

Development and Psychometric Properties of the Evasive Attitudes of Sexual Orientation Scale
(EASOS)

Jenna M. Brownfield

Mirella J. Flores

Sydney K. Morgan

Luke R. Allen

Jacob M. Marszalek

University of Missouri-Kansas City

Author Note

Jenna M. Brownfield, Mirella J. Flores, Sydney K. Morgan, Luke R. Allen, Jacob M. Marszalek, Counseling and Educational Psychology, University of Missouri-Kansas City.

Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Jenna M. Brownfield, Counseling and Educational Psychology, University of Missouri-Kansas City, 215 School of Education, 5100 Rockhill Road, Kansas City, Missouri, 64110. Email: jmbd57@mail.umkc.edu

©American Psychological Association, 2017. This paper is not the copy of record and may not exactly replicate the authoritative document published in the APA journal. Please do not copy or cite without author's permission. The final article is available, upon publication, at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000256>

Abstract

The purpose of this article was to develop and evaluate evidence for reliability and validity of a multifactor measure of evasive attitudes of sexual orientation across two studies. The Evasive Attitudes of Sexual Orientation Scale (EASOS) was inspired by Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, and Browne's Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scale (2000) and existing literature on contemporary homonegativism. In Study 1, data from 221 heterosexual participants were included in an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and resulted in a three-factor solution: Institutional Heterosexism, Aversive Heterosexism, and Heterosexual Privilege, with one global factor of Evasive Attitudes of Sexual Orientation. Correlational analyses with the present sample revealed evidence of convergent validity and a lack of response bias. A second sample of 270 heterosexual participants was collected for Study 2. EFA results from Study 2 confirmed the factor structure found in Study 1. Hierarchical regression was used to assess incremental validity of scores in the newly developed measure. Results indicated the EASOS explained participants' degree of LGBT allyship better than measures of homonegativity and modern heterosexism can alone. The present findings offer initial evidence for the use of the EASOS and may be valuable for future research on contemporary homonegativism.

Public Significance Statement: This study provided a measurement to capture the ways heterosexual/straight people subtly and sometimes unintentionally discriminate towards lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer (LGBQ) people by not recognizing the current ways heterosexism is experienced. Researchers are encouraged to consider the influence of failing to recognize the presence of institutional heterosexism, the need for further LGBQ-affirming legislation, and the continued existence of heterosexual privilege when examining modern beliefs and attitudes towards LGBQ people.

Keywords: sexual orientation, heterosexism, LGBT issues, instrument development, factor analysis

Development and Psychometric Properties of the Evasive Attitudes of Sexual Orientation (EASOS)

Within the 21 guidelines provided by the American Psychological Association (APA, 2012) for working with sexual minority clients, APA specifically encourages therapists to assess their explicit and implicit attitudes towards lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) people. APA directly name several ineffective approaches to working with LGB clients, and states one of these approaches is to "...adopt a 'sexual orientation blind' perspective . . . [S]uch a perspective ignores or denies the culturally unique life experiences of the lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations [A] so-called blind perspective would likely perpetuate heterosexism in a manner that is unhelpful to clients" (2012, p. 15). The "sexual orientation blind" perspective parallels that of colorblind racism, each invalidates and trivializes the experiences of minority people via evasiveness. While several scales exist to assess negative attitudes towards LGB people (e.g., the Modern Homonegativity Scale [Morrison & Morrison, 2002], or the Multidimensional Heterosexism Inventory [Walls, 2008]), to our knowledge no scale exists to specifically assess one's evasive attitudes of sexual orientation and subsequently impedes our ability to study the impact of this stance. As overt, expressed attitudes towards sexual minorities have become more positive (Fetner, 2016), exploring heterosexual people's evasive attitudes regarding sexual orientation will provide a more in-depth understanding of contemporary homonegativity. Individuals endorsing evasive attitudes towards sexual minority persons and concerns, may outwardly indicate neutrality or acceptance towards LGBQ individuals without acknowledging the disparities LGBQ people experience.

Building from Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, and Browne's Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS; 2000), we created the Evasive Attitudes of Sexual Orientation Scale (EASOS) to capture evasive attitudes of sexual orientation. As research continues to demonstrate disparities for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer (LGBQ) people, it is imperative we develop a better understanding of dominant group (heterosexuals) perceptions of individuals with marginalized sexual identity.

Colorblind Racism

Dominant discourse on interpersonal, interracial interaction within the United States focuses on the denial of difference (Apfelbaum, Pauker, Sommers, & Ambady, 2010). Despite the common notion that the United States is a "melting pot," Americans often receive subtle and overt messages that acknowledging difference is divisive. With regard to race and racism, this concept is captured by colorblind racial ideology or colorblindness. Colorblind racial attitudes are considered to promote meritocracy as an ideal, and to oppose the use of race as a basis for judgment and treatment of others (Rist, 1974). As such, colorblind racial attitudes are considered the expression of internalized racism and/or the acceptance of negative racial stereotypes of people of color (Neville, Awad, Brooks, & Flores, 2013). Colorblindness is a commonly used approach to address race relations in the United States despite previous research showing the deleterious effect colorblindness has on people of color, such as negatively affecting their cognitive performance (Holoien & Shelton, 2012). Neville and colleagues (2013) outline colorblindness as an ultramodern form of racism that works through both *color* and *power evasion*. Color evasion is a perspective in which people ignore racial differences and attempt to view each person as an individual (Apfelbaum, Pauker, Sommers, & Ambady, 2010), whereas power evasion refers to the belief that everyone has the same opportunities to succeed (Frankenberg, 1993). While these perspectives describe an egalitarian society, data continue to outline racial disparities (Neville et al., 2013). Neville and colleagues describe colorblindness as

unrealistic and harmful to disregard an individual's race in a society as racially stratified as the United States.

Neville and colleagues' (2000) CoBRAS looks at color-blind racism through the following subscales: Racial Privilege, Institutional Discrimination, and Blatant Racial Issues. The CoBRAS was developed to better assess the dimensions of color-blind racism: power evasion and color evasion. The scale has been used in research to better understand beliefs of White people in America about people of color. For example, researchers administered the CoBRAS to examine its ability to predict White, doctoral psychology students' multicultural counseling competence (Johnson & Jackson Williams, 2015) and to assess the impact of multicultural education interventions in White college students (Garriott, Reiter, & Brownfield, 2016). Moreover, researchers used the CoBRAS to investigate police officers' racial beliefs and better understand the relationship between color-blind racial attitudes and discriminatory criminal justice practices (Hughes, Hunter, Vargas, Schlosser, & Malhi, 2016).

Psychological Effects of Heterosexism

Within the past couple of decades, sexual minority people have gained critical legal protections and rights, such as the federal recognition of same-sex marriage, and there has been an increase in affirming attitudes about same-sex sexuality among Americans (Avery et al., 2007; Mucciaroni, 2008; Pew Research Center, 2015; Woodford, Atteberry, Derr, & Howell, 2013). Yet, sexual minority people continue to face discrimination, prejudice, and oppression. There is a growing body of research that illustrates the harmful effects heterosexism has on the daily lives and mental health of sexual minority people (Brewster, Moradi, DeBlaere, & Velez, 2013; Hatzenbuehler, Nolen-Hoeksema, & Erickson, 2008; Lehavot & Simoni, 2011; Velez, Watson, Cox, & Flores, 2017). Much of this research draws from minority stress theory (Meyer, 2003), which posits that in addition to the general life stressors to which everyone is exposed, sexual minority people are subjected to stressors stemming from societal heterosexist oppression. These minority stressors may lead to the observed poorer psychological health among sexual minority people relative to heterosexual people (e.g., King et al., 2008; Mays & Cochran, 2001; Meyer, 2003). Meyer (2003) identified heterosexist discrimination—the experience of differential treatment, derogation, rejection, harassment, and victimization based on sexual minority status—as a form of minority stress for sexual minority people that may explain their observed poorer psychological health when compared to heterosexual people.

Contemporary forms of discrimination, including heterosexual discrimination, tend to be exhibited in markedly different ways than in the past (Hebl & Dovidio, 2005; Nadal, Rivera, & Corpus, 2010). Subtle and often unintentional forms of heterosexism, such as sexual identity-based microaggressions, are more prevalent today than blatant heterosexist violence, such as hate-crimes (Jewell, McCutcheon, Harriman, & Morrison, 2012; Jewell & Morrison, 2010). Yet, these subtler but prevalent forms of heterosexism are insidious in nature and may have a traumatic effect on sexual minority people (Bandermann & Szymanski, 2014; Robinson & Rubin, 2016; Szymanski & Balsam, 2011). In support of the harmfulness of subtle forms of heterosexism, research found that heterosexist individual and environmental microaggressions, in particular environmental microaggression, were more influential on LGBQ college students' overall heterosexist discrimination experiences than blatant victimization (Woodford, Kulick, Sinco, & Hong, 2014). Additionally, both forms of microaggressions and overall heterosexist discrimination each had a direct and positive effect on psychological distress; yet, this relationship was not found for blatant victimization and psychological distress (Woodford et al., 2014). Taken together, these results support the notion that contemporary homonegativism, in

particular anti-LGBQ sentiments expressed in larger social environments, can have a detrimental effect on sexual minority people's psychological health.

