

6-2017

SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS ATTITUDES TOWARDS LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL AND TRANSGENDER FOSTER YOUTH

Katarina Kolde
koldek@coyote.csusb.edu

Daniel Benitez
DVBenitez93@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kolde, Katarina and Benitez, Daniel, "SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS ATTITUDES TOWARDS LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL AND TRANSGENDER FOSTER YOUTH" (2017). *Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations*. 462.
<http://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd/462>

This Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Office of Graduate Studies at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS LESBIAN, GAY,
BISEXUAL AND TRANSGENDER FOSTER YOUTH

A Project
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Social Work

by
Daniel Vincente Benitez
Katarina Rose Kolde

June 2017

SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS LESBIAN, GAY,
BISEXUAL AND TRANSGENDER FOSTER YOUTH

A Project
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Daniel Vincente Benitez
Katarina Rose Kolde

June 2017

Approved by:

Dr. Herb Shon, L.C.S.W. Faculty Supervisor, Social Work

Dr. Janet Chang, M.S.W. Research Coordinator

© 2017 Daniel Vincente Benitez and Katarina Rose Kolde

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine and assess social work students' attitudes towards working with Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) clients and identifying factors that would affect such attitudes. LGBT individuals face increased risk factors as opposed to their non-LGBT peers and are disproportionately over-represented in the foster care system. This study assessed California State University, San Bernardino Social Work student's attitudes towards working with LGBT clients through the use of self-administered questionnaires. The data acquired from such quantitative surveys was analyzed utilizing Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 23. Results yielded that sexual orientation, religion, religiosity and political view rate were factors that significantly affected attitudes towards LGBT clients. It was also found that Title IV-E participants did not differ significantly compared to non Title IV-E participants in attitudes towards LGBT clients. Implications for social work education and practice include increased training, experience, competence and humility building opportunities when working with LGBT clients.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Daniel Benitez

I would like to give acknowledgement and thanks to Dr. Shon and Dr. Chang for assisting in the completion of this research project. To my social work advisor Jeannine Meza, thank you for your constant guidance and support throughout the entirety of the program. I would also like to extend my thanks to the faculty and staff of California State University-San Bernardino Social Work. To my research partner Kat, thank you for meeting me halfway and making this research project as painless as possible. To my classmates, you guys have been such an amazing cohort and have challenged me to become such a better social worker. I look forward to working with you all in the field and wish you all the very best!

Katarina Kolde

I would like to thank the faculty and staff of California State University-San Bernardino Social Work program for shaping me into the person I am today. The faculty and staff have helped me grow not only as a professional but also as an individual. I would like to thank my family for being supportive and helping me get through these two years of graduate school. I would like to thank my research partner Daniel for being a rock and helping me when I needed him the most. While writing and researching this project I found a passion for the LGBT community that I never knew I had and could see myself focusing my career on this particular population.

DEDICATION

Daniel Benitez

Este trabajo está dedicado a la persona más importante de mi vida, mi nana, Teresa Retana. Sin ella, no sería la persona que soy hoy. Ella me demostró lo que es el amor incondicional y el apoyo. También, me enseñó lo importante que es la amabilidad hacia otros. Gracias a ella, se que el más mínimo destello de luz, alumbra la tempestad y nunca rendirme ante mis aspiraciones. Ella creyó en mi, cuando nadie más lo hizo. Me duele saber, que ella no sigue más aquí, pero se dentro de mi corazón que sus recuerdos y sus legado vive en mi. Por lo que a mi cuenta, me esforzare a hacer el bien y siempre destacar me. No hay palabras suficientes que describan mi agradecimiento por ella y espero que sepa que mis logros son gracias a ella. Te amo nana, como me hubiera gustado que estuvieras aquí para agradecerte en persona una última vez.

I would also like to dedicate this work to my friends Daisy Lopez-Batres, Saharay Torres and Veronica Torres. I am so fortunate to have friends as passionate, intelligent and as innately kind as you all. You guys have been such a strong support network for me, especially during these last few years. I hope that you all know that you are more than just friends to me, you are my family. I so look forward to what life will bring us in the years to come. So once again, thank you my dear friends. I love you from the bottom of my heart and humbly dedicate this work to you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
CHAPTER ONE: OVERVIEW	
Introduction.....	1
Problem Statement.....	1
Practice Context	3
Purpose of Study	3
Significance of the Study for Social Work	4
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	
Introduction.....	7
Theories Guiding Conceptualization	7
Risk Factors for LGBT Clients	9
Social Workers' Competence and Comfort.....	12
Educational Institutions.....	15
Scales to Measure Attitudes Towards LGBT Clients	18
Summary	20
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS	
Introduction.....	22
Study Design	22
Sampling.....	23
Data Collection and Instruments.....	24
Procedures	26

Protection of Human Subjects	26
Data Analysis.....	27
Summary	28
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	
Introduction	29
Demographics.....	29
Sexual Orientation	32
Religion.....	33
Religiosity	34
Political View Rate	34
Trends.....	34
Summary	35
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION	
Introduction	37
Discussion	37
Sexual Orientation.....	37
Religion and Religiosity.....	38
Political View Rate	39
Trends.....	39
Limitations.....	40
Recommendations for the Social Work Practice.....	41
Recommendations for Policy	42
Recommendations for Research	43
Conclusion	43

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE	45
APPENDIX B: DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONS.....	48
APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT	52
REFERENCES	54

CHAPTER ONE

OVERVIEW

Introduction

Child welfare has seen increasing rates of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) foster youth, yet there had been a lack of training done to assist workers in becoming culturally sensitive to this population. The purpose of this study is to assess cultural humility and comfort in working with LGBT foster youth. Factors such as gender, political views, religion, social groups and ethnicity can create a hostile environment for LGBT foster youth in receiving adequate services. It is important for social work professionals to understand the unique needs and services that LGBT foster youth require.

Problem Statement

The Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) population is important to understand due to the fact that these individuals face increased risk factors such as violence, discrimination and harassment when compared to heterosexual individuals. Due to these risk factors, LGBT individuals are more likely to suffer from mental health diagnoses such as: mood, anxiety, depression and substance use disorders (Alessi, 2013). In response to the increase in violence, discrimination and harassment LGBT individuals face, they require higher needs for services such as, additional services to assist in decreasing these risk factors and increasing restorative factors. It can then be

counterproductive for LGBT individuals to face violence, discrimination or harassment while receiving services, which would only increase the severity of the issues they already face. This is why it is essential for students to receive adequate and appropriate training in working with LGBT foster youth.

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) individuals need services such as mental health, substance abuse counseling, individual counseling and family counseling due to the discrimination, violence and harassment they face. The issues lie with the existence of appropriate service delivery towards the LGBT clients. Professionals working with LGBT clients may not have received adequate training in school or in their workplaces or simply the professionals may have a personal bias towards the LGBT population. The youth population is a topic of great importance in the field of social work. More specifically, the growing awareness of LGBT related issues has warranted the increase of services offered to this population. The concern is also whether or not the LGBT youth are receiving culturally sensitive services by professionals to address their specific needs and by which means these professionals are receiving training.

LGBT foster youth have higher levels than non-LGBT foster youth of becoming homeless, receiving maltreatment in foster care, are overrepresented in the foster care system, have higher placement relocations, are more likely to live in group homes, have longer overnight hospitalizations and are more likely to be hospitalized for emotional reasons (Wilson, Cooper, Kastanis, Nezhad, 2014).

This shows that there is still discrimination in the child welfare system and LGBT foster youth are being treated differently than their non-LGBT foster youth peers. LGBT youth are victimized in their homes then sent into the foster care system where they again have higher rates of victimization due to their sexual orientation and gender identity.

