INTRODUCTION & HYPOTHESES

- Past research has found that men who rate themselves as more masculine tend to have women partners that have preferences towards masculinity (Burriss, Welling, & Puts, 2011).
- Additionally, research has found that across cultures, parents can have varying degrees of influence on their children’s choice of spouse (Buunk, Park, Duncan, 2010).

H1. Participants whose parents have higher levels of education will place less importance on stereotypically masculine or feminine traits in their potential mates.

H2. Participants who have higher household incomes will place less importance on stereotypically masculine or feminine traits in their potential mates.

METHOD

- Participants:
  - Convenience sample
  - N=30
  - 80% Female (n=24), 17% Male (n=5), 3% Missing (n=1)
  - 57% Hispanic/Latinx (n=17), 30% White (n=9), 10% Mixed Races (n=3), 3% Missing (n=1)
  - Mean age: 24.45 (SD=9.27)

- Measure:
  - Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1974)
  - 7 point Likert scale
  - "Masculine" e.x.: Assertive, Dominant, Competitive
  - "Feminine" e.x.: Yielding, Flatterable, Compassionate

- Participants reported their parent’s highest level of education and household income.

RESULTS

1. Two one-way ANOVAs indicated that the importance placed on masculinity, F (6, 20) = 4.09, p = .008 as well as femininity, F (6, 20) = 2.82, p = .038 differed across parental educational levels.

2. Two Pearson correlations found no statistically significant relationships between income and value placed on gendered traits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masc.</th>
<th>Fem.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REFERENCES


DISCUSSION

- Individuals whose parents had higher levels of education placed less importance on potential partners exemplifying traditionally masculine or feminine traits.
- Meaning that individuals with more education raised their children to be less stereotypical in their partner selection.

- Having a larger participant pool would help to more clearly define relationships between variables.

- It is important that society as a whole becomes more educated so that our children can grow into a world that doesn’t demand that they exemplify gender stereotypes.

- Further research can be done on how other factors might impact an individual’s perceived value of gendered traits.
  - For example, cultural differences might have a considerable impact on the data.
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Parental Influences on Gender Stereotypes & Sexism

Karely Casas

Department of Psychological Science, Eastern Connecticut State University, Willimantic, Connecticut

BACKGROUND & CURRENT STUDY

- In a research study wives have reported doing twice as much of the housework than their husbands regardless if they both worked full time. This can model gender roles to children.
- Individuals that come from a home with gender stereotypes are more likely to be sexist because of those parental influences.
- Hypotheses
  1. The more gender stereotypical an individual's upbringing is, the more sexist the individual is towards women.
  2. The more gender stereotypical an individual's upbringing is, the more sexist the individual is towards men.
  3. The more parental influence an individual is, the more sexist they are towards men and women.

METHOD

Participants:
- Total #: 13 (2 males, 15%; 11 females, 85%)
- Average age: 19.38 years
- Ethnicity
  - Hispanic: 30.8%
  - White: 53.8%
  - Mixed race: 15.4%

Materials:
- Ambivalence Toward Men Inventory (Glick & Whitehead, 2010)
  - Test Format: Hostility Toward Men = average of items 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, while Benevolence Toward Men = average of items 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 11. “Men act like babies when they are sick.”
- Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Whitehead, 2010)
  - Test Format: Likert-type scale using a 0 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) scale. “Women exaggerate problems they have at work.”
- Based on Croft, et al., (2014) questionnaire
  - Test Format: On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being mom, 2 being dad) Gender stereotypical for women:
    - Laundry
    - cooking, etc. For men: mow the lawn, shovel/rake, etc.