Contemporary Homonegativism

Heterosexism has evolved over the decades to include subtler and sometimes unintentional forms of discrimination, not merely hostile forms of aggression, towards sexual minority people (Walls, 2008). People who operate from a contemporary homonegative perspective assume that heterosexism is in the past and that sexual minority people no longer face unequal treatment, and therefore, sexual minority people should not complain about their treatment (Cowan, Heiple, Marquez, Khatchadourian, & McNevin, 2005). These types of assertion ignore the power and oppression that exists within structural, disciplinary, and hegemonic domains and shapes people's experiences (Collins, 1990). In support of this assertion, research has supported the notion that institutional heterosexism—heterosexism that is observed at the institutional level in policies and negative societal attitudes—can negatively affect sexual minority people's mental health (Hatzenbuehler, McLaughlin, Keyes, & Hasin, 2010). For instance, in a qualitative examination, sexual minority participants identified environmental microaggressions, such as media, religious dogmas, and legislature, as a form of sexual minority microaggression they experienced (Nadal et al., 2011). Furthermore, heterosexual people's dismissal of sexual minority people's assertion of the realness of heterosexism has been identified as another form of microaggression (Nadal et al., 2010). This dismissal of the existence of heterosexism has been termed *aversive heterosexism*, the "attitudes, myths, and beliefs that dismiss, belittle, or disregard the impact of sexual orientation on life chances by denying, denigrating, stigmatizing and/or segregating any non-heterosexual form of behavior, identity, relationship, or community" (Walls, 2008, p. 46). In other words, aversive heterosexism attempts to justify societal oppression of sexual minority people by shaping social consciousness.

Limited attention has been given to processes of contemporary homonegativism. However, researchers have begun examining social dominance orientation, acceptance of structural violence, person-organization incongruent, and queer blindfolding (Eldridge & Johnson, 2011; Seelman & Walls, 2010; Smith & Shin, 2014; Walls, 2008), which are processes of contemporary homonegativism. Smith and Shin (2014) conducted a qualitative investigation of how self-identified well-intended "straight folks" uphold attitudes that minimize and even deny the experiences and effects of oppression on sexual minority and transgender people, which they termed queer blindfolding. They found that intra-psychic dissonance (the conflict between one's subconscious attitude and conscious intentions) is part of the process of queer blindfolding. For example, people from their study who view themselves as compassionate and pluralistic may express that individuals' sexual identities "don't matter" and that sexual minority people are "the same as heterosexual people" in order to hold their self-view; yet, such statements fail to acknowledge the systems of homonegativity that continue to oppress sexual minority people. Perhaps, some heterosexual people fail to acknowledge contemporary forms of homonegativity because of a lack of recognition of their own privilege. To our awareness, no research to date has examined the potential relationship between heterosexual privilege awareness to queer-blindfolding. However, scholars have noted the importance of increasing students' self-awareness of their own heterosexual privilege in order to promote their understanding of the discrimination faced by sexual minority people in today's society (Case & Stewart, 2010; Kite & Bryant-Lees, 2016).

The Present Study

The purpose of the present study was to develop a measure of evasive attitudes towards sexual orientation, (akin to “sexual orientation blindness”) created specifically using data collected from heterosexual participants. A multidimensional scale that examines the various subtypes of evasive attitudes to sexual orientation was constructed. The constructed items were tested using exploratory factor analysis, and we examined the resulting scale for evidence of reliability and validity.

Two measures exist that assess aspects of sexual orientation beliefs. The *Sexual Orientation Beliefs Scale (SOBS)*; (Arseneau, Grzanka, Miles, & Fassinger, 2013) was developed to assess a broad range of beliefs about sexual orientation through essentialist, social constructionist, and constructivist lenses. Four scales were identified through confirmatory and exploratory factor analyses when using a primarily heterosexual, college student sample: Naturalness, Discreetness, Homogeneity, and Informativeness. Similar to the SOBS, our scale works to better understand beliefs about sexual orientation. However, we were more interested in homonegative attitudes via evasive approaches to sexual orientation and how heterosexual individuals perceive the experiences of sexual minority people, as opposed to what heterosexuals perceive as the ‘cause’ of sexual orientation. Walls’ (2008) *Multidimensional Heterosexism Inventory (MHI)* scale looks at the modern prejudice of heterosexism covering four domains of heterosexism: Paternalistic Heterosexism, Aversive Heterosexism, Amnestic Heterosexism, and Positive Stereotypic Heterosexism. Walls (2008) defined paternalistic heterosexism as “subjectively neutral or positive attitudes, myths and beliefs that express concern for the physical, emotional or cognitive well-being of nonheterosexual persons while concurrently denying, denigrating, stigmatizing and/or segregating any nonheterosexual form of behavior, identity, relationship or community” (pp. 27-28). Walls described aversive heterosexism as reliance on traditional negative stereotypes of lesbians and gay men with concerns, whereas amnestic heterosexism as the denial of the existence of discrimination. The fourth domain, Positive Stereotypic Heterosexism, captures attitudes related to appreciating stereotypical gay and lesbian qualities, which ends up differentiating gay and lesbian people and culture along stereotypical lines (Walls, 2008). Our scale intends to align more on Walls’ Amnestic Heterosexism domain, which captures people’s thoughts about sexual orientation discrimination no longer existing. Unlike the MHI though, we assessed attitudes about lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer individuals, whereas Walls’ (2008) scale queries only about lesbian and gay individuals. Given bisexual individuals’ higher incidence of harmful psychological concerns (Barker et al., 2012; Friedman et al., 2014) and the use of “queer” as an umbrella term for individuals in the LGBTQIA+ community (Carter, 2016), inclusion of bisexual and queer individuals in the scale items provide us with a more comprehensive understanding of heterosexual people’s beliefs about sexual minority persons and issues related to identifying as a sexual minority person.

To expand the study of evasive attitudes of sexual orientation, we developed an instrument to assess a more complex framework that explores heterosexuals’ understanding of disparities and opportunity based on evasive attitudes. Our scale aimed to better understand beliefs of heterosexual people about sexual minorities. We included several reverse-coded items in our constructions of items. This decision to use reverse-coded items was made in order to create a more balanced scale and thereby reduce potential acquiescence bias (Furr & Bacharach, 2014). We expected that *Heterosexual Privilege* is an underlying dimension of evasive attitudes towards sexual orientation, as individuals with heterosexual privilege do not have to think about what it means to be a sexual majority, and therefore may be unlikely to see ways in which sexual

minorities are disadvantaged. Another anticipated dimension of evasive attitudes, *Institutional Heterosexism*, might assess one's attitudes and awareness around institutional heterosexism, forms of discrimination and exclusion. Institutional heterosexism refers to ways in which systemic forces, structures in our society, reinforce heterosexism; thereby disadvantaging LGBQ individuals. The final dimension we anticipated measuring, continuing to be inspired by the CoBRAS, was *Blatant Queer Issues*. Unlike heterosexual privilege and institutional heterosexism, blatant queer issues inquires about participants' awareness of discrimination based on sexual minority status. We expected this dimension would indicate unawareness to general, pervasive LGBQ discrimination. A lower score on this dimension may indicated a participants' beliefs that heterosexism is a major problem in the US, and that accomplishments of LGBQ individuals throughout history should be discussed in school, as well as issues surrounding heterosexism as important for political leaders to discuss. Whereas, participants with a high score would be indicative of their lack of awareness surrounding pervasive LGBTQ discrimination.