Practice Context

Since non-conforming sexual orientation and gender identity are becoming more openly accepted in society, there needs to be more training for adequate service delivery not only in the field but also in higher educational institutions. The goal is to have professionals working with LGBT clients to be trained on terminology, client specific needs and an understanding of the overrepresentation in the child welfare system.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study aims to analyze cultural humility, preparedness and to determine general attitudes social work students hold towards servicing LGBT foster youth. This study was aimed at understanding the effects that different educational levels (MSW and BASW) and specializations (Title IV-E, Non-Title IV-E) have on the cultural humility and preparedness of CSUSB social work students, in working with LGBT clients. There is a high probability that many social work students will receive a case concerning an individual that identifies as

LGBT. This highlights the importance for social work students to receive adequate training and exposure to the LGBT population to increase cultural humility and preparedness. This holistic training perspective and exposure will benefit client interactions and lead to much better field practice.

Each student's demographics can also play a vital role in their openness and preparedness in working with LGBT foster youth. Factors that can influence their service delivery can include age, gender, sexual identification, religiosity, racial/ethnic identification and political affiliation. These factors were assessed to determine attitudes towards LGBT foster youth.

This study employed a survey design and a survey questionnaire, which was distributed to undergraduate and graduate students within the school of social work program at California State University, San Bernardino, to assess the students' attitudes and level of comfort and preparedness when working with LGBT foster youth. Students were given a version of the Attitudes towards Lesbians and Gay Men (ATLG), Attitudes towards Transgender Individuals (ATTI) and Bisexualities: Indiana Attitudes Scale (BIAS) to evaluate attitudes social work students hold towards this population.

Significance of the Study for Social Work

The current study intended to understand attitudes social workers hold towards working with LGBT clients and determined the possible need for supplemental training to increase cultural humility with this population. It is to be

noted that a generalist approach in the application of social work may be unable to fully expose students to the entirety of what they may experience in the field. It is this acknowledgement that warrants and supports the necessity to assess these students' attitudes to decide if supplemental trainings and exposure are required. This awareness will lead to better field practice and a critical consciousness to assess service delivery and overall services to see if they are culturally appropriate. In turn, if providers are not delivering adequate services towards clients they are not effectively benefitting the clients.

The findings of this study relate to all stages of the generalist intervention process. Social workers that have increased exposure and training will be more effective in connecting with clients (engagement phase), be able to gather more holistic and accurate information (assessment phase), and create better treatment plans (planning phase). This would also lead to more effective interventions (implementation phase), better assessment of progress (evaluation phase), and overall completion of services (termination phase). The research on this topic would benefit the field of social work by increasing preparedness and cultural humility. This warrants for further research on social workers' attitudes towards LGBT foster youth. The research question is "Is there a difference in attitudes towards LGBT clients held by Title IV-E social work students and non-Title IV-E social work students?"

This study is relevant to child welfare because child welfare workers will inevitably encounter clients that identify as LGBT. Even non-child welfare

workers can encounter LGBT foster youth in settings such as crisis centers, hospitalizations, counseling settings and behavioral health to name a few. The purpose of analyzing non-Title IV-E social work students allows for a critical analysis of the Title IV-E curriculum and discipline to understand if any differences exist. It is also essential to determine if there is a necessity for further training in either discipline. Although child welfare workers will not always receive clients who identify as LGBT, it is important to have the tools necessary to engage effectively and appropriately when social workers do so.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

A review of previous literature is needed to better understand the importance of the study. In this chapter, five sections are provided: theories guiding conceptualization, risk factors for LGBT clients, social workers' competence and comfort, educational institutions, and scales to measure attitudes towards LGBT clients.

Theories Guiding Conceptualization

This theory guides conceptualization as it provides a framework in which social workers should work with client's that complies with their code of ethics. Harrison (2000) conducted a literature review analyzing gay affirmative therapy, practice and approach. Harrison inquired whether gay affirmative therapy exists, whether it can be defined, distinguishing features of the practice and issues that emerge when practicing with clients that are gay. Harrison conducted a literature review of 33 existing journal articles whose focus was on gay affirmative therapy, practice and approach. It was found that the literature supported the existence of gay affirmative practice, it's defining on an operational level, its distinguishing features and the existence of possible issues depending on the client's perspective of the practice. The study did well in its research on gay affirmative practice but stated that its data was not quantified and the possibility of personal

bias exists. The study addresses the validity of gay affirmative practice and its positive effect on LGBT clients.

Minority stress theory has been discussed in several articles (Graham, Carney & Kluck, 2012; Mustanski, Garofalo & Emerson, 2010) when researching LGBT populations. Minority stress theory believes that individuals who face stigmatization, discrimination, prejudice or victimization on an internal and/or external level endure more stress (Graham, Carney & Kluck, 2012; Mustanski, Garofalo & Emerson, 2010). LGBT foster youth have the stigmatization of not only identifying with a gender and sexual minority but they also have faced victimization, which has led them into the foster care system. Furthermore, racial and ethnic minorities are overrepresented in the foster care system and due to all these identifiers the youth can have adverse responses from society.

Luke and Goodrich (2015) discussed the importance of systems theory for family, friends and allies of LGBT youth. Systems theory looks at all possible factors that can affect or support the youth from a micro level to a macro level. Systems theory states that there are subsystems within a larger system (Luke & Goodrich, 2015), for example a LGBT foster youths' subsystems could include foster families, social workers, school, community or extracurricular activities. Examples of larger scale systems that can affect or support these subsystems include, the legal system or the child welfare system, which has the power to make legal decisions about the youth. It is important for professionals and

support systems of that youth to understand at a macro level the complexities that these youth face.

Risk Factors for LGBT Clients

LGB individuals have greater risk factors when compared to their non-LGB peers. Liu and Mustanski (2012) wrote about suicidal ideation and self harm as risk factors for LGB youth. They stated that LGB youth are prone to more risk factors and less protective factors making them more likely to have suicidal ideation and higher levels of attempted and successful suicide. Liu and Mustanski conducted a longitudinal study consisting of 246 LGB youth (aged 16 –20 years). These youth were surveyed regularly at 6-month intervals. The authors found that low social support, impulsivity and a history of attempted suicide were associated with increased risk for suicidal ideation. It was also found that a history of suicidal attempts, female gender identity and gender nonconformity in childhood were associated with a higher likelihood for self-harm. The study did well in its analysis of suicidal ideation and attempts in youth but would have been better to indicate sexual orientation identification to better compare rates of suicidal ideation and attempts between heterosexual youth and LGB youth. The study gives the current study a better understanding of the negative implications that a lack of cultural sensitivity may cause to LGBT clients by social workers not expressing such sensitivity necessary in working with this population.

Lennon-Dearing and Delavega (2015) studied the significant increase in legislative initiatives against the LGBT population. The authors also presented that legislation of this caliber can be detrimental to LGBT individuals as shown by their increased likelihood of suffering from emotional distress, depression, self-harm, suicidal ideation and suicide attempts. The authors conducted a survey of degreed social work professionals, graduate and undergraduate students in Tennessee to determine levels of LGBT acceptance and respect within the social work community. It was found that there were more positive than negative attitudes toward the LGBT population, yet there was still a number that expressed opinions that were deemed as harmful and problematic in the ethical practice at the individual and policy level. The study was limited in its sampling, due to the sample coming from only one state, the sample not being randomized and the high likelihood of social desirability effect. This study parallels that of the proposed study in its application to social work students at California State University, San Bernardino.

Ream and Forge (2014) surveyed homeless LGBT youth living in New York City and the problems the population faced while living on the streets and transitioning from the streets. Researchers wanted to examine the relationship between LGBT homeless youth and parental reactions, foster care, sex work, substance use, HIV risk and mental illness. Also, Ream and Forge (2014) looked at the difficulties LGBT homeless face when trying to overcome homelessness and transition into adulthood as well as the services to help.

