

A FEW GOOD (STRAIGHT) MEN: UNCOUPLING THE EFFECTS OF GENDER
ROLES AND SEXUAL ORIENTATION ON SEXUAL PREJUDICE TOWARD
ARMY PERSONNEL

by

Lauren Marie Hawthorne

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Science

in

Psychological Science

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

April 2011

©COPYRIGHT

by

Lauren Marie Hawthorne

2011

All Rights Reserved

APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Lauren Marie Hawthorne

This thesis has been read by each member of the thesis committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citation, bibliographic style, and consistency and is ready for submission to The Graduate School.

Jessi L. Smith, Ph.D.

Approved for the Department of Psychology

Keith Hutchinson, Ph.D.

Approved for The Graduate School

Dr. Carl A. Fox

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

If I have indicated my intention to copyright this thesis by including a copyright notice page, copying is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this thesis in whole or in parts may be granted only by the copyright holder.

Lauren Marie Hawthorne

April, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. STUDY 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Cultural Worldviews: A Role Congruity Perspective.....	2
A Role Congruity Perspective on Gender and Prejudice.....	4
Beyond Gender Worldviews: Inversion Theory, Sexuality, and Sexual Prejudice	5
A Focus on Violating Roles within a Male- Dominated Domain: The Army	9
Project Overview	11
Study 1	12
Study 1 Hypotheses.....	12
Pattern of Results Predicted by ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell’	12
Pattern of Results Predicted by Role-Congruity Theory	13
Pattern of Results Predicted by Inversion Theory	13
Gender of Participants and Prejudice Toward Recruits.....	14
2. STUDY 1 METHOD	15
Participants.....	15
Procedure and Materials	15
Gender and Sexual Orientation Manipulations.....	17
Dependent Measures.....	18
Manipulation Check.....	18
Blatant Prejudice Measures.....	18
Subtle Prejudice Measures.....	19
Overall Participant Characteristic Measures.....	20
Attitudes toward Gays and Lesbians.....	20
Attitudes toward Women	20
DADT Opinion Questionnaire.....	21
3. STUDY 1 RESULTS	22
Participant Characteristics	22
Blatant Prejudice Results	23
Hiring Recommendations for the Recruit.....	23

TABLE OF CONTENTS - CONTINUED

Suggested Salary.....	24
Promotion Likelihood.....	24
Subtle Prejudice Results	25
Impressions of General Competence	25
Perceptions of Career Ability.....	26
Social Distancing	27
Summary.....	28
4. STUDY 1 DISCUSSION.....	30
5. STUDY 2 INTRODUCTION.....	34
Threatened Cultural Worldviews: A Terror Management Theory Perspective.....	34
Study 2 Hypotheses.....	39
Main Effect of CWV Appeal	39
Main Effect of Participant Gender.....	39
Interaction Effects of Participant Gender and CWV Appeal	39
6. STUDY 2 METHOD	41
Participants.....	41
Procedure and Materials	41
Worldview Appeal Manipulations.....	43
7. STUDY 2 RESULTS	44
Participant Characteristics	44
Blatant Prejudice Results	45
Hiring Recommendations for the Recruit.....	45
Suggested Salary.....	45
Promotion Likelihood.....	46
Subtle Prejudice Results	46
Impressions of General Competence	46
Perceptions of Career Ability.....	47
Social Distancing	47
Feelings of Warmth toward the Recruit.....	48
Mortality Salience Results	48
Summary.....	49
8. STUDY 2 DISCUSSION.....	53

TABLE OF CONTENTS - CONTINUED

9. GENERAL DISCUSSION54

 Limitations and Future Directions57

 Implications of the Research.....62

REFERENCES CITED.....64

APPENDICES72

 APPENDIX A: Recruit Resume for Studies 1 and 2.....73

 APPENDIX B: Recruit Personal Statement for Studies 1 and 2 (Gay Man).....76

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Subtle and Blatant Prejudice Directed Toward the Recruit as a Function of the Soldier's Gender and Sexual Orientation in Study 1.....	28
2. Subtle and Blatant Prejudice Directed Toward the Recruit as a Function of Participant Gender and Worldview Appeal in Study 2	49
3. Pearson Correlations Among Mortality Salience and Measures of Subtle and Blatant Prejudice	51

ABSTRACT

How do gender and sexuality stereotypes combine to contribute to sexual prejudice? This project was designed to determine to what extent gender and sexual orientation separately and jointly contribute to prejudice resulting from role-incongruity and whether such prejudice could be attenuated by appealing to shared cultural worldviews. In two studies, participants were asked to rate former soldiers on their suitability to be re-recruited into the Army. Study 1 (n= 155) manipulated the gender and sexual orientation of the recruit and found that both gender and sexual orientation were influential in ratings of the recruit, such that for the man recruit, being straight resulted in the most favorable ratings whereas being gay resulted in the most negative bias. For the woman recruit, sexual orientation did not systematically influence ratings. Results support either a role congruity or an inversion theory hypothesis. Given the recruit's resume likely triggered thoughts of death (mortality salience) in participants, Study 2 (n = 163) attempted to experimentally attenuate the prejudice against the gay soldier via appeals to national and relationship worldviews. However, ratings were unchanged per the manipulations. Study 2 did find a positive correlation between amount of subtle prejudice and mortality salience. Implications for role-congruity theory, sexual prejudice, and applied implications for the military's 'don't ask, don't tell' policy are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

In its October 4, 2010 issue, a Newsweek article entitled “Do ask, do tell” told the story of Joseph Rocha, who joined the military as part of a specialized bomb-detection unit in Bahrain. Soon after he joined, his fellow soldiers learned that that Joseph was gay and he became an object of ridicule and derision for them. This continued until 2007 when he was forced to sign a document admitting his sexuality (Conant, 2010). Joseph Rocha is one of an estimated 11,000 troops that have been discharged under the military policy of “don’t ask, don’t tell” (DADT) (Servicemember’s Legal Defense Network, 2006).

This project aims to examine how cultural worldviews concerning gender and sexual orientation can cause sexual prejudice and discriminatory behaviors when individuals do not “fit” with the prescribed expectations for success in a given domain. With one or two notable exceptions, gender worldviews are typically confounded with sexual orientation worldviews and stereotypes (Lehavot & Lambert, 2007; Allen & Smith, 2011). Thus, it is important to understand the individual and joint influence of both worldviews in predicting sexual prejudice in a specific domain. Role incongruity theory provides a framework to examine the ways that gender norms and sexual orientation norms may individually and jointly influence prejudice. This thesis project aims to address two questions: What unique and combined roles do gender and sexual orientation play in the expression of sexual prejudice toward an individual and can sexual prejudice be attenuated by appealing to a core value of an individual’s cultural worldview? These questions will be examined using a military setting because military

settings have very clear gender and sexual orientation worldviews and the consequences for violating those worldviews are high. In addition, a military context adds applied value to the results, due to military laws such as “Don’t ask, don’t tell” which (at least until very recently) prohibited the service of those who are gay.

Cultural Worldviews: A Role Congruity Theory Perspective

A “cultural worldview” is as an individual’s set of beliefs about the way the world is organized, which includes information about what kinds of rules and guidelines an individual should follow in society in order to be seen as a good person (Rosenblatt, Greenberg, Solomon, Pyszczynski, & Lyon, 1989). The cultural worldview (CWV) can be at the level of national identity (e.g., American) as well as other important identities (e.g., religious identity, gender identity, or even sport team identity) (Dechesne et al., 2000; Jonas & Fischer, 2006; Walsh & Smith, 2002). A CWV is shaped by norms and stereotypes prescribed by the in-group (Schimel, Simon, Greenberg, Pyszczynski, Solomon, Waxmonsky, & Arndt, 1999). People who adhere to the CWV’s norms and values are afforded many psychological benefits (such as self-esteem, Greenberg, Solomon, Pyszczynski, Rosenblatt, Burling, Lyon, Simon, & Pinel, 1992) whereas people who violate the CWV are often derogated (Greenberg et al., 1992; Rosenblatt et al., 1989; Schimel et al., 1999).

A CWV provides a set of rules and roles for a person to follow – and to expect other people to follow. The focus of this thesis is on perceptions of others who violate a CWV. Role-congruity theory suggests that people will derogate others who do not fit the

CWV mandated “roles”. Specifically, the theory purposes that prejudice and discrimination will arise when people perceive a mismatch between the stereotypical characteristics of a group of people, and the roles that a member of that group is attempting to fulfill. Further, people are especially likely to be prejudiced against worldview violators under threatening conditions, because people will be highly motivated to defend their cultural worldview (Das, Bushman, Bezemer, Kerkhof, & Vermeulen, 2009). Therefore, to protect the cultural worldview, individuals who are threatened, should be more motivated to derogate a person who does not adhere to typical gender (and sexuality) norms.

People who have threatened worldviews may derogate others in different ways in order to alleviate the discomfort resulting from the threat (Greenberg Pyszczynski, Solomon, Rosenblatt, Veeder, Kirkland, & Lyon, 1990; McGregor, Lieberman, Greenberg, Solomon, Arndt, Simon, & Pyszczynski, 1998). These expressions of prejudice can take two forms: blatant and subtle prejudice. Blatant prejudice tends to be an overt dislike for an outgroup as well as a belief in the inferiority of that group (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). Expressions of blatant prejudice include taking steps to avoid threatening individuals or acting very coldly towards them during forced interactions (Rothschild, Abdollahi, & Pyszczynski, 2009).

However, research on the expression of prejudice over the last twenty years has found that the emergence of subtle prejudice is a more socially acceptable form of expressing prejudice than blatant prejudice because it can be masked as other phenomena (e.g., concern for the victim of prejudice; McConahay, 1983; Pettigrew & Meertens,

1995; Rattazzi & Volpato, 2003). Due to the emphasis on blatant prejudice not being socially acceptable, subtle prejudice has become a more common occurrence (Brief, Dietz, Cohen, Pugh, & Vaslow, 2000). Thus, prejudice has transformed from more explicit forms to more “modern” subtle forms because of social desirability and political correctness (Rattazzi & Volpato, 2003.) These expressions include men saying that they appreciate women as a whole, but they also generally find them less able in settings requiring dominant traits. Role-congruity research takes into account both expressions of prejudice to be able to fully account for the effects demonstrated in this line of research. Role-congruity theory is designed to explain the causes of prejudice toward a variety of groups, but the majority of research on role-congruity theory has centered on gender.

A Role Congruity Perspective on Gender Roles and Prejudice

How are people perceived if they violate their prescribed gender roles? Role congruity theory predicts that individuals who do not match the roles that are expected of them will experience prejudice. Instances of prejudice should be especially strong in the case of gender norms due to how prescriptive these norms tend to be compared to other types of norms (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992; Fiske & Stevens, 1993). For instance, women are expected to be nurturing and communal whereas men are expected to be agentic and independent (Fiske & Stevens, 1993). Stereotypes about other groups such as African-Americans are more descriptive than prescriptive. For instance, African-Americans may be stereotyped as underperformers in academic settings, but this does not necessarily mean that they are expected to underperform in academic settings and that they will suffer if they fail to live up to these expectations.

Role congruity theory predicts that women and men who violate prescriptive gender worldviews experience prejudice. Prejudice that arises from a gender role violation may be blatant as in the case of sexual harassment, but it may be evident in more subtle ways, such as others questioning the competence or ability for an individual to do their job. For instance, Smith, Paul, and Paul (2007) evaluated gender prejudice in domains where women were becoming more prevalent (the United States Senate) and domains that were still dominated by men (the United States Presidency). The researchers asked participants to evaluate resumes for these positions that were identical except for having a masculine name (Brian) or a feminine (Karen) name. Results showed that whereas men and women were evaluated equally for the Senate position (which has several women), the female candidate was evaluated lower than the male candidate for the Presidency (which has always been a male role). Numerous studies have established similar findings in regards to gender and prejudice stemming from role-incongruity (Diekmann & Goodfriend, 2006; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie, & Reichard, 2008), but fewer have focused on sexuality, despite the close link between gender and sexuality. The few that have are reviewed next.