Study 1: Instrument Development and Initial Psychometric Evaluation

Method

Participants. Three-hundred and seventy-eight people began the survey online through Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Participants were included in the final sample if they identified as heterosexual/straight (which resulted in 60 participants with identities such as gay/lesbian, bisexual, etc., being removed from the sample) and responded to all 39 EASOS items (which resulted in an additional 97 participants being removed from the sample; e.g. Mohr & Kendra, 2011). These selection criteria resulted in a final sample consisting of 221 participants. Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 74 years with a mean of 37.95 years ($SD = 13.32$). A majority of participants identified as women, not of transgender experience (54.3%), followed by men, not of transgender experience (45.2%). The remaining participant identified as woman of transgender experience (0.5%). Participants in the sample identified with the following racial/ethnic identity groups: 4.5% Asian/Pacific Islander, 1.4% South Asian, 9.0% Black/African American, 72.4% Caucasian/White/European American, 6.8% Hispanic/Latino/Latina/Latin@/Latinx, 0.9% Middle Eastern, 0.9% Native American/American Indian, and 2.3% Multiracial. Four participants did not select a given category that represented their racial/ethnic identity. One of those participants reported their racial/ethnic identity in their own words as "American." Demographic data on highest level of education attained revealed that 40.3% of participants obtained a Bachelor's Degree, 23.1% attended some college without obtaining a degree, 12.2% obtained a Master's Degree, 9.0% obtained a High School Diploma, 10.0% obtained an Associate's Degree, 0.9% a Doctorate Degree, 1.4% a Professional Degree, 1.4% GED, and 1.4% some high school with no diploma received. One participant did not report their highest level of education attained.

Political ideology and spiritual/religious affiliation provided additional information on the participants. Participants identified their political ideology as Very Liberal (9.0%), Liberal (20.4%), Somewhat Liberal (11.8%), Neutral (27.6%), Somewhat Conservative (14.5%), Conservative (12.2%), and Very Conservative (4.5%). They identified their spiritual/religious affiliation as follows: Christian/Protestant (20.8%), Agnostic (18.6%), Christian/Catholic (16.3%), Christian/Other (15.8%), Atheist (12.2%), Spiritual but not religious (10.4%), Buddhist/Taoist (0.9%), Hindu (0.9%), Jewish (0.5%), Muslim/Islam (0.5%), or Wiccan/Pagan/Neo-Pagan (1.4%). Four participants (1.8%) did not select a given category for their spiritual/religious affiliation. Three of these participants reported in their identity in their own words as "None," "Not spiritual not religious," and "Baptist."

Procedure. The recruitment call was posted on Amazon's MTurk and it provided a link to the survey, which contained an informed consent document and explained the survey would ask about their social attitudes. After obtaining informed consent, participants completed various measures. With the exception of the Global Belief in a Just World Scale (GBJWS; Lipkus, 1991), measures were presented in the order presented below. Due to the GBJWS being used to assess convergent validity and consisting of identical scaling (1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree), it seemed advantageous to disperse GBJWS items intermittently throughout the full item pool of the EASOS to better reduce response bias. All participants were compensated \$0.25.

Measures.

Demographic questionnaire. Participants were asked to report their age, gender, sexual identity, highest level of education, racial/ethnic identity, religious/spiritual identity, and political ideology.

Full item pool. Our initial scale consisted of 39 items. The number of items was determined based off guidelines by Hinkin, Tracey, and Enz (1997) to construct at least twice as many items as desired in the final scale. Given our desire to create a scale consisting of approximately 18 items (ideally 6 items/factor), generating an item pool of 39 items seemed adequate. Instructions for the measure clarified that sexual minority people would be identified in the measure with the acronym LGBQ, referring to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer identifying individuals. Participants were asked to rate their agreement with each statement on a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Slightly Disagree), 4 (Slightly Agree), 5 (Agree), 6 (Strongly Agree). Items were worded so higher scores reflected greater evasive attitudes. For example, "People treat LGBQ people as fairly as they treat heterosexual/straight people." Several items were constructed as reversal items such as "The U.S. social structure system promotes heterosexual/straight privilege."

The first, second, and third authors generated the item pool for the present study by examining items from the CoBRAS (Neville et al., 2000) and reviewing relevant literature on modern heterosexism and LGBQ discrimination. Due to the distinction between gender and sexual identities and not wanting to inappropriately aggregate the erasure experiences sexual minority people and transgender people face, we focused the present scale on sexual minority people's experiences of discrimination. Thus, items were written to elicit people's reactions to LGBQ people and issues of evasive attitudes. A subject matter expert who was external to the research team vetted items for clarity and content. His suggestions led to minor changes on five items. As a result of the present scale being developed through a single-semester course project, time only allotted for input from one subject matter expert before progressing on to piloting. A pilot of the scale consisted of collecting three subject interviews from heterosexual individuals of varying gender (two cisgender women and one cisgender man) and racial/ethnic identities (two White adults and one Asian adult). These interviews indicated more clarification and specificity for items would be beneficial. Minor modifications were made, such as: changing "heterosexual" to "heterosexual/straight" for each item in which "heterosexual" was present to assist participants who may be unfamiliar with the label "heterosexual;" adding a definition of heterosexism; and adding "within the U.S." to various items to create a cultural context through which respondents could interpret and respond to the items.

Global Belief in a Just World Scale (GBJWS). The GBJWS (Lipkus, 1991) is a 7-item scale constructed to assess one's endorsement of a worldview centered on fairness. Sample items include, "I feel that people who meet with misfortune have brought it on themselves" and "I basically feel that the world is a fair place." Responses range from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 6

(Strongly Agree). Total scores range from 7 to 42, with higher scores indicating greater levels of just world belief. In the initial development study of the GBJWS, reliability with an undergraduate sample was reported as $\alpha = .83$ (Lipkus, 1991). In the same study, convergent validity was exhibited with significant, positive associations to internal locus of control and trust. Two more recent studies, the development of the CoBRAS (Neville et al., 2000) and another examining the influence of people's stereotypes about gay and lesbian Americans (Hettinger & Vandello, 2014), both reported Cronbach's alphas of .85. The GBJWS demonstrated good scale score reliability in the present sample ($\alpha = .89$, 95% CI [.86, .91]).

Modern Homonegativity Scale (MHS). The MHS (Morrison & Morrison, 2002) is a 12-item instrument that measures modern prejudice toward gay men and lesbians. It employs a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) with higher scores indicating greater modern homonegativity. Two forms of the scale were developed, one form assessing attitudes towards gay men (MHS-G) and another assessing attitudes towards lesbians (MHS-L). The MHS-G and the MHS-L yielded Cronbach's alphas of .94 and .95 in a community sample (Morrison & Morrison, 2011), and Cronbach's alphas of .91 and .90 in a college sample (Morrison & Morrison, 2002). Evidence for convergent validity has been reported with significant, positive correlations between the MHS and scales designed to measure modern sexism (Morrison & Morrison, 2002). In addition, social desirability has been uncorrelated with the MHS (Morrison & Morrison, 2002). The present study sought to capture individuals' attitudes towards sexual minority individuals as a whole (LGBQ individuals). Therefore, instead of using both the MHS-G and MHS-L forms of the scale, which keeps items regarding gay men and lesbians separate from each other and excludes bisexual and queer individuals, MHS items were reworded in the present study to include the acronym LGBQ. Examples of items include, "LGBQ people have become far too confrontational in their demand for equal rights" and "Many LGBQ people use their sexual orientation so that they can obtain special rights and privileges." This modified form of the MHS demonstrated very good reliability in the present study ($\alpha = .91$, 95% CI [.89, .92]).

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale-Form C (MCSDS-C). The MCSDS-C (Reynolds, 1982) is a 13-item measure used to capture one's level of social desirability. Items are presented in a true-false format, asking participants if each statement is true or false as it applies to them. Sample items include, "I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings" and "I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake." Higher scores are indicative of more social desirability. Reynolds (1982) reported an acceptable level of scale score reliability for the MCSDS-C of .76. Previous studies on attitudes towards LGBQ individuals that utilized the MCSDS-C reported reliability coefficients ranging from .57 to .70 (Morrison & Morrison, 2002). Form C of the MCSDS demonstrated criterion-related validity with a positive, significant correlation to the Edwards Social Desirability Scale (Reynolds, 1982). Reliability of scores in the present study aligned closely with that of previous studies, with a Kuder-Richardson 20 of .71 (95% CI [.66, .77]).

Multidimensional Heterosexism Inventory (MHI). The MHI (Walls, 2008) measures four dimensions of heterosexism: (a) Paternalistic Heterosexism, seven items, (b) Positive Stereotypic Heterosexism, six items, (c) Aversive Heterosexism, six items, and (d) Amnestic Heterosexism, four items. The present study used the Amnestic Heterosexism subscale, which contains items that deny the existence of discrimination, as it aligned closest conceptually with the construct of sexual orientation blindness. Sample items include, "Discrimination against lesbians is virtually nonexistent in today's society" and "Gay men are treated as fairly as

everyone else in today's society." Participants rated their agreement with each statement ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree) with higher scores reflecting greater Amnestic Heterosexism. Convergent validity for the Amnestic Heterosexism subscale was supported via a significant, positive relationship between this subscale and hostile sexism, as predicted (Walls, 2008). Walls (2008) reported Cronbach's alpha for the subscale to be .79, and for the current study it was .93 (95% CI [.91, .94]).