Ream and Forge (2014) concluded that most of their participants experienced high incidents of physical and/or sexual abuse and all have been verbally abused. Mental health diagnoses were commonly seen in LGBT homeless youth. During intakes into an LGBT homeless youth shelter, 20% had been diagnosed with bipolar disorder. However, the prevalence rate for bipolar disorder is 3% in the general population (Ream & Forge, 2014). Fortunately, parents kicking youth out of the house for their sexual orientation or identity was lower than expected (between 14%-39%), few homeless LGBT youth shared they had experience with substance use or sex work (Ream & Forge, 2014). The study found that limited resources were offered to LGBT, therefore increasing the barriers for LGBT youth to get off the streets. Some programs in New York City have shown significance in helping youth transition into adulthood include transitional living programs, LGBT youth shelters and host homes. These programs are meant to help LGBT youth with housing, mental health resources and teaching them life skills to help them succeed into adulthood (Ream & Forge, 2014). While there are some programs for LGBT there is still a lack of services to help LGBT.

Mustanski, Garofalo and Emerson (2010) examined the relationship between race/ethnicity and the LGBT population with specific mental health issues. It was predicted that racial minorities and bisexual youth would have higher mental health disparities when compared to Caucasians and homosexuals. Researchers conducted a quantitative study with 246 LGBT youth who were asked to complete the Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children

(DISC) version 4.0 and the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI 18) to determine mental health disorders. Results showed that of the 246 participants 1/3 met criteria for any mental health diagnosis, 31% had a lifetime suicide attempt, 17% for conduct disorder, 15% for major depressive disorder, 9% for post traumatic stress disorder and eating disorders were uncommon. Racial minorities were 7 times more likely to be diagnosed with conduct disorder than compared to Caucasians. Limitations of the study by Mustanski, Garofalo & Emerson (2010) were not having random sampling, small sample size to determine significance between identifying groups and results may not be generalized to other geographical locations. Many LGBT individuals are diagnosed with a mental health disorder and need services and therapy specific to their sexual and gender identity. LGBT foster youth face many issues because of their sexuality or gender identity therefore, it is essential for professionals to be helpful and non-biased towards them.

Social Workers' Competence and Comfort

Living in a heteronormative society, LGBT individuals are faced with discrimination and social workers may not be comfortable working with clients that identify as LGBT nor do they utilize cultural humility when practicing with their LGBT identifying clients. Mallon and Woronoff (2006) assessed the lack in cultural humility and competency the child welfare system has when working with the LGBT population. The authors conducted interviews on child welfare workers

which they acquired through Child Welfare League of America (CWLA) and the Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund. The authors found that cultural humility and competence when working with LGBT clients was poor. The authors also found that there were limited to no resources tailored to the population. The authors concluded that there is a necessity for the LGBT population to be more visibly accounted for in child welfare to assist in the limitation of heterocentric tendencies. The results of this study guide the present study in assessing if the child welfare system has increased its competence in working with this population.

Berkman and Zinberg (1997) discussed the high prevalence of homophobia and heterosexism in the social work field due to a lack of cultural competence with the LGBT population. They posed that due to a lack of exposure to the LGBT population and heavy influence of mainstream media, social workers are less inclined to favor LGBT clients. Berkman and Zinberg (1997) conducted a large probability sample to survey heterosexual, MSW level social workers in the NASW to measure homophobia and heterosexism. It was found that more than one-quarter (26.7%) of the respondents were high-grade non-homophobic, 62.0% were low-grade non-homophobic, 10.7% were low-grade homophobic and only one respondent (0.5%) was high-grade homophobic of the social workers sampled. It was also found that men were more homophobic than women. The study was limited due to its low 54% response rate of the intended sample size and this low response rate limits the study's

generalizability to the entire population. Results raised the importance of the proposed study in attaining a high response rate from the intended population to increase generalizability.

Henrickson (2010) highlighted the transformation that social work has undergone due to the increased awareness of different aspects of diversity. Such aspects were referred to as cultural identity, gender identity and sexual orientation. Henrickson (2010) stated that certain terminology imposed limitations on self-identification, which became an obstacle to both the client and social worker. This passage does well in its use of inclusion as a factor that can negatively affect LGBT clients and raise awareness on how norms fuel the cyclical pattern, which sees non-heterosexuality as deviant. This article helps in identifying and explaining how LGBT individuals face inadvertent maltreatment by social workers that are not practicing inclusion and cultural sensitivity.

Mullins (2012) examined the relationships of practice beliefs and practice behaviors among social workers working with Lesbian and Gay clients. Mullins (2012) stated that attitudes towards LGBT individuals have become more affirming. Mullins (2012) conducted a stratified sample to survey medical social workers from a national mailing list and assess them utilizing the gay affirmative practice (GAP) scale. It was found that of the completed surveys respondent's gender, relationship status, sexual orientation, race, religion, education, role in agency, population density, social work experience and relationships with LGBT individuals had a significant effect on affirmative practice. The study was limited

due to its low response rate of the intended sample size but did well in its analysis of affirmative practice in unison with practice beliefs. The study raises the importance of the proposed study assessing affirmative practice in conjunction with social work beliefs.

Rutledge, Siebert and Chonody (2012) concluded that it is common for social work students and practitioners to hold antigay bias. The researchers also wrote that this bias is often related to relationship status, age and race. They stated that the likelihood of social workers to harm rather than to help their LGBT clients increased due to these unresolved biases. The authors conducted a non-probability availability sampling of undergraduate and graduate students from 19 courses at a large southeastern university to assess antigay bias in utilizing the Attitudes towards Lesbians and Gay Men Short Scale (ATLG-S). Of the students measured, those who majored in the helping disciplines showed no significant differences than those in non-helping disciplines. The study did well in analyzing antigay bias in its intended population but lacked generalizability due to its availability sampling method. Results provided the present study with the insight to utilize probability sampling to increase generalizability and introduce the ATLG-S scale for use as a valid measurement instrument.

Educational Institutions

Woodford, Brennan, Gutiérrez, and Luke (2013) studied the effect that faculty played on students' attitudes towards Lesbian and Gay individuals

through their own attitudes as perceived through their instruction. The authors state that through analysis and assessment of social work educators' attitudes towards LGBT individuals, the education of social work will benefit in its capacity to prepare students for ethical and competent practice with LGBT individuals. The authors conducted a non-probability availability sampling of 400 faculty members by email through websites of schools accredited by the Council on Social Work (CSWE) to assess attitudes towards Lesbian and Gay clients utilizing the Attitudes towards Lesbian and Gay Men (ATLG) measurement scale. It was found that 3% of participants held negative attitudes, 22% held positive attitudes and 75% held very positive attitudes towards LGBT individuals. The study did well in its focus on social work educators when looking at attitudes towards LGBT individuals but lacked in its non-probability sampling, which might have affected generalizability. The study has introduced the effect in which social work educators might play in the attitudes towards LGBT individuals.

Chinell (2011) surveyed social work students that identified as Gay and Lesbian regarding their expectations about heterosexism and homophobia in the field of social work. The author conducted in-depth interviews on three social work students in Canada to assess their expectations about encountering heterosexism and homophobia in the field. It was found that unexpected incidents of heterosexism and homophobia within the program led to the social work students to experience disengagement and disillusionment. The study did well in its focus on Gay and Lesbian social work students when looking at LGBT

topics in the social work field. This study granted perspective on LGBT social work students and how the present study should be aware of such students participating.

Fish (2008) wrote about the lack of attention given to LGB issues in key social work texts and little to no theoretical analysis of LGB oppression and little practice models for this population. The author conducted an analysis of legal, social and political inequalities in the everyday lives of LGB individuals. Findings show that the students' experiences did not match their expectations. It was also found that the family was a key socialization agent that normalizes heterosexuality, this normalized heterosexuality was kept dominant by the erasure of homosexual culture, negative connotation held by it and heterosexism intersects with racism, sexism and disabilism. The study did well in its focus on Gay and Lesbian topics in social work texts in the analysis of overall LGBT prevalence in such material. This study warrants the necessity for the present study to focus on the participants' education to see if attitudes towards LGBT individuals are affected by this.

