

DEVIANT STEREOTYPES: CALL GIRLS, MALE HOMOSEXUALS, AND LESBIANS*

Victor Gamboa and Henry J. Feenstra

A necessary condition for social life is the sharing of a set of normative expectations by all participants. When a rule is broken one can refer to the individual who does not adhere to the norm as a deviator and his peculiarity as a deviation (Goffman 1963:167). For example, one is normally expected not to kill one's neighbor indiscriminately, not to steal another's property, not to force a stranger of the opposite sex into sexual intercourse. To do so would be to expose oneself to being labeled a murderer, thief, or rapist. In all three instances one is engaging in deviant behavior and in due course may be characterized as having a deviant character.

The conventional way of studying deviance has been to focus on the deviant person *himself* and to ask such questions as: Who is he? Where does he come from? How did he become that way? Is he likely to keep on being that way? (Becker 1964). Answers to such questions have focused on the unearthing of inherent characteristics, motives, and drives within individuals as causes and explanations for deviant behavior.

*Revised version of a paper read at the 1969 National Convention of the Philippine Sociological Society, December 6-7, 1969. At the time of the convention, Mr. Gamboa was a graduate student in the Department of Sociology, University of the Philippines. He completed his masters degree in 1970 and is currently assisting Dr. Bonifacio Sibayan, Dean of the Graduate School, Philippine Normal College. Dr. Feenstra is a Ford Consultant, Philippine Normal College, whose home university is the University of Western Ontario. Authors Gamboa and Feenstra acknowledge the help extended by the University of the Philippines Computer Center, which provided computer time for the polarity and factor analyses.

Another approach sees deviance as always and everywhere a process of interaction (Lindesmith and Strauss 1968:390) between at least two kinds of people: those who commit (or are said to have committed) a deviant act, and the rest of society. The two groups—deviant and non-deviant—are in complementary relationship. One depends on the other for its existence.

One serious consequence of such an approach is that instead of assuming deviance to be a quality of the person who commits the deviant act, and assuming that somehow (unless he undergoes internal overhauling through psychiatric or psychotherapeutic treatment) such a person will be compelled to continue the deviant act, we begin to realize that changes in interaction may produce significant changes in behavior. Focus is therefore transferred to other persons involved in the deviance-labeling process. The role of the non-deviant is given due attention.

In this interactionist framework the role of the non-deviant is crucial in the deviance-labeling process. For it is one thing to commit a deviant act, for example, lying, stealing, homosexual intercourse, or prostitution, while it is another thing to be charged and invested with a deviant character (Cohen 1966:24). To be invested with a deviant character is to be assigned a role and to be categorized as a special type of person—an outsider (Becker 1963). What is more, the label does more than signify one who has committed such a deviant act. It evokes a characteristic imagery, and activates sentiments. Stereotypes emerge—deviant stereotypes here

defined as agreement among members of a group of "normals" concerning attributes of some deviant group.

Thus far, although there have been a number of studies on ethnic stereotypes (Gardner and Taylor 1969; Gardner, Wonnacott, Joy, and Taylor 1968; Taylor and Gardner 1969; Gardner, Taylor, and Feenstra 1969) no work has been done to determine stereotypes of behavior which may fall under the category of sexual perversion or sexual deviance. The purpose of this paper is to attempt to answer such questions as these: What are some consensual attributes which so called "normal" people have of call girls, male homosexuals, and lesbians? When such target words are presented to Ss, are the deviants signified by such stimulus words stereotyped indiscriminately or can Ss make distinctions among the three deviant groups? If they can, what is the nature of such distinctions among call girls, male homosexuals, and lesbians?

Another area of which little is known concerns the link between attitudes toward and stereotypes of target deviant groups. Again in the area of ethnic stereotypes, Gardner, Taylor, and Feenstra (1969) make a distinction between attributes which the individual himself ascribes to the group because of his personal feelings (attitudes) and attributes he ascribes because of shared beliefs in the community (stereotypes). In the present study, attitude is used more in terms of the *tolerance* one feels towards a deviant group or individual shown through responses to such statements as "Two women who are really in love may have sexual relations with each other," or "Call girls are a menace to family life." Do positive attitudes necessarily give rise to positive stereotypes of such deviant groups, such that the distinction between the two becomes purely academic—the evaluative dimension being really the best measure of attitude? Or would it be possible to have combinations such as negative attitudes (not tolerant at all) combined with positive stereotypes of deviant groups and vice versa, thus validating Gardner and others' (1969) distinction between the two? The following paper will thus attempt

to answer questions raised by our theoretical framework. It will seek to do so utilizing a polarity and factor-analytic approach.