Results

Missing data. The amount of missing data for any single item ranged from 0% to 2.3%; approximately 0.70% of data were missing overall. A nonsignificant Little's MCAR test ($\chi^2 = 1693.17$, $df = 1617$, $p = .09$) indicated no evidence of a pattern of missing data. In response to this finding, missing data were imputed using expectation-maximization (EM) in SPSS (Allison, 2009).

Item analysis. Initial scale score reliability analysis of the 39 EASOS items revealed item-total and inter-item correlations ranged from small to large. Two items seemed particularly weak with item-total correlations of .02 and .04. These two items were not removed before conducting EFA because their potential to detract from the scale's overall reliability, as examined by alphas if item deleted values, was minimal ($\alpha = .92$ if deleted for both items).

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA).

Determining number of factors. We conducted an EFA using principal axis factoring with an oblique rotation (promax) on the 39 items of the preliminary EASOS. KMO's Measure of Sampling Adequacy was adequate at .88, and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 = 4746.99$, $p < .001$). Criteria used to determine the number of factors consisted of (a) Velicer's MAP test, (b) minimum loading of at least 3 items per factor, and (c) minimum factor loading cutoff of .32 or higher. Application of these criteria yielded a three-factor solution as being the most interpretable.

Development of subscales. Items were sequentially eliminated, one after another, and EFA run after each elimination. Items were excluded based on consideration of (a) loading at $< .32$, (b) crossloading (loading at .32 or higher on two or more factors), (c) non-distinct loading (loading difference $\leq .10$ across factors), and (d) communality $< .40$ (Costello & Osborne, 2005). This resulted in a final scale consisting of 14 items. Results from the final EFA are presented in Table 1. KMO's Measure of Sampling Adequacy was adequate at .88, Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 = 1549.73$, $p < .001$), and this solution accounted for 56.54% of the total variance. Communalities ranged from .40 to .67 ($M = 0.57$). The first factor, labeled *Institutional Heterosexism*, contained six items and captured one's evasiveness to various institutional barriers for LGBQ individuals. The second factor, labeled *Heterosexual Privilege*, contained four items and captured the privileges associated with being heterosexual/straight. *Aversive Heterosexism*, the third factor, included four items and captured ideas about how much attention should be given to LGBQ issues and how much LGBQ individuals seem to be pushing their identities on others.

Global factor. The factor correlations ($r_{12} = .53$, $r_{13} = .46$, and $r_{23} = .54$) were strong enough to indicate the presence of a second order factor. Therefore, we conducted a PAF on the correlation matrix of the three factors (Osborne, 2014). A single, second-order factor accounted for 51.17% of the variance in the three first order factors. The factor loadings for the first order factors (*Institutional Heterosexism*, *Heterosexual Privilege*, & *Aversive Heterosexism*) on the second order factor (*Evasive Attitudes of Sexual Orientation*) were .67, .78, and .69, respectively.

Descriptive statistics and reliability. Descriptive statistics are summarized in Table 2. The reliability of the 14-item EASOS as a whole was good; Cronbach's alpha was .89 (95% CI [.86, .91]). The Institutional Heterosexism subscale had very good reliability ($\alpha = .90$; 95% CI [.87, .92]), and the Heterosexual Privilege subscale ($\alpha = .78$; 95% CI [.73, .83]) and the Aversive Heterosexism subscale ($\alpha = .82$; 95% CI [.77, .85]) both had good reliability.

Convergent validity. Correlations among the total EASOS, the three EASOS subscales, the MHS, MHI, and GBJWS were used to assess validity of EASOS scores. Small, medium, and large effect sizes ($r = .10$, $r = .30$, and $r = .50$, respectively) were identified based off Cohen's (1992) guidelines. Results are presented in Table 2. The MHS was strongly correlated with the total EASOS ($r = .70$, $p < .001$), the Institutional Heterosexism subscale ($r = .74$, $p < .001$), and the Aversive Heterosexism subscale ($r = .56$, $p < .001$), and moderately correlated with the Heterosexual Privilege subscale ($r = .30$, $p < .001$). MHI Amnestic Heterosexism subscale followed a similar pattern, as it was strongly correlated with total EASOS ($r = .75$, $p < .001$), the Institutional Heterosexism subscale ($r = .77$, $p < .001$), the Heterosexual Privilege subscale ($r = .50$, $p < .001$), and moderately correlated with the Aversive Heterosexism subscale ($r = .44$, $p < .001$). GBJWS was moderately correlated with the total EASOS ($r = .44$, $p < .001$), strongly correlated with the Institutional Heterosexism subscale ($r = .60$, $p < .001$), and weakly correlated with the Aversive Heterosexism subscale ($r = .35$, $p < .001$). GBJWS did not significantly correlate with the Heterosexual Privilege subscale ($r = .13$, $p = .06$).

Response bias. The correlations among the total EASOS, its subscales, and the MCSDS were examined to provide estimates of response bias. Results suggested weak associations among the MCSDS and the total EASOS ($r = .17$, $p < .05$), the Institutional Heterosexism subscale ($r = .14$, $p < .05$), the Aversive Heterosexism subscale ($r = .09$, $p = .17$), and the Heterosexual Privilege subscale ($r = .19$, $p < .05$).

Study 2: Replication of EASOS Structure and Further Assessment of Validity

The purpose of the second study was to obtain a second sample for further assessment of factor structure and to assess incremental validity of the EASOS. Previous research reports an association between attitudinal measures, such as the CoBRAS, and mental health practitioners'/trainees' multicultural competency such that greater reports of one's colorblind racial attitudes predicted less multicultural counseling skills (Burkard & Knox, 2004). Like the CoBRAS, the EASOS is also an attitudinal measure. Thus, the LGBT Ally Identity Measure (AIM; Jones, Brewster, & Jones, 2014) was selected to assess the EASOS' incremental validity due to its similarity with multicultural competency measures for mental health practitioners/trainees (which tend to assess awareness, knowledge, and skills). However, the AIM is a measure that can be administered to community samples of heterosexual adults, instead of being limited to people in the mental health field, and it is more specifically focused on allyship to LGBT individuals. Jones et al. (2014) concluded that if heterosexual people are not aware that LGBT people encounter oppression, they will not further their ally development via seeking knowledge or building supportive skills. It seems that if an individual possesses little knowledge of the current oppression faced by LGBQ individuals, such as endorsing higher levels of EASOS, they will also report less knowledge and supportive skills, such as endorsing lower levels of LGBT ally identity.

Method

Participants. Four-hundred and twenty-two people began the survey online. Participants were included in the final sample if they identified as heterosexual/straight (which resulted in 44 people being removed from the sample) and responded to all 39 EASOS items (which resulted in

an additional 108 people being removed from the sample; e.g. Mohr & Kendra, 2011). This selection criteria resulted in a final sample consisting of 270 participants. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 75 years with a mean age of 35.20 ($SD = 11.64$). A majority of participants identified as woman, not transgender (62.6%), followed by 37.0% identifying as man, not transgender. One participant (0.4%) identified as man of transgender experience. Participants in the sample identified with the following racial/ethnic identity groups: 4.1% Asian/Pacific Islander, 2.2% South Asian, 10.0% Black/African American, 72.2% Caucasian/White/European American, 6.7% Hispanic/Latino/Latina/Latin@/Latinx, 0.7% Middle Eastern, 1.1% Native American/American Indian, and 2.6% Multiracial. One participant did not select a given category that represented their racial/ethnic identity and chose to describe their racial/ethnic identity in their own words as “White/Latino.” Demographic data on highest level of education attained revealed that 28.1% of participants obtained a Bachelor’s Degree, 24.4% attended some college without obtaining a degree, 12.2% obtained a Master’s Degree, 11.9% obtained a High School Diploma, 17.0% obtained an Associate’s Degree, 0.4% a Doctorate Degree, 1.9% a Professional Degree, 3.0% GED, and 1.1% some high school with no diploma received.

Political ideology and spiritual/religious affiliation provided additional information on the participants. Participants identified their political ideology as Very Liberal (12.2%), Liberal (21.1%), Somewhat Liberal (12.6%), Neutral (23.3%), Somewhat Conservative (13.0%), Conservative (13.3%), and Very Conservative (4.1%). One participant did not identify their political ideology. They identified their spiritual/religious affiliation as follows: Christian/Protestant (24.1%), Agnostic (15.9%), Christian/Catholic (17.0%), Christian/Other (15.9%), Atheist (11.9%), Spiritual but not religious (10.0%), Hindu (1.1%), Jewish (0.4%), Muslim/Islam (0.7%), or Wiccan/Pagan/Neo-Pagan (1.5%). Four participants (1.5%) did not select a given category for their spiritual/religious affiliation and described their identities as “Jehovah’s Witness,” “Messianic Islamic Druid,” and two participants wrote “none.”