Correlation Among Parental Influences/Stereotypes and Sexism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Stereotypes</th>
<th>Sexism Towards Women</th>
<th>Sexism Towards Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p = .02 )</td>
<td>( p = .06 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you feel your parents have influenced your views on gender roles?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did your parents force gender stereotypes on you growing up?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

- Gender Stereotypes and Sexism
  - The more gender stereotypical an individual's upbringing is, the more sexist towards women the individual is (\( r(11) = .62, p = .02 \)).
  - Although it's not statistically significant, the trend was in the direction, the more gender stereotypical an individual's upbringing, the more sexist towards men the individual is (\( r(11) = .54, p = .06 \)).

- Parental Influences on Sexism
  - There is not a statistically significant relationship between the degree to which participants feel their parents have influenced their views on gender roles and their sexism towards women (\( r(11) = .27, p = .38 \)).
  - There is not a statistically significant relationship between the degree to which participants feel their parents have influenced their views on gender roles and their sexism towards women (\( r(11) = .17, p = .59 \)).

DISCUSSION

- Research indicates that the more gender stereotypical an individual's upbringing is the more sexist that individual is.
- My research supported this idea; the more gender stereotypical an individual reported their upbringing, the more sexist they reported to be.
- The sexism towards women is statistically significant but unfortunately not towards men, although it was approaching significance (women = .02, men = .06).
- This tells us that parents need to strive towards getting rid of gender stereotypes in their homes to reduce sexist views in individuals.
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The Association Between Feminism and Gender Roles
Shirley Holloway
Department of Psychological Science, Eastern Connecticut State University, Willimantic, Connecticut

BACKGROUND & CURRENT STUDY

- Males with higher levels of femininity are found to have more positive feelings about feminism and are more willing to identify as a feminist, while men with higher levels of masculinity are less willing to identify with feminism (Toller, Suter, & Trautman, 2004).
- Females identify with higher levels of feminism than males (Morgan, 1996).
- H1: The higher participants score on femininity, the higher levels of feminism will be reported.
- H2: The higher participants score on masculinity, the lower levels of feminism will be reported.
- H3: The younger a participant is, the higher levels of feminism will be reported.
- H4: Women will score higher on feminism than men.

METHOD

Participants
- 29 Participants
- 26.31 Years Mean Age
- 76% Female, 21% Male, 3% Prefer not to say
- 83% White, 17% Hispanic/LatinX

Measures
Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974)
- 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Never or Almost Never True) to 7 (Always or Almost Always True)
  - Masculine: “Aggressive”, “Independent”
  - Feminine: “Compassionate”, “Loyal”

Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS; Morgan, 1996)
- 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 6 (Strongly Agree)
  - “Both husband and wife should be equally responsible for the care of young children”
  - “In order to change inequalities between the sexes, we have to do more than just treat men and women fairly in our own lives”

RESULTS

Feminism and Femininity
- There was not a statistically significant relationship between femininity and feminism ($r(29) = .162$, $p = .402$).
- There was not a statistically significant relationship between masculinity and feminism ($r(29) = -.249$, $p = .194$).

Feminism and Age
- There was not a statistically significant relationship between age and feminism ($r(29) = -.347$, $p = .065$).

Feminism and Gender
- There were no significant differences in feminism between women ($M = 296.41$, $SD = 45.52$) and men ($M = 277.17$, $SD = 51.52$), $t(26) = .849$, $p = .380$.

DISCUSSION

- While no statistically significant results were found, all of the results did indicate the same direction or difference to an extent of what I expected.
- Interestingly, during the analysis of data, it was found that men were significantly more masculine than women, but there was not statistical difference in femininity between the two genders.
- This could be due to women tending to be more androgynous.
- Some limitations include sample size and limited male participants.
- Future research should include the importance of feminism and its impact on masculinity and femininity.

REFERENCES

While children are always warned to never “judge a book by its cover,” people’s appearances and attractiveness can easily change and perceive the way that others believe them to be.