Johnson (2014) examined heterosexism in the social work classroom and the responsibility of the instructor in addressing such feelings and actions. The author analyzed their personal experiences as an instructor and utilized the NASW code of ethics to construct professional methods to respond to this heterosexism. The author concluded that social work administrators and educators might respond to heterosexism through supportive dialogue regarding

experiences of these types of discrimination. LGBT faculty was notified that they were welcome to express their experiences of heterosexism in a professional environment and to create an open environment in which micro aggressions are avoided. The article highlighted the importance of addressing heterosexism in the classroom in a professional way as guided by the NASW code of ethics. This study creates the possibility of utilizing the NASW code of ethics to assess social works compliance with the code of ethics when applied to LGBT individuals.

Scales to Measure Attitudes Towards LGBT Clients

Green (2005) evaluated the necessity for using gender-specific subscales as opposed to a single global measurement device to assess respondents' differential attitudes towards Lesbians and Gay men. Green (2005) stated that historically, there has been a difference between attitudes held about Gay men and Lesbians, referred to as the "gender gap". The author studied this by conducting a nationwide survey to 317 social workers affiliated with the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) comprised of the Attitudes toward Lesbians and Gay Men scale (ATLG), the Attitudes toward Gay Men scale (ATG), and Attitudes toward Lesbians scale (ATL). It was found that, contrary to previous studies, there was no significant difference between gender in attitudes towards Gay men and Lesbians. The study did well to assess the role of gender in the assessment of attitudes towards Gay men and Lesbians. The study was limited due to its sample being homogeneous, small and the possibility of social

desirability effect. This study assists in the selection of the proposed study's measurement scale and highlights the potential pros and cons of using gender related scales to measure attitudes towards LGBT foster youth.

Monto and Supinski (2014) studied the possibility of utilizing a new measure to analyze homonegativity at lower thresholds. The authors administered the Homonegativity as Discomfort Scale (HADS) to 431 undergraduate students to assess levels of comfort with LGBT individuals. The authors determined that there were higher rates of discomfort associated with Gay men than towards Lesbian women. The study presented an additional assessment tool to measure attitudes towards Lesbians and Gay men that proved to contain both construct and criterion validity. The study grants the possibility of utilizing this assessment tool as a measurement.

Walch, Ngamake, Francisco, Stitt and Shingler (2012) researched the validity and reliability of the attitudes toward Transgendered individuals (ATTI) scale. Since little research has been conducted on stigma associated with Transgender persons specifically, the researchers wanted to test the ATTI scale on college students. The study had two samples that were surveyed. The first consisted of 129 undergraduate and graduate students ranging from 18 to 56 years of age and the second study consisted of 237 undergraduate students ranging from 18 to 64 years of age. Both samples involved mostly heterosexual Christian women. Participants completed the ATTI scale, Heterosexual Attitudes toward Homosexual scale (HATH), Index of Homophobia scale (IHP) as well as a

demographics page to determine the validity of the ATTI scale. Results showed that the ATTI scale is psychometrically sound and has a Cronbach's alpha of 0.95. Walch, Ngamake, Francisco, Stitt and Shingler (2012) also believe that individual factors play a vital role in determining transgender stigma. Factors can include political views, religion, age, gender, gender role belief, education and racial/ethnic identification. The researchers suggest further testing of the ATTI scale for validation with larger samples and populations other than college students to receive a more diverse validation.

Dodge, Herbenick, Friedman, Schick, Fu, Bostwick, Bartelt, Munoz-Laboy, Pletta, Reece and Standfort (2016) surveyed the general United States population to determine Heterosexuals, Gay, Lesbian and other identified sexualities attitudes towards Bisexuals. The researched used a modified version of the Bisexualities: Indiana Attitudes Scale (BIAS), which had been a validated subscale to conduct an on-line survey. The Cronbach alpha was highly reliable and valid at 0.909. Over 6,000 participants completed the on-line survey and the researchers concluded that heterosexual females were more positive than heterosexual males in regards to attitudes towards Bisexuality. Male participants had more positive attitudes in regards to Bisexual women over Bisexual men.

Summary

This literature review explored theoretical frameworks that deal with LGBT clients and the various risk factors they face. Social work practical and

educational competence and comfort with LGBT clients and topics were also discussed. Scales to assess levels of comfort and overall affirmative tendencies of social workers were detailed. The literature suggested social workers have had a positive trend of more affirming attitudes towards LGBT clients.

Additionally, the literature also evidenced a clear lack in cultural humility among social work practitioners and educators. It is therefore important to assess social work students' attitudes towards LGBT clients.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

Introduction

In this section the methods for the research question, social work students' attitudes towards working with Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender foster youth will be addressed. Included in this section are the study's research design, sampling method, data collection process, instruments, procedures, protection of human analysis and the data analysis.

Study Design

The study determined students' attitudes towards working with Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) foster youth. Participants included Masters and Bachelors level students as well as different specializations (Title IV-E versus non-Title IV-E). The data collected were used to determine California State University-San Bernardino's Social Work Departments' curriculum to prepare students to work with LGBT foster youth clients. Participant's personal factors influenced their attitudes in feeling prepared to work with LGBT clients. In order to ensure generalizability of the study, the researchers hand delivered a quantitative survey design to students in their classrooms and picked them up after the last participant finished. The research question is: What are California State University-San Bernardino's social work

students' attitudes towards working with Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) foster youth?

A potential limitation of the study was a small sample size from Title IV-E students, which prohibits this study to be generalized to Title IV-E students. Secondly, social desirability effect was another limitation of the study. Students may not have truthfully answered in order to give more socially accepted and desired responses even though the study was completely confidential. This could have affected the findings for this study since the researchers cannot rely on other sources to support the results.

Sampling

Researchers asked California State University-San Bernardino social work professors teaching Masters and Bachelors level students as well as California State University-San Bernardino social work professors teaching Title IV-E and non-IV-E students to allow the researchers to survey their students at the end of class. By surveying students at the end of class it allowed those students not wanting to participate to leave the room. Availability and convenient sampling was utilized with approximately 250 participants with a majority of the participants being from the Masters of social work program (MSW). Only a small fraction of the students were Title IV-E, therefore a smaller sample of BASW and MSW Title IV-E were surveyed.

Data Collection and Instruments

Four pre-existing instruments were used to measure social work students' attitudes towards working with Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender individuals. The Attitudes towards Transgendered Individuals scale (ATTI) was designed and tested by Walch, Ngamake, Francisco, Stitt and Shingler (2012), which was found to have a Cronbach's alpha of 0.95. The ATTI scale uses a 20-item Likert scale to determine attitudes towards Transgender individuals. A five point Likert scale measured potential answers of "strongly agree", "agree", "neither agree nor disagree", "disagree" or "strongly disagree". This scale has been empirically found to provide reliable and valid results when tested with university students to determine their attitudes towards Transgender individuals.

Attitudes towards Lesbians and Gay men were measured through the utilization of the revised short versions of the Attitudes towards Lesbians and Gay Men scale (ATLG). These scales are known as the Attitudes towards Lesbians scale (ATL) and the Attitudes towards Gay Men scale (ATG). These scales were designed and tested from the Attitudes towards Lesbians and Gay Men scale (ATLG) by Herek (1994). The scales have high levels of internal consistency and when self-administered have a Cronbach's alpha of .85. Both the ATL and ATG consist of 5-item Likert scales to determine attitudes towards Lesbian and Gay Men. A five point Likert scale will measure potential answers of "strongly agree", "agree", "neither agree nor disagree", "disagree" or "strongly disagree". These scales have been empirically found to provide reliable and valid

results when tested with university students to determine their attitudes towards Lesbians and Gay Men.

Dodge, Herbenick, Friedman, Schick, Fu, Bostwick, Bartelt, Munoz-Laboy, Pletta, Reece and Standfort (2016) created a modified version of the Bisexualities: Indiana Attitudes Scale (BIAS), which was a validated subscale to conduct an on-line survey. The Cronbach alpha was highly reliable and valid at 0.909. This scale was used specifically to measure students' attitudes towards Bisexual individuals. The survey asked ten questions and was utilized on a 5 point Likert scale that measured answers of "strongly agree", "agree", "neither agree nor disagree", "disagree" or "strongly disagree".

