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ABSTRACT

I assessed the influence prototypicality has on judgements individuals make about gay men. It has been demonstrated that individuals make inferences regarding a person’s traits and group membership based upon a person’s perceived prototypicality (Ambady, Hallahan, & Conner, 1999; Stephan & Stephan, 1989; Wilkins, Kaiser, and Rieck, 2010). I hypothesized that highly prototypical gay men would be perceived to be more identified with the gay community, possess more negative stereotypes of gay men, engage in more activities associated with the gay community, receive less positive feelings from others, and experience more discrimination. Additionally, perceived group identification and negative stereotyping were expected to mediate serially the relationship between prototypicality, perceived engagement in gay activities, positive attitudes from others, and discrimination from others. Participants (N=360) viewed an image of a gay man either low or high in prototypicality. Participants evaluated the gay man’s perceived group identification, perceived stereotypical traits, engagement in activities associated with the gay community, as well as their own feelings and behavioral intentions toward the gay men. Highly prototypical gay men were perceived to (1) identify more with the gay community, (2) possess more negative stereotypes associated with gay men, and (3) engage in more immoral activities associated with the gay community, than low prototypical gay men. Moreover, perceived group identification and negative stereotyping serially mediated the relationship between prototypicality,
and perceived engagement in gay activities, attitudes towards the target, and
discrimination from others.
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CHAPTER ONE:
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Individuals who belong to the same stigmatized group may share a common identity but may often have very different experiences surrounding racism, prejudice, and discrimination (Maddox & Gray, 2002; Kaiser and Wilkins, 2010; Blair, Judd, and Chapleau, 2004). One theoretical perspective that aims to explain this discrepancy for members within the same category is the Prejudice Distribution Account, which suggests that highly identified minorities may report more experiences with prejudice as a result of majority group members reacting more negatively towards highly identified minorities than low identified minorities (Kaiser & Pratt-Hyatt, 2009; Kaiser & Wilkins 2010). The Prejudice Distribution Account has tested various aspects with respect to racial group membership, but to my knowledge has never been examined with respect to sexual orientation group membership, which I aimed to do with the current study.

Approximately 20% of the sexual minority population in the United States have experienced some form of crime against them because of their sexual orientation (Herek, 2009). Previous research has examined experiences of openly gay men and found that a majority have experienced harassment, discrimination, and physical violence (Huebner, Rebchook, & Kegeles, 2004). Specifically, when comparing gay men to bisexual individuals and lesbians, gay men were found to be more likely to be victims of sexual assaults due to their
sexual orientation (Rothman, Exner, & Baughman, 2011). Gay men have also been stereotypically perceived as individuals who reject the male gender role (Madon, 1977), are feminine (Kite & Deaux, 1987), and as sexually deviant (Simmons, 1965). Moreover, gay men have been noted to have different experiences based on how effeminate they are perceived (Glick, Gangl, Gibb, Klumpner, & Weinberg, 2007). In sum, this indicates that resembling a prototypical gay male may influence inferences others make about gay men.

Categorization and detection of an individual’s group membership is thought to be done rather quickly (Zarate & Smith, 1990). Categorization stems from individuals using group prototypes, which use aspects that can be compared across group members (Hains, Hogg, & Duck, 1997). Developing a prototype for a group occurs from individuals using a series of exemplars to verify and develop an averaged representation of a category (Baudouin & Brochard, 2011). For example, gay men have been associated with possessing feminine facial features and others have used this gendered facial cue to correctly identify gay men at a rate better than chance (Freeman, Johnson, Ambady, & Rule, 2010; Rule, Ambady, Adams, & Macrae, 2008; Ambady, Hallahan, & Conner, 1999). Therefore, the extent an individual physically resembles the prototype of their group “Prototypicality” (e.g. Wilkins, Kaiser, & Rieck, 2010) may influence perceptions of group membership.

An individual’s resemblance to the prototype of their group does not only influence the group they are categorized into, but may influence inferences
regarding the individual's level of identification with group. Wilkins, Kaiser, & Rieck (2010), demonstrated that perceived level of group identification can be dependent upon how much a person resembles the prototype of their group. Black individuals perceived to be highly prototypical of their racial group, based on a photo, were perceived as being more highly identified with the black community than Black individuals who were perceived as low prototypical. This previous research demonstrates that individuals may use prototypicality as a cue to not only infer level of group membership, but they are relatively accurate when doing so.

One drawback of categorizing people into groups based on prototypicality is that it is strongly linked to the stereotypes we associate with a particular group (Ma, Correll, & Wittenbrink, 2015; Ma & Correll, 2011; Blair, Judd, & Fallman, 2004). Since prototype judgements are associated with the stereotypes we assign to individuals, it often means that the more similar a person is to the prototype of their group, the more stereotypical attributes one will associate with them. Specifically, when examining race, researchers have found that discrimination, stereotyping, and prejudice towards Black individuals is in part the result of focusing on physical attributes of individuals within their racial group (Maddox & Gray, 2002; Wilkins, Kaiser & Reick, 2010). Maddox and Gray (2002) examined how skin tone influenced the perceptions and representations of Black individuals and found that Black individuals were perceived differently based upon their skin tone. Black individuals with darker skin tones were more closely
associated with possessing negative and stereotypical traits than were Black individuals with lighter skin tones (Maddox & Gray, 2002). Indicating, that others may use an individual’s prototypicality to their group as a way to make assumptions about the trait’s others possess.