• Just by looking at someone else’s face, people are able to form quick judgments and bias based off of the physical qualities others can see, even if they know no information about the person behind the face.
• Beauty has been debated to be a cue of actual intelligence, while others believe it has no real relationship (Talamas, Mavor, & Perrett, 2016).
• If someone views another person positively with one or few qualities, such as attractiveness, it can be assumed that they will have other positive qualities too (Lammers, Davis, Davidson, & Hogue, 2016). This is called the Attractiveness Halo Effect.
• The relationship linked between attractiveness and perceptions of characteristic traits is evident, but is there data to support these perceptions?
• Can physical beauty truly be a cue of intelligence, responsibility, or kindness?
• Is it just a bias that the society of the world has formed?

HYPOTHESES
1. Attractive faces will be seen as more mean-spirited, responsible, and kind than unattractive faces.
2. Men, whether attractive or not, will be perceived as more kind and aggressive than women, while women, whether attractive or not, will be seen as more mean-spirited.
3. Attractive women and men will be seen as less intelligent than unattractive women and men.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Attractiveness on Mean-Spirited Perceptions
Hypothesis 1 was supported. The average score for attractive gender faces being rated lower for kindness than the unattractive faces.

People view attractive people as more mean-spirited, responsible, and less kind than people who are not as attractive.

Gender of Face on Kindness and Aggression Perceptions
Hypothesis 2 is supported. The male averages for kindness (M=3.15) and aggression (M=2.67) is higher when compared to female average scores (M=3.00 for kindness, M=2.29 for aggression).

People perceive men, regardless of their attractiveness, as more kind and aggressive than women.

Attractiveness on Intelligence Perceptions
Hypothesis 3 was not supported. For both genders the attractive face was rated as being perceived as more intelligent. (M=3.57 for attractive woman, M=3.14 for unattractive woman, M=3.71 for attractive man, M=2.87 for unattractive man).

This study shows the accurate and false perceptions or bias that people form purely based off attractiveness of others.

The Attractiveness Halo Effect does affect the way people view each other in the real world without knowing any real information about them.

For the future, more participants should be used with a broader range of personal characteristics and attractiveness of people.

METHOD
Participants
- 14 total
- Average age 19.1
- 78% female, 22% male
- 71% Caucasian, 22% Hispanic, 7% Multiracial

Materials
- Nominal scale for gender
- Ratio scale for ratings

Procedure
- Participants shown either top two faces, or bottom two faces
- Rate on a Likert scale of 0-5 on characteristic given
- 0 meaning not at all, 5 meaning extremely

Characteristics
Participants Rated for Each Face
- Attractiveness
- Intelligent
- Kind
- Responsible
- Mean-Spirited
- Aggressive

The results showed that women, whether attractive or not, were rated more mean-spirited than men. The attractive woman was rated as more likely to be mean-spirited than the unattractive woman.

The gender of the face affected the responsibility scores, being that women, whether attractive or not, were rated as more responsible than men and in both cases the more attractive faces were rated as being more responsible.

Effect of Gender Attractiveness on Mean-Spirited Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Attractive</th>
<th>Unattractive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect of Gender Attractiveness on Responsibility Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Attractive</th>
<th>Unattractive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect of Gender Attractiveness on Intelligence Ratings

Gender and attractiveness scores were rated as being more intelligent. (M=3.57 for attractive woman, M=3.14 for unattractive woman, M=3.71 for attractive man, M=2.87 for unattractive man).
Perceptions of Men and Women in Gender Stereotyped Sports

Sierra Nastasi

Eastern Connecticut State University

INTRODUCTION AND HYPOTHESES

- Predominantly female oriented sports, such as figure skating, lack stereotypically masculine characteristics, which discourages heterosexual men from associating with the sport (Lee & Cunningham, 2016). It is expected that male figure skaters will be viewed as less heterosexual than male hockey players.
- Women hockey players were assumed to be weaker athletes than their male counterparts (Pelak, 2002). It is expected that female athletes will be viewed as less masculine than their male counterparts.
- Media coverage of women’s sports has declined since the 1980s (Musto, Cooky, & Messner, 2017). It is expected that people will be willing to pay more to view male athletics.