Beyond Gender Worldviews: Inversion Theory, Sexuality and Sexual Prejudice

The majority of research on role-congruity theory has centered on gender with only one or two studies generalizing the findings from gender research into other areas such as ageism (Diekmann & Hirnisey, 2007). Allen and Smith (2011) have one notable exception. In this research, the authors examined heterosexual men's perceptions of and

motivations for stereotypically feminine professions (i.e., nursing, elementary school education) as a function of sexuality norms. In this set of studies, the researchers manipulated whether items were present in the environment that brought awareness of ideas and issues related to gay individuals (i.e., a Gay Pride pencil and calendar). They then had participants complete a feminine task (either an elementary school teaching task or a nursing task) and found that when gay salience was activated by those items, heterosexual men reported less interest in the feminine tasks, less effort, and lower future motivation for the task. This suggests that when sexuality stereotypes were activated, subtle heterosexism was operating and heterosexual men perceived a role “misfit” between their masculine gender role and the stereotypically feminine role of the profession and thus did not want to be associated with the profession.

These results were interpreted using implicit inversion theory. This theory suggests that people who are gay are expected to fulfill gender-roles similar to a heterosexual member of the opposite sex (Kite & Deaux, 1987). For instance, men who are gay and women who are straight are expected to have similar characteristics and to exhibit stereotypically feminine personality traits such as being graceful, kind, and communal. Both groups are also expected to take up stereotypically feminine roles. Women who are lesbian on the other hand are seen as more masculine and similar to men who are straight (Kite & Deaux, 1987). Results of Allen and Smith (2011) thus suggest that sexual orientation is an important part of the gender CWV. Additionally, further inversion research by Whitley (2001) also found that endorsement of traditional male gender roles and negative attitudes toward those who invert traditional male gender roles

was linked to negative views of gay men, providing further evidence for the link between gender roles and sexuality. As such, one goal of the current thesis is to further understand the unique contribution of these norms to sexual prejudice.

In comparison to other types of prejudice such as racial prejudice, less is known about sexual prejudice, and how sexual orientation role violations impact people's perceptions of others. What is known from the literature is that prejudice towards people who are gay or lesbian is a widespread occurrence in American culture that is associated with negative outcomes for the victim such as derogation and physical violence (Herek, 1988). Additionally, prejudice toward men who are gay and women who are lesbian are not necessarily equivalent. Herek (2000) found that expressions of prejudice toward individuals who are gay may depend both on whether one is examining gay men or lesbians as well as the gender of the people doing the rating, as women tend to be less negative toward individuals who are gay. These expectations of how gender roles and sexual orientation are linked may be a double-edged sword for people who are gay. This prejudice towards men who are gay and women who are lesbian can stem from motivations such as morals and religion, but research also links prejudice toward gay men and lesbian women to views about gender norms (Martin, 1995). Research has found that gay men who were stereotype-consistent (i.e., very feminine) were liked significantly less than those who was stereotype-inconsistent (i.e., very masculine) (Schimel et al., 1999; Glick et al., 2007). Lehavot and Lambert (2007) studied this further by disentangling the close links between sexual orientation and gender to determine which was motivating blatant sexual prejudice towards men who were gay and women who were lesbian. In

their study, Lehavot and Lambert independently manipulated sexual orientation, gender, and gendered behaviors (e.g. fixed the leaky bathroom faucet, noticed the spaghetti sauce had too much oregano) that the target performed. They asked participants to read a short biography of an individual, and then rate their general likeableness, how masculine or feminine they were, and how immoral they perceived the individual to be. The researchers found no effect of gendered behaviors, but they did find that gay targets were disparaged relative to straight targets, but only for high prejudice individuals (as determined by their responses to the Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians scale [Herek, 1988]). Furthermore, they found that perceived violations of gender roles as determined by biological sex also drove negative reactions, particularly towards the masculine lesbian. Again, this interaction was found only among high prejudice individuals.

This study was one of the first to try to precisely determine how gender and sexual orientation roles interact to determine sexual prejudice. However, this study only examined blatant prejudice toward men who are gay and women who are lesbian, which is important to determine, but does not provide a full range of the experience of prejudice that these individuals may face. For example, gay individuals in a workplace situation may be denied a promotion due to perceptions about his or her competence that these roles combine to create rather than perceptions of his or her immorality. Additionally, this study only examined general sexual prejudice rather than sexual prejudice in a certain context. Role congruity theory would predict that prejudice and which groups may be derogated may vary depending on what role these individual are trying to fulfill. When a group attempts to fill a role that is incongruent with the worldview about that

group, they will likely face prejudice (Eagly & Diekmann, 2005). Therefore, the current project aims to use a variation of the Lehavot and Lambert (2007) paradigm, but to examine indicators of both blatant and subtle prejudice as well as to place these individuals into a specific context to determine whether prejudice varies depending on their situation.

Due to gender worldviews and sexual orientation being closely linked, both blatant and subtle sexual prejudice should extend to individuals with a sexual orientation incongruent with the perceived gender roles of a job. In other words, implicit inversion theory and role congruity theory suggest that a gay man attempting to fulfill the role of a manager or a highly agentic job should suffer prejudice due to his being perceived as highly feminine and trying to fulfill a highly masculine role. However, role-congruity theory would go further and suggest that a straight woman would also suffer prejudice in these roles due to the mismatch of her own femininity to the masculinity of the domain. In this thesis, the focus is on a particularly masculine domain: the United States Army.

A Focus on Violating Roles within a Male-Dominated Domain: The Army

In considering arenas in which to study sexual orientation and gender role incongruity, the Army is ideal to focus attention on because it is an area where there are very definitive norms about the appropriate roles for men and women as well as individuals who are straight or gay. Overall, the Army is a very masculine domain, which makes it ideal to test what gender and sexual orientation roles fit there and which does not.

To begin, the Army is a male-dominated and male-centered domain. A 2007 military census from the Department of Defense reports that women comprise only 15% of active duty troops in the United States military and 16% of military officers. Additionally, the Army imposes differing physical standards for men and women (Department of the Army, 1998) and does not permit women to hold military positions that would result in active ground-troop combat, though they may now participate in air and boat combat (Secretary of Defense, personal communication, January 13, 1994). Women who do enlist in the military may also face significant prejudice from their fellow soldiers (Biernat et al., 1998). The Army explicitly states that they are an equal-opportunity organization and blatant prejudice among its troops is unacceptable. However, studies show that gender and racial subtle prejudice is still prevalent in the military. For example, Thomas and colleagues (1998) found that whereas performance ratings of Black and White officers were roughly equivalent, White officers received promotion recommendations significantly more often than Black officers (who received assignment-related recommendations). Similar results for subtle prejudice against women were obtained in a separate study. In a longitudinal study, researchers found that stereotyping against women officers in a training program increased over a 9-week program and men were ranked significantly higher in leadership qualities by their peers than women were (Biernat et al., 1998).

Secondly, the Army is clearly hetero-dominated and heterosexually-centered and people who are gay suffer blatant prejudice if enlisted in the military. Prior to 1992, military personnel were interviewed by military psychologists who would try to

determine their sexual orientation. Individuals who were either openly gay or were suspected of concealing a gay or lesbian sexual orientation were dishonorably discharged from the military (Herek & Belkin, 2006). In 1993, the military policy of “don’t ask, don’t tell” (DADT) was enacted, restricting the military from making concerted efforts to discover the sexual orientation of its service members, but still barring those who are openly gay, lesbian, or bisexual from enlisting in the military. Since the inception of the policy, over 13,000 troops have been discharged under DADT including a disproportionate amount of military specialists (i.e., linguistic specialists and engineers) (Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, 2006). Although the military policy was repealed by Congress in December 2010, there was tremendous opposition to the repeal, particularly from the Marines and many high-ranking officers. Since the general worldview currently is still that individuals who are gay do not belong in the military, this makes the Army an ideal test of sexual orientation role incongruity.

Project Overview

The goal of the current project was to determine how sexuality and gender worldviews influence people’s perceptions of men and women who are gay or straight in a military setting. Study 1 investigated the independent effects of gender and sexual orientation worldview violations on prejudice toward individuals who either violate or fulfill these norms (with a focus on military men who are gay). Three possible patterns of results were possible given previous theorizing. First, it was possible that results would support a ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ pattern in which individuals (no matter their gender) who

are gay experience more prejudice; second, it was possible that results would support a role-congruity pattern in which individuals who violate more military roles would experience more prejudice; third, it was possible that results would support inversion theory in which feminine individuals, particularly gay men who invert important male gender roles, would experience more prejudice. The objective of study two was to determine whether prejudice towards an Army man who is gay can be attenuated by appealing to a core value of the participants' worldview in order to offset the individual's initial violation of cultural worldviews. The aspects of worldviews that will be appealed to are nationalism and relationships based on previous research (Arndt et al., 2002).

Study 1

In study one, the effects of gender worldview and sexual worldview on prejudice and discrimination towards an individual was tested in a military situation. This was a 2 (man vs. woman military recruit) x 2 (gay vs. straight recruit) between-subjects design.

Study 1 Hypotheses

There are three patterns of effects that could result from the study design which are described below.

Pattern of Results Predicted by 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell': 1. If people are using just sexual orientation information to form impressions of the military recruit, then there would be a main effect of sexual orientation. This result would show that a recruit who is gay or lesbian should experience more blatant and subtle prejudice than the straight

recruits because the military does not permit individuals who are gay into the military despite the qualifications they may possess. The man and woman who are straight should be recommended for hire at higher rates because they do not violate the military's sexual role.

Pattern of Results Predicted by Role-Congruity Theory: 1. If people are using degree of perceived "fit" with the military role, then there would be an interaction between gender and sexual orientation wherein the woman recruit who is a lesbian would experience the highest amount of sexual prejudice because she is in violation of both the gender role and the sexual role of the ideal military personnel.

2. The woman who is straight and man who is gay would experience a moderate amount of sexual prejudice, more than of men who are straight, but less than the woman who is a lesbian. This is caused by both of these groups violating only one military role (men who are gay violate the sexual role of the military whereas women who are straight violate the gender role of the military).

3. The man who is straight would experience the least amount of prejudice as predicted by role-congruity theory as this individual is congruent with both the gender role and the sexual role proscribed by the military.

Pattern of Results Predicted by Inversion Theory: 1. The man who is straight should experience little blatant or subtle prejudice and should not be discriminated against as their masculine role is consistent with the masculine worldview of the military.

2. The woman who is straight should experience more blatant and subtle prejudice

than the man who is straight because her gender and sexual orientation should result in her being perceived as feminine, which is incongruent with the perceived social worldview of the military. However, because the woman who is straight is not inverting traditional male roles, she should experience less prejudice than the man who is gay.

3. The woman who is lesbian should experience less blatant or subtle prejudice than the woman who is straight. Her sexual orientation should modify her perceived gender role from being feminine to masculine, which is congruent with the gender worldview of the military (Kite & Deaux, 1987).

4. The man who is gay should be experience a large amount of blatant and subtle prejudice. Gay men are generally perceived as very feminine because of their sexual orientation (Kite & Deaux, 1987), which is incongruent with the masculine role of the military. Additionally, because he is inverting key male gender roles, he should experience more prejudice than the woman who is straight (Whitley, 2001).

Gender of Participants and Prejudice Toward Recruits: 1. Women participants will be more tolerant and show less prejudice toward the recruits who are gay or lesbian. Men will be much less tolerant of the recruits that are gay or lesbian.

2. Men will show the highest levels of prejudice toward the recruit who is a man who is gay. These predictions are consistent with previous literature (Kite & Whitley, 1996).

STUDY 1 METHOD

Participants

A total of 155 participants (56.8% women, 92.9% white) with a mean age of 20.19 years came into the lab to participate in a study concerning recruitment and perceptions of individuals. All participants were included in final analyses. The participants were recruited from an introductory psychology class and received partial course credit upon completion of the study. Up to four participants were run in each session.

Procedure and Materials

When participants entered the lab, they were told that the purpose of the experiment was to provide input on former soldiers who wanted to reenter the Army in order to increase their numbers due to the increased demands on the military because of recent troop surges in Afghanistan and Iraq. Participants were led to believe that in order to increase the effectiveness of the review board's decisions, provisions in the GI bill allowed us (as the researchers) to work with officials at Malmstrom Base to provide input on the candidates before they reach their decisions. The justification of this was that input from civilians and those familiar with psychology was sought because of research suggesting that "input on hiring decisions made by such individuals increases the success rate of these decisions by 70%." Participants were then told that they had been assigned

to review a random candidate and to give their input on whether this person should be allowed to reenlist.

