

Scale of Beliefs about Children's Adjustment in Same-Sex Families

(Escala de Creencias sobre el Ajuste Infantil en Familias con padres del mismo sexo)

Dolores Frías-Navarro

Faculty of Psychology

Department of Methodology of the Behavioural Sciences

University of Valencia

Spain

E-mail: M.Dolores.Frias@uv.es

Web: <http://www.uv.es/friasnav/>

Abstract

This study examines the conceptualization and psychometric properties of a new scale that measures of the adults' beliefs about negative impacts on children who are raised in same sex parents. Research findings, based on a sample of 212 university students (mean age 22 years, SD = 8.28), supported the reliability and validity of the scale. This measure include two factors, Individual Opposition (Cronbach's alpha = 0.87) and Normative Opposition (Cronbach's alpha = 0.88). Convergent validity of the scale is demonstrated by predictable correlations with beliefs about the cause of homosexuality and the support for homosexual rights. Our study reveals a strong positive association between high scores on the *Scale of Beliefs about Children's Adjustment in Same-Sex Families* and beliefs that the origin of homosexuality is learned and opposition to homosexual rights.

Key words: Children's Adjustment, Same-Sex Families, Reliability

Resumen

Este estudio examina el concepto y propiedades psicométricas de una nueva escala que mide las creencias de los adultos acerca del impacto negativo que sobre los niños tiene el ser educado por padres del mismo sexo, *Escala de Creencias sobre el Ajuste Infantil en Familias Homoparentales*. Los resultados, basados en una muestra de 212 estudiantes universitarios (edad media de 22 años, DT = 8.28) apoyan la validez y fiabilidad de la escala. Esta medida incluye dos factores, Oposición Individual (alfa de Cronbach=0.87) y Oposición Normativa (alfa de Cronbach = 0.88. La validez convergente de la escala señala correlaciones predecibles con creencias acerca de la causa de la homosexualidad y el apoyo de los derechos de los homosexuales. Nuestro

estudio señala una fuerte asociación positiva entre altas puntuaciones en la *Escala de Creencias sobre el Ajuste Infantil en Familias Homoparentales* y creencias que mantienen que el origen de la homosexualidad es aprendido y la oposición a los derechos de los homosexuales.

Palabras clave: Ajuste infantil, Familias con padres del mismo sexo, Fiabilidad

The construct of homophobia has evolved along with political and social changes just as occurred in the fields of racism and sexism. Researchers have recently begun to make a distinction between classical (old-fashioned, blatant, overt, and explicit) and modern (subtle, covert, and implicit) forms of prejudice. Sears (1988) characterized modern prejudice by three components: denial of continued discrimination, antagonism toward minority group demands, and resentment about special favors for minority groups. We suggest that the distinction between modern and classical types of prejudiced attitude is identifiable also for attitudes toward the person with a homosexual orientation. We find ourselves faced with a new expression of homophobia that is less aggressive and less open, but just as discriminatory as the traditional one, and that requires the elaboration of new measurement instruments.

In the 1970's, George Weinberg (1972) popularized the term homophobia in his work *Society and the Healthy Homosexual* as referring to the irrational fear or apprehension felt by a heterosexual subject when shut in a room with a lesbian woman, a gay man or a bisexual. The heterosexism is the belief that heterosexuality is the only normal or natural option for human relationships and that heterosexuality is superior to homosexuality. Herek (1992) defined heterosexism as "an ideological system that

denies, denigrates, and stigmatizes any nonheterosexual form of behavior, identity, relationship or community” (p.89). The current discourse includes respect for all the sexual orientations, without publicly labeling homosexuals as sick people. However, normality and naturalness are attributed to heterosexual behavior compared to the unnatural and, therefore, deviant behavior of the other types of sexual orientation (Burrige, 2004).

Clearly, the manifestations of homophobia are now more subtle, and certain social rights that were not recognized before are tolerated, but without accepting the equality and normalization of the lives of people with a non-heterosexual sexual orientation. For example, the results of the surveys point out that the majority of heterosexuals support the protection of the civil rights of gays and lesbians, but they show a greater opposition to allowing them to be parents, rejecting, above all, adoption (Frias-Navarro, 2005). Furthermore, those surveyed do not accept their own prejudice as a personal belief, given the social rejection it produces, but they do grant it validity within the perspective of heterosexism, which assumes the superiority of heterosexuality over homosexuality as the natural manifestation of the sexual orientation. This type of reasoning is quite present, especially in their opinions about marriage and parenting by gays and lesbians and the psychological well-being of their children. From our point of view, the expression of homophobia has transformed into a new cognitive, affective and behavioral manifestation, where open and aggressive discrimination against the homosexual person is attacked, but which defends socio-cultural values that maintain the superiority of the heterosexual model: heterosexual fathers and mothers naturally possess the best standards of child-raising and education. Within this perspective, we

frame the development of the *Scale of Beliefs about Children's Adjustment in Same-Sex Families* (SBCASSF).