One consequence that arises from using an individual’s prototypicality to detect group membership is that it often results in differences in treatment (Kaiser & Pratt-Hyatt, 2009; Sanchez & Bonam, 2009). Blair, Judd, & Chapleau (2004), demonstrated that Black individuals with more Afrocentric facial features were stereotyped more, experienced more prejudice and they were more likely to receive longer sentencing than Black individuals with fewer Afrocentric facial features; even with equivalent criminal histories. This difference in sentencing highlights the real-world consequences that prototypicality plays in the treatment that minority members receive.

This difference in treatment may be occurring as a consequence of prototypicality in part because majority group members may be inferring that highly prototypical members are highly group identified. It has been found in previous research that majority group members hold more negative attitudes and were less inclusive toward highly identified minority group members (Kaiser & Pratt-Hyatt, 2009; Kaiser, Drury, and Malahy, 2009; Sellers & Shelton, 2003). For instance, Kaiser, Drury, and Malahy (2009), demonstrated that when a Black individual appeared to be more highly identified with being Black, White participants used less inclusive language when writing an essay about an
interaction they had with a Black student. Negative evaluations of highly identified minority group members have been thought to be a reaction from the majority group feeling threatened in regard to status legitimacy, or believing highly identified minorities hold negative attitudes toward the majority group (Kaiser & Wilkins, 2010; Johns, Scmader, & Lickel, 2005, Brewer, 2007, Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999). Taken together the previous researchers demonstrates that white individuals may have an underlying bias that influences their perceptions of minority group members who highly identify with their minority group identity.

Even though there has been research examining experiences of prejudice between groups, there is a lack of literature examining experiences of prejudices based on within group variation. Kaiser and Wilkins (2010), outlined existing support for the Prejudice Distribution Account with respect to racial groups, but this model has not been extended to or applied to sexual orientation. This research is needed as the majority of research that examines within group variation examines groups based on factors that are easily identifiable (i.e., skin color). Moreover, previous research that does examine perceptions of gay men utilizing image of gay men primarily focuses on being able to correctly identify if a person is a gay man or not (Freeman, et al., 2010; Rule, et al., 2008). Rule and colleagues (2010) demonstrated that individuals are able to correctly identify a gay male’s sexual orientation at a rate that is only slightly better than chance. Thus, it is important to examine this novel group because, while gay men are
often seen as an ambiguous or visually concealable group, judgements made based on their prototypicality may be influencing their treatment similarly to how they influence more unambiguous groups (e.g. Blacks).

While prototypicality has been suggested to influence inferences and experiences of racial minority members, it has not been examined in regard to sexual orientation; specifically, how prototypicality influences inferences regarding gay men. Although I expect inferences based on prototypicality for racial minorities and gay men to be similar I aim to test the model outlined by Kaiser and Wilkins (2010), regarding gay men in order to determine the influence prototypicality has on the inferences and experiences of this group. In addition, I aim to test the model proposed by Kaiser and Wilkins (2010) which has not been fully examined within a single study. While pieces of this model have been tested in various papers, none have examined the whole model in a single experiment. With this model they Kaiser and Wilkins implied that prototypicality influences experiences with prejudice, discrimination, and negative evaluations via perceived group identification and negative stereotyping (see Figure 1 in Appendix A).

To examine how prototypicality influences perceptions and judgements regarding gay men, the current study was modeled after Wilkins, Kaiser, and Rieck (2010). Specifically, I hypothesized that when compared to a low prototypical gay male, a highly prototypical gay male would:

(1) Be perceived to be more identified with being gay.
(2) Be perceived to possess more negative stereotypical qualities associated with gay men.

(3) Be perceived to engage in more activities associated with the gay community.

(4) Receive fewer positive attitudes.

(5) Experience more discrimination.

In addition to these hypotheses I also aimed to test and expand upon a theoretical model outlined by Kaiser and Wilkins (2010; See Figure 1 in Appendix A). Therefore, I expected that the relationship between prototypicality, activity engagement, discrimination, and warmth from others will be mediated by perceived group identification and perceived negative stereotype possession. Meaning that highly prototypical individuals should be perceived as more identified with the gay community. This increase in perceived group identity should be associated with being attributed more negative stereotypes of gay men which in turn should be associated with higher levels of perceived engagement in the gay community, more discrimination from others, and less positive attitudes from others. My study and hypotheses were all preregistered on the Open Science Framework website and can be viewed using the following link: https://osf.io/tpy9x.
CHAPTER TWO:  

METHOD

Participants

Utilizing TurkPrime, an online crowd sourcing platform, 467 participants were recruited for a rate of $1.38 per participant. Participants received the agreed upon amount as determined by the TurkPrime platform for their involvement in the study. One hundred and six participants were removed from analyses for not paying attention and 1 participant was removed because they were an outlier on multiple dependent measures. Participants were viewed as not paying attention if they failed any of the 5 attention checks which indicated for participants to select a specific response such as: “please mark strongly disagree”. This criteria resulted in a final sample of 360 participants (76.4% White, 11.9% African American, 3.3% Asian, 4.7% Hispanic/Latino, and 3.3% Other; 64.4% Female, 35.3% Male; age: \( M = 41.72, \ SD = 14.70 \)).