Participants first examined a folder with papers containing basic statistics describing military operations, base operations, and elaboration on the cover story. Participants read that the recent GI bill allowed the Army to increase their numbers by recruiting former soldiers and officers that had been discharged due to various reasons pending approval from an Army review board. A description of the position the soldier would occupy was also included in this folder to boost the credibility of the cover story. After reading through this folder, participants completed an awareness sheet included in the folder to gauge how well they read through the folder and retained the information. They had a limit of 10 minutes to read through the folder and complete the awareness sheet.

After reading through this folder or when time was called, participants were then told that they would read through a second folder containing a resume and personal statement from each soldier and that in the interest of time, they would only be reviewing one. The résumé and personal statement were selected based on pilot testing ($n = 36$), which describe a former soldier who was discharged from the Army after an injury sustained during a combat scenario in which twenty-five others died. The scenario and resume contained the manipulations of gender and sexual orientation (see below). After reading through this second folder, participants then completed a second awareness sheet that asked them questions regarding the candidate's demographics as well their impressions of the leadership skills, managerial skills and any concerns they may have

had about the candidate's suitability to return to the Army. Participants had another 10 minutes to complete this portion of the study. When the ten minute period was over, the research assistant administered a packet of filler task puzzles for participants to complete for five minutes.

After completing the puzzles, both folders were taken away. The research assistant administered a packet with questionnaires containing the dependent measures (described in detail below). They also contained basic memory questions concerning the soldier to probe how well participants retained information from the two folders. Participants had as long as they needed to complete this packet. After all participants were finished with the questionnaire packet, they received a second packet containing secondary measures including the Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians scale, the Attitudes Towards Women scale, a questionnaire concerning opinions toward the Don't Ask, Don't Tell military policy, and a demographics measure. These measures are further described below. After completing these measures, participants were then debriefed and thanked for their time. It took approximately 60 minutes for participants to complete this study.

Gender and Sexual Orientation Manipulations

The résumé (see Appendix A) conveyed gender information through the name of the recruit which was either male or female (Brian or Karen Miller). These names were used to manipulate gender in a resume setting in past research as they are perceived as equally competent and do not differ in terms of age or race (Kasof, 1993; Smith, Paul, & Paul, 2007). The sexual orientation of the recruit was conveyed in the letter of application

where the recruit made a reference to the person they were in a relationship with (Melissa or Matthew, underlined in the Appendix but was not underlined for participants). All other information regarding the recruit remained the same across conditions.

Dependent Measures

Manipulation Check. At the end of each folder, participants completed a questionnaire about the information contained in that folder (e.g., “What was the sexual orientation of the recruit you reviewed?”). At the end of the hiring recommendations packet, general questions to test the participant’s memory of the recruit’s information were asked. These were questions asking about the recruit’s name and the position they may obtain as well as their gender, sexual orientation, and other filler items such as perceived age and race. All participants correctly answered these questions and were included in final analyses.

Blatant Prejudice Measures: The blatant measures of prejudice included surveys concerning backlash toward the targets (Rudman, 1998). In the current study, this was measured using questions assessing discriminatory behaviors. First, to assess hiring likelihood, participants were asked on a 1 (Not at all recommend) to 5 (Recommend highly) Likert scale whether they would recommend the former soldier for re-enlistment and whether they personally would hire the recruit. These questions were averaged to create a variable measuring total perceived likelihood of being hired for later analysis. Participants were then asked what salary they felt the soldier deserved. The final measure of blatant prejudice asked participants to write down what they perceived as the recruit’s

likelihood of being promoted within the next five years should they be allowed to re-enlist. These measures were adapted from Fuegen, Biernat, Haines, & Deaux (2004) to assess discriminatory behavior and blatant prejudice.

Subtle Prejudice Measures: The measures of subtle prejudice used were measures regarding general perceptions of the recruit's abilities as well as how socially close participants wanted to be to the target soldiers. First, to understand general prejudiced attitudes towards the target, participants were first asked how many others they believed the recruit would perform better than on a 1 (10% of all others in this position) to 10 (all others in this position) Likert scale. They were then asked the percentage of responsibilities they believe the recruit could handle well on a Likert scales from 1 (target would be competent at 10% of responsibilities) to 10 (target would be competent at 100% of responsibilities). Finally, they were asked how they should be ranked compared to others who are being considered for reenlistment from 1 (the best; top candidate) to 10 (The worst compared to nine others). This question was reverse-scored during analyses. (Fuegan et al., 2004). These questions were then converted to z-scores to standardize the scores, and averaged to create a variable measuring general perception of the recruit.

The second measure of subtle prejudice also measured perceptions of the recruit, but specifically in regards to their abilities in their career (Smith, Paul, & Paul, 2007). This 7-item measure used a Likert scale with 1 being strong disagreement with the statement and 7 being strong agreement. Sample items include "I would describe this candidate as having good ability" and "Overall, I perceived this candidate as very unskilled".

The final measure of subtle prejudice that was used is an adaptation of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale (1923). This 7 item scale measures the willingness that individuals have to engage in social contact or to form close emotional connections with other individuals or groups and was adapted and used in other research examining sexual prejudice (Crandall, Glor, & Britt, 1997; Gowen & Britt, 2006). This was also assessed using a 1-7 Likert scale with higher scores indicate greater desired closeness with the target individual. Sample items include “The recruit appears to be a likable person”, “I would feel uncomfortable around the recruit” (reverse scored), and “I would like the recruit to be a close personal friend”.

Overall Participant Characteristic Measures

Attitudes towards Gays and Lesbians: In study one, the sexual orientation of the recruit was randomly varied across participants. In order to determine the sample’s overall attitudes toward individuals who are gay or lesbian, they were given Herek’s (1988) 20 item Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians (ATGL) scale. The scale used ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Example items from this scale are “Male homosexuality is a perversion” and “A woman’s homosexuality should *not* be a cause for job discrimination in any situation (reverse coded)”.

Attitudes Towards Women: The woman recruit conditions showed a woman putting herself in a very nontraditional role, that being a possible military officer. Therefore, trait attitudes towards women (ATW) in traditional or nontraditional roles may play an important role in any results obtained from the study. To measure these,

participants completed the 15-item Attitudes toward Women scale (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). The scale used ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). One example item from this scale is “There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.”

DADT Opinion Questionnaire: These studies deal with what can be a particularly sensitive topic about the effectiveness of having openly gay soldiers in the military, particularly when it is currently outlawed under the DADT policy. Therefore, some participants may not recommend the two gay targets simply because of knowledge of that policy. Therefore a questionnaire concerning the participants’ knowledge of and attitudes toward the ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ policy was designed (modeled after Moradi, 2009). It first asked to indicate their awareness of the ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ policy as well as whether they supported or opposed the repeal of the policy. They were then asked to indicate their level of agreement to statements such as “Gays and lesbians should be allowed to enter and remain in the military”, “Straights would not respect gay or lesbian leaders”, and “No one should be able to avoid a service obligation by claiming to be gay” using a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) Likert scale.

STUDY 1 RESULTS

Participant Characteristics

Due to the emphasis on prejudice towards individuals who may or may not fit into the role of the military as well as research suggesting that high-prejudice individuals are more likely to demonstrate prejudice (Levahot & Lambert, 2007), it was important to ascertain the general attitudes that the current sample had towards individuals who were gay, women, and their general feelings on the policy of ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’. For attitudes toward gay men, the mean for the sample was 2.96 ($SD = 1.50$) and the mean attitudes towards lesbians was 2.58 ($SD = 1.24$). These means were both well below the neutral point of 4, indicating that the sample had generally more tolerant attitudes towards individuals who were gay ($t(140) = -8.19, p < .05$) or lesbian ($t(142) = -13.71, p < .05$). The mean attitude toward women was 2.67 ($SD = .81$). Again, this was below the neutral point of 4, indicating that the sample did not highly endorse traditional roles for women ($t(144) = -19.77, p < .05$). Finally, 78% of the current sample was aware of the ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ policy. To determine whether the sample generally opposed or favored the repeal of the policy, a one-sample t-test was run with 0 as the neutral test point, -8 representing being more opposed to the repeal and 8 being more in favor of the repeal. The sample was not significantly different from 0 ($t(149) = 1.38, p > .05$), showing that participants tended to be neutral on the policy ($M = .53, SE = .38$).

Blatant Prejudice Measures

Hiring Recommendations for the Recruit

A 2 (participant gender) x 2 (recruit gender) x 2 (recruit sexual orientation) ANOVA was conducted to test the effects of participant gender, recruit's gender and recruit's sexual orientation on whether the recruit should be allowed to re-enlist. Gender of participant did not significantly interact with the other variables or significantly influence the results ($p > .05$). A significant main effect of the name of the recruit's significant other was found on likelihood of being hired ($F(1, 144) = 4.22, p < .05$), and this was qualified by a marginally significant interaction between the recruit's gender and sexual orientation ($F(1, 145) = 3.05, p = .058$). Even though this effect was marginally significant, due to the *a priori* hypotheses, I conducted simple effects tests to explore the nature of this interaction. As seen in Table 1, the straight male recruit was significantly more likely to be recommended for hiring than the gay male recruit ($F(1, 144) = 8.39, p < .05, d = 0.60$), a medium effect. Both the man and the woman who were straight did not differ significantly in their likelihood of being hired. The man and woman who were gay and the woman who was straight were all equally likely to be hired ($F_s < 1$). This pattern suggests that at least for men, sexual orientation does seem to somewhat affect how suitable they were viewed for the military. For a woman recruit however, sexual orientation did not seem to significantly influence people's perception of how suitable she was for reenlisting in the military.

Suggested Salary

A 2 (participant gender) x 2 (recruit gender) x 2 (recruit sexual orientation) ANOVA was conducted on the ratings of the recommended salary for the recruit in terms of how much thousand they should receive per year. Gender of participant did not significantly interact with the other variables ($p > .05$). Additionally, no significant interaction emerged between the recruit's gender and sexual orientation on their salary ($F(1, 145) = .001, p > .05$). The overall average salary in thousands per year was 67.65 ($SE = 49.31$). Straight men were recommended for a salary of 68.65 ($SE = 8.63$) whereas straight women were recommended for a salary of 61.93 ($SE = 8.72$). Men who were gay had an average salary of 72.81 ($SE = 8.82$) and women who were gay were recommended for a salary of 65.54 ($SE = 7.99$). The non-significant interaction could be due to a lack of familiarity by the participants with an average recruit's salary. Due to this lack of familiarity, the participants may have been forced, for example, to speculate as to what the recruit should earn, thereby washing out any effects of the manipulations. Additionally, it may be that for salary, a blatant measure of prejudice, the null hypothesis that sexual orientation and gender have no effects is true.

Promotion Likelihood

The final blatant measure of prejudice measured how likely it was that the candidate would be promoted if they were to re-enlist. A 2 (participant gender) x 2 (recruit gender) x 2 (recruit sexual orientation) ANOVA was conducted to test these effects on the ratings of the recruit's likelihood of being promoted with other soldiers. The participant's gender did not significantly interact with the other variables or

influence the results ($p > .05$), however there was a marginally significant two-way interaction between the recruit's gender and sexual orientation on their perceived likelihood of being promoted ($F(1, 145) = 3.31, p = .071$). To explore if the pattern of this interaction was similar to the pattern that emerged for the hiring recommendation variable, simple effects tests were conducted. As seen in Table 1, none of the four conditions differed significantly from each other ($F_s < 1$). It seems that for perceived likelihood of promotion, gender and sexual orientation do not have an effect.

Subtle Prejudice Results

Impressions of General Competence

The first measure of subtle prejudice examined general perceptions of competence in comparison with others. A 2 (participant gender) x 2 (recruit gender) x 2 (recruit sexual orientation) ANOVA was conducted to test the effects of participant gender, recruit's gender and recruit's sexual orientation on the ratings of general impressions of the recruit's competence. Gender of participant did not significantly interact with the other variables or influence the results ($p > .05$). No main effects were found ($p_s > .05$) but a significant interaction did emerge between the recruit's gender and sexual orientation ($F(1, 145) = 6.83, p < .05$) as seen in Table 1. The straight male recruit was perceived as being significantly more competent than both the man who was gay ($F(1, 145) = 4.48, p < .05, d = 0.46$) and the woman who was gay ($F(1, 145) = 5.27, p < .05, d = 0.56$), but not significantly different from the woman who was straight ($F < 1$). Neither of the gay targets differed significantly from each other, or from the straight woman recruit ($F_s < 1$).