Since the 1970's, researchers have developed different scales to measure attitudes toward lesbians and gays. In the 1980's, within a traditional theoretical model of homophobic attitudes, two of the most important measures were the Hudson and Ricketts scale (1980), the *Index of Homophobia* (IHP) and, especially, the Herek scale (1984, 1988), *Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men* (ATLG).

Currently, the perspective of modern prejudice has gained strength, which has led to the elaboration of new instruments, such as the *Modern Homophobia Scale* (MHS) by Raja and Stokes (1998) and, more recently, the *Modern Homonegativity Scale* (MHS) by Morrison and Morrison (2002), whose purpose is to measure attitudes toward lesbians and gays that are not based on religious or moral judgments (what the authors call "traditional homonegativity").

Together with the general dimension of homophobia, there are beliefs about the quality of the home formed by parents of the same sex. The basic question is do the children develop properly in a family with same-sex parents? Or, highlighting a heterosexual component, do children of same-sex parents develop in the same way as those in homes with heterosexual parents? The increasingly large body of research on same-sex families indicates that the social and emotional adjustment children of homosexual parents are likely to be at least as positive as those of the children of heterosexual-partnered parents, and that the quality and quantity of parenting by lesbian couples is likely to be high compared to that by heterosexual couples (Frías-Navarro, 2005;

Golombok, 2000; González, Morcillo, Sánchez, Chacón & Gómez, 2004; Lambert, 2005; Patterson, 2006; Tasker, 2005; Wainright, Russell & Patterson, 2004).

The main purpose of our study is to present the psychometric properties of the first evaluation instrument oriented exclusively toward measuring the beliefs about the childhood adjustment of children raised and educated by same-sex parents, the *Scale of Beliefs about Children's Adjustment in Same-Sex Families* (SBCASSF). The validity of the instrument is analyzed through the relationships of scores from the scale with the attributions about the origin of homosexuality, opinions about certain traditional values related to the family, opinions about gender roles and heterosexuality, and the recognition of the societal rights of same-sex couples, such as marriage or adoption.

The results from the literature point out that the greatest degree of homophobia is related to attributions maintaining that homosexuality is learned (there is control over the choice of the homosexuality by the subject), compared to genetic or biological explanations (there is no control) about the origin of the homosexuality, which are linked to a lesser degree of prejudice (Aguero, Block & Byrne, 1984; Ernulf, Innala, & Whitam, 1989; Herek, 2002; Oldham & Kasser, 1999; Piskur & Degelman, 1992; Raiz, 2006; Røndahl, Innala & Carlsson, 2004; Sakalli, 2002; Schneider & Lewis, 1984; Whitley, 1990).

Opinions assigning different traditional roles to men and women also predict more negative attitudes toward gays and lesbians (Agnew, Thompson, Smith, Gramzow & Currey, 1993; Basow & Johnson, 2000; Cotten-Huston & Waite, 2000; Ficarotto, 1990; Kerns & Fine, 1994; Kite & Whitley, 1996; Louderback & Whitley, 1997; MacDonald &

Games, 1974; Patel, Long, McCammon & Wuensch, 1995; Whitley, 1987; Whitley & Aegisdottir, 2000).

Supporting the civil rights of gays and lesbians is associated with more positive attitudes about tolerance toward and acceptance of the life of the homosexual person (Brewer, 2003; Ellis, Kitzinger & Wilkinson, 2002; Irwin & Thompson, 1977; Kite & Whitley, 1996; Wood & Bartkowski, 2004).

Method

Participants

The sample was composed of 212 university Psychology students in Valencia (Spain) (mean age 22 years, standard deviation 8.28). 78.3% were women, and 21.2% were men; one participant did not give his or her sex (0.5 %). Participation in the study was voluntary, and it took place after civil marriage between same-sex couples had been approved in Spain (reform of the Spanish Civil Code with regard to the right to contract marriage, introduced by Law 13/2005 of July 1st 2005).

