



Currie, M. R., Cunningham, E. G., Findlay, B. M. (2004). The short internalized homonegativity scale: examination of the factorial structure of a new measure of internalized homophobia

Originally published in *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 64(6), 1053-1067.

Available at:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013164404264845>

Copyright © 2004 SAGE Publications.

This is the author's version of the work. It is posted here with the permission of the publisher for your personal use. No further distribution is permitted. If your library has a subscription to this journal, you may also be able to access the published version via the library catalogue.



DRAFT

The Short Internalized Homonegativity Scale: Validation of the factorial structure  
of a measure of internalized homophobia

Matthew R. Currie<sup>a</sup>, Everarda G. Cunningham<sup>b</sup>, and Bruce M. Findlay<sup>a</sup>

Swinburne University of Technology

Australia

Address correspondence to:  
Dr Bruce Findlay  
Psychology Department  
Swinburne University of Technology  
PO Box 218  
Hawthorn 3122  
Australia  
Ph: +61 3 9214 8093  
Email: bfindlay@swin.edu.au

<sup>a</sup>School of Behavioural Sciences, <sup>b</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences

Running Head: The Short Internalized Homonegativity Scale

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to develop a short measure of internalized homophobia (IH), one that reflected contemporary attitudes toward homosexuality and included items designed to assess the domain of sexual comfort with gay men, a domain which has been notably absent from other measures of IH. The Short Internalized Homonegativity Scale (SIHS) was informed by Ross and Rosser's (1996) Reactions to Homosexuality Scale (RHS) and the contention that currently available measures of IH were outdated in their assessment of the construct and/or failed to assess its covert manifestations. A geographically diverse sample of gay men completed an online questionnaire ( $N = 1305$ ) and the 677 respondents from the USA formed the sample for the study. Confirmatory factor analyses supported a single higher-order construct of IH comprising the lower order factors of Public Identification as Gay, Sexual Comfort with Gay Men, and Social Comfort with Gay Men.

The socio-cultural stigmatization of homosexual men has profound and lasting effects upon intrapsychic development for many gay men (Cornett, 1993). Malyon (1982) argues that the omnipresent homophobic and heterosexist beliefs within contemporary culture become to some extent an internalised constituent of the ego functioning of all gay men. He conceptualized the process of heterosexual socialisation for the adolescent homosexual as internalised homophobia (IH), which he defined as the “internalization of the mythology and opprobrium that characterise current social attitudes toward homosexuality” (p. 78). He states that “it [internalised homophobia] influences identity formation, self-esteem, the elaboration of defenses, patterns of cognition, psychological integrity, and object relations” (p.78). Without sufficient internal and external validation of these components of the self-construct, the development of stable and functional self-esteem becomes a life-long struggle.

Numerous studies have implicated IH in a diverse range of intra- and interpersonal negative outcomes and life situations for gay and lesbian people, including: distrust and loneliness (Finnegan & Cook, 1984; Shidlo, 1994); eating disorders (Brown, 1987); defense mechanisms, including rationalization, denial, projection, and identification with the aggressor (Margolies, Becker, & Jackson-Brewer, 1987); difficulties in intimate relationships such as self-sabotaging and projection of poor self-image onto a partner (Friedman, 1991); substance abuse (Glaus, 1988); high risk sexual behaviour (Nicholson & Long, 1990; Ratti, Bakeman & Peterson, 2000; Shidlo, 1992); depression (Otis & Skinner, 1996); alcoholism (Finnegan & Cook, 1984); and suicide

(Meyer, 1995). Clearly internalised homophobia represents a central clinical theme in working with non-heterosexual clients.

Several researchers have described IH as operating at both a conscious and unconscious level with subsequent variations in symptomatology (Gonsierok, 1995; Malyon, 1982; Margolies, Becker, & Jackson-Brewer, 1987). Gonsierok suggested that conscious IH may be reflected in a belief of self as being inferior, worthless, and/or perverted on account of one's homosexuality. He suggested that overt manifestations of these beliefs may be seen in self-destructive or self-defeating behaviours such as substance abuse and violent relationships. More commonly, IH remains unconscious, operating at a covert, intra-psychic level. Such individuals often appear accepting of their same-sex orientation but harbour a range of subtle self-derogating or self-sabotaging symptoms. Gonsierok suggests that these unconscious negative feelings regarding one's sexual orientation may become global generalisations encompassing the whole self.