METHOD

Subjects

Two samples of students were selected for study. For the Manila sample, 49 male and 50 female students from the first year psychology department of the University of the Philippines served as Ss. The Ss for the Baguio sample consisted of 56 male and 79 female students from first to third year of the University of Baguio, taking courses such as guidance, criminology, and education.

Materials

Three measures of attitudinal "tolerance" towards each of the three deviant groups were used. The items making up each measure were randomly arranged so that statements concerning call girls, male homosexuals, and lesbians followed no logical or patterned order or cluster. The items were presented using a five-alternative format with possible responses ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." The measures were the following.

Male Homosexual Tolerance Scale. Three negatively and two positively worded statements about *male homosexuals*, or *baklá*, were presented. A high score indicates a tolerant or favorable attitude towards male homosexuals.

Lesbian Tolerance Scale. Five items were presented to the Ss. Two items were statements pointing out the disastrous consequences of having *tomboy* in a society. Three items were statements advocating leniency with regard to *tomboy* marriage and lesbian relationship. A high score indicates a high degree of tolerance toward lesbians.

Call Girl Tolerance Scale. Of the five items on call girls, two were statements to the effect that call girls served a useful function in society, while the last three were statements blaming call girls for the deterioration of the family and society. Here, also, as in the other two scales, a

high score would indicate a favorable attitude or tolerance towards call girls.

One statement, "People should be encouraged to choose their sexual partners from persons of either sex," was included as a general Pro-homosexual index.

Ss were also asked to rate the three concepts, *Male Homosexual*, *Lesbian*, and *Call Girl* on 25 semantic differential scales (see Table 1). To counterbalance for concept response set, the concepts were arranged in a Latin Square manner. The instructions were similar to those suggested by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957). The scales were selected for their potential relevance to such deviant groups on the basis of a review of literature on the area of sexual deviation. Previous work on the scales had been done by Todd Fay, Visiting research associate from Northwestern University then at the Ateneo de Manila's Institute of Philippine Culture.

RESULTS

Polarity analysis

A polarity analysis (see Gardner *et al.* 1968) was employed to determine which traits were most closely associated with each of the three concepts. The analysis makes use of the *t*-distribution to identify those scales for which the mean ratings depart significantly from a neutral rating of 4.0. Tables 1 and 2 present the means, variances, and *t*'s for each semantic differential scale for each of the deviant group labels. For each group label the scales are ranked in terms of the magnitude of the absolute value of the *t*-statistic.

Baguio sample. For the ratings of the concept Call Girl, eight of the scales yield *t* values greater than ± 7.0 , the value found previously (Gardner *et al.* 1968) to indicate a preponderance of ratings on one side of the neutral position. Accepting that criterion, eight attributes—*immoral*, *aggressive*, *feminine*, *nonconforming*, *industrious*, *dirty*, *dishonest*, *young*, and *lazy* evidence sufficient agreement to be

characterized as reflecting the stereotype about call girls.

For the ratings of the concept Male Homosexual, only two scales, *immoral* and *aggressive*, yield *t* values greater than the criterion value. For the concept Lesbian only one scale, *immoral*, meets the criterion.

U.P. sample. For the ratings of the concept Call Girls, 7 of the scales yield *t* values greater than 7.0. Defining the stereotype Call Girl in terms of these seven scales would result in call girls being characterized as *feminine*, *immoral*, *aggressive*, *young*, *poor*, *bad*, and *dirty*.

Two scales, *immoral* and *friendly*, emerge as stereotypes of male homosexuals. Using the our criterion cut-off point, lesbians are given the attributes of being *aggressive* and *immoral*.

Comparison of polarity analysis of Baguio and U.P. samples

The U.P. and Baguio samples find little difficulty in ascribing consensual traits to call girls. However, the polarity analysis so far utilized seems to indicate that attributes of male homosexuals and lesbians are not consensual enough to be stereotypic. If this should be so, a possible explanation is that the phenomena of male homosexuality and lesbianism (at least as compared to call girls) is not observed, interacted with, and talked about enough for stereotypes to develop. An alternative explanation would suggest that call girls differ from either homosexuals and lesbians in that the former is a heterosexual relationship, while the later two are homosexual relationships. Differences in stereotypes held by the male and female Ss toward the latter groups might tend to be somewhat different, thus accounting for the lack of consensus on the part of the total group.