Measures

The Scale of Beliefs about Children's Adjustment in Same-Sex Families. The instrument used to measure the beliefs about the effects of the child-raising and education practices of same-sex parents on their children's adjustment is the *Scale of Beliefs about Children's Adjustment in Same-Sex Families*, whose psychometric properties are presented in this study. The construction of the scale passed through different prior phases of research on the construct of beliefs about negative effect on children of being raised by homosexual parents (an initial pool of 95 items) until arriving at the version presented and analyzed in the present study (Frías-Navarro, 2005, Frías-Navarro,

Pascual & Monterde, 2003; Frías-Navarro, Pascual, Monterde & Montejano, 2005). The original scale consisted of sixteen items, and responses were given on a Likert type scale from 'Completely agree' (5) to 'Completely disagree' (1).

Beliefs about the origin of homosexuality (BOH). In addition, a measurement instrument was elaborated on the *Beliefs about the Origin of Homosexuality* (BOH), consisting of 7 items whose purpose is to find out opinions about the biological (three items, Cronbach's alpha of 0.93) or learned (four items, Cronbach's alpha of 0.82) origin of homosexuality.

Opinions about the rights of homosexuals. Two items were included that reflect opinions about the social rights of homosexuals in general, and there were two other items dealing with the specific question of the legalization of civil marriage between same-sex partners.

Traditional values, gender roles and heterosexuality. In the study, information was also gathered related to the opinions about traditional family values ("*having a family is one of my most important goals in reaching personal fulfillment*"), gender roles ("*women are usually better suited than men for taking care of children and the elderly*") and heterosexist questions related to the education, development and raising of children.

Procedure

The sample of university students completed the instrument during class hours and all responses were kept confidential and anonymous. They were told that it was a study designed to find out what people think about family relationships and certain issues in everyday life.

Results

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

The development of a new instrument to measure beliefs about children's adjustment in families of the same sex, called the *Scale of Beliefs about Children's Adjustment in Same-Sex Families*, first consisted of performing a principal components exploratory analysis. In the analysis, the correlation matrix was used as the association matrix. The determinant value of the correlation matrix (determinant 7.91E-005), the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin sample fit measure (KMO) (.91) and the Bartlett sphericity test ($\chi^2=1792,96$, degrees of freedom 120, $p<.0001$) showed that the application of principal components analysis was appropriate. For the extraction of the components, the Kaiser criterion (*eigenvalues* >1, Kaiser, 1960) and the screen plot (Cattell, 1966) were taken into account. Both of these criteria made it possible to conclude that there were two main components.

The factorial matrix was rotated using the oblimin oblique rotation ($\delta=0$) procedure. All of the items saturate positively in their components. The results of the principal components analysis show a two dimensional structure. After examining the results of the structure matrix, items 6 ("It is quite likely that the child adopted by a homosexual couple will have conflicts with other children, which may lead to emotional disorders") and 2 ("If a child is adopted by a homosexual, it is likely that in the future s/he will feel ashamed when comparing him/herself to classmates who have fathers and mothers") were eliminated from the final scale due to their high saturation in both components (greater than .4). All the items saturate in the corresponding component with values superior to .4. The scale consists, therefore, of 14 items; seven for each subscale (see

Table 1). The variability of items 11 (.33) and 14 (.35) is the least explained according to their final communalities (proportion of item variance explained by the components).

Table 1. *Matrix of rotated components of the oblimin oblique rotation in the principal components analysis*

*h ²	Oblimin		h ²
	Factor loadings		
<i>The Scale of Beliefs about Children's Adjustment in Same-Sex Parent Families</i>	1	2	
Item 12. A child who is raised by a homosexual couple will be teased by his/her classmates.	.86	.40	.74
Item 8. A child adopted by a homosexual couple will be the butt of jokes and rejection by his/her classmates.	.85	.35	.73
Item 4. It is more likely that the child will experience social isolation if his/her friends know that his/her parents are homosexuals.	.81	.48	.66
Item 10. Surely, the classmates will reject a child whose father or mother is homosexual.	.81	.43	.66
Item 16. If the parents are homosexuals, it will be difficult for the child to be invited to friends' parties.	.73	.35	.54
Item 13. The child raised by homosexual parents will probably not be chosen as a leader by his/her classmates or friends.	.71	.37	.51
Item 14. The child usually hides the sexual orientation of his parents from his friends out of fear of being rejected socially.	.59	.34	.35
Item 9. If a child is adopted by a homosexual couple, s/he will surely have psychological problems in the future.	.40	.85	.72
Item 7. If we want to defend the interests of the child, only heterosexual couples should be able to adopt.	.33	.83	.69
Item 5. If children are raised by homosexuals, they will have more problems with their own sexual identity than when they are raised by a father and a mother.	.43	.82	.69
Item 1. In general, the social development of a child is better when it is raised by a father and a mother, and not by a homosexual couple.	.38	.79	.63
Item 3. In general, children raised by homosexual parents will have more problems than those who are raised by a father and a mother.	.40	.79	.62
Item 15. When a child manifests homosexual behaviors, it would be wise to take him/her to the psychologist.	.37	.66	.44
Item 11. A child raised by lesbian mothers will be an effeminate child.	.40	.60	.33
<i>Percentage of variance explained</i>	<i>44.48</i>	<i>14.73</i>	