Procedure. Procedures mirrored that of the procedures used in Study 1.

Measures. All measures employed in Study 1 were also administered in Study 2, with the addition of the Ally Identity Measure (AIM; Jones et al., 2014). Scale score reliabilities for all measures included in Study 2 are reported in Table 4.

Ally Identity Measure (AIM). The AIM (Jones et al., 2014) measures qualities of being a heterosexual ally to LGBT groups along three dimensions: (a) knowledge and skills, (b) openness and support, and (c) oppression awareness. It consists of 19 items with sample items including, “I have engaged in efforts to promote more widespread acceptance of sexual minority people” and “I know about resources (for example: books, Web sites, support groups, etc.) for sexual minority people in my area.” Responses range from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Total scores range from 19 to 95, and higher scores indicate greater levels of allyship to LGBT individuals. Initial studies using the AIM reported scale score reliabilities of $\alpha = .97, .92,$ and $.88$ (Jones et al., 2014). Test-retest reliability was reported as $r = .73$ (Jones et al., 2014). Convergent validity was demonstrated with significant, negative correlations to social dominance, and significant, positive correlations to collective action (Jones et al., 2014). The AIM showed good scale score reliability in the present sample ($\alpha = .92, 95\% \text{ CI } [.91, .93]$).

Results

Missing data. The amount of missing data for any single item ranged from 0% to 1.9%; approximately 0.59% of data were missing overall. A nonsignificant Little’s MCAR test ($\chi^2 = 2663.08, df = 2823, p = .98$) indicated no evidence of a pattern of missing data. In response to

this finding, missing data were imputed using expectation-maximization (EM) in SPSS (Allison, 2009).

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA).

Determining number of factors. EFA procedures mirrored that of Study 1 (i.e. used principal axis factoring with an oblique rotation) on the 39 preliminary EASOS items. KMO's Measure of Sampling Adequacy was excellent at .93, and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 = 6115.09, p < .001$). The same criteria were used to determine the number of factors that were used in Study 1. These criteria, again, yielded a three-factor solution as being the most interpretable solution.

Development of subscales. Using the same item selection process as in Study 1, we again arrived at a final scale consisting of 14 items. Results from the final EFA are presented in Table 3. KMO's Measure of Sampling Adequacy was excellent at .91, Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 = 2292.44, p < .001$), and this solution accounted for 61.89% of the total variance. Communalities ranged from .42 to .74 ($M = 0.62$). The first factor contained the same six items from Study 1's first factor, (*Institutional Heterosexism*), the second factor contained the same four items as Study 1's second factor (*Heterosexual Privilege*), and the third factor contained the same four items as Study 1's third factor (*Aversive Heterosexism*). Descriptive statistics and correlations for the three factors are presented in Table 4.

Global factor. The factor correlations ($r_{12} = .68, r_{13} = .52, \text{ and } r_{23} = .54$) were again strong enough to indicate the presence of a second order factor. Therefore, we conducted a PAF on the correlation matrix of the three factors (Osborne, 2014). A single, second-order factor accounted for 59.02% of the variance in the three first order factors. The factor loadings for the first order factors (Institutional Heterosexism, Heterosexual Privilege, & Aversive Heterosexism) on the second order factor (Evasive Attitudes of Sexual Orientation) were .82, .83, and .64, respectively. Descriptive statistics and correlations for the global factor are presented in Table 4.

Incremental validity. We used hierarchical linear regression to assess how well the various validity measures (MHS, MHI, GBJWS) and the EASOS predicted LGBT ally identity. Specifically, we wanted to assess if the EASOS predicted AIM scores above and beyond similar measures (MHS, MHI, GBJWS). Social desirability was entered in Step 1, MHS, MHI, and GBJWS were entered in Step 2, and the EASOS was entered in Step 3. Results revealed that social desirability alone did not significantly predict any variance in AIM scores ($F(1, 268) = .88, p = .35, R^2 = .00$). The addition of the MHS, MHI, and GBJWS significantly accounted for 24% of the variance in AIM scores ($\Delta F(2, 265) = 27.89, p < .001, \Delta R^2 = .24$). Specifically, the MHS surfaced as a significant predictor of LGBT ally identity ($\beta = -.61, p < .001$), but the MHI, GBJWS, and MCSDS were not significant predictors. The addition of the EASOS in the model significantly accounted for 8% incremental variance ($\Delta F(1, 264) = 29.28, p < .001, \Delta R^2 = .08$). In this final model, the EASOS ($\beta = -.49, p < .001$), GBJWS ($\beta = .12, p < .05$), MHS ($\beta = -.42, p < .001$), and MHI ($\beta = .31, p = .001$) all significantly predicted LGBT ally identity (see Table 5).

Discussion

Inspired by the CoBRAS and previous literature on attitudes towards LGBTQ individuals, the EASOS measured aspects of evasive attitudes towards sexual orientation. Results showed the global construct of evasive attitudes of sexual orientation including institutional heterosexism, aversive heterosexism, and heterosexual privilege. Investigation of the psychometric properties of the EASOS demonstrated evidence for this three-factor structure of the EASOS with one global factor across two separate samples of heterosexual participants. Also, scores for each factor of the EASOS and the global factor exhibited good scale score reliability with both

obtained samples. Convergent validity evidence was found for each of the three factors and the global factor; demonstrating the EASOS' relation to similar constructs such as modern homonegativity, amnesic heterosexism, and just world beliefs. Despite the strong correlation between the MHS (which was adapted in the present study to use "LGBQ") and total EASOS possibly indicating collinearity, the EASOS provides a more extensive and multi-dimensional measurement of people's sexual orientation attitudes compared to the MHS. Weak correlations between the EASOS and social desirability (MCSDS) provided evidence for a lack of response bias, thereby strengthening the conclusion that scores on the EASOS were poorly related to desirability. Hierarchical regression results elucidated incremental validity evidence of scores on the EASOS. Specifically, scores on the EASOS predicted variance in participants' degree of LGBT ally identity above and beyond what is explained by homonegativity, modern heterosexism, and a global belief in a just world. These results indicate the EASOS is a distinct and significant construct in understanding LGBT ally identity development.

Two of the subscales (Institutional Heterosexism and Heterosexual Privilege) mirror that of the CoBRAS (Institutional Discrimination and Racial Privilege), reflecting some similar mindsets from dominant groups towards minority individuals' realities. It seems there may be some parallel processes to the manner in which racial attitudes manifest in White individuals to the manner in which heterosexist attitudes manifest in heterosexual individuals. Findings from these two subscales in the present study capture how heterosexual individuals may have difficulty recognizing present-day institutional barriers for LGBQ individuals and the remaining presence of heterosexual privilege. When investigating social work students' process in learning about heterosexual privilege, Walls and colleagues (2009) explained how the Acceptance stage of social identity development consists of people accepting the narrative dictated by the dominant culture and rejecting the notion of inequality currently existing. This stage of social identity development can manifest through colorblindness and/or being "sexuality blind" (Walls et al., 2009). Thus, it seems pertinent for the constructs of institutional discrimination and privilege, which have been included in the colorblind racism discourse (Neville et al., 2000; Neville et al., 2013), to also be included in the evasive attitudes of sexual orientation discourse.

Our factor of Aversive Heterosexism appears distinct from the CoBRAS' third factor of Blatant Racial Issues. Neville et al. (2000) described their factor of Blatant Racial Issues to capture White individuals' "unawareness to general, pervasive racial discrimination" (p. 63). Items retained in the Aversive Heterosexism subscale of the EASOS speaks primarily to heterosexual individuals' unawareness of legislative and legal concerns for LGBQ individuals. Also captured in this subscale is one's awareness of LGBQ individuals encountering the stereotype of pushing the 'gay agenda' (as demonstrated in the item "When LGBQ people talk about their significant others they should not be accused of pushing their sexual identity onto others"). This difference in subscales between the CoBRAS and EASOS could be a reflection of the current political climate. The development of this scale shortly followed a timeframe where LGBQ legislative concerns reached the federal level (e.g., marriage equality). In light of marriage equality passing on the federal level, it seems likely that heterosexual people may be less inclined to continue seeing LGBQ issues as warranting legislative attention and this might present a unique condition of evasive attitudes for LGBQ individuals in present day.