#### *Measurement of Internalised Homophobia*

The Nungesser Homosexual Attitudes Inventory (NHAI; Nungesser, 1983) represents the earliest and most widely used scale in the assessment of internalised homophobia. The NHAI is a 34-item scale consisting of three subscales, namely *Self*, *Other*, and *Disclosure*. The *Self* subscale consists of items measuring attitudes toward one's own homosexuality (e.g., "Whenever I think a lot about being homosexual, I feel depressed"). The *Other* subscale measures attitudes toward homosexuality in general and toward other gay persons (e.g., "Homosexuality is a sexual perversion") and the *Disclosure* subscale is comprised of reactions toward others knowing about one's own homosexuality (e.g., "It is important for me to conceal the fact that I am gay from most

people”). Nungesser reported good internal consistency reliability for the total NHAI (Cronbach alpha = .94), with Cronbach alpha internal consistencies ranging from .68 to .93 for the three subscales. However, many of the items comprising the NHAI seem to tap overt manifestations of IH and may be dated in its assessment of the construct given recent advances in the sociopolitical status of homosexual persons. Following an evaluation of the face validity of the items comprising the NHAI and consultation with gay men, the present researchers concluded that many of the items could appear transparent and extreme in their assessment of IH, possibly eliciting a negative response bias from participants.

A more recent attempt to design and validate a measure of internalised homonegativity (IH) was conducted by Mayfield (2001). He recruited 241 gay men from various states within the USA through advertisements placed at gay related events, venues, and Internet sites. Participants completed a 42-item questionnaire designed to assess IH along with a number of validating instruments. Exploratory factor analysis reduced the total item bank of Mayfield’s Internalised Homonegativity Inventory (IHNI) to a 23-item scale comprising three subscales namely (1) Personal Homonegativity (e.g., “I feel ashamed of my homosexuality”); (2) Gay Affirmation (e.g., “I am thankful for my sexual orientataion”) and (3) Morality of Homosexuality (e.g., “I believe it is morally wrong for men to be attracted to each other”). Mayfield reported good internal consistency with a Cronbach’s alpha of .91 for the total scale and alphas ranging from .70 to .89 for the three subscales. Support for the scales’ discriminant and convergent validity was indicated by correlations between the IHNI and a number of validating instruments including the NHAI (Nungesser, 1983).

Fassinger and Miller (1996) commented that contemporary models of gay and lesbian identity development frequently confounded two theoretically distinct aspects of gay/lesbian identity formation, namely acceptance of same-sex erotic desire and group identification/membership. Mayfield (2001) suggested that the latter has frequently been over-emphasised in the theoretical construct of IH and its measurement, while the role of same-sex sexual expression and erotic desire has been consistently overlooked. Indeed, in his definition of IH, Shildo (1994) described IH “as a set of negative attitudes and affects toward homosexuality in other persons and toward homosexual features in oneself. These features include; same-gender sexual and affectional feelings; same-gender sexual behaviour; same-gender intimate relationships; and self-labelling as lesbian, gay or homosexual” (p. 178). It seems evident from his definition that Shidlo views the role of same-sex sexual expression and erotic desire in IH as an important theoretical consideration that has notable implications for the design of any instrument purporting to assess the construct.