Participants were also asked to complete a demographics questionnaire inquiring about their age, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, current level of education, current class cohort, specialization, religion, political views, training received from internship and school, if they have ever worked with foster youth and if they plan on working with foster youth in the future. No identifying information was asked. Age was measured on an interval level. Gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, level of education, cohort, specialization, religion, political views, training received from internship and school and whether the participants have worked with foster youth or are planning on working with foster youth was measured on a nominal level. The independent variable for this study was factors affecting social work students' attitudes towards LGBT foster youth.

The dependent variable was social work students' attitudes towards LGBT foster youth. The survey was used to understand perceptions of the students surveyed.

Procedures

The survey questionnaire consisted of a self-administered questionnaire and was handed out by the researchers to students. Students completed the surveys in their classrooms and were picked up by the researchers after the completion of the last survey. The survey took no longer than 5-15 minutes to complete. Once the surveys were imputed into the California State University-San Bernardino Qualtrics program all surveys were shredded and destroyed.

Prior to completing the survey all participants were handed an informed consent and a confidentiality statement. Participants completed the survey by marking an X, which represented their signature in agreement to the terms of the survey.

Protection of Human Subjects

The leading concern was to protect the confidentiality of all participants involved in this study. For the protection of the participants the following safeguards were implemented. First, limited identifiable information was gathered from the participants. Examples included not asking participants for names or addresses. In order to ensure the anonymity of the participants' survey data, the researchers and the research advisor were the only one who viewed

the data. The data was collected and kept in the researchers locked cabinet until entered into Qualtrics then was shredded and disposed of. Lastly, each participant was provided an informed consent, which explained to participants their right to refuse to withdrawal from the survey and their right to skip any questions they did not feel comfortable with. Confidentiality was also discussed in the informed consent for the participants. There were no foreseeable immediate or long-term risks to participants who participated in the study. One minor risk to the participants could have been some discomfort resulting from the nature of the questions asked in the survey. Some participants may have been uncomfortable to answer certain personal background questions such as age, sexual orientation, religion or political views. In such case, participants were informed that they have the right to refuse to answer those questions or to withdraw any time without any consequences.

Data Analysis

The study included a non-probability sampling by using a qualitative analysis and after collecting the results they were transferred to Qualtrics. Data analysis that were utilized included inferential statistics by using multiple t-tests to analysis bivariate statistics to conclude students' attitudes and factors that can determine students' attitudes. The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized as needed for multivariate statistics. Pearson's r was also conducted

when one-way ANOVA did not show statistical significance between the independent and dependent variables.

Summary

Researchers conducted a quantitative non-probability sampling analysis to determine students' attitudes and personal factors that determine levels of comfort in working with Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) foster youth. This study helped California State University-San Bernardino Social Work Department to determine students' preparedness to work with the LGBT population.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

In this chapter the researchers reported the demographics, key factors influencing attitudes towards LGBT clients (sexual orientation, religion, religiosity, and political alignment), trends found that influenced attitudes towards LGBT clients (age and ethnicity) and lastly a summary of the overall findings.

Demographics

The demographics consisted of participants identification of their biological sex, gender identification, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, class standing, part-time/full-time status, Pathways (on-line) status, Title IV-E (child-welfare scholarship recipients) status, specialization (for participants that are not Title IV-E), religion, religiosity and political view rate.

A majority of the participants identified their biological sex as female, 210 (84%). The participants that identified as male included, 39 (15.6%) and one (0.4%) participant identified as intersex. The majority of participants identified their gender identity as female, 209 (83.6%). Male participants consisted of 40 (16%) and one (0.4%) participant identified as genderfluid.

Participants were asked to answer their age based on a range that were made up of 76 (30.4%) participants identifying as 18-24 years old. One hundred and twenty four (49.6%) participants identified between 25-34 years old. Thirty

(12%) participants identified between 35-44 years old. Sixteen (6.4%) participants identified between 45-54 years old and four (1.6%) participants identified as 55 years and older.

A majority of participants identified their ethnicity as Hispanic/Latino/Chicano, 139 (55.6%). The participants that identified as White accounted for 57 (22.8%). Participants that identified as Bi-racial consisted of 25 (10%). African American/Black participants made up 17 (6.8%). Asian American participants comprised of eight (3.2%). Native American/Alaskan Native participants made up two (0.8%) along with Middle Eastern/North African consisting of two (0.8%) participants.

The bulk of the participants identified their sexual orientation as being heterosexual/straight, 221 (88.4%). Bisexual participants accounted for 12 (4.8%), Lesbian participants accounted for five (2%), Questioning participants were identified as four (1.6%), Gay participants accounted for three (1.2%), Pansexual participants consisted of three (1.2%), Asexual participants accounted for one (0.4%), Queer participants made up for one (0.4%).

A question was asked in regards to participants' class standing which included the Bachelor of Social Work and the Master of Social Work program. The first year Bachelor of Social Work made up of 45 (18%) participants and the second year Bachelor of Social Work comprised of 40 (16%) participants. The first year Master of Social Work participants totaled 78 (31.2%), the second year Master of Social Work consisted of 65 (26%) participants and the third year

Master of Social Work participants consisted of 22 (8.8%). A majority of the participants identified as full time, 173 (69.2%). The part time participants comprised of 77 (30.8%) and of those part-time students 12 (4.8%) identified as being a Pathway (on-line) student.

A majority of the participants were not Title IV-E (child-welfare scholarship recipients) participants, 177 (70.8%) while, 73 (29.2%) of participants identified as Title IV-E recipients. If participants were not Title IV-E recipients they were asked about their area of specialization. Mental Health comprised of the majority of participants with 87 (34.8%). The specialization of Substance Abuse consisted of 17 (6.8%) participants similarly to the specialization of Medical with 17 (6.8%). Sixteen (6.4%) participants identified their specialization as Geriatrics. Nine (3.6%) participants identified Macro as their specialization. The specialization of Family and Children consisted of five (2%) participants as well as the specialization of Child Welfare five (2%). Three (1.2%) participants identified their specialization as Generalist. Two (0.8%) participants identified their specialization as School social work. One (0.4%) participant identified their specialization as LGBTQ. Five (2%) participants were “unknown” to their specialization and 83 (33.2%) participants were missing. The speculation of the missing data is due to Title-IV-E recipients not needing to answer this question.

The bulk of participants identified their religion as Catholic, 104 (41.6%). The participants that identified as Christian made up 40 (16%). The participants that identified as Atheist consisted of 29 (11.6%). The participants that identified

as Protestant comprised of 25 (10%). The participants that identified as Agnostic were ten (4%). Seven (2.8%) participants identified as spiritual. The participants that identified as Seventh-Day Adventist consisted of four (1.6%). Participants that identified as Jewish was made up of three (1.2%) similarly, those that identified as Christian Scientist were three (1.2%). Two (0.8%) participants identified as Muslim. Nineteen (7.6%) participants reported they had “none” and four (1.6%) participants were missing.

Religiosity was asked to determine participants’ level of religious beliefs. Twenty nine (11.6%) identified as being very religious. 80 (32.0%) of the participants identified as somewhat religious. Participants that identified as neutral included 55 (22%). Twenty eight (11.2%) identified as not very religious and 58 (23.2%) participants identify as not religious.

Participants were asked to identify their political view rate. Six (2.4%) participants identified as very conservative, 24 (9.6%) participants identified as somewhat conservative. 50 (20%) participants identified as neutral. Seventy four (29.6%) of the participants identified as somewhat liberal, 79 (31.6%) of the participants identified as being very liberal and 14 (5.6%) participants identified as radical and three (1.2%) participants are missing.