Experimental Stimuli

In a previous study, 41 independent raters rated 16 different stimuli (i.e., pictures of gay men) that had been previously rated for prototypicality. They rated how prototypical and attractive each individual appeared on a 7-point scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely). I analyzed the stimuli means for prototypicality and attractiveness and selected the stimuli that were at least ±1 standard deviation away from the mean in regard to prototypicality and matched each low
prototypical photo to a high prototypical photo in regard to attractiveness. Therefore, I retained the stimuli that were greater than ±1 standard deviation away from the mean ($M = 3.54, SD = .57$) which consisted of the 3 lowest prototypical ($M = 2.99, SD = .02$) and 3 highest prototypical stimuli ($M = 4.79, SD = .16$). The stimuli selected were tested utilizing a repeated measures 2 (High Prototypical vs. Low Prototypical) x 3 (Photo) ANOVA and were found to be statistically different based on prototypicality $F(1, 40) = 50.13, p < .01$, but were not statistically different in regard to level of attractiveness $F(1, 40) = 1.21, p = .28$. The inter-rater reliability for the stimuli was consistent as there was an intraclass correlation of .96 regarding prototypicality and an intraclass correlation of .82 regarding attractiveness.

Procedure

Before beginning, the study participants were informed they would be asked to view and evaluate an image of a gay man. After providing their consent to participate, participants were randomly assigned to view either a gay male previously rated as low prototypical or high prototypical. Once randomly assigned participants were asked to complete a ranking task. In this ranking task participants were asked to use a list of attributes that they were led to believe the individuals in the stimuli had provided to complete the statement “I am…” For this task participants rank ordered these statements top down from what they perceived would be most important to the individual to least important for the individual in the photo. Following the rank order task participants were asked to
indicate how much they perceived the individual in the photo to identify with the gay community and the community’s level of importance to the individual’s sense of self. Upon completing the group identity and importance task participants were asked to indicate the likelihood the individual in the photo possessed different traits. After assessing the individual on the traits, they possess participants were presented with a list of activities and asked to indicate the likelihood the individual in the photo engaged in the activities listed. Once participants finished indicating the extent they perceived the individual to engage in activities, they were asked how warm/positive they feel toward the individual represented in the stimuli. Lastly, participants were asked to indicate how likely they would interact with the individual. Before exiting the survey, participants were asked to provide some demographic information and were thanked for their time. During all of the rating tasks, the photo participants were randomly assigned to view was present at all times for reference.

Measures

Correlations among variables and Information regarding descriptive information, such as means, standard deviations, and scale alphas are presented in Table 1 in Appendix A.

Perceived Self-Concept

To measure perceived self-concept, I adapted a modified version of the Twenty Statements Test (e.g. Wilkins, Kaiser, and Rieck, 2010; McPartland, Cumming & Garretson, 1961). This measure contained a list of 10-attributes that
finished the statement “I am”. Attributes consisted of a son, a student, funny, helpful, a roommate, gay, a good friend, athletic, thoughtful, and procrastinator. I was most interested to assess where participants placed the word “gay” as a measure of the perceived importance of sexual identity for the individual in the photo.

**Perceived Group Identification**

I assessed perceived group identification for the individual in the photo using four items adapted from Luhtanen and Crocker (1992) that assess identification centrality: (1) Overall, being gay has very little to do with how he feels about himself (reverse-coded). (2) Being gay is an important reflection of who he is. (3) Being gay is unimportant to his sense of what kind of person he is (reverse). (4) In general, being gay is an important part of his self-image. Moreover, I also used two additional questions measuring self-importance of group identification adapted from McCoy and Major (2003) measuring perceived overlap of the self and the group: (1) In general gay men’s successes feel like his successes. (2) When people derogate gay men, it feels like a personal insult to him. All items in this measure were rated on a 1(strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Stereotypical Quality Possession**

To assess perceived possession of stereotypical quality attribution for the individual in the photograph I used a list containing 29 traits, some stereotypical (e.g., soft voice, fashionable, feminine, flirtatious) and some non-stereotypical
traits (e.g., macho, tough, unemotional) about gay men. For this, measure I was most interested the extent participants rated the individual in the stimuli on the negatively stereotyped traits associated with gay men, the other traits were included to disguise what I was examining. The negative traits within the scale were 4 items: “Mean”, “Soft voice”, “Melodramatic”, and “Feminine”. All items were assessed based on the likelihood the individual in the photo possessed each trait and was rated on a 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely) scale and were averaged together to create a single score.

**Activity Engagement**

To assess perceived engagement in activities I utilized a list containing 43 activities. This list consisted of several scales that were created to assess different types of perceived activity engagement, as well as distractor items embedded throughout to disguise what I was interested in assessing. The items for each of these scales were averaged together to create a single score where higher values indicated more perceived engagement for the particular activity types.

**Gay Community Involvement**: This scale consisted of 6 items: “Participate in a Gay pride Event”, “Go to a ‘gay bar’”, “Protest for gay rights”, “Sign a petition for gay rights”, “Be an activist for gay rights”, and “Perform in a drag show”. These items were designed to measure perceptions of involvement with the gay community for the individual being evaluated and all items were rated on a 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely) scale.
Immoral Activities: This scale consisted of two subscales. *Immoral “Gay” Activities:* This subscale consisted of 4 items: “Have a lot of sexual partners”, “Use drugs”, “Engage in unprotected sex”, and “Dislike Straight Men”. These items were designed to assess perceived engagement with immoral activities stereotypically associated with the gay community for the individual being evaluated. *Immoral “Non-Gay” Activities:* This subscale consisted of 8 items: “Drink excessively”, “Steal from their employer”, “Lie to others”, “Get into physical fights against others”, “Argue with others”, “Threaten to hurt someone”, “Be arrested for a crime”, and “Commit fraud”. These items were created to measure perceived perceptions of engagement with activities considered to be immoral, but not stereotyped to be associated with the gay community. All items were assessed based on the likelihood the individual in the photo engage in the activity listed and was rated on a 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely) scale.