This suggests that when reading identical information about a military applicant, the combination of sexual orientation and gender information are being used to form biased impressions of competence for the military such that for men, having the ‘correct’ sexual orientation does improve perceptions of competence for a domain whereas being gay hurts those perceptions. For women recruits, sexual orientation did not seem to influence these perceptions as there were no significant differences in perceptions between the women who were straight or gay.

Perceptions of Career Ability

A 2 (participant gender) x 2 (recruit gender) x 2 (recruit sexual orientation) ANOVA was conducted to test the effects of participant gender, recruit’s gender and recruit’s sexual orientation on the ratings of the recruit’s perceived military career ability. Gender of the participant did not significantly influence the results ($p > .05$). There were no main effects for recruit gender or recruit sexual orientation ($ps > .05$), but a significant interaction did emerge between the recruit’s gender and sexual orientation on ratings of perceived career ability ($F(1, 145) = 6.86, p < .05$). As seen in Table 1, the resume of the man who was straight was rated similar in overall ability compared to the straight woman. The man who was gay ($F(1, 145) = 7.71, p < .05, d = 0.64$) and the woman who was a lesbian ($F(1, 145) = 4.61, p < .05, d = 0.62$) were both rated statistically lower in career ability compared to the man who was straight. The two gay targets did not significantly differ on career ability from each other or from the woman who was straight. The woman who was straight was also not seen as being significantly different than the straight male soldier. This is in line with the inversion and the role-congruity

hypotheses which suggest an interaction between sexual orientation and gender affecting perceptions of one's career ability such that for especially for men, having the 'incorrect' sexual orientation can damage perceptions of career ability.

Social Distancing

To measure subtle prejudice towards the recruits, a 2 (participant gender) x 2 (recruit gender) x 2 (recruit sexual orientation) ANOVA was conducted to test the effects of participant gender, recruit's gender and recruit's sexual orientation on amount of social distancing between the participants and the recruits. Participant gender did not significantly interact with or influence the results ($p > .05$). Similar to general competence perceptions of the recruit, and career ability perceptions, there were no main effects ($ps > .05$), but a significant interaction did emerge between the recruit's gender and sexual orientation on social distancing ($F(1, 140) = 4.04, p < .05$). As seen in Table 1, participants wanted significantly more distance between themselves and the man who was gay in comparison to the man who was straight ($F(1, 140) = 5.77, p < .05, d = 0.53$). Both women targets did not differ significantly from each other in amount of social distancing ($F_s < 1$). Additionally neither of the straight soldiers differed significantly from each other ($F_s < 1$). Finally, neither of the gay targets were significantly different in how much social distance participants wanted between themselves and the target ($F_s < 1$). Similar to the blatant prejudice measures, sexual orientation of the recruit affects the amount of closeness participants want to have with a male recruit, whereas for women, sexual orientation is not as influential in how much distance participants want to maintain.

Summary

Overall, these results suggest an interaction between gender and sexual orientation such that for a recruit who is a man, having a sexual orientation that is congruent with the perceived roles of the military does improve perceptions of his abilities and competence. It may even affect the man's likelihood of being hired or promoted in his chosen field. This interaction does seem to be stronger for subtle prejudice as this can be hidden or masked as other concerns. For a recruit who is a woman, this emphasis on being the correct sexual orientation does not seem to matter as much, possibly because they are already isolated in the military as a function of their gender. These results link back to results predicted by the set of hypotheses of how role-congruity is affected by both gender and sexual orientation, particularly the pattern of results that was predicted for men.

Table 1. Subtle and Blatant Prejudice Directed Toward the Recruit as a Function of the Soldier's Gender and Sexual Orientation in Study 1.

<i>Recruit's gender</i>	<i>Recruit's sexual orientation</i>			
	Straight		Gay	
	<i>M</i>	<i>(SE)</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>(SE)</i>
HIRING				
RECOMMENDATIONS				
FOR THE RECRUIT				
Man	4.16 _a	(.15)	3.53 _b	(.15)
Woman	3.90 _{ab}	(.15)	3.95 _{ab}	(.15)

Table 1 Continued

SUGGESTED SALARY				
Man	68.65 _a	(7.99)	72.81 _a	(8.82)
Woman	65.55 _a	(8.72)	61.93 _a	(7.99)
PERCEPTIONS OF PROMOTION LIKELIHOOD				
Man	76.13 _a	(3.26)	69.60 _a	(3.23)
Woman	74.68 _a	(3.21)	69.63 _a	(3.03)
TOTAL RANKING OF RECRUIT				
Man	.23 _a	(.12)	-.13 _b	(.12)
Woman	.11 _{ab}	(.12)	-.15 _{ab}	(.11)
PERCEPTIONS OF ABILITY IN CAREER				
Man	6.06 _a	(.15)	5.49 _b	(.15)
Woman	5.81 _{ab}	(.15)	5.63 _b	(.14)
SOCIAL DISTANCING				
Man	5.13 _a	(.15)	4.57 _b	(.15)
Woman	4.95 _{ab}	(.15)	4.87 _{ab}	(.15)

Note. Means not sharing a subscript differ at $p < .05$.

STUDY 1 DISCUSSION

Taken together, Study 1 results lend support for either an inversion theory or a role-congruity hypothesis regarding subtle sexual prejudice toward men in a military setting. For a recruit who was a man, having a sexual orientation that is congruent with the worldviews of the military appeared to raise perceptions of his abilities as well as lessen how much social distance people want to maintain from him. On the other hand, being gay appeared to hurt how people perceive the man and his chances of being re-enlisted into the military. For the woman recruit, sexual orientation may also matter to people's perceptions, but the effects of sexual orientation on perceptions of the woman recruit did not vary significantly. These results demonstrate support for how context may differentially effect expressions of sexual prejudice toward a man who is gay more so than for a woman who is lesbian (Herek, 2000).

Neither the role-congruity nor the inversion hypotheses were fully supported however. For the role-congruity hypothesis to be fully supported, the lesbian woman should have been significantly different from her straight counterpart and also should have received the most prejudice, which she did not. However, for the inversion hypothesis to be supported, the results should have shown a crossover interaction wherein the lesbian woman was not significantly different from the man who was straight and received less prejudice than the woman who was straight and the man who was gay. It could be that inversion only happens for individuals who are in a domain congruent with their gender such as for men in the military or women in nursing. This could also be a

modified role-congruity in that occurs only for men such that for men, sexual orientation is the key point but that this does not matter for women.

Additionally, it may be that the results in part reflect a well-known finding in the gender studies literature that it is more preferable for women to act in masculine ways than it is for men to act in feminine ways. In a series of cross-cultural studies, Williams & Best (1990) found that for many cultures, traits associated with masculinity are ideal for the self to possess whereas this is not the case for feminine traits. Additionally, research regarding the backlash effect by O'Neill and O'Reilly (2011) find that when women act in a masculine manner within their workplace, they receive more promotions than women who do not, suggesting that within a workplace, masculine traits are more highly valued. Therefore, a man who is gay and therefore seen to be feminine may have more prejudice held against them because of the lack of valued masculine traits he has.

The amount of prejudice demonstrated toward the recruits differed based on whether the type of prejudice was blatant or subtle in nature. For the most part, no differences in amount of prejudice directed toward the recruits were found when examining blatant prejudice measures such as the perceived promotion likelihood of the candidate. However, all subtle prejudice results were significant. Considering previous research, this result is not surprising. As reviewed, expressions of subtle prejudice are more socially acceptable and therefore more likely to occur (Rattazzi & Volpato, 2003). Given, by definition, subtle prejudice is hard to detect and can manifest in undercover conditions, it is important for the military to try and determine ways to overcome subtle prejudice resulting from perceiving individuals as being incongruent with the cultural

worldview of the military. Study 2 sought to determine a method to attenuate the subtle prejudice found against the man who was gay in Study 1.

Study 1 used a military context which introduces the possibility that thoughts of death were activated within the participants. The military in general could be associated with death given its emphasis on combat and exterminating threatening targets. Additionally, within the personal statement, the target writes fairly explicitly about a combat situation the target took part in which twenty-five of their subordinates died in an IED attack on their caravan. Research in the terror management literature has shown that mortality salience can be activated in subtle ways such as reading about terrorist attacks or watching news reports about terrorist attacks (Das et al., 2009). If this is the case, then results shown from Study 1 could be interpreted using terror management theory. Terror management theory predicts that under mortality salience, people would derogate individuals that violate the dominant cultural worldview. Being gay is a violation of the American cultural worldview (Schimel et al., 1999) particularly in the military where there are explicit restrictions on being openly gay. If this is the case, one way to overcome prejudice resulting from violations of cultural worldviews is to emphasize ways in which the individual is congruent with other more central American cultural worldviews.

Therefore, Study 2 examined the degree to which mortality salience was activated for participants who read about the soldier, and tested if appealing to specific gender-related worldviews could improve perceptions of the soldier. Due to the gay man experiencing the most prejudice in Study 1, Study 2 only used the recruit who was a gay

man. Supporting literature regarding terror management theory and violations of cultural worldviews is further detailed the next section.

STUDY 2 INTRODUCTION

The military conveys strong perceptions of masculine gender roles (Boyce & Herd, 2003), but it may also strongly bring to mind thoughts of death, especially in the current wartime climate. Landau et al. (2004) conducted a study to determine whether stimuli related to the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center would prime increased accessibility to death-related thoughts. Landau et al. found that when primed with subliminal stimuli related to the terrorist attacks and subsequent military action (i.e., 9/11, WTC), death-related thoughts did increase in comparison to a control group and that support for and defense of President George W. Bush's military policies increased with the accessibility of the death-related thoughts. Generally, when people are thinking about death or death is salient in a given situation (such as the military), they will be more motivated to defend the cultural worldview from those that would threaten it. In the current project, the potentially threatening nature of the Army context is considered.

Threatened Cultural Worldviews: A Terror Management Theory Perspective

If people are thinking about death when evaluating someone else, they are likely to be especially motivated to defend their CWV (Greenberg et al., 1994; Schmeichel et al., 2009). Terror management theory suggests that people are most threatened by reminders of the inevitability of death under such "mortality salient" conditions. Mortality salience occurs when an individual is reminded or made aware of their mortality (i.e., that they will ultimately die). When this happens, terror management

theory posits that humans are motivated to try to alleviate the fear that results from this realization (see Burke, Martens, & Faucher, 2010 for a review). One way to alleviate this fear is to put more faith in the cultural world view, which consists of sets of values people are expected to live up to. If people are able to live up to those values, then they have the assurance that they will achieve immortality either literally (by going to Heaven for example) or symbolically (e.g., by leaving behind a legacy), offsetting their fears of death. Individuals under mortality salience also take more steps to protect their cultural worldview from outside threats (McGregor et al., 1998). Invalidating the cultural worldview would render meaningless the work the individual has done to uphold the values of a culture. In addition, it would leave them with no promise of immortality after death, which an individual under mortality salience would find threatening and take steps to remedy (Greenberg et al., 2003; Rosenblatt et al., 1989).

There are a variety of ways in which people can alleviate the “terror” (anxiety) associated with thoughts of death. In some cases, individuals will derogate the threatening group or worldview in order to offset their threat. The attacks on the World Trade Center provide a real-world example of this resulting derogation. Pyszczynski, Greenberg, and Solomon (2003) suggested that the behavior of Americans derogating and repudiating Muslim culture subsequent to 9/11 attacks was due to staving off anxiety caused by attack of the American CWV. Rothschild, Abdollahi, and Pyszczynski (2009) provided laboratory evidence of derogation when they showed that after mortality salience was induced, Americans showed an increased support for military measures such as using nuclear or chemical weapons to defend American interests, while Iranian

Muslims demonstrated stronger Anti-Western attitudes in comparison with control groups.