item communalities at extraction

The theoretical labeling for each component was performed with the psychological content of the items in mind. The first component includes items related to the personal or individual beliefs the subjects make about the adverse effects of the upbringing and education by same-sex parents on the psychological adjustment of their children (construct called *Individual Opposition*). The second component involves making the

opinions using the heterosexist norm as the cause of the child's maladjustment (construct called *Normative Opposition*). The correlation between the two subscales is statistically significant ($r = .51, p < .001$).

Reliability Estimates

The results of the analysis of the reliability of the *Scale of Beliefs about Children's Adjustment in Same-Sex Families* show an adequate internal consistency of the items and a high reliability of the two subscales, given the Cronbach's alpha values of 0.87 and 0.88 for the subscales of *Individual Opposition* and *Normative Opposition*, respectively (see Table 2). The Cronbach's alpha value for the entire 14-item scale is 0.90 (mean of 24.94, SD=8.45).

Table 2. *Means, Standard Deviations, and Internal Consistency Estimates for ECAIFH*

Subscales

Item	M	SD	Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's alpha: item deleted
Individual Opposition (Cronbach's alpha= 0,87)				
1	1,90	1,14	,704	,85
3	1,65	,97	,685	,85
5	1,67	1,02	,728	,84
7	1,45	,93	,726	,84
9	1,38	,73	,762	,84
11	1,18	,47	,466	,88
15	1,36	,81	,536	,87
Normative Opposition (Cronbach's alpha= 0,88)				
4	2,34	1,05	,731	,86
8	2,20	,96	,766	,85
10	1,96	,91	,725	,86
12	2,34	,97	,806	,85
13	1,67	1,01	,582	,88
14	2,64	1,15	,512	,89
16	1,36	,66	,637	,87

The descriptive statistics for the final 14-item scale are presented in Table 3. Keeping in mind that the range of the score in each subscale varies from seven to thirty-two (mode = 7 and mode = 12), a low score is observed in the two dimensions of opposition in general terms in the sample of university participants. The mean score on the *Individual Opposition* scale is 10.58 (SD=4.69), while on the *Normative Opposition* scale a higher score is obtained, 14.51 (SD=5.19). The observed difference was statistically significant ($F_{(1, 197)} = 117.41, p < 0.001, \text{Cohen's } d = 0.79, \text{CI } 0.59 \text{ to } 0.99$).

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of the Individual Opposition and Normative Opposition Subscales in the final 14-item SBCASSF scale

	Individual Prejudice	Normative Prejudice
Mean	10.58	14.51
Standard Deviation	4.69	5.19
Mode	7	12
Range	25	25
Minim	7	7
Maxim	32	32

Validity

The study of the convergent validity of the *Scale of Beliefs about Children's Adjustment in Homoparental Same-Sex Families* was carried out based on the results provided by the literature on homophobia and the study of the opinions about the biological or learned origin of homosexuality, the social rights of homosexuals, traditional family values as one of the goals to pursue in achieving personal fulfillment, the classical assignment of gender roles and the supremacy of the family model with heterosexual parents.

The results of the correlations between the two subscales and the beliefs about the origin of homosexuality, measured with the *Scale of Beliefs about the Origin of Homosexuality* (BOH), support the findings from previous studies (Frías, Pascual, Monterde & Montejano, 2006). The scores on the *Individual Opposition* subscale do not correlate in a statistically significant way with the factor that measures the belief that homosexuality is biological or genetic ($r=.00$, $p=.99$), but it does when measuring the belief that homosexuality is learned ($r=.79$, $p<.001$). The same pattern of correlations is obtained with the *Normative Opposition* subscale, where the correlation with the genetic attribution of homosexuality is not statistically significant ($r=.01$, $p=.21$), but it is with the belief that homosexuality is learned ($r=.50$, $p<.001$). The correlations between the two subscales of the SBCASSF and the items that make up the Scale of beliefs about the origin of Homosexuality are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Beliefs about the origin of homosexuality, social rights, family, sexism and heterosexism