RESULTS

Masculinity
- The female figure skater was significantly more masculine than the male figure skater t = -2.35 p = .03

Femininity
- The male hockey player was significantly less feminine than the female hockey player t = -3.06 p = .008
- The female figure skater was significantly more feminine than the male figure skater t = -2.4 p = .03

Sexual Orientation
- The male hockey player was seen as significantly more straight than the male figure skater
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METHOD

Participants
- N = 16
- 75% female (n=12), 25% male (n=4)
- 75% White (n=12), 19% Hispanic/Latino (n=3), 6% other (n=1)
- Mean age = 21.19 years old

Materials
- 7 point Likert Scale ranging from 1 to 7
- Pictures of a male hockey player, a female hockey player, a male figure skater, and a female figure skater, where participants rated each athlete on masculine characteristics (e.g. aggressiveness, competitiveness, & athleticism), feminine characteristics (e.g. loyalty, shyness, & childishness), and how much the participant would be willing to pay in order to watch the athlete compete.

DISCUSSION

Summary
- The male figure skater was viewed as less masculine than the female figure skater, which could be a result of women in cross gendered athletics being more culturally acceptable.
- The male figure skater was also viewed as less feminine than the female figure skater, which could be a result of the females being viewed as more feminine in society.
- The male figure skater was viewed as more heterosexual than the male hockey player, which could be a result of heterosexual men not possessing societal support in cross gendered athletics.
- While not statistically significant, it is worth noting that participants were willing to pay more for women’s hockey as opposed to men’s hockey, which holds a societal significance in relation to the lack of emphasis placed on women’s athletics.

Limitations
- Small sample size
- Pictures utilized

Future Directions
- Perceptions of men in other cross gendered sports
- Stereotypes associated with athletes in specific cross gendered sports
Perceptions of Female and Male Suspects
Gabrielle Palumbo
Eastern Connecticut State University

INTRODUCTION
- Female murderers are more likely to be spared the death sentence than male murders (Rapaport, 1991).
- Murders made by females are more likely believed to be due to self-defense (Rapaport, 1991).
- Males victims are less likely to receive justice for hate crimes. (Plumm & Terrance 2013).

HYPOTHESES
- H1: Male suspects will receive a longer sentence time.
- H2: Male suspects will have a higher likelihood of being believed as guilty
- H3: Female participants will have a higher likelihood of viewing the violence as self-defense regardless of the suspects gender.
- H4: Male participants will have a lower likelihood of believing that the suspect’s actions were due to mental health conditions regardless of the suspects gender.

METHOD Part 2

Procedure:
1) Participant received an image of either a male or female suspect.
2) Participant reads through the domestic violence scenario. The only difference between the scenario is what gender of the suspect is arrested.
3) Participants completed a measure regarding the perception of the suspects-
   - Likelihood of suspect being guilty
   - Suspects sentence length
   - Likelihood of suspects actions being due to mental health conditions
   - Likelihood of the suspect instigating the crime
   - Likelihood of crime being due to self-defense

RESULTS

Method Part 1

Participants:
- There were 18 participants (22.22% males; 77.78% females)
- Average age of the participants were 24 years old
- Ethnicity/race of participants:
  - Caucasian: 72.22%
  - African American: 5.56%
  - Hispanic: 16.66%
  - Other: 5.56%

RESULTS

Summary:
- There was no significance difference in punishment sentence length for the male (M= 8.33) and female (M= 5.00) suspect.
- H2: There was no significant difference in likelihood of being guilty for the male (M= 2.89) and female suspect (M= 2.33) suspect.
- H3: There was no significant difference in likelihood of believing that the suspect’s accused were due to self-defense for female (M= 2.36) and male (M= 1.75) participants.
- H4: There was no significant difference in likelihood of believing that the suspects accused were due to a mental health condition for female participants (M= 1.56) was higher than for males (M= 1.25)

DISCUSSION

Summary:
- There was no significance difference between participant and suspect gender on the dependent variables.
- The results did go in the direction of my hypotheses.
- Past research has shown that there is a difference between how male and females are perceived criminally. Males are perceived as being likely to be a criminal than females.
- Since the crime scenario used was domestic violence, this type of crime could affect how people view the suspects capability in participating in the violence.