Sexual Orientation

An independent samples t-test was run to compare means of total attitudes towards working with LGBT clients between heterosexual and non-

heterosexual participants. A bivariate analysis of these groups was done by creating two groups: the heterosexual group (Heterosexual/Straight) and the non-heterosexual group (Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual, Asexual, Questioning, Pansexual, and Queer). Statistical significance was found to be present between the group's compared means. It was found that the non-heterosexual group had a higher mean (182.75) as opposed to the heterosexual group (158.4263) ($t=-2.288$, $df=230$, $p=.023$). For the purpose of this study a higher mean score was attributed to more positive and affirming attitudes towards LGBT clients.

Religion

An independent samples t-test was run to compare means of total attitudes towards working with LGBT clients between non-religious and religious participants. A bivariate analysis of these groups was done by creating two groups: the non-religious group (Atheist, Agnostic, and Non-Religious) and the religious group (Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, Seventh-Day Adventist, Christian Scientist, Orthodox, Mormon, Christian and Spiritual). Statistical significance was found to be present between the group's compared means. It was found that the non-religious group had a higher mean (178.1964) as opposed to the religious group (156.0170) ($t=-2.2756$, $df=230$, $p=.006$). For the purpose of this study a higher mean score was attributed to more positive and affirming attitudes towards LGBT clients.

Religiosity

A Pearson's r Correlation test was run to measure the strength of linear relationships between religiosity and total attitudes towards working with LGBT clients. Statistical significance was found and a trend of higher scores of attitudes towards LGBT clients appeared as religiosity decreased (not very religious and not religious). A trend of lower scores of attitudes towards LGBT clients appeared as religiosity increased (religious and very religious) (Pearson's $r=.178$, $p=.007$).

Political View Rate

A Pearson's r Correlation test was run to measure the strength of linear relationships between participant's political view rate and total attitudes towards working with LGBT clients. Statistical significance was found and a trend of higher scores of attitudes towards LGBT clients appeared as political view rate became more liberal (liberal, very liberal and radical). A trend of lower scores of attitudes towards LGBT clients appeared as political view rate became more conservative (conservative and very conservative) (Pearson's $r=.251$, $p=.000$).

Trends

Independent samples t-test, one-way ANOVA, and Pearson's r Correlations were run to determine if attitudes towards LGBT clients were affected by the following variables: biological sex, gender identity, ethnicity, class

standing, age, part time/full time status, pathways status, IV-E/ Non IV-E status specialization, current internship LGBT training experience, California State University-San Bernardino LGBT training experience, Foster Care experience and planned Foster Care work. Statistical significance was not found for these variables although notable trends among some variables were discovered. A trend of more positive attitudes was found for younger aged participants, negative attitudes decreased as age increased for the participants. A trend also appeared to demonstrate more positive attitudes towards LGBT clients among Non-White Students as opposed to White students. A bivariate analysis of these groups was done by creating two groups: the White group (White) and the Non-White group (Black/African American, Asian American, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, Native American/Alaskan Native, Bi-racial, Hispanic/Latino/Chicano, and Middle Eastern/North African). It was also found that a total of 115 (46%) participants felt that CSUSB had not prepared them to work with LGBT clients as opposed to 82 (32.8%) who felt that CSUSB had prepared them to work with LGBT clients. A total of 52 (20.8%) participants remained neutral and 1 (.4%) did not answer.

Summary

A total of 257 surveys were gathered, of which only 250 could be utilized, due to lack of completion. Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 23 was used for data analysis, and data interpretation. Research results

yielded generally positive attitudes towards LGBT clients. The results of this research were able to answer the research question and clarify that there were no statistically significant differences in attitudes towards LGBT clients between IV-E students and non-IV-E students.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter contains a discussion of significant results and key findings of the study, limitations and recommendations for the social work practice, policy and research.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine social work student's attitudes towards working with LGBT clients. It will be very likely that social work students will work with LGBT clients in their social work career and it is highly important that these professionals be adequately trained on working with the LGBT population. Previous research hypothesizes that social work students have generally positive and affirming attitudes towards working with LGBT clients but also have a limited amount of training, experience, competence and humility when working with the LGBT population. This study aimed to assess attitudes towards LGBT clients of graduate and undergraduate social work students at California State University, San Bernardino.

Sexual Orientation

In the present study students that identified with non-heterosexual orientations (gay, lesbian, bisexual, questioning, pansexual, asexual, and queer) had higher scores in attitudes towards working with LGBT clients as opposed to

their heterosexual peers (straight). These findings correlate with the aforementioned research of Dodge, Herbenick, Friedman, Schick, Fu, Bostwick, Bartelt, Munoz-Laboy, Pletta, Reece and Standfort (2016) and Lennon-Dearing, R., & Delavega, E. (2015). Both of the above listed studies found that participants who identified as LGBT "reported significantly higher levels of LGBT Acceptance and LGBT Respect than their heterosexual colleagues" (Lennon-Dearing & Delavega 2015, p. 425). Social workers who identified as LGBT were more affirming than their non-LGBT peers. This proves to be an interesting topic of discussion when looking at the disproportionate ratio of heterosexual to non-heterosexual social work students.

Religion and Religiosity

There were also significant differences in scores on attitudes towards LGBT clients between religious (Catholic, Christian, Protestant, Seventh-Day Adventist, Jewish, Christian Scientist, and Muslim) and non-religious (Atheist, Agnostic, and No Religion) participants. These findings correlated with the aforementioned research of Berkman & Zinberg (1997). In addition to statistical significance being found between religious and non-religious groups the study also discovered significance between different levels of participant religiosity. It was found that higher levels of religiosity of participants correlated with lower scores on attitudes towards LGBT clients. These findings prove that not only is religion a factor to be considered but similarly religiosity can also be seen to contribute to affirmative perspectives of LGBT clients. These trends raise

concerns regarding social work ethics seeing that social workers that identify with higher levels of religiosity have much lower levels of LGBT affirmation and acceptance.

Political View Rate

Similar to that of religiosity, political views among participants were also found to affect attitudes towards LGBT clients. Higher scores for attitudes towards working with LGBT clients were found to be correlated to more liberal political views (somewhat liberal, very liberal, and radical) while lower scores were correlated to more conservative political views (conservative and very conservative). These findings need to be further researched as no articles were found that could support or deny these findings.

Trends

While age was not a factor that was statistically found, there was a trend found in age. The younger the students identified, the more positive their attitudes were towards LGBT whereas, the older a participant identified the more negative their attitudes towards LGBT were. In a similar article by Dodge, Herbenick, Friedman, Schick, Fu, Bostwick, Bartelt, Munoz-Laboy, Pletta, Reece and Standfort (2016) studies also found that age was a significant predictor in attitudes towards Bisexual men and women. More specifically, participants under the age of 25 years old had the most favorable attitudes towards Bisexual men and women.

Ethnicity was another factor that not statistically found but showed a trend in attitudes towards LGBT. The researchers found that White/Caucasian students were more favorable towards LGBT than non-White students. In similarity to the researcher's findings, Dodge, Herbenick, Friedman, Schick, Fu, Bostwick, Bartelt, Munoz-Laboy, Pletta, Reece and Standfort (2016) study found that ethnicity was a significant predictor in attitudes towards Bisexual men and women. Their research found that White/non-Hispanic participants had the most positive attitudes towards Bisexual men and women while Black/non-Hispanic participants had the highest scores for negative attitudes towards Bisexuals. Other researchers, Lennon-Dearin, and Delavega (2015) found that minority groups had lower levels of LGBT acceptance and respect when compared to non-minority groups.

Limitations

Limitations of this study include the underrepresentation of participants that identify as male, adults aged 35 and over, ethnicities such as Middle Eastern, African American, Asian American and Native Americans, religions such as Jewish or Christian scientists and identifying as a gender or sexual minority (i.e. Pansexual, Transgender, Agender and Intersex).

The researchers did not analyze the statistics to determine if there were differences in attitudes specifically between Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals and Transgender individuals.

Social desirability could also be another limitation within the study. Students could have been more favorable towards LGBT in an effort to not show biases towards that population.