In his definition of IH and subsequent item design and selection Mayfield (2001) appears to have avoided confounding the two domains identified by Fassinger and Miller. However, as with the Nungesser (1983) scale, the items in the IHNI that were presumably designed to address the domain of same-sex erotic desire and expression (i.e., the Personal Homonegativity subscale) appear extreme and overt in their assessment of IH (e.g., “Sometimes I feel that I might be better off dead than gay”). The inclusion of extreme items such as this is evident in varying degrees in all of the IH scales reviewed in the present paper. This may largely explain the skewed distribution of scores reported by Mayfield and particularly for the subscale of Morality of Homosexuality. Moreover, the

extremity of such statements seems likely to assess only what Gonsierok (1995) identified as 'conscious internalised homophobia' (p.117), while failing to tap the more covert and, according to Gonsierok, more common and unconscious manifestations of the construct.

Given contemporary attitudes toward homosexuality, the scale developed by Ross and Rosser (1996) may be a more sensitive measure of the subtle forms that IH may take. The initial psychometric assessment of their Reactions to Homosexuality (RHS; Ross & Rosser, 1996) scale was based upon data collected from 184 male participants who "identified as being attracted to men" and who attended a "Man to Man" sexual health seminar. Participants completed the questionnaire at baseline and post-seminar. A factor analysis revealed 26 items falling into one of four dimensions: (1) Public Identification as Gay; (2) Perception of Stigma Associated with Being Gay; (3) Social Comfort with Gay Men; and (4) Moral and Religious Acceptability with Being Gay. The internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach alphas) for each of the subscales were .85, .69, .64 and .62 respectively. Other than for Public Identification as Gay, the remaining reliabilities were lower than generally desired. Moreover, for the subscale Perception of Stigma Associated with Being Gay, only one validating measure (i.e., Relationship Satisfaction) was found to have a weak though significant correlation with the subscale ( $r = .25$ ), while the other three subscales were significantly associated, as expected, with most of the validating measures. As with all published measures of IH the initial psychometric assessment of the RHS was based upon a convenience sample, suggesting a biased sample of 'gay' men who had, to some extent, accepted their sexual orientation. This is



particularly so for the RHS given the circumstances of sample recruitment employed by Ross and Rosser.

#### *Aims and Objectives of The Present Study*

The research investigating IH has been conducted using small, convenience samples within the USA. Ross and Rosser (1996) and Mayfield (2001) indicated concern with regard to the generalizability of their results for these reasons. The present study aimed to overcome these methodological limitations by recruiting all participants from the World Wide Web (WWW), thus overcoming the problems of small sample size and lack of diversity within the sample population.

A further aim of the present study was to improve the reliability of Ross and Rosser's (1996) RHS, and to produce a shorter IH measurement tool that assesses contemporary (i.e., covert) manifestations of the construct. In addition, in accordance with Gonsierok (1995) and others (e.g., Malyon, 1982; Margolies, Becker, & Jackson-Brewer, 1987) the present researchers added items to the RHS specifically designed to assess covert, unconscious manifestations of IH, particularly with regard to addressing the domain of same-sex erotic desire and expression that Mayfield (2001) identified as being notably absent in previous measures of IH. The inclusion of items such as "Gay men tend to flaunt their sexuality inappropriately" were designed to assess acceptance or rejection of stereotypes associated with gay men's sexual expression. Such items were designed to reflect covert beliefs that are contrary to self-acceptance of individual sexual identity, and were expected to be associated with increased individual IH.

Finally, previous validations of instruments designed to assess the dimensionality of IH have all employed exploratory factor analysis (EFA) techniques. Based on the

results of a series of Monte Carlo simulations, Gerbing and Hamilton (1996) recommend a two-stage process in the exploration and validation of the factorial structure of questionnaire items. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is recommended as a useful initial strategy to determine the underlying dimensional model. Such analyses tend to result in relatively stable solutions for samples sizes exceeding 300. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is then used to evaluate the model derived from EFA (Gerbing & Hamilton, 1996). The present study aimed to validate the underlying structure of IH derived from EFA by using the responses from a second independent sample in CFA. Furthermore, CFA techniques allow for the exploration of higher-order factorial models. Given that previous studies have found moderate correlations between factors comprising IH (e.g., Mayfield, 2001; Ross & Rosser, 1996), a further aim of the current study was to explore the validity of a second-order hierarchical structure for the construct of IH.