Limitations:
- Small, non-diverse in gender and ethnicity sample

Future Discussion:
- Male suspects receiving longer sentencing and is more likely to be believed as guilty is problematic in the justice system.
Personality and Prejudice: Examining the Relationship between The Big Five and Racism

Alexandra Peters
Eastern Connecticut State University

INTRODUCTION

- Prejudice is often examined in psychology as the product of either one's social environment or biological personality traits.
- Results from previous studies have concluded that prejudice is caused by a combination of both social and personality factors (Ekehammar, Akrami, & Yang-Wallentin, 2009).
- According to the personality approach, prejudice was found to be most attributed to right wing authoritarism and social dominance (Dunbar, 1995).
- Using The Big Five model, agreeableness and openness to experience have been found to have a strong relationship to prejudice (Ekehammar, Akrami, & Yang-Wallentin, 2009).
- These traits often lead to increased susceptibility to follow and idealize ingroup attitudes while criticizing outgroups (Dunbar, 1995).
- While personality is a necessary component in explaining prejudice, it often works in junction with social status to predict attitudes (Dunbar, 1995).
- However, in the instance of ethnic prejudice, personality has been found to be more related than social factors (Dunbar, 1995).

METHOD

- Participants: 13
- Ages 18-22, mean= 19
- 15% male, 84% female
- 61% White, 23% Hispanic/Latino(a), 8% Mixed Race, 8% South Asian
- Racism: ATB - 7 pt. Likert Scale
  - 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree a little, 3 = disagree somewhat, 4 = neutral, 5 = agree somewhat, 6 = agree, 7 = strongly agree
- Used to assess racial attitudes and interracial contact
  - “I enjoy a funny racial joke, even if some people might find it offensive.”
  - “If I had a chance to introduce Black visitors to my friends and neighbors, I would be pleased to do so.”
  - 5 point Likert scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree a little, 3 = neutral/no opinion, 4 = agree a little, 5 = agree strongly
  - Open Mindedness: “Avoids intellectual, philosophical discussions”
  - Conscientiousness: “Is systematic, likes to keep things in order”
  - Extroversion: “Has an assertive personality”
  - Agreeableness: “Is respectful, treats others with respect”
  - Neuroticism: “Is moody, has up and down mood swings”

PURPOSE

- The purpose of this study is to explore the personality traits that increase likeliness for prejudicial beliefs.
- The study aims to uncover the relationships between common personality traits as defined by The Big Five: Open-Mindedness, Conscientiousness, Extroversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism, with the individuals’ beliefs about race and race relations.

HYPOTHESES

1. Higher open mindedness scores will lead to decreased reported prejudice.
2. Higher scores of conscientiousness will lead to decreased reported prejudice.
3. Higher scores of extroverted traits will lead to increased reported prejudice.
4. Higher scores of agreeable traits will lead to decreased reported prejudice.
5. Higher scores of neuroticism will lead to increased reported prejudice.

RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Mindedness</th>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
<th>Extroversion</th>
<th>Agreeable</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DISCUSSION

- Even though the correlations are not statistically significant, they were in the expected direction.
- Four out of the five personality traits had a negative correlation which matched the predicted hypotheses. For example, people who were more open minded, conscientious, neurotic, and agreeable tended to score lower on the ATB.
- Extroversion and racism were the only variables with a positive correlation however this agreed with the predicted hypothesis. The only correlation that was contrary to the expected results was between neuroticism and racism.
- The research results indicate how difficult it is to test personality traits which are not constant and have many variances within individuals, especially when the sample group is not homogenous.
- One limitation was the small sample size.
- The data still offers implications when looking at racial prejudice, an issue which has become increasingly prevalent in the United States. It provides a general idea of which personality traits put individuals and groups at risk for developing prejudicial beliefs.
- This type of data can provide information to teachers, parents and public figures on how to educate individuals with these personality traits about the importance of social awareness and empathy.
- The implementation of this type of research in school can help prevent future violence against minority groups, and serve as a layer of additional protection to marginalized groups.

Questions? Contact: petersa@my.easternct.edu
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**INTRODUCTION**

- Attitudes towards same sex orientation have been seen as a cause for debates especially in religious settings specifically Christian churches (McLelan & Sutton, 2008).
- Religion has also been related to prejudice against gender minorities such as transgender people (Cragun & Sumerau, 2015).
- People who hold many traditional beliefs feel threatened by those who believe they can 'change' their gender, therefore creating a prejudice and further causing discrimination (McCullough, Dispenza, Chang, & Zeligman, 2019).
- People with intergroup contact to sexual minorities have shown less prejudice towards the groups they are familiar/close with (Gorska, Zomeren, & Bilewicz, 2017).

**METHOD**

- **Participants:**
  - 31.8% Males, 61.4% Females, 6.8% Transgender
  - 86.4% White, 9.1% Latino, 4.5% Other
  - 79.5% Heterosexual, 9.1% Homosexual, 9.1% Bisexual, 2.3% Other
  - M = 20.55 years old, SD = 8.43

- **Materials:**
  - Transphobia Scale (Likert 1-7)
  - "I believe that a person can never change their gender"
  - Polymorphous Prejudice Scale-Short Form (Likert 1-5)
  - "I see the lesbian and gay movements as a positive thing"
  - Spirituality Scale for College Students (Likert 1-5)
  - "I believe there is some kind of sacred or higher power."

**PURPOSE**

- To test whether there was a relationship between spiritual beliefs and acceptance of the LGBTQ+ community.
- To test whether being in contact with someone who’s in the LGBTQ+ community or not has an effect on the acceptance from those people.

**HYPOTHESES**

1. The more spiritual someone is, the more transphobic they will be.
2. The more someone values the progress of gay men and women, the less spiritual they will be.
3. If the person is in contact with someone in the LGBTQ+ community, they will have more positive beliefs about gay men.
4. If the person is in contact with someone from the LGBTQ+ community, they will have more positive beliefs about gay men.

**RESULTS**

- **Spirituality and Transphobia:**
  - There was not a significant relationship between spirituality and transphobia ($r(42) = -0.10$, $p = 0.53$).
- **Spirituality and Valuing Gay Progress:**
  - There was not a significant relationship between valuing the progress of gay men and lesbians and spirituality ($r(42) = 0.02$, $p = 0.92$).
- **Group Contact and Positive Beliefs (Lesbian):**
  - There ended up being no significant relationship between having contact with the LGBTQ+ community and having high positive beliefs about lesbian women ($p = 0.23$).
- **Group Contact and Positive Beliefs (Gay):**
  - There was a nonsignificant relationship between having contact with the LGBTQ+ community and having high positive beliefs about gay men ($p = 0.059$).

**DISCUSSION**

- Based on my research there was no relationship between someone's spirituality and being transphobic.
- There is no relationship between someone who values the progress of the gay movement and how spiritual they are.
- There was no significance between being in contact with the LGBTQ+ community and having positive beliefs about lesbian women.
- There was a nonsignificant trend between having contact with the LGBTQ+ community and having positive beliefs about gay men ($p = 0.059$).
- This study tells us that lack contact is more detrimental to the acceptance gay men than strength of spirituality.
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Gracie Schauster  
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Questions? Contact Gracie Schauster- schausterg@my.easternct.edu
INTRODUCTION/HYPOTHESIS

A study found that the less likely you are to intervene when you hear a microaggression, the more likely you are to say/use the microaggression in the future (Mekawi and Todd, 2018).