**Feeling Thermometer**

Positive attitudes from others was assessed utilizing a feeling thermometer by asking participants to indicate how warm/positive they feel toward the individual pictured above on a scale ranging from 0 = cold to 100 = warm (Craig and Richeson, 2014).

**Behavioral Intentions**

To assess discriminatory behavior toward the target the Behavioral Intentions Index was adapted from Brochu and Morrison (2007): (1) “How likely is it that you would want to become friends with them?”. (2) “How likely is it that you
would invite them out socially?". (3) “How Likely is it that you would ask them to fill you in on a meeting you missed?”. (4) “How likely is it that you would want to get to know them?”. (5) “How likely is it that you would want to work with them?”. Each item was rated on a 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely) scale to indicate the likelihood they would want to interact with the individual in the stimuli. These items were averaged together in order to obtain a single value where higher values meant more willingness to interact with the gay man represented with the stimuli.

**Analysis Plan**

My design is a single factor design (prototypicality) with two levels (Low Vs. High). In order to analyze my hypotheses examining differences in perceived group identification, perceived stereotype possession, perceived activity engagement, positive attitudes, and behavioral intentions I utilized a series of independent sample t-tests for each analysis with significance criteria of p < .05 and confidence intervals not encompassing 0. Additionally, in order to test my serial mediation hypotheses, I used PROCESS (Model 6: Hayes; 2018). I examined the direct and indirect effects utilizing a bias corrected 95% confidence interval and 5,000 bootstrapped samples. Significant indirect effects are indicated when the confidence interval of the effect does not encompass 0
CHAPTER THREE:

RESULTS

Perceived Self-Concept: The data associated with this measure was ordinal, I utilized a non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test to determine if individuals viewed the importance of being "gay" to a gay man’s self-concept differently based on prototypicality. I found that the “gay” attribute was ranked differently for individuals who were low (17% of participant perceived as most important attribute to individual) and high (46% of participant perceived as most important attribute to individual) prototypical photo $U = 11115.0, p < .01, \eta^2 = .05$. These findings suggest that others perceive the attribute “gay” to be more important for high prototypical gay men than low prototypical gay men.

Perceived Group Identification: I conducted an independent sample t-test and revealed that there was a significant difference between highly prototypical gay men ($M = 4.89; SD = 1.10$) and low prototypical gay men ($M = 4.58; SD = 1.21$) regarding perceived group identification based on prototypicality $t(358) = -2.54, p = .012, d = .27; CI:[-.55; -.07]$. Specifically, I found that high prototypical gay men were perceived to identify more with the gay community when compared to low prototypical gay men (see Table 2 in Appendix A).

Perceived Negative Stereotypes: An independent samples t-test was conducted showing that there was a difference in how others attribute negative stereotypes associated with being gay based on prototypicality $t(358) = -5.16, p<.01, d = .54; CI:[-.82; -.37]$. Specifically, I demonstrated that highly prototypical
gay men were perceived to possess more negative traits associated with being gay than low prototypical gay men (see Table 2 in Appendix A).

Gay Community Involvement: I conducted an independent sample t-test and it revealed that individuals perceive gay men to be more engaged in the gay community based on prototypicality $t(358) = -3.95$, $p< .01$, $d = .37$; CI:[-.75; -.25]. (See Table 2 in Appendix A).

Immoral Activities: An independent sample t-test revealed that high prototypical gay men are perceived to engage in more immoral activities in general than low prototypical individuals $t(358) = -2.34$, $p = .02$, $d= .19$; CI: [-.45; -.04]. However, an independent sample t-test revealed that this was driven by the *Immoral “Gay” Activities* subscale. Gay men high in prototypicality were believed to engage in more immoral activities associated with being gay compared to gay men low in prototypicality $t(358) = -3.23$, $p < .01$, $d = .34$; CI: [-.69; -.17] (see Table 2 in Appendix A). The *Immoral “Non-gay” Activities* were not found to differ between high and low prototypical gay men $t(358) = -1.38$, $p = .17$, $d=.15$; CI: [-.36; .06], suggesting that prototypicality is only influencing judgements regarding stereotypically relevant immoral behaviors rather than all immoral behaviors.

Feeling Thermometer: An independent samples t-test revealed that gay men were not evaluated significantly differently based on prototypicality $t(356.45) = 1.84$, $p = .07$, $d= .19$; CI: [-.31; 9.09]. Indicating that other individuals’ feelings of warmth/negativity were not influenced by gay men’s level of prototypicality (see Table 2 in Appendix A).
Behavioral Intentions: I found that individual’s behavioral intentions towards gay men did not differ statistically based on prototypicality $t(358) = 1.77$, $p = .08$, $d = .19$; CI: $[-.03; .55]$. (see Table 2 in Appendix A).