Review of the items reveals the second and third factors are composed entirely of reverse-scored items, whereas the first factor contains no reverse-scored items. If these results were impacted by shared method variance and/or construct variance, we would expect to see

higher cross-loadings for items. However, the distinctness in factor loadings lead us to conclude the three factors represent related, but distinct aspects of evasive attitudes.

Limitations

There are a few limitations of this study worth mentioning. Given the increasingly polarized and changing political climate in the United States, we noticed that on our brief demographic questionnaire item measuring political ideology with only *liberal*, *neutral*, and *conservative* options may not have captured all ideologies. For example, libertarians often describe themselves as “socially liberal and fiscally conservative.” This may explain why 27.6% of our first sample, and 23.3% in our second sample responded with neutral. Future research should continue to examine the generalizability of the EASOS among diverse samples.

There was some debate among the authors of how to describe the factors, and specifically the second factor of *Aversive Heterosexism*. Future research should keep in mind that the current study may have fallen into the naming fallacy. In addition, *Institutional Heterosexism* may be the result of a measurement artifact due to the use of ordered categorical variables. Using Pearson correlations to compute relationships among polytomous items may attenuate estimates of the correlations among the underlying constructs. Future research should use data analysis techniques such as polychoric correlations to account for this possibility.

Future development and use of EASOS

Given the developmental nature of the present study, continued testing of reliability and validity is warranted. For example, conducting test-retest reliability would provide further empirical grounding for the EASOS. As mentioned above, examining the validity of the EASOS across various diverse samples and settings would offer greater understanding of conceptual similarities and differences in evasive attitudes of sexual orientation across populations and contexts. Evasive attitudes of sexual orientation likely hold different meanings and may manifest differently for LGBTQ people compared to heterosexual/straight people. Analyzing LGBTQ participants' responses to the EASOS would illuminate these potential differences.

It is clear that self-awareness is an essential component of cultural competence. Thus, future researchers may utilize the EASOS among psychology trainees to assess cultural competence or examine any potential moderating effect it has between other predictive variables and multicultural competence. Utilizing the EASOS with more general populations as an outcomes measure may help assess the effectiveness of various community multicultural competency efforts and building LGBT allies. Qualitative studies might be able to offer a deeper understanding of evasive attitudes of sexual orientation, and therefore, inform us how to further interpret and study the phenomenon.

Conclusion

Evasive attitudes of sexual orientation are of interest as they may lead to micro- and macro-aggressions, the denial of culturally unique experiences of individuals with marginalized sexual identities, and the perpetuation heterosexism (APA, 2012). To our knowledge, the EASOS is the first to specifically assess one's evasive attitudes about sexual orientation. Overall, the preliminary evidence showed good reliability and validity for the EASOS. The EASOS should prove a useful tool to better understand beliefs of heterosexuals about sexual minorities, with both clinical and research applications.

References

- Allison, P. D. (2009). Missing data. In R. E. Millsap & A. Maydeu-Olivares (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of quantitative methods in psychology* (pp. 72-89). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- American Psychological Association. (2012). Guidelines for psychological practice with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients. *American Psychologist*, *67*, 10-42.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0024659>
- Apfelbaum, E. P., Pauker, K., Sommers, S. R., & Ambady, N. (2010). In blind pursuit of racial equality? *Psychological Science*, *21*, 1587-1592.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797610384741>
- Arseneau, J. R., Grzanka, P. R., Miles, J. R., & Fassinger, R. E. (2013). Development and initial validation of the Sexual Orientation Beliefs Scale (SOBS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *60*, 407-420. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0032799>
- Avery, A., Chase, J., Johansson, L., Litvak, S., Montero, D., & Wydra, M. (2007). America's changing attitudes toward homosexuality, civil unions, and same-gender marriage: 1977-2004. *Social Work*, *52*, 71-79. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/sw/52.1.71>
- Bandermann, K. M., & Szymanski, D. M. (2014). Exploring coping mediators between heterosexist oppression and posttraumatic stress symptoms among lesbian, gay, and bisexual persons. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, *1*, 213-224.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000044>
- Barker, M., Richards, C., Jones, R., Bowes-Catton, H., Plowman, T., Yockney, J., & Morgan, M. (2012). *The bisexuality report: Bisexual inclusion in LGBT equality and diversity*. Milton Keynes: The Open University Centre for Citizenship, Identities, and Governance. ISBN: 978-1-78007-41-6.
- Brewster, M. E., Moradi, B., DeBlaere, C., & Velez, B. L. (2013). Navigating the borderlands: The roles of minority stressors, bicultural self-efficacy, and cognitive flexibility in the mental health of bisexual individuals. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *60*, 543-556.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0033224>
- Burkard, A. W., & Knox, S. (2004). Effect of therapist color-blindness on empathy and attributions in cross-cultural counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *51*, 387-397.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.51.4.387>
- Carter, C. (2016). A way to meet queer women? Reflections on sexuality and desire in research. *Sexualities*, *19*, 119-137. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1363460715583594>
- Case, K. A., & Stewart, B. (2010). Changes in diversity course student prejudice and attitudes toward heterosexual privilege and gay marriage. *Teaching of Psychology*, *37*, 172-177.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00986283.2010.488555>
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*, 155-159.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155>
- Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J.W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, *10*(7). Retrieved from <http://pareonline.net/pdf/v10n7.pdf>
- Cowan, G., Heiple, B., Marquez, C., Khatchadourian, D., & McNevin, M. (2005). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward hate crimes and hate speech against gays and lesbians:

- Old-fashioned and modern heterosexism. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 49(2), 67–82.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J082v49n02_04
- Eldridge, J., & Johnson, P. (2011). The relationship between old-fashioned and modern heterosexism to social dominance orientation and structural violence. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 58(3), 382–401. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2011.546734>
- Fetner, T. (2016). U.S. Attitudes toward lesbian and gay people are better than ever. *Contexts: Understanding People in their Social Worlds*, 15, 20-27.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1536504216648147>
- Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Friedman, M. R., Dodge, B., Schick, V., Herbenick, D., Hubach, R. D., Bowling, J. . . Reece, M. (2014). From bias to bisexual health disparities: Attitudes toward bisexual men and women in the United States. *LGBT Health*, 1, 309-318.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/lgbt.2014.0005>
- Furr, M. R., & Bacharach, V. R. (2014). *Psychometrics: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Garriott, P. O., Reiter, S., & Brownfield, J. (2016). Testing the efficacy of brief multicultural education interventions in white college students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 9, 158-169. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039547>
- Hatzenbuehler, M. L., McLaughlin, K. A., Keyes, K. M., & Hasin, D. S. (2010). The impact of institutional discrimination on psychiatric disorder in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: A prospective study. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100, 452-459.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.168815>
- Hatzenbuehler, M. L., Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Erickson, S. J. (2008). Minority stress predictors of HIV risk behavior, substance use, and depressive symptoms: Results from a prospective study of bereaved gay men. *Health Psychology*, 27, 455-462.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.27.4.455>
- Hebl, M. R., & Dovidio, J. F. (2005). Promoting the “social” in the examination of social stigmas. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9, 156–182.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0902_4
- Hettinger, V. E., & Vandello, J. A. (2014). Balance without equality: Just world beliefs, the gay affluence myth, and support for gay rights. *Social Justice Research*, 27, 444-463.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11211-014-0226-2>
- Hinkin, T. R., Tracey, J. B., & Enz, C. A. (1997). Scale construction: Developing reliable and valid measurement instruments. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 21(1), 100-120.
- Holoien, D. S., & Shelton, J. N. (2012). You deplete me: The cognitive costs of colorblindness on ethnic minorities. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 48, 562-565.
- Hughes, C. E., Hunter, C. D., Vargas, P. T., Schlosser, M. D., & Malhi, R. S. (2016). Police endorse color-blind racial beliefs more than laypersons. *Race and Social Problems*, 8, 160-170. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12552-016-9170-0>
- Jewell, L. M., McCutcheon, J. M., Harriman, R. L., & Morrison, M. A. (2012). “It’s like a bunch of mosquitoes coming at you . . .”: Exploring the ubiquitous nature of subtle discrimination and its implications for the everyday experiences of LGB individuals. In T. G. Morrison, M. A. Morrison, M. A. Carrigan, & D. T. McDermott (Eds.), *Sexual minority research in the new millennium* (pp. 157–186). New York, NY: Nova Science.