Derogation of others helps a person to manage death anxiety by eliminating the threat of an opposing cultural worldview. The presence of an opposing CWV is very distressing for those under death-threat due to the anxiety that this engenders. If an individual or group is unable to eliminate the opposing worldview by converting them to their own, then derogation helps to assure those who subscribe to the original CWV that those who oppose the CWV are not good people and therefore, nothing good will happen to them as in the case of Iranians holding stronger anti-Western attitudes (Pyszczynski, Greenberg, & Solomon, 2003; Rothschild, Abdollahi, and Pyszczynski, 2009). If this cannot alleviate anxiety, then the most extreme measure to take is to completely eliminate the opposing CWV by killing those who hold it, which may explain American support for nuclear and chemical attacks on those who threaten American interests.

Derogation is but one possible way to manage the terror; alternatively people may choose to react to worldview threat by bolstering that worldview through such actions as aligning themselves with their in-group (e.g., a sports team, Dechesne et al., 2000), help their in-group members (Jonas, Schimel, Greenberg, & Pyszczynski, 2002), engage in acceptable cultural worldview behavior (e.g., women displaying feminine traits or choosing female-oriented products, Walsh & Smith, 2007) or supporting charismatic leaders (Landau et al., 2004). For example, Landau et al. found that standard manipulations of mortality salience increased support for George W. Bush during the election campaign in comparison to a neutral group. Another study conducted by Van den

Berg and Soeters (2009) asked two groups of Dutch soldiers their opinions regarding proper military conduct and the justness of their country's participation in the Iraq war. One group was seen to be under a death-threat by currently serving an active combat role in Iraq while the other group was on standby in the Netherlands and served as a neutral group. They found that serving an active combat role served to make mortality salient and soldiers under mortality threat were more likely to espouse the righteousness of their cause and other military principles ("it is better to die than to be seen as a coward"). In short, by bolstering a CWV a person will feel a sense of belonging that reestablishes group ties and provides a feeling of symbolic immortality (belonging to a group that will live on after one is dead). In this way, the death anxiety is reduced (Pyszczynski, Greenberg, & Solomon, 2003).

Under mortality salient conditions, certain aspects of the worldviews that are more central to the individual become more accessible. For example, women who were thinking about their gender identity were more likely to follow communal gender norms (compared to agentic American norms) under mortality salience (Walsh & Smith, 2007). Indeed, gender is an important determining factor in predicting which cultural worldviews become more accessible under mortality salience. Arndt et al. (2002) conducted a study to determine whether certain constructs that are more central to the CWV would be more accessible to participants using a word-fragment completion task. They predicted that men would have an increased accessibility to patriotic and nationalistic concepts or those related to an individual's love of their country and their belief in its moral superiority respectively (Griffith, 2010). They found that men showed

increased accessibility to constructs related to nationalism and patriotism such as ‘flag’, ‘patriot’ and ‘law’, ostensibly due to the increased importance that men place on patriotism and defending one’s country. On the other hand, women demonstrated more romantic-relationship construct accessibility due to relationships being a more central part of a woman’s cultural worldview (Arndt, et al., 2002). Arndt et al (2002) showed that under mortality salient conditions, it is not every aspect of a worldview that becomes salient, but only those parts that are more central to the worldview of the participant.

In short, in situations where death is made salient, it follows that individuals will feel more of a need to defend their cultural worldview from those who would violate it by derogating those individuals. Van den Berg & Soeters (2009) found that soldiers serving an active combat role within the military do experience mortality salience in comparison to those not serving an active combat role. Generalizing these findings to the current project, it seems that individuals would experience mortality salience when thinking about soldiers in an active combat situation. Gay men who serve in the Army are individuals violate cultural worldviews by being feminine individuals serving in a masculine profession. Additionally, Study 1 showed that the male soldier who was gay experienced the greatest degree of sexual prejudice. Perhaps if this individual who is gay appeals to central worldviews regarding nationalism or interpersonal relationships thereby becoming congruent with these CWVs, this may be enough to offset their initial role violation and therefore reduce any prejudice against them that may result from this violation.

Study 2 Hypotheses

Main Effect of CWV Appeal

1. Appealing to nationalistic values will result in overall less prejudice because holding these values is congruent with military values and service (Griffith, 2010).

Main Effect of Participant Gender

1. It is predicted that there will be no main effects of participant gender on ratings of the recruit in Study 2 due to there being no main effects of participant gender found in Study 1.

Interaction Effects of Participant Gender and CWV Appeal:

1. When the recruit appeals to nationalistic values, men will demonstrate less prejudice toward the recruit. This will be because nationalism is a very key aspect of men's cultural worldview (Arndt et al., 2002).

2. When the recruit appeals to nationalistic values, women will demonstrate more prejudice than in the relationship condition due to these values not being as important to women.

3. When the recruit appeals to relationship values, women will demonstrate less prejudice toward the recruit. This is due to women generally having relationships as a central part of their worldview (Arndt et al., 2002).

4. When the recruit appeals to relationship values, men will demonstrate more prejudice toward the recruit. This is because relationship values are not as central to men's cultural worldviews (Arndt et al., 2002).

5. When no information is given about the recruits' values, men and women will both demonstrate more prejudice toward the recruit, similar to the amount of prejudice demonstrated in Study 1.

STUDY 2 METHOD

Participants

A total of 163 participants (47.9% women, 95.1% Caucasian) with a mean age of 20.07 years came into the lab to participate in a study concerning recruitment and perceptions of individuals. Participants were recruited from introductory psychology classes and were given partial course credit for their time. However, in examining the manipulation checks at the end of the dependent variable packet, 27% of participants failed to correctly recall the recruit's sexual orientation. These participants were dropped, leaving a sample size of 115 to be used in further analyses.

Procedure and Materials.

The procedure was similar to that of Study 1. Participants were given the same cover story regarding a group of ex-military personnel who seek to reenlist and that we (the researchers) and Malmstrom Base sought outside impressions of these recruits before making final recommendations. After hearing this, participants were given the first folder containing basic military statistics and a job description and had ten minutes to read through this folder and complete an awareness check.

After they completed this folder, they received the second folder with the recruit's résumé and letter of application. Unlike Study 1, the recruit was always the man who was gay. This information was conveyed in the same way as Study 1 with mentions of the recruit's partner (Matthew). Within the letter of application, the appeal to a different

aspect of the participant's CWV was embedded (described in more detail below). All other materials that the participants saw were the same as in Study 1. Participants had ten minutes to read through this folder and complete the demographic awareness sheet. This was the same check from study 1.

Following the second folder, the research assistant administered a packet of filler task puzzles for participants to complete. Participants had five minutes to complete as many puzzles as they could. In order to measure whether reading the recruit's personal statement made mortality salient, this packet included the well validated word-fragment completion puzzle used in previous research to measure mortality salience. In this measure, three critical words could be completed as neutral words or death-related words (COFF_ _ can be completed as COFFEE or COFFIN) (Greenberg et al., 1994). The number of words that were completed in a death-related manner provided a measure of whether mortality was made salient for participants. This was always the first task within the puzzle packet.

After reading through the materials, participants completed the dependent variable packet containing the manipulation check and the blatant and subtle prejudice measures from Study 1. Additionally, a feeling thermometer scale was used as a measure of subtle prejudice. The feeling thermometer scale is a 101-point measure that gauges from 0 to 100 how warmly a participant feels about another person, in the case the recruit. After completing that questionnaire, they were given a second packet containing the ATGL, the DADT Inventory, and a set of demographics questions. These

questionnaires are described in Study 1. After completing this final packet, participants were thoroughly debriefed and assigned course credit.

Worldview Appeal Manipulations

The letter of application contained varying appeals to different core CWVs and was randomly distributed across participants. In the nationalism appeal condition, the letter stated that “I want to reenlist because I am very passionate about my country and I feel the need to help protect and serve it.” In the relationships appeal condition, this section read that “I want to reenlist because I am passionate about my relationships and the people I love and I feel the need to help protect them.” This section was not included at all in the no-appeal condition. This section was added in at the end of the personal statement.

STUDY 2 RESULTS

In order to determine whether appealing to CWVs can attenuate prejudice that is occurring toward the man who is gay and whether it is differentiated by participant gender, the measures of both blatant and subtle prejudice that were used in Study 1 were again assessed. An additional measure of subtle prejudice, the feeling thermometer, was also added into analyses. Finally, to measure what relationship, if any, mortality salience had on the expression of sexual prejudice, mortality salience was measured by the number of death-related words participants completed on their word completion task, was examined, first as a dependent variable and then as a correlational variable.

Participant Characteristics

Due to the focus on Study 2 on the gay-male soldier, general attitudes of the sample towards men who are gay as well as their opinions of the ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ military policy were assessed similar to Study 1. For attitudes towards gay men, the mean of the sample was 3.15 ($SD = 1.64$). A one-sample t-test found that this mean was below the neutral point of 4 on the scale ($t(111) = -5.45, p < .05$), meaning that the sample generally demonstrated more tolerant attitudes toward men who are gay. In regards to ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’, 76% of the sample was aware of this policy. As in Study 1, a one-sample t-test was run to determine whether participants were more in favor or opposed to the repeal of the ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ policy with 0 representing the neutral test-point. Overall, the mean for the sample ($M = -0.38, SD = 4.81$) was not found to be significantly different from 0 ($t(112) = -.841, p > .05$) meaning that similar to Study 1,

the sample was generally neutral in regards to whether ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ should be repealed.

Blatant Prejudice Results

Hiring Recommendations for the Recruit

A 2 (participant gender) x 3 (nationalistic vs. relationship-oriented vs. no expressed reason for re-enlistment) ANOVA was conducted to test the effects of participant gender and stated reasons the recruit gave on why he wanted to re-enlist on whether the recruit should be allowed to re-enlist. As seen in Table 2, there was no significant main effect of participant gender and no significant interaction between participant gender and reasons for re-enlisting ($F(2, 111) = 2.72, p > .05$). However, there was a significant main effect of reasons to re-enlist ($F(2, 111) = 4.82, p < .05$) such that the average hiring ranking for the recruit who gave his reason for re-enlisting as protecting those he loved was significantly lower than the soldiers who stated that their reasons for re-enlistment were nationalistic in nature or gave no reason. This could be due to nationalistic reasons being congruent with the role of the military whereas relationship reasons are incongruent with the role of the military and result in a lower hiring rating for the recruit.

Suggested Salary

A 2 (participant gender) x 3 (reasons for re-enlistment) ANOVA was conducted to test the effects of participant gender and stated reasons for re-enlistment on the salary that participants suggested the recruit should receive. No main effects of participant

gender ($F(1, 97) = 0.56, p > .05$) or reasons for re-enlistment ($F(2, 97) = 2.81, p > .05$) were found and there was no significant interaction ($F(2, 97) = 0.07, p > .05$). This suggests that neither participant gender nor reasons for re-enlistment had any significant effect on the suggested salary for the recruit.

Promotion Likelihood

A 2 (participant gender) x 3 (reasons for re-enlistment) ANOVA was conducted to test the effects of participant gender and the recruit's reasons for re-enlistment on the perceived likelihood of the recruit receiving a promotion. No significant main effects of participant gender ($F(1, 111) = 0.23, p > .05$) or reasons for re-enlistment ($F(2, 111) = 3.02, p > .05$) was found and there was no significant interaction ($F(2, 111) = 0.82, p > .05$). As with salary, this suggests that neither participant gender nor reasons for re-enlistment had any significant effect on the recruit's perceived promotion likelihood.

Subtle Prejudice Results

Impressions of General Competence

This measure of subtle prejudice measured perceptions of general competence in comparison with others. A 2 (participant gender) x 3 (reasons for re-enlistment) ANOVA was conducted to examine the effects of participant gender and re-enlistment reasons on perceptions of the recruit's competence. There were no main effects of participant gender ($F(1, 111) = 0.17, p > .05$) or stated re-enlistment reasons ($F(2, 111) = 1.97, p > .05$) on perceived competence, nor was there a significant interaction ($F(2, 111) = 0.62, p > .05$)

suggesting that these variables had no significant effect on ratings of the recruit's general competence.

Perceptions of Career Ability

A 2 (participant gender) x 3 (reasons for re-enlistment) ANOVA was conducted to examine the effects of participant gender and re-enlistment reasons on perceptions of the recruit's competence specifically in regards to his career ability. There were no main effects of participant gender ($F(1, 111) = 1.63, p > .05$) or re-enlistment reasons ($F(2, 111) = 2.07, p > .05$) and no significant interaction between the two ($F(2, 111) = 2.00, p > .05$). This suggests that the null hypothesis is correct and that these variables had no significant effect in changing the career ability ratings for the man who was gay.