Recommendations for the Social Work Practice

It is inevitable that social workers will come across and work with LGBT clients therefore; workers need to feel comfortable and have an understanding of the complex issues that LGBT face. Educational institutions can implement LGBT issues into their curriculum, lectures and trainings. Further, the educational institutions can inform students on conferences in which, LGBT related issues are a topic for discussion. Internships can also be helpful for students to gain an awareness of working with LGBT since most students provide direct services to clients in their field placements. More students will run across LGBT clients in their internships than in the classroom setting.

Additionally, social work students can increase their knowledge and self-awareness of the LGBT population by doing their own research on LGBT topics. This may include reading articles, watching documentaries, or reading autobiographies about LGBT issues. Social work students may also attend events in which the LGBT population may be in attendance such as a local Pride event or parade.

It is important for social work students to assess their own biases towards the LGBT population. Homophobia and transphobia does exist, which is what

oppressed the LGBT population from the non-LGBT population. Ensuring that the students are not treating LGBT clients different from their non-LGBT clients is essential to providing adequate services.

In child welfare, it is known that LGBT foster youth are overrepresented in the foster care system, have troubles with placement, struggle from mental health and are more likely to be homeless than their non-LGBT foster youth peers but by being educated, social work students are able to advocate and educate for the rights of LGBT foster youth to create a better environment for them.

Recommendations for Policy

While learning about diversity it is important for educational institutions, to have more of a focus on LGBT related issues. Almost half of the students at CSUSB did not feel they had an understanding of LGBT related issues and how to work with the LGBT population. Both Title IV-E and non-Title IV-E students need to have adequate training on working with the LGBT population.

The courts do not identify LGBT foster youth and unless the youth discloses there is no way for child welfare to track it. Without the knowledge of a youth identifying as LGBT there may not be any concerns for discrimination or harassment in the child welfare system but in opposition a youth that has not openly identified as LGBT may not be receiving adequate services to tackle any concerns that need to be addressed.

Recommendations for Research

There are several areas in which this research study could be improved. One area that should be expanded on is that this should expand beyond an educational institution and should survey internships, service providers and local agencies to gain a better rounded view of attitudes towards LGBT. Secondly, there is a lack of research to show that political view is a factor in attitudes towards LGBT; this could be another area of research to expand. Another area could be to gain a broader range of demographics such as ethnicities (Native Americans, Middle Eastern, Asian American and African American) as well as different age groups, more especially older adults (35 and up). Lastly, more research can be dedicated towards identifying what specific factors students could learn to make them feel more comfortable with working with the LGBT population.

Conclusion

In conclusion, while many social work students have positive attitudes towards the LGBT populations there are still factors that influence students to have less favorable attitudes towards the LGBT community. These factors include age, ethnicity, religion, religiosity, sexual orientation, and political views. With increased education, experience, training and exposure to LGBT affirming

practices, theories and clients; social workers will be able to increase their competence and humility when working with these populations.

APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think male homosexuals are disgusting.					
2. Male homosexuality is a perversion.					
3. Male homosexuality is a natural expression of sexuality in men.					
4. Sex between two men is just plain wrong.					
5. Male homosexuality is merely a different kind of lifestyle that should not be condemned.					
6. I think lesbians are disgusting.					
7. Female homosexuality is a perversion.					
8. Female homosexuality is a natural expression of sexuality in women.					
9. Sex between two women is just plain wrong.					
10. Female homosexuality is merely a different kind of lifestyle that should not be condemned.					
11. I think bisexual men are confused about their sexuality.					
12. People should be afraid to have sex with bisexual men because of STD/HIV risk					
13. Bisexual men are incapable of being faithful in a relationship					
14. Bisexual men would have sex with just about anyone					
15. I think bisexuality is just a phase for men					
16. I think bisexual women are confused about their sexuality.					
17. People should be afraid to have sex with bisexual women because of STD/HIV risk					
18. Bisexual women are incapable of being faithful in a relationship					
19. Bisexual women would have sex with just about anyone					
20. I think bisexuality is just a phase for women.					
21. It would be beneficial to society to recognize transgenderism as normal					
22. Transgendered individuals should not be allowed to work with children					
23. Transgenderism is immoral					
24. All transgendered bars should be closed down					
25. Transgenderism is a sin					
26. Transgenderism endangers the institution of the family.					
27. Transgendered individuals are a vital part of our society					
28. Transgendered individuals should be barred from the teaching profession					
29. Transgendered individuals should be accepted completely in our society					
30. There should be no restrictions on transgenderism.					
31. I avoid transgendered individuals whenever possible.					
32. I would feel comfortable working closely with a transgendered individual.					
33. I would enjoy attending social functions at which transgendered individuals were present.					

34. I would feel comfortable if I learned that my neighbor was a transgender individual.					
35. Transgendered individuals should not be allowed to cross dress in public.					
36. I would like to have friends who are transgendered individuals.					
37. I would feel comfortable if I learned that my best friend was a transgendered individual.					
38. I would feel uncomfortable if a close family member became romantically involved with a transgendered individual.					
39. Transgendered individuals are really just closeted gays					
40. Romantic partners of transgendered individuals should seek psychological treatment.					

Green, R. G. (2005). The use of bidimensional scales to assess social workers' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Social Work Research, 29*(1), 57-60.

Dodge, B., Herbenick, D., Friedman, M.R., Schick, V., Fu, T., Bostwick, W., Bartelt, E., Munoz-Laboy, M., Pletta, D., Reece, M., and Standfort, T.G.M. (2016). Attitudes toward bisexual men and women among a nationally representative probability sample of adults in the united states. *PLOS ONE, 11*-18. Doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0164430

Walch, S. E., Ngamake, S. T., Francisco, J., Stitt, R. L., & Shingler, K. A. (2012). The attitudes toward transgendered individuals scale: Psychometric properties. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 41*(5), 1283-1291. doi:10.1007/s10508-012-9995-6

APPENDIX B
DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONS

1. What is your biological sex?
 - 1. Female
 - 2. Male
 - 3. Intersex
 - 4. Other, specify _____

2. What is your gender identity?
 - 1. Female
 - 2. Male
 - 3. Agender
 - 4. Bigender
 - 5. Genderfluid
 - 6. Intergender
 - 7. Third gender
 - 8. Other, specify _____

3. What is your current age?
 - 1. 18-24
 - 2. 25-34
 - 3. 35-44
 - 4. 45-54
 - 5. 55+

4. What is your ethnicity?
 - 1. Black/African American
 - 2. Asian American
 - 3. Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander
 - 4. Native American/ Alaskan Native
 - 5. Bi-racial
 - 6. Hispanic/Latino/Chicano
 - 7. White
 - 8. Middle Eastern/ North African
 - 9. Other, specify _____

5. Sexual Orientation
 - 1. Heterosexual/Straight
 - 2. Lesbian
 - 3. Gay
 - 4. Bi-sexual
 - 5. Asexual
 - 6. Questioning
 - 7. Pansexual
 - 8. Other, specify _____

6. What is your current class standing?

- 1. Bachelors of Social Work BSW (1st year)
- 2. Bachelors of Social Work BSW (2nd year)
- 3. Masters of Social Work MSW (1st year)
- 4. Masters of Social Work MSW (2nd year)
- 5. Masters of Social Work MSW (3rd year)
- 6. Other, specify _____

7. Are you a part time or full time student?

- 1. Part time
- 2. Full-time

8. Are you a pathways student?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

9. Are you Title IV-E

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

10. If answered No to question #9 then what is your specialization?

- 1. Geriatrics
- 2. Substance Abuse
- 3. Mental Health
- 4. Other, specify _____

11. Religion

- 1. Protestant
- 2. Catholic
- 3. Jewish
- 4. Muslim
- 5. Atheist
- 6. Seventh-Day Adventist
- 7. Christian Scientist
- 8. An Orthodox church such as the Greek or Russian Orthodox church
- 9. Mormon
- 10. Other, specify _____

12. How religious are you

- 1. Very religious
- 2. Somewhat religious
- 3. Neutral
- 4. Not very religious
- 5. Not religious

13. Political View Rate you political ideas

- 1. Very conservative
- 2. Somewhat conservative
- 3. Neutral
- 4. Somewhat liberal
- 5. Very liberal
- 6. Radical
- 7. Other, specify _____

14. How much do you feel your current internship has trained you to work with different sexual orientations or gender identities?