## Method

### *Participants*

Participants for the present study were recruited via the world-wide-web (WWW). The site was active for a three-month period, during which time a total of 1307 gay men completed the online questionnaire. The majority of the respondents ( $n = 677$ ; 51.4%) resided in the USA and these respondents form the sample of the present study. Respondents ranged in age from 18 to 79 years ( $M = 38.53$ ,  $SD = 12.51$ ) and nearly ninety percent lived in inner cities, suburban or larger (over 5000) regional towns. Only 10.9 percent of respondents reported their place or residence as rural or remote. Most of the respondents (58.6%) had completed undergraduate or postgraduate studies and only 12.7 percent indicated that they had not graduated from high school. Nearly three-

quarters were in full-time employment (72.6%) and a further 12.2 percent were currently studying. Almost equal proportions of respondents were single (50.4%) or in a relationship (49.6%). The number of years reported since “coming out” ranged from 0 (5.1%) to 57 years ( $M = 14.33$ ,  $SD = 11.42$ ).

### *Measure*

*Reactions to Homosexuality Scale* (RHS; Ross & Rosser, 1996). The RHS is a 26-item questionnaire that comprises four sub-scales, namely Public Identification as Gay (e.g., I am worried about anyone finding out that I am gay), Perception of Stigma Associated with Being Gay (e.g., Society still punishes people for being gay), Social Comfort with Gay Men (e.g., Social situations with gay men make me feel uncomfortable) and Moral and Religious Acceptability with Being Gay (e.g., Homosexuality is morally acceptable). In the current study, the scale containing six items pertaining to perceptions of stigma was omitted on theoretical grounds and because of lack of evidence for convergent validity with other constructs in a previous study (see Ross & Rosser, 1996). Participants responded to the 20 items by endorsing the extent to which they agreed to each statement on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 for “*strongly disagree*” to 7 for “*strongly agree*”. Items were scored such that higher scores indicated higher internalized homonegativity. Ross and Rosser report Cronbach alpha internal consistency reliabilities for Public Identification as Gay, Social Comfort with Gay Men, and Religious Acceptability with Being Gay as respectively .85, .64 and .62. In the current study these respective reliabilities, based on the first sample, were .75, .51 and .63.

Ten additional items using the same response format as the RHS were added to the RHS in an attempt to improve the internal consistency reliabilities of two of the RHS subscales and in order to include a measure of sexual comfort. Six of these items were specifically constructed to measure theoretical dimension of sexual comfort (e.g., I prefer the company of straight acting men). Hence the final questionnaire consisted of 30 items that were designed to measure the three underlying dimensions assessed by the RHS and the additional dimension of sexual comfort in gay men.

### *Procedure*

Respondents were recruited via Internet links posted on various gay-related sites (e.g., newsgroups, e-lists, message boards, chat rooms). Gay men who investigated the site were initially greeted with an introductory overview of the study and its purpose. Prior to clauses relating to informed consent and confidentiality, the qualifications and contact details of the first two authors were supplied. Participants then completed the questionnaire on-line.

### *Statistical analyses*

Participants were randomly divided into two approximately equal sized samples by using the random sample selection procedure in SPSS 11.0 so that the two-stage process for establishing factorial validity (i.e., EFA followed by CFA) that was recommended by Gerbing and Hamilton (1996) could be implemented. In the first stage of analysis, after removing unsuitable items due to their lack of variability, EFAs using maximum likelihood extraction with oblique rotation were conducted on the remaining items until a satisfactory model of the factorial structure of the questionnaire items was

determined. In the second stage, the responses from the second independent group of participants were employed in a series of CFA analyses. Initially, one-factor congeneric models for each of the constructs were evaluated prior to testing the factorial validity of the hypothesized lower order model that was derived using EFA (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). In these models, the variances of the latent variables were set to unity in order to identify the models. Finally, given that the intercorrelations between the latent variables were expected to be of a moderate magnitude (Ross & Rosser, 1996), the lower order model was evaluated as a higher order structure in which covariation among the first order constructs was hypothesized to be explained via the higher order construct of internalized homonegativity (Byrne, Baron, & Balev, 1998). To identify the higher-order portion of the model, two of the variances of the lower order factors were constrained to be equal (Byrne, 2001).