Social Distancing

A 2 (participant gender) x 3 (reasons for re-enlistment) ANOVA was conducted to examine the effects of participant gender and re-enlistment reasons on amount of social distance participants wanted between themselves and the recruit. There was no main effect of reasons for re-enlistment ($F(2, 111) = 1.05, p > .05$) and no significant interaction ($F(2, 111) = 0.77, p > .05$), but there was a significant main effect of participant gender ($F(1, 111) = 6.47, p < .05$) such that women ($M = 4.93, SD = 0.83$) wanted to be significantly closer to the recruit than men ($M = 4.45, SD = 1.10$) ($t(115) = 2.62, p < .05$). This would be in line with previous research that suggests that women tend to hold less negative feelings toward individuals who are gay than men (Herek, 2002; Kite & Whitley, 1996).

Feelings of Warmth toward the Recruit

A 2 (participant gender) x 3 (reasons for re-enlistment) ANOVA was conducted to determine the effects of participant gender and the recruit's stated reasons for re-enlistment on how warmly participants felt about the recruit. No main effects of participant gender ($F(1, 111) = 2.67, p > .05$) or reasons for re-enlistment ($F(2, 111) = 0.44, p > .05$) reached significance and there were no significant interactions ($F(2, 111) = 1.15, p > .05$). This indicates that neither participant gender nor reasons for re-enlistment influenced the degree of warmth toward the recruit.

Mortality Salience Results

Next, analyses were conducted to examine whether mortality salience was triggered more or less as a function of the manipulations. A 2 (participant gender) x 3 (reasons for re-enlistment) ANOVA was run to determine if participant gender and stated re-enlistment reason had any effects on the number of death-related words participants completed out of three. There were no main effects of participant gender ($F(1, 111) = 3.45, p > .05$) or reasons for re-enlistment ($F(2, 111) = 0.00, p > .05$), and no significant interactions ($F(2, 111) = 0.79, p > .05$) suggesting that mortality salience was equal across conditions. Following this, correlational analyses were conducted to determine whether amount of mortality salience was significantly correlated with any of the prejudice measures. As shown in Table 3, mortality salience was significantly negatively correlated with two measures of subtle prejudice; amount of social distancing, $r(115) = -.21, p < .05$, and how warmly participants felt about the target, $r(115) = -.19, p < .05$.

These correlations suggest that as mortality salience increased, the amount of warmth participants felt toward the recruit decreased and the more social distance participants wanted between themselves and the recruit.

Summary

Overall, these results suggest that using appeals to nationalism or relationship CWVs did not serve to attenuate (or exaggerate) the perceptions of the soldier (who was always depicted as a man who was gay). Assuming that the military setting triggered mortality salience, TMT was used to predict that congruence between cultural worldviews of the recruit and of the participants would produce positive evaluations of the soldier, but this was not supported. However, while appealing to higher order CWVs was not effective, the results did demonstrate a relationship between mortality salience and subtle prejudice directed toward the target. One direction for future research is to determine whether this relationship is demonstrated once again when actually manipulating mortality salience in the typical manner used in terror management research (Burke et al., 2010), a point returned to in the discussion below.

Table 2: Subtle and Blatant Prejudice Directed Toward the Recruit as a Function of Participant Gender and Worldview Appeal in Study 2.

<i>Worldview Appeal</i>	<i>Participant Gender</i>			
	<i>Man</i>		<i>Woman</i>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>(SE)</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>(SE)</i>

Table 2 Continued

HIRING				
RECOMMENDATIONS				
FOR THE RECRUIT				
Nationalistic appeal	4.07	(.17)	4.15	(.18)
Relationships appeal	3.46	(.17)	3.88	(.20)
No appeal	4.40	(.18)	3.97	(.18)
SUGGESTED SALARY				
Nationalistic appeal	59.91	(18.42)	73.44	(21.60)
Relationships appeal	62.19	(18.85)	77.73	(26.05)
No appeal	107.65	(20.95)	111.86	(21.60)
PERCEPTIONS OF				
PROMOTION				
LIKELIHOOD				
Nationalistic appeal	75.00	(4.47)	75.00	(4.69)
Relationships appeal	62.14	(4.47)	65.31	(5.24)
No appeal	76.58	(4.81)	67.78	(4.94)
TOTAL RANKING OF				
RECRUIT				
Nationalistic appeal	-0.07	(.15)	-0.10	(.16)
Relationships appeal	-0.08	(.15)	0.04	(.17)
No appeal	0.34	(.16)	0.10	(.16)

Table 2 Continued

PERCEPTIONS OF ABILITY IN CAREER				
Nationalistic appeal	5.86	(.17)	6.04	(.18)
Relationships appeal	5.50	(.17)	6.08	(.20)
No appeal	6.26	(.19)	6.09	(.19)
SOCIAL DISTANCING				
Nationalistic appeal	4.29	(.21)	4.86	(.22)
Relationships appeal	4.29	(.21)	4.97	(.25)
No appeal	4.81	(.23)	4.96	(.23)
FEELINGS OF WARMTH TOWARD RECRUIT				
Nationalistic appeal	76.68	(3.30)	81.25	(3.46)
Relationships appeal	71.23	(3.30)	80.19	(3.87)
No appeal	79.68	(3.55)	78.28	(3.65)

Table 3. Pearson Correlations Among Mortality Salience and Measures of Subtle and Blatant Prejudice

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Mortality Salience	-.06	-.09	-.02	.08	-.01	-.20*	-.22*
		.11	.58**	.53**	.78**	.48**	.53**

2. Hiring					
Recommendations					
for Recruit					
3. Suggested	.08	.19	.18	.22*	.22*
Salary					
4. Perception of		.39**	.56**	.37**	.45**
Promotion					
Likelihood					
5. Total Ranking			.64**	.42**	.53**
of Recruit					
6. Perception of				.60**	.66**
Ability in Career					
7. Social					.73**
Distancing					

Note: * signifies $p < .05$ and ** signifies $p < .01$

STUDY 2 DISCUSSION

It was demonstrated in Study 1 that prejudice results from a perceived incongruence between gender and sexual orientation roles in a stereotype relevant domain, which replicates past research. Using past findings from terror management theory, it was expected that congruence between the cultural worldviews of the recruit and the participant would result in a lessening of prejudice as finding that an individual places a high value on shared beliefs could alleviate threat resulting from incongruent worldviews (Castano, Yzerbyt, Paladino, & Sacchi, 2002). However, this hypothesis was not supported. There were no differences in prejudice demonstrated toward the man who was gay no matter what CWV he appealed to in his personal letter meaning that appealing to CWVs is not enough to help attenuate prejudice resulting from violating gender or sexuality worldviews.

Study 2 did show a relationship between mortality salience and some measures of subtle sexual prejudice which suggests that some sexual prejudice towards individuals in the military may result from mortality salience that would naturally occur from thinking about the military (Van den Berg & Soeters, 2009). Further research could determine whether this relationship remains when actively manipulating mortality salience using paradigms long used in the terror management literature.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Overall, the current project was designed to study how the different role expectations accompanying gender and sexuality worldviews in the military make independent and joint contributions to prejudice and to discriminatory behaviors resulting from perceived role-incongruity. Examples of these discriminatory behaviors are lower levels of recommendations for role incongruent positions, lower perceptions of competence at positions one is theoretically qualified for, and more social distancing from other individuals. Study 1 independently manipulated the gender and sexuality of soldiers who sought to be re-enlisted within the Army. Study 1 did find sexual prejudice resulting from an interaction of both gender and sexual orientation. For the man recruit, but not the woman, being gay resulted in more negative perceptions of the recruit, especially in more subtle forms. The woman who was gay experienced some prejudice compared to the man who was straight but not to the degree that the man who was gay did, and not consistently across measures of bias.

This pattern of results could be explained using both role congruity theory and inversion theory, meaning that further research could disentangle which theory truly explains the results. It may be that a modified version of role congruity theory would explain the results in which only certain groups need to be congruent with the worldviews of the domain. For instance, because the military is a masculine domain, it may be that only men truly need to be congruent with the roles of the military. Since gay men are not congruent with those roles, they would be the only ones to experience prejudice as a result. In order to determine whether this was the case, the study would need to be re-run

using a feminine domain in which it is more appropriate to be straight than gay. For instance, in a field such as nursing, it may be more necessary for women to be congruent with the role of the domain whereas men do not need to be congruent with the roles of nursing to the same degree. Additionally, the current study could be re-run in a domain that may favor being a gay man, such as in the domain of fashion. Further research needs to be done to disentangle whether inversion theory or role-congruity theory more fully explains the current results.

This program of research has theoretical implications for role congruity theory. This program of studies adds to the role congruity literature by unpacking the different role expectations that accompany gender and sexual orientation stereotypes instead of studying them together as previous role congruity research has. For instance, a gay man's gender which prompts him to take on the role of being very masculine is at conflict with his sexual orientation which ascribes him as being feminine. To determine whether

An interesting result from Study 1 is that having a sexual orientation incongruent with the role of the military did not matter as much for the woman as for man recruit. The recruit who was a lesbian woman was at times subject to prejudice in comparison to the man who was straight, but never as often as the man who was gay. Additionally, the woman who was gay was never seen as significantly less competent than the woman who was straight. One interpretation of these results is that in the military, perceived role "misfits" are stronger for gay men than for women, regardless of their sexual orientation despite the presence of the 'don't ask, don't tell' policy which forbids any individual who may engage in homosexual behavior from serving openly. Analysis of statistics regarding

'don't ask, don't tell' seem to support this. The Williams Institute estimates that lesbian women are significantly more likely to serve in the military than gay men and currently have a greater presence (Gates, 2010). Despite this, the Servicemember's Legal Defense Network estimates that roughly equal amounts of gay men and lesbian women have been discharged under 'don't ask, don't tell', suggesting that men who are gay may be targeted more under this policy than women who are gay. Allen & Smith (2011) suggested that stereotypes of men who are gay appear to have more negative stigma attached to them than to women who are gay, which may offer an explanation for the pattern of results seen in Study 1 as well as in current military discharges.

Study 2 investigated whether prejudice directed toward the soldier who was a man who was gay as a result of his violations of sexuality worldviews could be attenuated by focusing on ways in which he upheld other CWVs. This was manipulated by including in the soldier's personal letter either a nationalistic reason for re-enlistment, a relationship-centric reason, or no reason for re-enlistment (Arndt et al., 2002). Prejudice was expected to lessen depending on a participants' gender and the gender related cultural worldview. However, the manipulation failed to influence ratings of the recruit one way or the other. A relationship between mortality salience and measures of subtle prejudice such that as mortality salience rose, the amount of subtle prejudice the recruit experienced (as measured by social distancing and feelings of warmth) also rose.

Limitations and Future Directions

One objective of the current project was to determine a way to attenuate prejudice that resulting from incongruity resulting from inversion of gender roles by sexual orientation by appealing to shared cultural values. Although this manipulation failed to attenuate prejudice, an interesting pattern that emerged was that as the amount of mortality salience within the sample increased, the amount of subtle prejudice directed toward the recruit who was gay also increased. This study was not able to determine whether mortality salience was causing this prejudice however, so a follow-up study is underway in which a standard mortality salience manipulation (Burke et al., 2010) is employed to determine whether an absence of mortality salience reduces subtle prejudice. The design of the study is similar to that of Study 2, but prior to receiving information regarding the military position and the recruit, participants complete a “pilot” study including a standard manipulation of mortality salience (Write down the emotions you feel at the thought of your death) or an aversive non-death related question (Write down the emotions you feel at the thought of your next exam). In addition, the materials were revised to exclude any mentions of combat or death. To the extent that eliminating mortality salience also attenuates prejudice, this follow up study will add to the known effects of mortality salience and as well as possible methods to help combat subtle prejudice, at least in specific situations.