	<i>Individual Prejudice</i>	<i>Normative Prejudice</i>
<i>Origin of homosexuality</i>		
Homosexuality is an inevitable behavior that is determined by genetics.	$r=-.04$ ($p=.56$)	$r=.05$ ($p=.49$)
The sexual orientation is caused by biological factors like genes and hormones.	$r=.02$ ($p=.83$)	$r=.09$ ($p=.20$)
Genetic factors are the causes of homosexuality.	$r=.03$ ($p=.64$)	$r=.11$ ($p=.12$)
On many occasions, homosexual behavior is learned.	$r=.43$ ($p<.001$)	$r=.35$ ($p<.001$)
A child educated by homosexuals will be more likely to have homosexual tendencies.	$r=.64$ ($p<.001$)	$r=.36$ ($p<.001$)
Children need a father and a mother who can provide them with masculine and feminine roles.	$r=.77$ ($p<.001$)	$r=.48$ ($p<.001$)
I think homosexual parents will influence the sexual orientation of their children.	$r=.66$ ($p<.001$)	$r=.41$ ($p<.001$)
<i>Civil rights</i>		
Nowadays, celebrating "Gay Pride Day" doesn't make any sense because their rights have already been recognized.	$r=.16$ ($p=.03$)	$r=.13$ ($p=.07$)
Homosexual couples should have the same rights as heterosexual couples.	$r=-.40$ ($p<.001$)	$r=-.14$ ($p=.05$)

I think it was a mistake to legalize marriage between people of the same sex.	$r=.57$ ($p<.001$)	$r=.26$ ($p<.001$)
Recognizing the rights of homosexual couples with a civil contract is enough, and it would avoid controversy.	$r=.24$ ($p=.001$)	$r=.10$ ($p=.15$)
<i>Values related to the family</i>		
Having a family is one of my most important goals in reaching personal fulfillment.	$r=.29$ ($p<.001$)	$r=.30$ ($p<.000$)
<i>Sexism</i>		
Women are usually better suited than men for taking care of children and the elderly.	$r=.40$ ($p<.000$)	$r=.34$ ($p<.000$)
<i>Heterosexism</i>		
Children have the right to grow up in an atmosphere that is as close as possible to the natural family with a father and mother.	$r=.68$ ($p<.000$)	$r=.38$ ($p<.000$)
I highly respect whatever sexual orientation people may have, but allowing adoption involves the future of a child, and the best thing for a child's development is a father and a mother.	$r=.78$ ($p<.000$)	$r=.36$ ($p<.000$)
If children could choose, I am almost positive that they would prefer a dad and a mom.	$r=.61$ ($p<.000$)	$r=.50$ ($p<.000$)

When the opinions about the social rights of homosexuals are analyzed, the scores on the *Individual Opposition* and *Normative Opposition* subscales correlate in a positive and statistically significant way with the opinions that maintain that the legalization of homosexual marriage in Spain was a 'social' error (see Table 4) while in the other three items they present a different profile. Only the scores on the *Individual Opposition* subscale obtain statistically significant correlations with the belief that the rights of homosexuals have already been recognized, even though they should not have the same rights as heterosexual couples, supporting the idea that a civil contract would have been sufficient for recognizing the rights of homosexuals, and it would have avoided controversy (see Table 4).

The value of the family as a goal in striving for personal fulfillment, the sexist distribution of the roles of men and women, and the belief in the greater well-being of the child raised and educated in a family structure with heterosexual parents maintain positive and statistically significant correlations with the scores on the *Individual Opposition* and *Normative Opposition* subscales (see Table 4).

The scores on the two subscales of the SBCASSF correlate in a statistically significant way with opinions about heterosexism, with the correlations being especially high on the *Individual Opposition* subscale (see Table 4).

Discussion

The results of our study indicate that the new 14-item *Scale of Beliefs about Children's Adjustment in Same-Sex Families* is a reliable and valid instrument that can be used to measure opposition about the parenting of gay fathers and lesbian mothers. The development of the SBCASSF scale responds to the lack of instruments that directly measure what we could call 'homoparentophobia' or the *fear that a child will be educated by a lesbian mother, a gay father or a couple of the same sex, resulting in the appearance of childhood psychological problems, especially the social rejection of the child* (Frias-Navarro, 2005). This attitude is clearly discriminatory, as it incapacitates gay fathers and lesbian mothers solely and exclusively due to their sexual orientation. Recent research on the relationships between same-sex couples has focused on three areas (Peplau & Fingerhut, 2007): the legalization of these relationships; the experience of parenthood; and the impact of prejudice and social discrimination toward same-sex couples. One of the arguments most widely used to reject the upbringing and education of children by homosexual parents lies in the social rejection and discrimination to which they will be subjected by a heterosexist society. As Litovich and Langhout (2004) point out, it is ironic that the quality of the parenting of same-sex parents should be questioned based on the difficulties the children will suffer in a society with prejudices against homosexuals. Our study contributes to identifying this opposition, making it possible to measure the construct of fear of gays and lesbians becoming parents, and