A study found that the aversive racism scale can predict dehumanization of certain races (Kteily, 2015).

H1. When education level is high school, aversive racism will be higher than it would be for the other education levels.

H2. When the level of education is a Bachelors, the level of microaggression acceptability will be lower than when the level of education is high school.

PARTICIPANTS:

N = 20 (Average age = 22.15)

75% females, 25% males

80% Caucasian, 15% Hispanic, 5% other

Education = High School, some college, Associates, Bachelors

MEASURES:

Aversive Racism Scale (Kteily, 2015).

A paragraph describing an Arab American man, participants had to judge on a scale from 1-100 how they perceived his moral character, ability to be fair, thoughtfulness, intelligence, and overall approval for a job.

Acceptability of Racial Microaggressions Scale (Mekaw and Todd, 2018).

Participants rated how acceptable they perceived different sentences to be on a scale from 1-6, 1 being the least acceptable and 6 being the most.

Ex: “If African Americans spoke less slang, they’d be more likely to get jobs.”

RESULTS

H1. Education level also did not have a significant effect on Aversive Racism. F (3,16) = .91 , p = .50. However, there was a trend in the data set that supported the hypothesis.

H2. The level of education did not have a significant effect on microaggression acceptability F (3,16) = .48, p = .70.
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Parental Education, Preparation for Bias on Level of Racism and Prejudice
Michel K. Valencia
Department of Psychological Science, Eastern Connecticut State University, Willimantic, Connecticut

BACKGROUND & CURRENT STUDY

- The school setting, diversity of one's hometown, the diversity of friendships, and international travel experience has been found to influence whether a child develops racism (Miville, 2008).
- The purpose of this study was to see if other factors like parental influence and education, impacted someone's level of racism.

Hypothesis:
H1: The higher the father's education the lower your prejudice and level of racism.
H2: The higher your mother's education the lower your prejudice and level of racism.
H3: The higher your positive racial socialization the lower your prejudice and level of racism.

METHOD

Participants
N= 19
Average age =19.63
Percentage of
• males = 21.1
• females = 73.7
• not applicable =5.3
Percentage of
• Hispanic = 36.8
• White = 36.8
• Black = 15.8
• Black and white = 5.3
• Multiracial = 5.3

Materials
• Denial of Racism Scale (Critcher & Risen, 2014)
• Prejudice Scale (Lepore & Brown, 1997)
• Preparation for Bias Measure (Hagelskamp & Hughes, 2014)
• Racial Socialization Measure (Telzer & Vazquez Garcia, 2009)

RESULTS

H1: The ANOVA test indicated that father's with a high education did not differ from father's with a low education on someone's level of prejudice, F(5,13)=1.19, p=.37 and level of racism, F(5,13)=.90, p=.51.
H2: The ANOVA test indicated that a mother's education did not differ from mother's with a low education on someone's level of prejudice, F(7,11)=.39, p=.90 and level of racism, F(7,11)=.63, p=.73.
H3:
• As positive racial socialization increased, prejudice decreased, r(17)= -.39, p=.10. This was not statistically significant.
• As racial socialization increased, denial of racism increased r(17)=.26, p=.27. This was not statistically significant.

Other Findings:
• A Pearson correlation indicated that as positive racial socialization increased, the preparation for bias increased, r(17)=.54, p=.02

DISCUSSION

• Research showed that both parents' education levels did not make a difference on someone's level of racism.
• My research did not support the idea that positive racial socialization measure was related to someone's level of prejudice and racism.
• My study did show that positive racial socialization was related to someone's preparation for bias.
• This tells us that parents should talk to their kids about positive racial socialization to prepare them for biases.
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