Tests for the factorial validity of items in the CFAs were conducted using maximum-likelihood estimation procedures on the covariance structures using the AMOS 4.0 program. Both pattern and structure coefficients were considered in evaluating the full measurement structure and multiple criteria were employed to assess the goodness-of-fit of the models (Thompson, 1997; Thompson & Daniel, 1996). The chi-square likelihood ratio was used to determine the statistical fit of the models. The indices used to measure the descriptive fit of the models were the ratio of  $\chi^2$  to degrees of freedom (*df*), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), the adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI), and the comparative fit index (CFI) (Kline, 1998; Thompson & Daniel, 1996).

## Results

Based on the descriptive statistics and frequency distributions of item responses from the first sample ( $n = 336$ ), seven items from the RHS (items 8, 9, 14, 19, 21, 22 and 26) and three of the newly constructed additional items were removed from further analyses using the criterion of means less than 2 and frequency distributions indicating problematic skewness and kurtosis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). As a result, only one item (item 16) remained from the Moral and Religious Acceptability of Being Gay scale of the RHS and hence this item was not included in further analyses. The remaining 19 items were hypothesized to result in a three-factor solution and hence a maximum likelihood three-factor EFA with oblique rotation was conducted on these items. Item 1 from the RHS and two additional new items loaded on to more than one factor. Furthermore, three items from the RHS (items 2, 3 and 4) yielded low communality scores ( $< 0.20$ ) and failed to load on to any of the factors. These items were removed and the exploratory factor analysis was re-run on the remaining 13 items. Table 1 displays the pattern coefficients and factor intercorrelations for the three-factor solution that accounted for 53 percent of the variance.

-----  
Insert table 1 about here  
-----

Using an arbitrary cut-off point of .35 for factor coefficients, Table 1 reveals three interpretable factors that are consistent with theoretical formulations. The first factor comprises a subset of five items from Ross and Rosser's (1996) original 10-item subscale of Public Identification as Gay (items 10, 11, 12, 23, 25). The second factor comprises

four new items that were added to the RHS to measure sexual comfort amongst gay men. Finally, the third factor comprises three items from the Social Comfort with Gay Men scale from the RHS in addition to one new item, namely “I often feel intimidated while at gay venues”. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency reliabilities for these three factors were respectively .73, .71 and .68.

Based on the responses of the second sample of gay men ( $n = 335$ ), one-factor congeneric models using maximum likelihood CFAs were initially evaluated for the three hypothesized latent constructs of public identification as gay, and sexual and social comfort with gay men. The one-factor model for the construct of public identification as gay revealed that item 5 (item 10 from the RHS scale) “I feel comfortable about being seen in public with an obviously gay person” was responsible for major model misspecification. The removal of this item resulted in a very good fit of the data to the model,  $\chi^2 (2, N= 335) = 2.24, p = .367$ , RMSEA = .00 (.00; .11), TLI = 1.00, CFI = 1.00 and AGFI = .99. For the new construct of sexual comfort with gay men, the data fit the model well in both statistical,  $\chi^2 (2, N= 335) = 2.24, p = .326$ , and practical terms, RMSEA = .02 (.00; .11), TLI = .99, CFI = 1.00 and AGFI = .98. Finally, while the model for the latent variable of social comfort with gay men was statistically significant,  $\chi^2 (2, N= 335) = 7.23, p = .027$ , indices of practical fit indicated that the data was an acceptable fit to the model, RMSEA = .08 (.03; .16), TLI = .94, CFI = .98 and AGFI = .95. The resultant Cronbach alpha internal consistency reliabilities for the three respective four-item factors were .77, .68 and .72.