Serial Mediation Analyses

Immoral “Gay” Activities: Consistent with my hypothesis, there was a significant indirect effect of prototypicality on perceived engagement in immoral “gay” activities via perceived group identification and negative stereotyping (see Figure 2 in Appendix A). As shown in Table 3 prototypicality was positively associated with perceived group identification and negative stereotyping. The indirect pathway from prototypicality to immoral gay activities via perceived group identification was not significant, however the indirect pathway via negative stereotyping revealed a significant positive influence. The serial mediation pathway from prototypicality to perceived group identification to negative stereotyping to immoral gay activities was also significant. This analysis suggests that prototypicality is positively associated with perceptions that an individual will engage in immoral gay activities via perceptions of group identification and negative stereotyping.

Feelings Thermometer: As predicted there was a significant indirect effect of prototypicality on positive feelings toward gay men (see Figure 3 in Appendix A). As seen in Table 4 (see Appendix A), prototypicality was positively associated with perceived group identification and negative stereotyping. The indirect pathway from prototypicality to positive feelings via perceived
group identification was not significant. However the indirect pathway from prototypicality to positive feeling via negative stereotyping was significant. The serial indirect pathway from prototypicality to perceived group identification, to negative stereotyping to positive feelings was significant as well. This model suggests that prototypicality is negatively associated with positive feelings towards gay men via both perceived group identification and negative stereotyping.

Behavioral Intentions: As expected there was a significant indirect effect of prototypicality on behavioral intentions via perceived group identification influencing negative stereotyping (see Figure 4 in Appendix A). The indirect effect of prototypicality on behavioral intentions via perceived group identification was not significant. The indirect effect of prototypicality on behavioral intentions via negative stereotyping was significant. In addition, the indirect pathway from prototypicality to behavioral intentions via perceived group identification and negative stereotyping was also significant. This model suggests that prototypicality is negatively associated with willingness to interact with a gay man through both perceived group identification and negative stereotyping. For details regarding model analyses refer to Table 5 (see Appendix A).
CHAPTER FOUR:
DISCUSSION

Previous research has demonstrated that members of the same minority group may have different experiences of discrimination because of within group variations in prototypicality. This difference in treatment ultimately suggests that some members of the same group may be at greater risk of being victims of discrimination. The prejudice distribution account argues that this stems from majority group individuals reacting more negatively towards highly identified minority group members (Kaiser & Pratt-Hyatt, 2009). Consistent with my hypothesis I found that a highly prototypical gay man was perceived to be more identified with the gay community when compared to a low prototypical gay man. I found that participants viewed highly prototypical gay men to be more identified with the gay community and that the attribute of being gay was viewed to be more important to a highly prototypical gay man’s self-concept. Indicating that prototypicality influences perceived group identification for gay men in the same way it does for racial groups. This finding is consistent with past findings that, highly prototypical racial minorities are perceived to be more identified with their racial group (Wilkins, Kaiser, and Rieck, 2010).

As predicted, I found that highly prototypical gay men were found to be perceived to possess more negative stereotypes associated with gay men (i.e., feminine, soft voice, melodramatic, etc.) than low prototypical gay men. This is in line with previous research demonstrating that highly prototypical Black
individuals are often attributed more negative stereotypes associated with their group than low prototypical individuals (Maddox and Gray, 2002). Demonstrating that gay men are attributed negative traits differently based on their perceived prototypicality, similarly to Black individuals.

My analysis also showed that, consistent with my hypothesis, highly prototypical gay men were also perceived to engage in more activities associated with the gay community than low prototypical gay men. Thus, demonstrating that highly prototypical gay men are perceived to be more involved within the gay community. I found evidence to support the notion that highly prototypical gay men are perceived to engage in more immoral activities than low prototypical gay men. When all immoral activities were assessed together highly prototypical gay men were perceived to engage in immoral activities more than low prototypical gay men. However, this result is driven by the immoral activity items that are stereotype consistent with gay men. High and low prototypical gay men were not perceived differently in their engagement in immoral activities that were not specifically associated with the gay community. This result demonstrates that individuals perceive highly prototypical gay men to be engaging in more immoral behavior stereotyped to be associated with gay men, which can be thought of as prejudice towards highly prototypical gay men. Taken together this result indicates that highly prototypical gay men are seen to be more engaged in the gay community, but also viewed as individuals who engage in immoral, stereotypical behaviors.
While it was expected that highly prototypical gay men would receive fewer positive attitudes and experience more discrimination from others than low prototypical gay men, I did not find this group difference. Although, I did see trends that approached a significant difference, these hypotheses were not confirmed. This indicated that positive attitudes received from others and discrimination from others did not significantly differ based on prototypicality. Previous literature has demonstrated that highly prototypical minority individuals often receive more discrimination from others (Kaiser & Pratt-Hyatt, 2009), but this overall group difference was not seen in regard to gay men.

Lastly, it was expected that perceived group identification and negative stereotyping would mediate the relationship between prototypicality and perceived engagement in immoral gay activities, positive attitudes from others, and behavioral intentions. All of these models found support for these relationships. Highly prototypical gay men were perceived to be more identified with the gay community which was associated with being perceived as possessing more negative stereotypes, which in turn was associated with immoral gay activities. Similarly, prototypicality was negatively associated with both positive behavioral intentions and positive feelings towards gay men via perceived group identification and negative stereotyping.