identifying two factors of the opposition to their parenthood. One factor is called *Individual Opposition*, and it includes the beliefs derived from one's personal attitude about the effects of homoparenthood. The other factor is called *Normative Opposition*, and it uses social pressure as an argument to justify discrimination against same-sex parents. The two types of prejudice are distinguishable but correlated.

To examine the discriminant validity of scale, we first expected participants to score higher on the *Normative Opposition* than the *Individual Opposition*. This expectation was based on the contention that the overt nature of the *Individual Opposition*, as compared with the *Normative*, restrains participants' responses. The higher score on the Normative Opposition subscale compared to the *Individual Opposition* subscale is a sign of greater personal permissiveness to the sexual prejudice when the cause of the problems of a child raised in a homoparental home is attributed to the heterosexist society and not to one's own opinion.

From our point of view, heterosexist beliefs frame the so-called modern prejudice, where normality and the privileges of the heterosexual model stand out as examples of a healthy and natural life. The heterosexist model attributes the possible childhood maladjustment to the social rejection suffered by gay fathers or lesbian mothers. Moreover, the model highlights the value of a father and a mother as necessary elements for the well-adjusted development of the child, regardless of the family processes that take place within the family structure. Within this context, broader than the mere fear of the homosexual person (homophobia), lies the development of the SBCASSF instrument.

The correlations point out the statistically significant relationship between beliefs about the maladjustment of the children raised and educated in homoparental families and opinions that the origin of homosexuality is learned. Therefore, believing that homosexuality is learned correlates with greater rejection of homosexual parenthood. The subscale of *Individual Opposition* correlates with modern homophobic opinions related to the recognition of the rights of homosexuals. However, both the *Individual Opposition* and *Normative Opposition* subscales maintain a close link with traditional family values, gender roles and, especially, beliefs that highlight the heterosexual parental model as the natural and ideal family for the well-adjusted development of a child.

The results of our study have limitations related to the type of sample (Psychology students), and probably also related to nationality. It would be helpful to apply the instrument using another type of sample and country, in order to be able to generalize the results.

In conclusion, the results of our study contribute to the literature that supports the transformation of sexual prejudice, providing evidence of a specific component of homophobia: the rejection of the parenthood of gay fathers and lesbian mothers. The interpretation of the discrimination finds support in the manifestation of modern prejudice, which hides behind the heterosexism argument: in a heterosexist society, it is better for the child not to be raised and educated by gay fathers or lesbian mothers. The new sexual prejudice does not use an individual and open posture of personal discrimination against the homosexual. Instead, it is maintained by social arguments that do not affect the self-esteem of the subject.

References

- Agnew, C. R., Thompson, V. D., Smith, V. A., Gramzow, R. H. & Currey, D. P. (1993). Proximal and distal predictors of homophobia: framing the multivariate roots of out-group rejection. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 23*, 2013-2042.
- Aguero, J. E., Block, L. & Byrne, D. (1984). The relationship among sexual beliefs, attitudes, experience, and homophobia. *Journal of Homosexuality, 10*, 95-107.
- Basow, S. A. & Johnson, K. (2000). Predictors of homophobia in female college students. *Sex Roles, 42*, 391-404.
- Brewer, P. R. (2003). The shifting foundations of public opinion about gay rights. *Journal of Politics, 65*, 1208-1220.
- Burridge, J. (2004). 'I am not homophobic but': Disclaiming in discourse resisting repeal of section 28. *Sexualities, 7*, 327-344.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1*, 245-276.
- Cotten-Huston, A. L. & Waite, B. M. (2000). Anti-homosexual attitudes in college students: Predictors and classroom interventions. *Journal of Homosexuality, 38*, 117-133.
- Ellis, S., Kitzinger, C., & Wilkinson, S. (2002). Attitudes towards lesbians and gay men and support for lesbian and gay human rights among psychology students. *Journal of Homosexuality, 44*, 121-138.
- Ernulf, K. E., Innala, S. M. & Whitam, F. L. (1989). Biological explanation, psychological explanation, and tolerance of homosexuals: A cross-national analysis of beliefs and attitudes. *Psychological Reports, 65*, 1003-1010.