A three-factor independent cluster measurement model comprising latent variables for public identification as gay and sexual and social comfort with gay men was

specified such that items were hypothesized to load uniquely on their respective latent constructs and the correlations between these constructs were freely estimated. The data was a very good fit to the model in both statistical and practical terms,  $\chi^2 (51, N= 335) = 66.67, p = .069, RMSEA = .03 (.00; .05), TLI = .98, CFI = .98$  and  $AGFI = .95$ . The factor patterns and structure coefficients for the estimated parameters are presented in Table 2.

-----  
 Insert Table 2 about here  
 -----

All factor pattern coefficients on the respective factors ranged from a low of .40 to a high of .89 and were statistically significant and, with the exception of one item, exceeded .50. The intercorrelations between the latent variables were all positive and significant. The factor, public identification as gay, had respective correlations of .43 and .48 with the sexual and social comfort with gay men factors. The correlation between these latter two factors was .42. An inspection of the structural coefficients (see Table 2) revealed that, with the exception of the item related to the degree of comfort about other people finding out about one's sexuality (respective structural coefficients of .38 and .43 on the sexual and social comfort factors), the factors represent distinguishable constructs.

A second-order model in which it was hypothesized that the covariations between the three lower order factors could be explained by the more general construct of internalized homonegativity was specified. In this model the variances of the two factors that closely reflect Ross and Rosser's (1996) subscales of Public Identification as Gay and Social Comfort with Gay Men were constrained to be equal so that the higher-order



portion of the model was identified (Byrne, 2001). As the higher-order model is simply a special case of the lower order model in which a single additional constraint is placed upon one of the variances of the lower order constructs, the fit of the data to the model was expected to closely reflect the three-factor lower order model. The data fit the model well,  $\chi^2(52, N=335) = 66.69, p = .083, RMSEA = .03 (.00; .05), TLI = .98, CFI = .98$  and  $AGFI = .95$ . As expected, the pattern factor coefficients were identical to those found in the lower order three-factor model (see Table 2). The standardized parameter estimates for the factor coefficients of the three lower order factors on the higher order construct of internalized homonegativity were .71 for public identification as gay, .61 for sexual comfort with gay men and .68 for social comfort with gay men. These second-order factor coefficients were all significant at  $p < .001$ . The Cronbach alpha internal consistency reliability for the 12-item measure of IH was .78.

### Discussion

The aim of the current study was to develop a short measure of internalized homonegativity that better reflected contemporary attitudes toward homosexuality and also improved the reliability and validity of existing measures. It was believed that this could be achieved through the adaptation of Ross and Rosser's (1996) RHS and the addition of new items designed to broaden the construct of IH to include a dimension assessing sexual comfort among gay men. The results of exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses based on the responses from two independent samples of gay men suggested that a 12-item measure of IH that reflected the three underlying and moderately correlated dimensions of public identification as gay, social comfort with gay men, and sexual comfort with gay men represented the factorial structure of these items.

With the addition of a single item, the remaining items comprising the first two dimensions consist entirely of a subset of items from the RHS. Despite the fact that the dimension representing public identification as gay was reduced from 10 to 4 items, the internal consistency reliability for this dimension remained acceptable. Equally, the internal consistency reliability for the 4-item dimension of social comfort with gay men was an improvement on the original 6-item subscale of the RHS. This dimension, together with the new dimension of sexual comfort with gay men, have internal consistency reliabilities in the vicinity of 0.7, a level considered a minimum for a scale to be suitable for research (Nunnally, 1978).

A hierarchical CFA model in which a second-order factor of internalized homonegativity was proposed and identified as comprising the three first-order dimensions has implications for the measurement of IH. In particular, this finding suggests that it is appropriate to total the scores of the 12-item measure as a single measure of internalized homonegativity. A further advantage of this approach is that the overall measure now meets acceptable levels of internal consistency reliability. The recruitment procedures used in the current study resulted in a larger sample size than many other similar studies (e.g., Mayfield, 2001; Ross & Rosser, 1996). This suggests that the gay men who participated may be more representative of this population and hence the results may have greater external validity. However, the extent to which the factorial validity is stable and invariant across different cultural and ethnic groups remains to be determined. Further studies using the 12-item scale are required not only to determine the stability and generalizability of the hierarchical model of IH in more diverse populations but also to demonstrate convergent and discriminant validity for the

measure. Clinicians and theorists of gay affirmative psychotherapies have emphasized the need for mental health practitioners to be attentive to the covert expression of internalized homonegativity and its psychosocial ramifications for gay men. The short internalized homonegativity scale provides a quick and easy means for assessing the extent to which gay men have internalized antigay prejudice. Such information can serve to inform gay-affirmative psychotherapeutic and psycho-educative interventions.