These results taken together provide evidence in support of the prejudice distribution model proposed by Kaiser and Wilkins (2010), that indicates highly identified minority group members may face more discrimination as a result of
being perceived as highly identified with their minority identity. Meaning, that highly prototypical gay men may experience more prejudice/discrimination because of negative reactions from majority group members that stem in part from appearing, and being perceived as, someone who highly identifies with their minority group. Additionally, my results not only provide support for the model proposed by Kaiser and Wilkins (2010) but demonstrate that this model is not limited to groups that are easy to identify (e.g., race).

By demonstrating that inferences and behaviors towards gay men may differ, not solely because of prototypicality, but because of other underlying biases working in tandem with prototypicality may provide insight into the process of how others perceive minority group members. Specifically, I demonstrated that a person may not experience discrimination just because of their appearance, or the group they are perceived to belong to, but others may interact with a person based on the extent to which they are perceived to identify with a group, which in turn may influence the traits others attach to them, thus resulting in how others treat them. Moreover, my study aides in furthering social psychological theory as it the first, to my knowledge, to successfully test the complete model regarding the prejudice distribution account proposed by Kaiser and Wilkins, (2010).

Limitations and Future Directions

Although, these results provide useful and important advances to the existing literature it is not without its limitations. One limitation of the current study is that I relied on self-report of behavioral measures. One issue with this type of
measure for instance is that self-reported liking or behavioral intentions may not always map on to actual behavior. Additionally, this study only examined how prototypicality influences inferences and bias toward White gay men, and although I do not expect the process to be different for gay men of other ethnicities, it remains an open question as to how race/ethnicity may influence these judgements. For example, Calabrese et al. (2018), demonstrated that Black gay men face stereotypes that are unique to Black men who have sex with other men, and intersect with their race, but do not necessarily fit the stereotypes associated with White gay male. Future research should examine if the prototypicality and these mediation models replicate for ethnic minority gay male targets. Future researchers should also examine if these models hold the same way for individuals of other perceptually ambiguous groups and other members of the LGBT community.

Conclusions

Overall, this study provided support for a theoretical model that aims to explain why highly prototypical individuals may be at greater risk for prejudice and discrimination based on perceived group identification and negative stereotyping they experience. Additionally, the process individuals may utilize to determine their attitudes and inferences towards minority group members appears to be applicable not only to easily identifiable groups, but to groups that may be more visually ambiguous. Lastly, the results of my study have important implications for future research. I demonstrated that researchers should not only
examine prejudice and discrimination from an intergroup lens, but the role within-
group variations play for minority group members. By examining accounts of
discrimination or prejudice with respect to within-group variation it will enable the
scientific community to gain a better understanding of the mechanisms that
influence differential treatment towards members of the same group.
APPENDIX A:
FIGURES AND TABLES
Figure 1. Theoretical model of prejudice distribution account proposed by Kaiser and Wilkins (2010).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perceived Group Identification</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.75 (1.16)</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Negative Stereotypes</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.53 (1.13)</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gay Community Involvement</td>
<td>.401**</td>
<td>.520**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.12 (1.22)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Immoral “Gay” Activities</td>
<td>.208**</td>
<td>.591**</td>
<td>.416**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.34 (1.27)</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Immoral “Non-Gay” Activities</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.411**</td>
<td>.150**</td>
<td>.556**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.67 (1.02)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Immoral Activities (Combined)</td>
<td>.105*</td>
<td>.540**</td>
<td>.284**</td>
<td>.817**</td>
<td>.934**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.90 (1.02)</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Behavioral Intentions</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-.330**</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>-.306**</td>
<td>-.209**</td>
<td>-.277**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.09 (1.40)</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Feelings Thermometer</td>
<td>-.114**</td>
<td>-.356*</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>-.373**</td>
<td>-.231**</td>
<td>-.320**</td>
<td>.767**</td>
<td>70.94 (23.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p < .05  ** p < .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Low Prototypical</th>
<th>High Prototypical</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perceived Group Identification</td>
<td>4.58 (1.21)</td>
<td>4.89 (1.10)</td>
<td>-2.54*</td>
<td>-.55; -.07</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Negative Stereotypes</td>
<td>3.20 (1.14)</td>
<td>3.80 (1.05)</td>
<td>-5.16**</td>
<td>-.82; -.37</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gay Community Involvement</td>
<td>4.84 (1.30)</td>
<td>5.35 (1.11)</td>
<td>-3.95**</td>
<td>-.75; -.25</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Immoral &quot;Gay&quot; Activities</td>
<td>3.10 (1.19)</td>
<td>3.53 (1.31)</td>
<td>-3.23**</td>
<td>-.69; -.17</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Immoral &quot;Non-Gay&quot; Activities</td>
<td>2.59 (.99)</td>
<td>2.74 (1.05)</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>-.36; -.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Immoral Activities Combined</td>
<td>2.76 (.97)</td>
<td>3.00 (.99)</td>
<td>-2.34*</td>
<td>-.45; -.04</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Behavioral Intentions</td>
<td>5.22 (1.26)</td>
<td>4.97 (1.49)</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>-.03; .55</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Feelings Thermometer</td>
<td>73.36 (20.0)</td>
<td>68.96 (25.31)</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>-.31; 9.1</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Means are displayed outside the parentheses and standard deviations are displayed within the parentheses. * p < .05, ** p < .01.*
Table 3. Prototypicality, Perceived Group Identification, and Negative Stereotyping on Immoral Gay Activities Serial Mediation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prototypicality</td>
<td>Perceived GID</td>
<td>.31 (.12)</td>
<td>.07, .55</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>F(1, 358) = 6.44, p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived GID</td>
<td>Negative Stereotyping</td>
<td>.16 (.05)</td>
<td>.07, .26</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>F(2, 357) = 19.27, p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototypicality</td>
<td>Negative Stereotyping</td>
<td>.54 (.11)</td>
<td>.32, .77</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived GID</td>
<td>Immoral &quot;Gay&quot; Activities</td>
<td>.10 (.05)</td>
<td>.01, .20</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>F(3, 356) = 65.91, p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Stereotyping</td>
<td>Immoral &quot;Gay&quot; Activities</td>
<td>.65 (.05)</td>
<td>.55, .75</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototypicality</td>
<td>Immoral &quot;Gay&quot; Activities</td>
<td>.01 (.29)</td>
<td>-.21, .24</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect:
- Prototypicality -> Perceived GID -> IGA: .03 (.02)
- Prototypicality -> Negative Stereotyping -> IGA: .35 (.08)
- Prototypicality -> Perceived GID -> Negative Stereotyping -> IGA: .03 (.02)