- Ficarotto T. J. (1990). Racism, sexism, and erotophobia: attitudes of heterosexuals towards Homosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 19, 111-116.
- Frias-Navarro, D. (2009). *Scale of Beliefs about Children's Adjustment in Same-Sex Families*. Spain: University of Valencia.
- Frias-Navarro, D. (2005). Matrimonio y adopción por personas del mismo sexo: resultados de la investigación psicológica. *Cuadernos de Derecho Judicial*, 26, 491-571.
- Frias-Navarro, D.; Pascual, J. & Monterde, H. (2003). Familia y diversidad: hijos de padres homosexuales. *IV Congreso Virtual de Psiquiatría Interpsiquis 2003*, 1 - 28 Febrero 2003.
- Frias-Navarro, M. D., Pascual, J., Monterde, H. & Montejano, S. (2005). *Desarrollo de una escala sobre el ajuste infantil en familias homoparentales*. IX Congreso de Metodología de las Ciencias Sociales y de la Salud. Granada (Spain), 14 a 16 de Septiembre.
- Golombok, S. (2000). *Parenting: What really matters?* London: Routledge.
- González, M.M., Morcillo, E., Sánchez, M.A., Chacón, F. & Gómez, A. (2004). Ajuste psicológico e integración social en hijos e hijas de familias homoparentales. *Infancia y Aprendizaje*, 27, 327-344.
- Herek, G. M. (1984). Attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: a factor-analytic study. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 10, 39-52.
- Herek, G. M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: correlates and gender differences. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 25, 451-477.

- Herek, G. M. (1992). The social context of hate crimes: Notes on cultural heterosexism. In G. M. Herek & K. T. Berrill (Eds.), *Hate crimes: Confronting violence against lesbians and gay men*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Herek, G. M. (2002). Gender gaps in public opinion about lesbians and gay men. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 66, 40-66.
- Hudson, W. W. & Ricketts, W. A. (1980). A strategy for the measurement of homophobia. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 5, 357-372.
- Irwin, P. & Thompson, N. L. (1977). Acceptance of the rights of homosexuals: A social profile. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 3, 197-121.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1960). The application of electronic computers to analysis factorial. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20, 141-151.
- Kerns, J. G. & Fine, M. A. (1994). The relation between gender and negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbians: Do gender role attitudes mediate the relation? *Sex Roles*, 31, 297-307.
- Kite, M. E. & Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1996). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexual persons, behaviors, and civil rights: a meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 336-353.
- Lambert, S. (2005). Gay and lesbian families: What we know and where to go from here. *The Family Journal*, 13, 43-51.
- Litovich, M. L., & Langhout, R. D. (2004). Framing heterosexism in lesbian families: A preliminary examination of resilient coping. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 14, 411-435.

- Louderback, L. A. & Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1997). Perceived erotic value of homosexuality and sex-role attitudes as mediators of sex differences in heterosexual college students' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Sex Research, 34*, 175-182.
- MacDonald, A. P. Jr. & Games, R. G. (1974). Some characteristics of those who hold positive and negative attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality, 1*, 9-27.
- Morrison, M. A. & Morrison, T. G. (2002) Development and validation of a scale measuring modern prejudice toward gay men and lesbians. *Journal of Homosexuality, 43*, 15-37.
- Oldham, J. D. & Kasser, T. (1999). Attitude change in response to information that male homosexuality has a biological basis. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 25*, 121-124.
- Patel, S., Long, T. E., McCammon, S. L. & Wuensch, K. L. (1995). Personality and emotional correlates of self-reported antigay behaviors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10*, 354-366.
- Patterson, Ch. J. (2006). Children of lesbian and gay parents. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 15*, 241-244.
- Peplau, L. A. & Fingerhut, A. W. (2007). The close relationships of lesbians and gay men. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 405-424.
- Piskur, J., & Degelman, D. (1992). Effect of reading a summary of research about biological bases of homosexual orientation on attitudes toward homosexuals. *Psychological Reports, 71*, 1219–1225.