### References

- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1988, 411-423.
- Brown, L. S. (1987). Lesbians weight and eating: New analysis and perspectives. In Boston Lesbians Psychologies Collective (Ed.). *Lesbian Psychologies: Explorations and challenges* (pp. 294-309). Urbana: University of Illinois.
- Byrne, B. M. (2001). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. Mahweh, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Byrne, B. M., Baron, P., & Balev, J. (1998). The Beck Depression Inventory: A cross-validated test of second-order factorial structure for Bulgarian adolescents. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 58, 241-251.
- Cornett, C. (1993). Dynamic psychotherapy of gay men: a view from self psychology. In C. Cornett (Ed.), *Affirmative Dynamic Psychotherapy with Gay Men* (pp.45-76). Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson Press.

Fassinger, R. E., & Miller, B. A. (1996). Validation of an inclusive model of sexual minority identity formation on a sample of gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 32(2), 53-78.

Finnegan, D. G., & Cook, D. (1984). Special issues affecting the treatment of male and lesbian alcoholics. *Alcoholics Treatment Quarterly*, 1, 85-98.

Friedman, R.C. (1991). Couple therapy with gay couples. *Psychiatric Annals*, 21, 485-490.

Glaus, O. K. (1988). Alcoholism, chemical dependency, and the lesbian client. *Women and Therapy*, 8, 131-144.

Gerbing, D. W., & Hamilton, J. G. (1996). Viability of exploratory factor analysis as a precursor to confirmatory factor analysis. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 3, 62-72.

Gonsiorek, J. C. (1995). Gay male identities: Concepts and issues. In D'Augelli, A. R., & Patterson, C. J. (Eds.), *Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Identities Over The Lifespan: Psychological perspectives* (pp. 24-47). New York: Oxford University Press.

Kline, R. B. (1998). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Malyon, A.K. (1982). Psychotherapeutic implications of internalized homophobia in gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality*. 7, 59-70.

Margolies, L., Becker, M., & Jackson-Brewer, K, (1987). Internalized homophobia: Identifying and treating the oppressor within. In Boston Lesbians Psychologies Collective (Ed.). *Lesbian Psychologies: Explorations and challenges* (pp. 229-241). Urbana: University of Illinois.

- Mayfield, W. (2001). The development of an internalized homonegativity inventory for gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 41(2), 53-76.
- McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In J.F. Dovidio & S.L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91-125). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Meyer, I.H., (1995). Minority stress and mental health in gay men. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 36, 38-56.
- Nicholson, W. D., & Long B. C. (1990). Self-esteem, social support, internalized homophobia, and coping strategies of HIV+ gay men. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 58(6), 873-876.
- Nungesser, G. (1983). *Homosexual Acts, Actors, and Identities*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Otis, M.D., & Skinner, W.F. (1996). The prevalence of victimization and its effect on mental well-being among lesbian and gay people. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 30(3), 93-121.
- Ratti, R., Bakeman, R., & Peterson, J. L. (2000). Correlates of high-risk sexual behavior among Canadian men of South Asian and European origin who have sex with men. *AIDS Care*, 12, 193-203.
- Ross, M. W., & Rosser, S. B. R. (1996). Measurement and correlates of internalized homophobia: A factor analytic study. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 52, (1), 15-21.

Sears, D. O. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating Racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 53-84). New York: Plenum Press.