- Jewell, L. M., & Morrison, M. A. (2010). "But there's a million jokes about everybody . . .": Prevalence of, and reasons for, directing negative behaviors toward gay men on a Canadian university campus. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*, 2094–2112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0886260509354499>
- Johnson, A., & Jackson Williams, D. (2015). White racial identity, color-blind racial attitudes, and multicultural counseling competence. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 21*, 440-449. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0037533>
- Jones, K. N., Brewster, M. E., & Jones, J. A. (2014). The creation and validation of the LGBT Ally Identity Measure. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 1*, 181-195. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000033>
- King, M., Semlyen, J., Tai, S. S., Killaspy, H., Osborn, D., Popelyuk, D., & Nazareth, I. (2008). A systematic review of mental disorder, suicide, and deliberate self harm in lesbian, gay and bisexual people. *BMC Psychiatry, 8*, 70–78. doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-8-70
- Kite, M. E., & Bryant-Lees, K. B. (2016). Historical and contemporary attitudes toward homosexuality. *Teaching of Psychology, 43*, 164-170. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0098628316636297>
- Lehavot, K., & Simoni, J. M. (2011). The impact of minority stress on mental health and substance use among sexual minority women. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 79*, 159-170. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0022839>
- Lipkus, I. (1991). The construction and preliminary validation of a global belief in a just world scale and the exploratory analysis of the multidimensional belief in a just world scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12*, 1171-1178. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(91\)90081-L](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(91)90081-L)
- Mays, V. M., & Cochran, S. D. (2001). Mental health correlates of perceived discrimination among, lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health, 91*, 1869-1876. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.91.11.1869>
- Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 674-697. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.674>
- Mohr, J. J., & Kendra, M. S. (2011). Revision and extension of a multidimensional measure of sexual minority identity: The Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identity Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58*(2), 234-245. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0022858>
- 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*(2), 15-37. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J082v43n02_02
- Morrison, M. A., & Morrison, T. G. (2011). Sexual orientation bias toward gay men and lesbian women: Modern homonegative attitudes and their association with discriminatory behavioral intentions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 41*, 2573-2599. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00838.x>
- Mucciaroni, G. (2008). *Same sex, different politics: Success and failure in the struggles over gay rights*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226544106.001.0001>
- Nadal, K. L., Rivera, D. P., & Corpus, M. J. H. (2010). Sexual orientation and transgender microaggressions: Implications for mental health and counseling. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 217–240). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley

- Nadal, K. L., Wong, Y., Issa, M., Meterko, V., Leon, J., & Wideman, M. (2011). Sexual orientation microaggressions: Processes and coping mechanism for lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling, 5*, 21-46. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15538605.2011.554606>
- Neville, H. A., Awad, G. H., Brooks, J. E., & Flores, M. P. (2013). Color-blind racial ideology: Theory, training, and measurement implications in psychology. *American Psychologist, 68*, 455-466. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0033282>
- Neville, H. A., Lilly, R. L., Duran, G., Lee, R. M., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 59-70. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.59>
- Osborne, J. W. (2014). *Best practices in exploratory factor analysis*. Scotts Valley, CA: CreateSpace Independent Publishing.
- Pew Research Center. (2015). Changing attitudes on gay marriage. Retrieved from <http://www.pewforum.org/2015/07/29/graphics slideshow-changing-attitudes-on-gay-marriage/>
- Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 38*, 119-125.
- Rist, R. C. (1974). Race, policy and schooling. *Society, 12*, 59-63.
- Robinson, J. L., & Rubin, L. J. (2016). Homonegative microaggressions and posttraumatic stress symptoms. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health, 20*, 54-69. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19359705.2015.1066729>
- Seelman, K. L., & Walls, N. E. (2010). Person—organization incongruence as a predictor of right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and heterosexism. *Journal of Social Work Education, 46*, 103–122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5175/JSWE.2010.200800082>
- Smith, L. C., & Shin, R. Q. (2014). Queer blindfolding: A case study on difference ‘blindness’ toward persons who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender. *Journal of Homosexuality, 61*, 940-961. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014.870846>
- Szymanski, D. M., & Balsam, K. F. (2011). Insidious trauma: Examining the relationship between heterosexism and lesbian’s PTSD symptoms. *Traumatology, 17*(2), 4-13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1534765609358464>
- Velez, B. L., Watson, L. B., Cox, R., Jr., & Flores, M. J. (2017). Minority stress and racial or ethnic minority status: A test of the greater risk perspective. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 4*(3), 257-271. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000226>
- Walls, N. E. (2008). Toward a multidimensional understanding of heterosexism: The changing nature of prejudice. *Journal of Homosexuality, 55*, 20–70. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00918360802129287>
- Walls, N. E., Griffin, R., Arnold-Renicker, H., Burson, M., Johnston, C., Moorman, N., ... & Schutte, E. C. (2009). Mapping graduate social work student learning journeys about heterosexual privilege. *Journal of Social Work Education, 45*, 289-307.
- Woodford, M. R., Atteberry, B., Derr, M., & Howell, M. (2013). Endorsement for civil rights for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people among heterosexual college students: Informing socially just policy advocacy. *Journal of Community Practice, 21*, 203-227. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10705422.2013.811623>
- Woodford, M. R., Kulick, A., Sinco, B. R., & Hong, J. S. (2014). Contemporary heterosexism on campus and psychological distress among LGBTQ students: The mediating role of self-

acceptance. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 84, 519-529.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ort000001>

Table 1.
Exploratory Factor Analysis Final EASOS Item Stems, Factors, Coefficients, and Communalities for Study 1 (N = 221)

Item Stem	Factors ^{a,b}			h ²
	1	2	3	
20. There is sufficient legislation in place to protect LGBQ people within the U.S.	.85 (.81)	-.13 (.35)	.05 (.37)	.66
16. LGBQ student organizations - such as gay-straight alliances - are sufficiently available throughout the U.S.	.85 (.75)	-.22 (.24)	.03 (.30)	.59
22. Community centers serving LGBQ people - such as LGBT Centers - are sufficiently available throughout the U.S.	.84 (.81)	-.07 (.39)	.02 (.37)	.67
29. People treat LGBQ people as fairly as they treat heterosexual/straight people.	.73 (.79)	.22 (.54)	-.12 (.34)	.65
24. LGBQ people have equal advantages compared to heterosexual/straight people.	.71 (.78)	.18 (.52)	-.06 (.37)	.63
15. U.S. public school teachers and staff receive adequate training on the challenges faced by LGBQ youth.	.65 (.67)	.11 (.41)	-.08 (.28)	.46
27. Heterosexual/Straight people-compared to LGBQ people- have increased possibilities for getting a job, receiving on the job training, and promotion. (R)	-.07 (.38)	.75 (.77)	.10 (.47)	.60
2. Heterosexual/Straight people in the US have certain advantages due to their sexual identity (R)	-.06 (.26)	.71 (.62)	-.11 (.24)	.40
25. The U.S. social structure system promotes heterosexual/straight privilege. (R)	.08 (.43)	.71 (.72)	-.05 (.37)	.53
17. Heterosexual /Straight people have it easier than LGBQ people. (R)	-.05 (.33)	.64 (.67)	.10 (.42)	.45
8. When LGBQ people talk about their significant others they should not be accused of pushing their sexual identity onto others. (R)	-.13 (.20)	-.08 (.28)	.80 (.70)	.51
32. LGBQ people deserve the same employment rights and benefits as heterosexual/straight people. (R)	-.11 (.22)	-.01 (.32)	.72 (.67)	.46
33. It is important for political leaders to address LGBQ issues. (R)	.20 (.54)	.04 (.51)	.68 (.80)	.67
34. There is a need for more legislation that protects LGBQ people against sexual identity-based discrimination. (R)	.18 (.54)	.16 (.58)	.60 (.77)	.65

Note. 1 = Institutional Heterosexism. 2 = Heterosexual Privilege. 3 = Aversive Heterosexism. Bolded coefficients are those items retained for that factor.

a. Factor correlations were as follows: $r_{12} = .53$, $r_{13} = .46$, and $r_{23} = .54$. b. Pattern coefficients are followed by structure coefficients in parentheses.