- Raiz, L. (2006). College students' support of rights for members of the gay community. *Journal of Poverty, 10*, 53-75.
- Raja, S., & Stokes, J. P. (1998). Assessing attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: The Modern Homophobia Scale. *Journal of Gays, Lesbian, and Bisexual Identity, 3*, 113–134.
- Röndahl, G.; Innala, S., & Carlsson, M. (2004). Nurses' attitudes towards lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 47*, 386-392.
- [Sakalli N.](#) J. (2002). Application of the attribution-value model of prejudice to homosexuality. *Social Psychology, 142*, 264-271.
- Schneider, W. & Lewis, I. A. (1984). The straight store on homosexuality and gay rights. *Public Opinion, 7*, 16-20.
- Sears, D. O. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P.A. Katz & D.A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: profiles in controversy*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Tasker, F. (2005). Lesbian mothers, gay fathers, and their children: A review. *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics, 26*, 224-240.
- Wainright, J. L., Russell, S. T. & Patterson, Ch. P. (2004). Psychosocial adjustment, school outcomes, and romantic relationships of adolescents with same-sex parents. *Child Development, 75*, 1886-1898.
- Weinberg, G. (1972). *Society and the healthy homosexual*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1987). The relationship of sex-role orientation to heterosexual's attitudes toward homosexuals. *Sex Roles, 17*, 103-113.

Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1990). The relationship of heterosexuals' attributions for the causes of homosexuality to attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 16, 369-377.

Whitley, B. E., Jr. & Aegisdottir, S. (2000). The gender belief system, authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Sex Roles*, 42, 947-967.

Wood, P. B., & Bartkowski, J. P. (2004). Attribution style and public policy attitudes toward gay rights. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85, 58-74.

Scale of Beliefs about Children's Adjustment in Same-Sex Families (SBCASSF)

(Frias-Navarro, 2009)

Instruction: Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by circling your answer using the scale from "1 = completely disagree" to "5 completely agree".

Item	1	2	3	4	5
1. In general, the social development of a child is better when it is raised by a father and a mother, and not by a homosexual couple. <i>En general, el desarrollo social de un niño es mejor cuando es educado por un padre y una madre y no por una pareja de homosexuales.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
2. In general, children raised by homosexual parents will have more problems than those who are raised by a father and a mother. <i>En general, los niños criados con padres homosexuales tendrán más problemas que los que son criados por un padre y una madre.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
3. It is more likely that the child will experience social isolation if his/her friends know that his/her parents are homosexuals. <i>Es más probable que un niño sufra aislamiento social si sus amigos saben que sus padres son homosexuales.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
4. If children are raised by homosexuals, they will have more problems with their own sexual identity than when they are raised by a father and a mother. <i>Si los niños son criados por homosexuales tendrán más problemas de confusión con su propia identidad sexual que si son criados por un padre y una madre</i>	1	2	3	4	5
5. If we want to defend the interests of the child, only heterosexual couples should be able to adopt. <i>Si queremos defender los intereses del niño, sólo las parejas de heterosexuales deberían poder adoptar</i>	1	2	3	4	5
6. A child adopted by a homosexual couple will be the butt of jokes and rejection by his/her classmates. <i>Un niño adoptado por una pareja de homosexuales será objeto de broma y rechazo por parte de sus compañeros.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
7. If a child is adopted by a homosexual couple, s/he will surely have psychological problems in the future. <i>Si un niño es adoptado por una pareja de homosexuales seguramente tendrá problemas psicológicos en el futuro.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
8. Surely, the classmates will reject a child whose father or mother is homosexual. <i>Seguramente los compañeros rechazarán a un niño cuyo padre o madre es homosexual.</i>	1	2	3	4	5
9. A child who is raised by a homosexual couple will be teased by his/her classmates.	1	2	3	4	5

Un niño que es educado por una pareja de homosexuales sufrirá las burlas de sus compañeros.					
10. The child raised by homosexual parents will probably not be chosen as a leader by his/her classmates or friends. Probablemente el niño criado por padres homosexuales no será escogido como líder por sus compañeros de clase o amigos.	1	2	3	4	5
11. When a child manifests homosexual behaviors, it would be wise to take him/her to the psychologist. Cuando un niño manifiesta conductas homosexuales sería conveniente llevarlo al psicólogo.	1	2	3	4	5
12. If the parents are homosexuals, it will be difficult for the child to be invited to friends' parties. Si los padres son homosexuales será difícil que los hijos sean invitados a las fiestas de sus amigos.	1	2	3	4	5
13. A child raised by lesbian mothers will be an effeminate child. Un niño educado por madres lesbianas será un niño afeminado.	1	2	3	4	5
14. The child usually hides the sexual orientation of his parents from his friends out of fear of being rejected socially. Lo más común es que el niño oculte la orientación sexual de sus padres a sus amigos por el temor al rechazo social.	1	2	3	4	5

Individual Opposition: Items 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 11 and 13.

Normative Opposition: Items 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 14.