Shidlo, A. (1994). Internalized homophobia: Conceptual and empirical issues in measurement. In Greene, B., & Herek, G. M. (Eds.). *Lesbian and Gay Psychology: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 176-205). California: Sage Publications Inc.

Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 199-214.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

Thompson, B. (1997). The importance of structure coefficients in structural equation modeling confirmatory factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 57*, 5-19.

Thompson, B., & Daniel, L. G. (1996). Factor analytic evidence for the construct validity of scores: A historical overview and some guidelines. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 56*, 197-208.

Table 1  
*Factor Pattern Coefficients for the Three Factors of Internalized Homonegativity  
 Derived from Oblique Rotation*

Items	Factors		
	I	II	III
1. I am comfortable about people finding out that I am gay	<b>.90</b>	-.06	-.10
2. It is important to me to control who knows about my homosexuality	<b>.64</b>	.06	-.06
3. I feel comfortable discussing homosexuality in a public situation	<b>.54</b>	.01	.08
4. Even if I could change my sexual orientation I wouldn't	<b>.39</b>	-.02	.20
5. I feel comfortable being seen in public with an obviously gay person	<b>.36</b>	.19	.03
6. Most gay men cannot sustain a long-term committed relationship	.06	<b>.70</b>	.02
7. Most gay men prefer anonymous sexual encounters	-.02	<b>.67</b>	-.02
8. Gay men tend to flaunt their sexuality inappropriately	-.05	<b>.57</b>	-.11
9. Gay men are generally more promiscuous than straight men	.12	<b>.53</b>	.13
10. I often feel intimidated while at gay venues	-.05	-.01	<b>.79</b>
11. Social situations with gay men make me feel uncomfortable	-.09	.02	<b>.63</b>
12. I feel comfortable in gay bars	.06	.06	<b>.61</b>
13. Making an advance to another man is difficult for me	.22	-.22	<b>.36</b>
Factor intercorrelations			
Factor II	.47		
Factor III	.42	.29	
Percentage of explained variance	29.04	13.62	10.35

*Note.* Coefficients exceeding an arbitrary cut-off loading of .35 are shown in bold type.  $N = 336$ .

Table 2  
*Factor Pattern and Structure Coefficients for Public Identification as Gay and Sexual and Social Comfort with Gay Men*

Items	Factors					
	Public Identification as Gay		Sexual Comfort with Gay Men		Social Comfort with Gay Men	
	P	S	P	S	P	S
1. People finding out	.89	.89	0 <sup>a</sup>	.38	0 <sup>a</sup>	.43
2. Controlling who knows	.70	.70	0 <sup>a</sup>	.30	0 <sup>a</sup>	.34
3. Discussing homosexuality	.56	.56	0 <sup>a</sup>	.24	0 <sup>a</sup>	.27
4. Changing sexual orientation	.58	.58	0 <sup>a</sup>	.25	0 <sup>a</sup>	.28
6. Long-term relationships	0 <sup>a</sup>	.26	.61	.61	0 <sup>a</sup>	.26
7. Anonymous sexual partners	0 <sup>a</sup>	.26	.60	.60	0 <sup>a</sup>	.25
8. Flaunting sexuality	0 <sup>a</sup>	.30	.69	.69	0 <sup>a</sup>	.29
9. More promiscuous	0 <sup>a</sup>	.17	.40	.40	0 <sup>a</sup>	.17
10. Intimidated at gay venues	0 <sup>a</sup>	.36	0 <sup>a</sup>	.31	.74	.74
11. Uncomfortable in social situations	0 <sup>a</sup>	.33	0 <sup>a</sup>	.29	.68	.68
12. Comfortable in gay bars	0 <sup>a</sup>	.29	0 <sup>a</sup>	.27	.61	.61
13. Making advances difficult	0 <sup>a</sup>	.24	0 <sup>a</sup>	.21	.51	.51

*Note.* P = pattern coefficient; S = structure coefficient.  $N = 335$ . Factor correlations were free to be estimated. All pattern coefficients are statistically different from zero.

a. Parameters fixed at reported levels to identify the model.