Note: GID = Perceived Group Identification; IGA = Immoral "Gay" Activities; CI = Confidence Interval; Bold = significant indirect effects.
Figure 2. The relationship between prototypicality and perception of immoral activities associated with the gay community is mediated by perceived group identification and negative stereotyping. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$
Table 4. Prototypicality, Perceived Group Identification, and Negative Stereotyping on Feeling Thermometer Serial Mediation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prototypicality</td>
<td>Perceived GID</td>
<td>.32 (.12)</td>
<td>.08, .56</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>6.73, p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived GID</td>
<td>Negative Stereotyping</td>
<td>.17 (.05)</td>
<td>.07, .27</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>19.29</td>
<td>19.29, p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototypicality</td>
<td>Negative Stereotyping</td>
<td>.53 (.11)</td>
<td>.31, .76</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived GID</td>
<td>Feeling Thermometer</td>
<td>-.87 (1.02)</td>
<td>-2.87, 1.12</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>16.82, p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Stereotyping</td>
<td>Feeling Thermometer</td>
<td>-.703 (1.08)</td>
<td>-9.14, -4.91</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototypicality</td>
<td>Feeling Thermometer</td>
<td>.01 (2.40)</td>
<td>-4.70, 4.72</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect:

- Prototypicality -> Perceived GID -> FT: -.28 (.38) -1.12, .41
- Prototypicality -> Negative Stereotyping -> FT: -3.75 (1.20) -6.39, -1.70
- Prototypicality -> Perceived GID -> Negative Stereotyping -> FT: -.38 (.25) -.97, .04

Note: GID = Perceived Group Identification; FT = Feeling Thermometer; CI = Confidence Interval; Bold = significant indirect effects.
Figure 3. The relationship between prototypicality and positive attitudes toward gay men is mediated by perceived group identification and negative stereotyping. * p < .05 ** p < .01
Table 5.  
Prototypicality, Perceived Group Identification, and Negative Stereotyping on Behavioral Intentions Serial Mediation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prototypicality</td>
<td>Perceived GID</td>
<td>.31 (.12)</td>
<td>.07, .55</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>F(1, 358) = 6.44, p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived GID</td>
<td>Negative Stereotyping</td>
<td>.16 (.05)</td>
<td>.07, .26</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>F(2, 357) = 19.27, p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototypicality</td>
<td>Negative Stereotyping</td>
<td>.54 (.11)</td>
<td>.32, .77</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived GID</td>
<td>Behavioral Intentions</td>
<td>.02 (.06)</td>
<td>-.11, .14</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>F(3, 356) = 14.58, p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Stereotyping</td>
<td>Behavioral Intentions</td>
<td>-.41 (.07)</td>
<td>-.54, -.29</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototypicality</td>
<td>Behavioral Intentions</td>
<td>-.02 (.15)</td>
<td>-.31, .27</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect:

- Prototypicality -> Perceived GID -> BI: .01 (.02) [-.04, .05]
- Prototypicality -> Negative Stereotyping -> BI: -.22 (.07) [-.39, -.10]
- Prototypicality -> Perceived GID -> Negative Stereotyping -> BI: -.02 (.01) [-.06, -.01]

Note: GID = Perceived Group Identification; BI = Behavioral Intentions; CI = Confidence Interval; Bold = significant indirect effects.
Figure 4. The relationship between prototypicality and behavioral intentions towards gay men is mediated by perceived group identification and negative stereotyping. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$
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STUDY MATERIALS
INFORMED CONSENT

Phenotypic Prototypicality

PURPOSE: The study in which you are being asked to participate is designed to assess how individuals make judgments about others. This study is being conducted by Dr. Joseph Wellman, Assistant Professor of Psychology, California State University, San Bernardino. This study has been approved by the Department of Psychology Institutional Review Board Sub-Committee of California State University, San Bernardino.

DESCRIPTION: If you choose to participate in the study, you will be asked to view an image of a Gay man and then rate the individual in the image. You will be asked to rate the individual in regard to their sense of self, qualities, experiences, and activities. Overall, the study should take no more than 20 minutes.

COMPENSATION: If you are participating through MTurk or TurkPrime, you will receive the set amount determined by those platforms for your involvement in our study today.

PARTICIPATION: Participation in this research is voluntary. You have the right to refuse to participate in this study or answer any questions or terminate your participation at any time.