- 1. Very much so
- 2. Somewhat
- 3. Neutral
- 4. Not so much
- 5. Not at all

15. I feel that CSUSB has prepared me to work with LGBT foster youth?

- 1. Very much so
- 2. Somewhat
- 3. Neutral
- 4. Not so much
- 5. Not at all

16. Have you ever worked with youth in Foster Care?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Unsure

17. Do you plan on ever working with youth in Foster Care?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Unsure

Developed by: Daniel Vincente Benitez and Katarina Rose Kolde

APPENDIX C
INFORMED CONSENT



California State University, San Bernardino
 Social Work Institutional Review Board Sub-Committee
 APPROVED 12/12/17 VOID AFTER 12/19/19
 IRBS SW/17/18 CHAIR *[Signature]*

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
 School of Social Work

INFORMED CONSENT

The study in which you are asked to participate is designed to examine attitudes towards LGBT foster youth among social work students attending California State University, San Bernardino. The study is being conducted by Katarina Kolde and Daniel Benitez, MSW students under the supervision of Dr. Herb Shon, Professor in the School of Social Work, California State University, San Bernardino. The study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board Social Work Sub-committee, California State University, San Bernardino.

PURPOSE: The purpose of the study is to examine attitudes towards LGBT foster youth among social work students attending California State University, San Bernardino

DESCRIPTION: Participants will be asked to complete a self administered questionnaire regarding opinions towards LGBT individuals.

PARTICIPATION: Your participation in the study is totally voluntary. You can refuse to participate in the study or discontinue your participation at any time without any consequences.

CONFIDENTIALITY OR ANONYMITY: Your responses will remain anonymous and data will be reported in-group form only.

DURATION: It will take 5 to 15 minutes to complete the survey.

RISKS: There are no foreseeable risks to the participants.

BENEFITS: There will not be any direct benefits to the participants.

CONTACT: If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact Dr. Herb Shon at 909-537-5532.

RESULTS: Results of the study can be obtained from the Pfau Library ScholarWorks (<http://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/>) at California State University, San Bernardino after December 2017.

This is to certify that I read the above and I am 18 years or older.

Place an X mark here _____

Date _____

909.537.5501

5500 UNIVERSITY PARKWAY, SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407-2393

The California State University - Bakersfield - Channel Islands - Chico - Dominguez Hills - East Bay - Fresno - Fullerton - Humboldt - Long Beach - Los Angeles
 Maritime Academy - Monterey Bay - Northridge - Pomona - Sacramento - San Bernardino - San Diego - San Francisco - San Jose - San Luis Obispo - San Marcos - Sonoma - Stanislaus

REFERENCES

- Alessi, E. J. (2013). Acknowledging the impact of social forces on sexual minority clients: Introduction to the special issue on clinical practice with lgbtq populations. *Clinical Social Work Journal* 41(3), 223-227.
doi:10.1007/s10615-013-0458-x
- Berkman, C. S., & Zinberg, G. (1997). Homophobia and heterosexism in social workers. *Social Work*, 42(4), 319-332.
- Chinell, J. (2011). Three voices: Reflections on homophobia and heterosexism in social work education. *Social Work Education*, 30(7), 759-773.
doi:10.1080/02615479.2010.508088
- Dodge, B., Herbenick, D., Friedman, M.R., Schick, V., Fu, T., Bostwick, W., Bartelt, E., Munoz-Laboy, M., Pletta, D., Reece, M., and Standfort, T.G.M. (2016). Attitudes toward bisexual men and women among a nationally representative probability sample of adults in the united states. *PLOS ONE*, 1-18. Doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0164430
- Fish, J. (2008). Far from mundane: Theorizing heterosexism for social work education. *Social Work Education*, 27(2), 182-193.
doi:10.1080/02615470701709667
- Graham, S. R., Carney, J. S., & Kluck, A. S. (2012). Perceived competency in working with lgb clients: Where are we now? *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 51(1), 2-16. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2012.00001.x

- Green, G. & Herek, G. M. (1994). *Lesbian and gay psychology: Theory, research, and critical applications*. SAGE Publications Inc.
- Green, R. G. (2005). The use of bidimensional scales to assess social workers' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Social Work Research, 29*(1), 57-60.
- Harrison, N. (2000). Gay affirmative therapy: a critical analysis of the literature. *British Journal Of Guidance & Counselling, 28*(1), 37-53.
doi:10.1080/030698800109600
- Henrickson, M. (2010). Social work practice with lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people, 2nd ed. *Journal of Social Work, 10*(1), 129-130.
- Johnson, L. M. (2014). Teaching note—heterosexism as experienced by lgbt social work educators. *Journal of Social Work Education, 50*(4), 748-751.
doi:10.1080/10437797.2014.947165
- Lennon-Dearing, R., & Delavega, E. (2015). Policies discriminatory of the lgbt community: Do social workers endorse respect for the nasw code of ethics?. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 27*(4), 412-435.
doi:10.1080/10538720.2015.1087266
- Liu, R. T., & Mustanski, B. (2012). Suicidal ideation and self-harm in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 42*(3), 221-228. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2011.10.023
- Luke, M., & Goodrich, K. M. (2015). Working with family, friends, and allies of lgbt youth. *Journal for Social Action in Counseling & Psychology, 7*(1), 63-83.

- Mallon, G. P., & Woronoff, R. (2006). Busting out of the child welfare closet: lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender-affirming approaches to child welfare. *Child Welfare*, 85(2), 115-122.
- Monto, M. A., & Supinski, J. (2014). Discomfort with homosexuality: A new measure captures differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 61(6), 899-916.
doi:10.1080/00918369.2014.870816
- Mullins, M. H. (2012). The relationship of practice beliefs and practice behaviors among social workers with lesbian and gay clients. *Journal of Human Behavior in The Social Environment*, 22(8), 1050-1064.
doi:10.1080/10911359.2012.707959
- Mustanski, B. S., Garofalo, R., & Emerson, E. M. (2010). Mental health disorders, psychological distress, and suicidality in a diverse sample of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youths. *Am J Public Health American Journal of Public Health*, 100(12), 2426-2432. doi:10.2105/ajph.2009.178319
- Ream, G. L., & Forge, N. R. (2014). Homeless lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (lgbt) youth in new york city: Insights from the field. *Child Welfare*, 93(2), 7-22.
- Rutledge, S. E., Siebert, D. C., Siebert, C., & Chonody, J. (2012). Attitudes toward gays and lesbians: A latent class analysis of university students. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 38(1), 18-28.
doi:10.1080/01488376.2011.598721

- Walch, S. E., Ngamake, S. T., Francisco, J., Stitt, R. L., & Shingler, K. A. (2012).
The attitudes toward transgendered individuals scale: Psychometric
properties. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 41(5), 1283-1291.
doi:10.1007/s10508-012-9995-6
- Wilson, B.D.M., Cooper, K., Kastanis, A., & Nezhad, S., (2014). Sexual & gender
minority youth in los angeles foster care. 1-6.
- Woodford, M. R., Brennan, D. J., Gutiérrez, L., & Luke, K. P. (2013). U.S.
graduate social work faculty's attitudes toward lesbian, gay, bisexual, and
transgender people. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 39(1), 50-62.
doi:10.1080/01488376.2012.666936

ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITIES PAGE

Researchers Daniel Vincente Benitez and Katarina Rose Kolde completed the research project. This research project was completed in a joint effort as both researchers contributed to all sections.