient satisfaction. *Communication Research Reports, 19*, 207-215.
- Sears, J. T., & Williams, W. L. (1997). *Overcoming heterosexism and homophobia: Strategies that work (between men-between women)*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Thomas, C. E., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1994). The association between immediacy and socio-communicative style. *Communication Research Reports, 11*, 107-114.
- Thompson, C. A., Ishii, S., & Klopff, D. W. (1990). Japanese and Americans compared on assertiveness/responsiveness. *Psychological Reports, 66*, 829-830.
- Van Izendoorn, M. H. (1990). The relations of moral judgment to authoritarianism, sexism, ethnocentrism, and concern about nuclear war. *Journal of Moral Education, 19*, 38-48.
- Wanzer, M. A., & McCroskey, J. C. (1998). Teacher socio-communicative style as a correlate of student affect toward teacher and course material. *Communication Education, 47*, 43-52.

- Weinberg, G. (1972). *Society and the healthy homosexual*. Boston: Alyson.
- Wheles, V. E., & Dierks-Stewart, K. (1981). The psychometric properties of the BEM Sex-Role Inventory: Questions concerning reliability and validity. *Communication Quarterly*, 29, 173-186.
- Wheless, L. R., & Wheless, V. E. (1981). Attribution, gender orientation, and reconceptualization, measurement, and research results. *Communication Quarterly*, 30, 56-66.
- Wickberg, D. (2000). Homophobia: On the cultural history of an idea. *Critical Inquiry*, 27, 42-52.
- Wooten, A. G., & McCroskey, J. C. (1996). Student trust of teacher as a function of socio-communicative style of teacher and socio-communicative orientation of student. *Communication Research Reports*, 13, 94-100.
- Wrench, J. S. (2001). *Intercultural communication: Power in context*. Acton, MA: Tapestry Press.
- Wrench, J. S., & McCroskey, J. C. (2003). A communibiological explanation of ethnocentrism and homophobia. *Communication Research Reports*, 20, 24-33.
- Wrench, J. S., McCroskey, J. C., & Fiore, A. (2004). *Socio-communicative orientation and ethnocentrism and the impact on perceptions of stereotypical male and female socio-communicative styles and perceived sexual equality*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
-