CONFIDENTIALITY: The information that you give us will remain confidential. Your name will not be associated with your data in any way. The research may be presented at professional conferences or submitted to scientific journals for publication. The data will be destroyed 7 years after publication.

RISKS & Benefits: There are no known risks to participating in this study. This task should cause no more discomfort than you would experience in your everyday life. Although participation may not benefit you directly, I believe that the information obtained from this study will help us gain a better understanding of how individuals make inferences about other individuals and their experiences.

Questions: If you have questions about the research or your rights as a research subject, or if you wish to learn about the results of this study (after June 4, 2019), please contact Dr. Joseph Wellman at 909-537-3893 or Jwellman@csusb.edu.

I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and that I understand, the nature and purpose of this study, and I freely consent to participate.

Agree_____
Disagree____
Instructions Given to Participants

Study Instructions

Today, we are asking you to view an image of a Gay man and then provide your perception of the individuals sense of self, qualities, experiences, and activities they may engage in. We are interested in your gut responses so there are no correct or incorrect responses. We are interested in having you provide your perception of the individuals based on their photograph. Even though it may seem odd to make a judgment about someone based on minimal information, previous research suggests that individuals are actually quite accurate in making these judgments (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1992). We are interested in assessing the extent to which individuals’ perceptions are accurate.
Instructions: In a previous study the individual pictured above was asked to complete the statement “I am….,” with different traits that define who they are and then ranked these from most to least important.

The attributes the individual listed as important to them are listed below. These traits have been randomized so they appear in no particular order.

Please read through the attributes and rank them in the order you think the individual above ranked these traits. The most important should be listed at the top and least important is listed at the bottom.

1. A son
2. A student
3. Funny
4. Helpful
5. A roommate
6. Gay
7. A good friend
8. Athletic
9. Thoughtful
10. Procrastinator
Group Identification Continued….

(Stimuli)

1. Overall, being gay has very little to do with how he feels about himself.
2. Being gay is an important reflection of who he is.
3. Being gay is irrelevant to his sense of what kind of person he is. (reverse)
4. In general, being gay is an important part of his self-image.
5. In general gay men's successes feel like his successes.
6. When people derogate gay men it feels like a personal insult to him.
Stereotype Attribution

(Stimuli)

1. Not at all
2. Moderately
3. Slightly
4. Neutral
5. Slightly
6. Moderately
7. Extremely

Instructions: Please rate the individual in the photo on the likelihood they would possess qualities from the list below.

1. Soft Voice
2. Fashionable
3. Good listener
4. Melodramatic
5. Has a lot of female friends
6. Liberal
7. Feminine
8. Affectionate
9. Emotional
10. Sensitive
11. Understanding
12. Please mark not at all
13. Artistic
14. Flirtatious
15. Outspoken
16. Gentle
17. Sociable
18. Macho
19. Hunts animals
20. Mean
21. Athletic
22. Conservative
23. Unemotional
24. Masculine
25. Unfriendly
26. Tough
27. Aggressive
28. Cruel
29. Prejudice
Group activities

(Stimuli here)

Instructions: Please rate the individual in the photo on the likelihood they would engage in the following activities.

1. Participate in a Gay pride event.
2. Be an activist for Gay rights.
3. Work out every day.
4. Go to a “gay bar”.
5. Attend a drag show.
6. Please mark extremely
7. Perform in a drag show.
8. Attend musicals.
9. Interact with other gay men.
10. Have a lot of female friends.
11. Use drugs.
12. Have a lot of sexual partners.
13. Engage is unprotected sex.
14. Attend concerts such as lady gaga/Cher/Beyoncé/Madonna.
15. Dislike straight men.
17. Sign a petition for gay rights.
18. Engage in violent acts if it is to stand up gay rights.
19. Attend a ballet.
20. Shop at whole foods.
22. Attend concerts such as ACDC/Metallica/Led Zeppelin.
23. Go to a shooting range.
24. Go hiking.
25. Go to a sports bar.
26. Join a CrossFit gym.
27. Enjoy running.
28. Attend a football game.
29. Attend a boxing match.
30. Drink beer.
31. Attend a car show.
32. Go fishing.
33. Watch action movies.
34. Do construction.
35. Play Call of Duty.
36. Join a fraternity.
37. Drink excessively
38. Steal from their employer
39. Lie to others
40. Get into physical fights against others
41. Argue with others
42. Threaten to hurt someone
43. Be arrested for a crime
44. Commit Fraud
Feeling Thermometer

(Stimuli here)

Instructions: Please use the sliding scale below to rate how warm/positive you feel about the individual in the photo above.

1 = Cold  100 = Warm Behavioral Intentions Index
Instructions: Please look at the photo above and indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

1. How likely is it that you would want to get to know them?
2. How likely is it that you would ask them to fill you in on a meeting you missed?
3. How likely is it that you would want to work with them?
4. How likely is it that you would invite them out socially?
5. How likely is it that you would want to become friends with them?
Demographic Information

Age: _______

Gender:

_______ Male
_______ Female

Ethnicity:

_______ Asian
_______ White
_______ African American

_______ Latino/Hispanic
Other (Please Specify): _______

Sexual Orientation:

_______ Gay
_______ Lesbian
_______ Bisexual
_______ Straight
_______ Other

Political Orientation:

1 = Conservative to 4 = Moderate to 7 = Liberal
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