Table 2.
Correlations and Reliability Coefficients for Study 1 (N = 221)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. EASOS-IH	--							
2. EASOS-HP	.42**	--						
3. EASOS-AH	.44**	.48**	--					
4. EASOS-Total	.85**	.76**	.77**	--				
5. GBJWS	.60**	.13	.25**	.44**	--			
6. MHS	.74**	.30**	.56**	.70**	.50**	--		
7. MHI-AH	.77**	.50**	.44**	.75**	.46**	.63**	--	
8. MCSDS	.14*	.19*	.09	.17*	.10	.05	.14*	--
Reliability [95% CI]	.90 [.87, .92]	.78 [.73, .83]	.82 [.77, .85]	.89 [.86, .91]	.89 [.86, .91]	.91 [.89, .92]	.93 [.91, .94]	.71 [.66, .77]
M	3.13	3.02	2.66	2.96	23.64	34.66	11.91	19.13
SD	1.11	1.11	1.12	.89	7.06	10.68	6.41	2.97
Range	1-5.83	1-6	1-6	1.06-5.07	7-40	12-58	4-28	13-26

Note. EASOS-IH = Evasive Attitudes of Sexual Orientation Scale -Institutional Heterosexism; EASOS-HP = Evasive Attitudes of Sexual Orientation Scale - Heterosexual Privilege; EASOS-AH = Evasive Attitudes of Sexual Orientation Scale -Aversive Heterosexism Scale; EASOS-Total = Evasive Attitudes of Sexual Orientation Scale -Total; GBJWS = Global Beliefs in a Just World Scale; MHS = Modern Homonegativity Scale; MHI-AH = Multidimensional Heterosexism Inventory-Amnestic Heterosexism; MCSDS = Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale Form C.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 3.
Exploratory Factor Analysis Final EASOS Item Stems, Factors, Coefficients, and Communalities for Study 2 (N = 270)

Item Stem	Factors ^{a,b}			h ²
	1	2	3	
22. Community centers serving LGBQ people - such as LGBT Centers - are sufficiently available throughout the U.S.	.84 (.79)	-.03 (.51)	-.07 (.36)	.63
29. People treat LGBQ people as fairly as they treat heterosexual/straight people.	.83 (.83)	-.02 (.56)	.02 (.45)	.69
16. LGBQ student organizations - such as gay-straight alliances - are sufficiently available throughout the U.S.	.83 (.78)	.05 (.52)	-.16 (.30)	.62
20. There is sufficient legislation in place to protect LGBQ people within the U.S.	.82 (.82)	-.14 (.52)	.20 (.55)	.71
24. LGBQ people have equal advantages compared to heterosexual/straight people.	.75 (.84)	.22 (.67)	-.10 (.41)	.74
15. U.S. public school teachers and staff receive adequate training on the challenges faced by LGBQ youth.	.66 (.65)	.00 (.43)	-.03 (.32)	.42
2. Heterosexual/Straight people in the US have certain advantages due to their sexual identity (R)	.00 (.53)	.86 (.80)	-.11 (.35)	.65
27. Heterosexual/Straight people-compared to LGBQ people- have increased possibilities for getting a job, receiving on the job training, and promotion. (R)	-.03 (.52)	.85 (.80)	-.05 (.39)	.64
25. The U.S. social structure system promotes heterosexual/straight privilege. (R)	.06 (.56)	.68 (.76)	.06 (.46)	.58
17. Heterosexual /Straight people have it easier than LGBQ people. (R)	-.02 (.52)	.67 (.75)	.17 (.52)	.58
32. LGBQ people deserve the same employment rights and benefits as heterosexual/straight people. (R)	-.19 (.21)	-.08 (.26)	.86 (.72)	.56
8. When LGBQ people talk about their significant others they should not be accused of pushing their sexual identity onto others. (R)	-.07 (.33)	.00 (.36)	.76 (.72)	.52
33. It is important for political leaders to address LGBQ issues. (R)	.22 (.60)	.06 (.55)	.65 (.80)	.68
34. There is a need for more legislation that protects LGBQ people against sexual identity-based discrimination. (R)	.23 (.63)	.17 (.62)	.54 (.75)	.65

Note. 1 = Institutional Heterosexism; 2 = Heterosexual Privilege; 3 = Aversive Heterosexism. Bolded coefficients are those items retained for that factor.

a. Factor correlations were as follows: $r_{12} = .68$, $r_{13} = .52$, and $r_{23} = .54$. b. Pattern coefficients are followed by structure coefficients in parentheses.

Table 4.
Correlations and Reliability Coefficients for Study 2 (N =270)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. EASOS-IH	--								
2. EASOS-HP	.61**	--							
3. EASOS-AH	.52**	.54**	--						
4. EASOS-Total	.89**	.84**	.78**	--					
5. GBJWS	.61**	.28**	.31**	.51**	--				
6. MHS	.78**	.50**	.61**	.77**	.53**	--			
7. MHI-AH	.80**	.56**	.55**	.78**	.50**	.78**	--		
8. MCSDS	.19**	.13*	.20**	.21**	.19**	.17**	.16**	--	
9. AIM	-.31**	-.39**	-.61**	-.50**	-.19**	-.48**	-.33**	-.06	--
Reliability [95% CI]	.91 [.89, .92]	.86 [.83, .88]	.83 [.79, .86]	.92 [.90, .93]	.90 [.88, .92]	.93 [.92, .94]	.96 [.95, .97]	.74 [.69, .78]	.92 [.91, .93]
<i>M</i>	3.07	3.00	2.55	2.90	23.43	33.70	7.08	19.47	60.16
<i>SD</i>	1.19	1.25	1.18	1.02	7.48	11.82	11.53	3.09	14.28
Range	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-5.86	7-42	12-60	4-28	13-26	19-95

Note. EASOS-IH = Evasive Attitudes of Sexual Orientation Scale -Institutional Heterosexism; EASOS-HP = Evasive Attitudes of Sexual Orientation Scale -Heterosexual Privilege; EASOS-AH = Evasive Attitudes of Sexual Orientation Scale -Aversive Heterosexism Scale; EASOS-Total = Evasive Attitudes of Sexual Orientation Scale -Total; GBJWS = Global Beliefs in a Just World Scale; MHS = Modern Homonegativity Scale; MHI-AH = Multidimensional Heterosexism Inventory-Amnestic Heterosexism; MCSDS = Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale Form C; AIM = Ally Identity Measure
p* < .05, *p* < .01.

Table 5.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting AIM (N = 270)

Step and variable	<i>B</i> [<i>SE</i>]	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i> ²	Adjusted <i>R</i> ²
Step 1					.003	.000
MCSDS	-.263 [.281]	-.057	-.936	.350		
Step 2					.242	.231
MCSDS	.061 [.252]	.013	.241	.810		
MHS	-.731 [.107]	-.605	-6.844	.000		
MHI-AH	.201 [.174]	.100	1.156	.249		
GBJWS	.157 [.123]	.082	1.275	.204		
Step 3					.318	.305
MCSDS	.183 [.241]	.040	.759	.449		
MHS	-.506 [.110]	-.419	-4.610	.000		
MHI-AH	.624 [.183]	.310	3.412	.001		
GBJWS	.234 [.118]	.122	1.985	.048		
EASOS	-6.852 [1.266]	-.488				

Note. EASOS = Evasive Attitudes of Sexual Orientation Scale -Total; GBJWS = Global Beliefs in a Just World Scale; MHS = Modern Homonegativity Scale; MHI-AH = Multidimensional Heterosexism Inventory-Amnestic Heterosexism; MCSDS = Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale Form C; AIM = Ally Identity Measure.

Appendix
Evasive Attitudes of Sexual Orientation Scale

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statement below by circling the appropriate number to the right of each statement. In the following statements, sexual identity minorities will be identified with the acronym LGBQ - referring to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer identifying individuals.

EASOS Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Heterosexual/Straight people in the US have certain advantages due to their sexual identity (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. When LGBQ people talk about their significant others they should not be accused of pushing their sexual identity onto others. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. U.S. public school teachers and staff receive adequate training on the challenges faced by LGBQ youth.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. LGBQ student organizations - such as gay-straight alliances - are sufficiently available throughout the U.S.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Heterosexual /Straight people have it easier than LGBQ people. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. There is sufficient legislation in place to protect LGBQ people within the U.S.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Community centers serving LGBQ people - such as LGBT Centers - are sufficiently available throughout the U.S.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. LGBQ people have equal advantages compared to heterosexual/straight people.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. The U.S. social structure system promotes heterosexual/straight privilege. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Heterosexual/Straight people-compared to LGBQ people-have increased possibilities for getting a job, receiving on the job training, and promotion. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. People treat LGBQ people as fairly as they treat heterosexual/straight people.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. LGBQ people deserve the same employment rights and benefits as heterosexual/straight people. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. It is important for political leaders to address LGBQ issues. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. There is a need for more legislation that protects LGBQ people against sexual identity-based discrimination. (R)	1	2	3	4	5	6

Researchers may use this scale without obtaining our permission. Items followed by (R) should be reverse-scored before calculating totals. To obtain subscale scores, average the following items: *Institutional Heterosexism* (3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11); *Aversive Heterosexism* (2, 12, 13, 14); and *Heterosexual Privilege* (1, 5, 9, 10).