In addition to further investigating the relationship between mortality salience and subtle prejudice, future research could be conducted to investigate other methods of attenuating prejudice toward men and women who are gay, particularly in a context such

as the military where prejudice is prevalent. Most of the research examining methods of reducing prejudice has examined this in relation to racial prejudice (e.g., Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Stewart, Latu, Branscombe, & Denney, 2010) but there are some findings that may be able to be generalized to prejudice against gay and lesbian individuals. Focus within the prejudice reduction literature has focused on intergroup contact theory, the study of how contact between stigmatized and non-stigmatized groups may help to reduce prejudice toward the stigmatized groups. Research regarding the efficacy of intergroup contact has been mixed. In their meta-analysis on intergroup contact, Pettigrew & Tropp (2006) found that across studies, intergroup contact typically reduces intergroup prejudice, particularly under “optimal” conditions (Dixon, Durrheim, & Tredoux, 2005). However, other researchers have put forward some caveats, noting that intergroup contact theory has only been studied in regards to reduction of personal prejudice rather than societal prejudice and that it has only been studied in regards to rarefied circumstances (Dixon et al., 2005). Additionally, these intergroup contact interventions as well as other interventions encouraging disadvantaged groups to like advantaged groups may actually come at a cost to the disadvantaged group as they may begin to underestimate the need for interventions to combat injustice suffered by their group (Dixon, Tropp, Durrheim, & Tredoux, 2010). Although ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ was repealed by the United States Congress and signed into law by President Obama, the repeal remains to be implemented, thus this is a prime time for researchers to determine whether intergroup contact between straight and openly gay service members can reduce

prejudice toward these individuals and whether this contact comes at a cost to the gay service members.

Another possible avenue of research concerns the role of efficacy in prejudice reduction. Recent research has found that feeling that one's actions may not be ignored, but actually have a large impact on reducing institutionalized racism can improve intergroup attitudes and increase the amount of anti-discrimination actions that an individual is willing to undertake (Stewart, Latu, Branscombe, & Denney, 2010). The Department of Defense and other military officials are now examining ways to ease the transition that officers will face in mediating relations between straight and openly gay soldiers, and possible classes regarding efficacy and the impact that individual soldiers can have on lessening prejudice toward their fellow soldiers who are gay may help to ease the transition and reduce prejudice.

The current project used a career paradigm in which participants were asked to rate a soldier on their suitability for a military position based on their previous military experience. Due to the interest in how sexual orientation and gender interact to form these impressions, the project used only one military position in order to limit extraneous variables. However, other research with an applied value may choose to examine how differing positions with less combat experience or higher status may result in differing levels of prejudice. For instance, Brescoll, Dawson, and Uhlmann (2010) found that when men and women were in high-status positions, they were more likely to suffer perceptions of lessened competence and status when they made a mistake, but only in positions that were gender-incongruent (e.g., women police chiefs and men women

college presidents). Generalizing those findings to the military, it may be that when gay soldiers perform their job successfully, they will be accorded the same status as straight soldiers. However, gay soldiers who make mistakes may be punished to a greater degree than their straight counterparts who make the same mistakes.

Certainly there were some limitations to the current project. One limitation was that there was little attempt to examine other personality variables or political attitudes that may moderate the current results. In their study, Lehavot & Lambert (2007) found that their results were driven by high-prejudice individuals. The samples used in the current studies were each relatively liberal in their attitudes toward gay men and lesbians, but this may not fully capture the full spectrum of American attitudes which appear to be fairly divided on these issues, so further research could attempt to similar studies to the current ones on a high-prejudice sample. Another personality variable that may be relevant is trait levels of system justification, which has been defined as a preference for the existing social-order, sometimes at the expense of other, lower-status groups (Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004). This has been linked to lessened support for hate-crime legislation (Mallett, Huntsinger, & Swim, 2011) and further research could determine whether it has effects in this public policy domain.

An additional limitation of the current project was that there were no attempts to determine what the central worldviews of the individual participants were in Study 2. The manipulations in Study 2 were guided by research in terror management theory (Arndt et al., 2002), but there is a possibility that the reasons that no results were found was that the manipulations did not actually tap into the central worldviews of the

participant or that appealing to the shared cultural worldview was not strong enough to offset prejudice resulting from the initial worldview violation. In conducting a study into the relationship between mortality salience and subtle prejudice, I plan to partly correct this oversight by including Arndt et al.'s measures of nationalism and relationship worldview centrality. Additionally, other research could further examine the importance of a variety of cultural worldviews to individuals and where worldviews regarding gender and sexuality fall on that scale.

Another possible limitation of the current project from an applied point of view is that this study only examined prejudice originating from a civilian population, which may not fully encompass prejudice directed toward soldiers who are gay as their interactions within the military setting may be quite different than interactions with a civilian populace. For instance, a recent Gallup poll showed that about two-thirds of Americans supported the repeal of 'don't ask, don't tell' (Gallup, 2010). However, a recent Department of Defense report noted that nearly 60% of combat troops, particularly in the Army and Marines were against the repeal, saying it would have negative consequences on unit cohesiveness and battle readiness (Department of Defense, 2010). Troops serving in an active combat environment may have a different experience with prejudice therefore than those not actively serving a combat role or those interacting heavily with civilians, which the current project does not measure.

Implications of the Research

In 2010, the DADT military policy towards individuals who are gay became an increasing source of controversy with several Democratic leaders and over half of the United States public calling for its repeal. Measures to repeal DADT passed through the House and the Senate and President Obama signed the repeal into law on December 22, 2010 despite the strong protests of many conservative and military leaders and a large amount of the general public. The strength of the protests may be in part due to the nature of the military making mortality salient and the need to uphold cultural worldviews became strengthened. In a nation such as the United States with a large amount of the population subscribing to some form of Christianity where a main tenant is that homosexuality is morally wrong, the strong negative reaction towards gay and lesbian individuals under these conditions may not be surprising. Now that this repeal has passed though, Pentagon and military officials face the difficult task of trying to overturn years of institutionalized discrimination and make gay and lesbian soldiers feel comfortable in openly serving their country.

This line of research reveals that simply repealing DADT may not be enough to end sexual prejudice in military contexts despite what many hope. If prejudice is resulting from a perception of a lack of fit between the sexual orientation role of (male) soldiers and the military, then prejudice will persist. Men who are gay may no longer be discharged under DADT, but in the future, there may be a disproportionate amount of men who are gay being discharged due to unsuitability or misconduct for behavior that may be excused when committed by a straight individual. Future research will need to

study how the outcomes of individuals who are gay change from DADT to the period after the repeal, but it is likely that researchers and activists will need to continue to research ways to attenuate prejudice in the military. It is clear that while the military wishes to be an equal-opportunity organization, more progress will need to be made in order to truly make it a welcoming place for individuals of all races, genders, and sexual orientations.

REFERENCES CITED:

- Allen, J., & Smith, J. L. (2011). The influence of sexuality stereotypes on men's experience of gender-role incongruence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 12, 77-96. doi: 10.1037/a0019678
- Arndt, J., Greenberg, J., & Cook, A. (2002). Mortality salience and the spreading activation of worldview-relevant constructs: Exploring the cognitive architecture of terror management. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 131, 307-324. doi: 10.1037//0096-3445.131.3.307
- Biernat, M., Crandall, C. S., Young, L. V., Kobrynowicz, D., & Halpin, S. M. (1998). All that you can be: Stereotyping of self and others in a military context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 301-317. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.75.2.301
- Bogardus, E. S. (1923). *Immigration and race attitudes*. Boston, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Boyce, L. A., & Herd, A. M. (2003). The relationship between gender role stereotypes and requisite military leadership characteristics. *Sex Roles*, 49, 365-378. doi: 10.1023/A:1025164221364
- Brescoll, V. L., Dawson, E., & Uhlmann, E. L. (2010). Hard won and easily lost: The fragile status of leaders in gender-stereotype-incongruent occupations. *Psychological Science*, 21, 1640-1642. doi: 10.1177/0956797610384744.
- Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., Cohen, R. R., Pugh, S. D., & Vaslow, J. B. (2000). Just doing business: modern racism and obedience to authority as explanations for employment discrimination. *Organization Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 81, 72-97. doi: 10.1006/obhd.1999.2867
- Burke, B. L., Martens, A., & Faucher, E. H. (2010). Two decades of terror management theory: A meta-analysis of mortality salience research. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 14, 155-195. doi: 10.1177/1088868309352321
- Castano, E., Yzerbyt, V., Paladino, M., & Sacchi, S. (2002). I belong, therefore, I exist: Ingroup identification, ingroup entitativity, and ingroup bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 135-143. doi: 10.1177/0146167202282001
- Conant, E. (2010, October 4). Do ask, do tell. *Newsweek*, 35-37.
- Crandall, C. S., Glor, J., & Britt, T. W. (1997). AIDS-related stigmatization: Instrumental and symbolic attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27, 95-123. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1997.tb00625.x

- Das, E., Bushman, B. J., Bezemer, M. D., Kerkhof, P., & Vermeulen, I. E. (2009). How terrorism news reports increase prejudice against outgroups: A terror management account. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, 453-459. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2008.12.001
- Dechesne, M., Greenberg, J., Arndt, J., & Schimel, J. (2000). Terror management and the vicissitudes of sports fan affiliation: The effects of mortality salience on optimism and fan identification. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30*, 813-835. doi: 10.1002/1099-0992(200011/12)30
- Department of Defense. (2007). *Population representation in the military services*. Retrieved from <http://prhome.defense.gov/poprep2007/>
- Department of Defense. (2010). *Report of the comprehensive review of the issues associated with a repeal of "don't ask, don't tell"*. Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office.
- Department of the Army. (1998). *Physical Fitness Training*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Diekmann, A. B., & Eagly, A. H. (2000). Stereotypes as dynamic constructs: Women and men of the past, present, and future. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*, 1171-1188. doi: 10.1177/0146167200262001
- Diekmann, A. B., & Goodfriend, W. (2006). Rolling with the changes: A role congruity perspective on gender norms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 30*, 369-383. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00312.x
- Diekmann, A. B., & Hirnisey, L. (2007). The effect of context on the silver ceiling: A role congruity perspective on prejudiced responses. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*, 1353-1366. doi: 10.1177/0146167207303019
- Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2005). Beyond the optimal contact strategy: A reality check for the contact hypothesis. *American Psychologist, 60*, 697-711. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.60.7.697
- Dixon, J., Tropp, L. R., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2010). "Let them eat harmony": Prejudice-reduction strategies and attitudes of historically disadvantaged groups. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 19*, 76-80. doi: 10.1177/0963721410363366
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*, 573-598. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573

- Eagly, A., Makhijani, M., & Klonsky, B. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *111*, 3-22. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.111.1.3
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1991). Explaining sex differences in social behavior: A meta-analytic perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*, 306-315. doi: 10.1177/0146167291173011
- Fiske, S. T., & Stevens, L. E. (1993). What's so special about sex? Gender stereotyping and discrimination. In S. Oskamp & M. Costanzo (Eds.), *Gender issues in contemporary society* (pp.173-196). Newbury Park, NJ: Sage Publications.
- Fuegan, K., Biernat, M., Haines, E., & Deaux, K. (2004). Mothers and fathers in the workplace: How gender and parental status influence judgments of job-related competence. *Journal of Social Issues*, *60*, 737-754.
- Gates, G. J. (2010). *Lesbian, gay, and bisexual men and women in the US military: Updated estimates*. Retrieved from the Williams Institute website: <http://www2.law.ucla.edu/williamsinstitute/pdf/GLBmilitaryUpdate%282%29.pdf>
- Glick, P., Gangl, C., Gibb, S., Klumpner, S., & Weinberg, E. (2007). Defensive reactions to masculinity threat: More negative affect toward effeminate (but not masculine) gay men. *Sex Roles*, *57*, 57-59. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9195-3
- Gowen, C. W., & Britt, T. W. (2006). The interactive effects of homosexual speech and sexual orientation on the stigmatization of men: Evidence for expectancy violation theory. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *25*, 437-456. doi: 10.1177/0261927X06292769
- Greenberg, J., Martens, A., Jonas, E., Eisenstadt, D., Pyszczynski, T., & Solomon, S. (2003). Psychological defense in anticipation of anxiety: Eliminating the potential For anxiety eliminates the effect of mortality salience on worldview defense. *Psychological Science*, *14*, 516-519. doi: 10.1111/1467-9280.03454
- Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., Simon, L., & Breus, M. (1994). Role of consciousness and accessibility of death-related thoughts in mortality salience effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*, 627-637. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.627
- Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., Rosenblatt, A., Veeder, M., Kirkland, S., & Lyon, D. (1990). Evidence for terror management theory II: The effects of mortality salience on reactions to those who threaten or bolster the cultural worldview. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*, 308-318. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.58.2.308

- Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., Pyszczynski, T., Rosenblatt, A., Burling, J., Lyon, D., ... Pinel, E. (1992). Why do people need self-esteem? Converging evidence that self-esteem serves an anxiety-buffering function. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *63*, 913-922. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.63.6.913
- Griffith, J. (2010). When does soldier patriotism or nationalism matter? The role of transformational small-unit leaders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *40*, 1235-1257. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2010.00617.x
- Herek, G. M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *25*, 451-477. doi: 10.1080/00224498809551476
- Herek, G. M. (2000). Sexual prejudice and gender: Do heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men differ? *Journal of Social Issues*, *56*, 251-266. doi: 10.1111/0022-4537.00164
- Herek, G. M. (2002). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward bisexual men and women in the United States. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *39*, 264-274. doi: 10.1080/00224490209552150
- Herek, G. M., & Belkin, A. (2006). Sexual orientation and military service: Prospects for organizational and individual change in the United States. In *Military life: The psychology of serving in peace and combat* (pp. 119-142). Westport, CT: Praeger Security International.
- Hudak, M. A. (1993). Gender schema theory revisited: Men's stereotypes of American women. *Sex Roles*, *28*, 279-293. doi: 10.1007/BF00289886
- Johnson, S. K., Murphy, S. E., Zewdie, S., & Reichard, R. J. (2008). The strong sensitive type: Effects of gender stereotypes and leadership prototypes on the evaluation of male and female leaders. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *106*, 39-60. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2007.12.002
- Jonas, E., & Fischer, P. (2006). Terror management and religion: Evidence that intrinsic religiousness mitigates worldview defense following mortality salience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*, 553-567. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.91.3.553
- Jonas, E., Schimel, J., Greenberg, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (2002). The Scrooge effect: Evidence that mortality salience increases prosocial attitudes and behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*, 1342-1353. doi: 10.1177/014616702236834

- Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system-justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology, 25*, 881-919. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00402.x
- Kasof, J. (1993). Sex bias in the naming of stimulus persons. *Psychological Bulletin, 113*, 140-163. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.113.1.140
- Kite, M. E., & Deaux, K. (1987). Gender belief systems: Homosexuality and the implicit inversion theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11*, 83-96. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1987.tb00776.x
- Kite, M. E., & Whitley, B. E. (1996). Sex differences in attitudes towards homosexual persons, behavior and civil rights: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 336-353. doi: 10.1177/0146167296224002
- Kruglanski, A. W., Webster, D. M., & Klem, A. (1993). Motivated resistance and openness to persuasion in the presence or absence of prior information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 861-876.
- Landau, M. J., Solomon, S., Cohen, F., Pyszczynski, T., Arndt, J., Miller, C. H., ... Cook, A. (2004). Deliver us from evil: The effects of mortality salience and reminders of 9/11 on support for president George W. Bush. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 1136-1150. doi: 10.1177/0146167204267988
- Mallett, R. K., Huntsinger, J. R., & Swim, J. K. (2011). The role of system-justification motivation, group status and system threat in directing support for hate crimes legislation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*, 384-390. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2010.10.014
- Martin, C. L. (1995). Stereotypes about children with traditional and nontraditional gender roles. *Sex Roles, 33*, 727-751. doi: 10.1007/BF01544776
- Mason, K. O. (1975). *Sex role attitude items and scales from U.S. sample surveys*. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Mental Health.
- McConahay, J. B. (1983). Modern racism and modern discrimination: The effects of race, racial attitudes, and context on simulated hiring decisions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 9*, 551-558. doi: 10.1177/0146167283094004
- McGregor, H. A., Lieberman, J. D., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., Arndt, J., Simon, L., & Pyszczynski, T. (1998). Terror management and aggression: Evidence that mortality salience motivates aggression against worldview-threatening others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 590-605. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.590

- Moradi, B. (2009). Sexual orientation disclosure, concealment, harassment, and military cohesion: Perceptions of LGBT military veterans. *Military Psychology, 21*, 513-533. doi: 10.1080/08995600903206453
- O'Neill, O. A. and O'Reilly III, C. A. (2011). Reducing the backlash effect: Self-monitoring and women's promotions. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 84*, 1-8. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.2010.02008.x
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 25*, 57-75. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2420250106
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 751-783. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751
- Pyszczynski, T., Greenberg, J., & Solomon, S. (2003). *In the wake of 9/11: The psychology of terror*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Rattazzi, A. M., & Volpato, C. (2003). Social desirability of subtle and blatant prejudice scales. *Psychological Reports, 92*, 241-250. doi: 10.2466/PRO.92.1.241-250.
- Rosenblatt, A., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., Pyszczynski, T., & Lyon, D. (1989). Evidence for terror management theory: I. the effects of mortality salience on reactions to those who violate or uphold cultural values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 681-690. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.57.4.681
- Rothschild, Z. K., Abdollahi, A., & Pyszczynski, T. (2009). Does peace have a prayer? The effect of mortality salience, compassionate values, and religious fundamentalism on hostility towards out-groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, 816-827. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2009.05.016
- Schimel, J., Simon, L., Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., Waxmonsky, J. & Arndt, J. (1999). Stereotypes and terror management: Evidence that mortality salience enhances stereotypic thinking and preferences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 905-926. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.77.5.905
- Schmeichel, B. J., Gailliot, M. T., Filardo, E., McGregor, I., Gitter, S., & Baumeister, R. F. (2009). Terror management theory and self-esteem revisited: The roles of implicit and explicit self-esteem in mortality salience effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 1077-1087. doi: 10.1037/a0015091

- Schope, R. D., & Eliason, M. J. (2004). Sissies and tomboys: Gender role behaviors and homophobia. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 16*, 73-97. doi: 10.1300/J041v16n02_05
- Servicemembers Legal Defense Network. (2006). *Total "don't ask, don't tell" discharges 1994-2006*. Retrieved from <http://www.sldn.org/page/-/Website/Fact%20Sheets/DADT%20Fact%20Sheets/Fact%20Sheet%20-%20Discharges%201994-1996.pdf>
- Smith, J. L., Paul, D., & Paul, R. (2007). No place for a woman: Evidence for gender bias in evaluations of presidential candidates. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 29*, 225-233.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Stewart, T. L., Latu, I. M., Branscombe, N. R., & Denney, H. T. (2010). Yes we can! Prejudice reduction through seeing (inequality) and believing (in social change). *Psychological Science, 21*, 1557-1562. doi: 10.1177/0956797610385354
- Thomas, P. J., Edwards, J. E., Perry, Z. A., & David, K. M. (1998). Racial differences in male Navy officer fitness reports. *Military Psychology, 10*, 127-143. doi: 10.1207/s15327876mp1002_4
- Van den Berg, C., & Soeters, J. (2009). Self-perceptions of soldiers under threat: A field study of the influence of death threat on soldiers. *Military Psychology, 21*, S16-S30. doi: 10.1080/08995600903249081
- Walsh, P. E., & Smith, J. L. (2007). Opposing standards within the cultural worldview: Terror management and American women's desire for uniqueness versus inclusiveness. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*, 103-113.
- Whitley, B. E. (2001). Gender-role variables and attitudes toward homosexuality. *Sex Roles, 45*, 691-721. doi: 10.1023/A:1015640318045
- Williams, J. E. & Best, D. L. (1990). *Sex and psyche: Gender and self viewed crossculturally*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

APPENDICES:

APPENDIX A:

RECRUIT RESUME FOR STUDIES 1 AND 2

Brian Miller

1201 N. 25th Avenue, Apt. 204
 Bozeman, MT 59718
 (406) 523-8825
 Email: miller_1019@gmail.com

OBJECTIVE	To work with the United States military to assist in completing peacetime and combat operations in an effective manner.
DATE OF BIRTH	June 1, 1980
EDUCATION	Bachelor of Science degree – Sociology Montana State University – Billings May 2000
CERTIFICATION	Teacher Certification – State of Montana, 2000
EXPERIENCE	<p>Combat Tour – Afghanistan 2008-2009 Convoy Commander August – November 2009</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Coordinated deliveries of supplies, troops, and vehicles to various bases ➤ Shared responsibility for planning and execution of missions ➤ Responsible for obtaining authorization for missions <p>Combat Tour – Afghanistan 2008-2009, Iraq 2006-2007, Iraq 2005-2006 Special Forces Weapons Sergeant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Read, interpreted, and prepared combat orders ➤ Recruited, trained, and prepared troops with weapons and for combat ➤ Conducted offensive raids against enemy targets
ACTIVITIES AND AWARDS	Army Achievement Medal Afghanistan Campaign Medal Iraq Campaign Medal Good Conduct Medal

Bronze Star with Valor
Purple Heart
Recipient, Regent's Scholarship
Volunteer, Disabled American Veterans, 2001

REFERENCES

Col. Michael Havens, Fort Harrison
(406) 557-2248 or mhavens@gmail.com

Lt. James McMullen, Fort Harrison
(406) 476-2958 or jjmcmull@gmail.com

Col. David Sullivan, Fort Harrison
(406) 657-2053 or david.sullivan1@hotmail.com

APPENDIX B:

RECRUIT'S PERSONAL STATEMENT FOR STUDIES 1 AND 2 (GAY MAN)

To Whom it May Concern

I am writing to reobtain my former position as Special Forces Weapons Sergeant for the Second Battalion Army Regiment. As requested, I have enclosed my current resume with the names and contact information of three professional references.

Active duty in the Army requires a spirit of service and sacrifice which I appreciated during my former service. During the 9/11 attack when I witnessed the fall of the World Trade Center on television and the deaths of so many, I was inspired to serve my country in the Army. During my service, I developed strong managerial and leadership experience that can allow me to continue to serve.

With a Bachelor's in Science in Sociology, I have obtained an understanding in the importance of working with others and treating them with respect, which I utilized in helping me become an effective officer.

In my former experience, the importance of managerial and coordination skills cannot be overstated which I already have developed. During the last three months of my deployment to Afghanistan. I was assigned as convoy commander for the weekly supply convoy. I was responsible for coordinating the delivery of supplies, troops and vehicles to outlying bases, planning the mission, submitting for approval to higher headquarters, and passing out information to subordinate vehicle commanders. In all, I was responsible for approximately 85 troops per convoy, three times per week for three months.

The Army also did much to strengthen my leadership skills. All told, I would say that the most formative part of my experience came at the end of my last tour of duty, which I can safely describe as my darkest day in the Army. Three months into the convoy operations, my battalion was leaving the village of Khakrez after dropping off several ships of food and supplies to the troops and the villagers. As we were making our way back to the base at Kandahar, we came under IED (improvised explosive device) attack by insurgents. Two of our trucks were destroyed in the initial blast, killing everyone inside. I attempted to communicate with the base for help, but the other squadron didn't arrive in time to help. After the initial blast, another one of our trucks was hit by a mortar. Only one man, Lt. Benson, lived through the attack. We eventually fought our way out of the ambush, but overall, twenty-five men I was responsible for lost their lives that day. I made sure to personally write a letter to each one of their families explaining what happened and took responsibility for their deaths. This experience taught me that while it is easy to take leadership responsibility for positive events that occur, you must also learn to take responsibility for the negative events as well as be able to learn from them in order to become a truly great leader.

As you are aware, I was discharged from the Army soon after this event. This was a medical discharge from the Army due to an injury I sustained in the attack. I had been wounded by shrapnel lodging in my right leg. The wound was bandaged at Kandahar

base, but the extent of the damage to my leg was such that I could not keep up with the other troops or with my duties subsequently. I tried to hide the extent of my injury so that I would be able to stay in the Army, but the base commander intercepted an e-mail I sent back home to my **life partner Matthew**, detailing the extent my injury pained me, and I was discharged two days later.

You may have concerns about my fitness for the position. In the previous year, I have undergone an extensive round of physical therapy and feel well enough to resume my duties. As for hiding my previous injuries, I recognize that my actions were not in keeping with the spirit of honesty and integrity the Army requires and I apologize wholeheartedly for my actions.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to speaking with you at the end of my hearing.

Sincerely,

Brian Miller