Factor analysis of reactions to call girls, male homosexuals, and lesbians

In order to further investigate rating reactions to the three concepts for each sample, a factor analysis of the following variables was performed: (a) sex, (b) the 15 semantic differential

scales for the concept Call Girl, (c) the 15 semantic differential scales for the concept Male Homosexual, (d) the 15 semantic differential scales for the concept Lesbian, (e) one tolerance attitude score for each of the three concepts, and (f) the pro-homosexual item statement. The 15 scales to be used were chosen from the polarity analysis *t* scores of the present study on the basis of an exploratory polarity and factor-analytic probe in which only semantic differential scales were used. Only those scales with the highest *t* values or factor loadings across the three concepts were chosen to be included in the factor analysis for the present study.

The 45 scales, the four attitude scores and the sex variable were intercorrelated to yield a 50 x 50 correlation matrix. The matrix was factor analyzed by means of a Principal Axis factor solution with the highest absolute correlation for a variable used as its communality estimate. Tables 3 and 4 present the rotated factor matrices for the Baguio and U.P. samples respectively, obtained by applying the Normalized Varimax rotation solution (Kaiser 1958) to the Principal Axis factor matrix.

The purpose of the factor analysis was (1) to determine the relationship, if any, between the attitude scores and the attribute scales, (2) through the overall factor structure, to find out possible explanations for the dearth of stereotypic consensus (polarity) for the target concepts Male Homosexual and Lesbian, and (3) to interpret patterns emerging from the factor configuration of both samples.

Baguio sample. Factor I receives appreciable loadings (greater than 3.0) from 11 variables, the five semantic differential scales on the concept Male Homosexual (*immoral, dirty, bad, feminine, and unfriendly*) and the six scales on the concept Lesbian (*immoral, dirty, weak, bad, feminine, and slow*). The loadings indicate a split between the stereotypes held toward homosexual and heterosexual groups, since the attributes of the call girls do not load on this factor. This same split was noted earlier in the polarity analyses (see Tables 1 and 2). All the scales are negatively evaluative indicating that the stereo-

types of the male homosexuals and lesbians tend to be quite negative. Factor I is best defined as a *General Homosexual Factor*.

Factor II receives appreciable loadings from three variables—*passive* for call girls and *soft* and *passive* for lesbians. The pattern of the loadings describes a *Deviant Impotence Factor*, since this general notion of impotence tends to be ascribed to all three deviant groups.

Factor III is defined by six semantic differential scales. The cluster of the adjectives, *happy* and *wise*, for all three concepts, suggests that this factor is best identified as a "*Contented Deviant*" Factor. *Ss* who are somewhat tolerant towards homosexuals as shown by the loading on the pro-homosexual item, tend to view members of all three deviant groups as *happy* and *wise*, possibly because they feel that these individuals have at least resolved their sexual dilemma by finding a partner who meets their specific needs.

Factor IV is defined by 13 variables. Two of these are measures obtained from attitude statements on male homosexuals and call girls. The other variables loading on this factor are five attributes of call girls (*immoral, dirty, bad, feminine, and aggressive*), three attributes of the male homosexuals (*immoral, foolish, and aggressive*), and three attributes of the lesbians (*immoral, bad, and foolish*). The configuration suggests a *General Negative Attitude Towards Deviants* since the direction of both the attitudes and attributes are negative. In addition it is noteworthy that the attitudes toward both homosexual deviants (but not those toward heterosexual deviants) load on this factor, further emphasizing the homosexual-heterosexual split. This finding suggests that negative attitudes may be linked to negative traits ascribed to deviant groups. The heterosexual-homosexual split is highlighted by the homosexual being described as *immoral* but *foolish* in contrast with the heterosexual deviant, described simply as *immoral*. A glance at the negative loading on attitude towards male homosexuals and call girls by females indicates a willingness to take a stand concerning homosexuality of the opposite

sex and heterosexual deviance, but a shying away from taking strong attitudinal views concerning homosexual deviance involving one's own sex.

Factor V is defined by five attributes describing male homosexuals as *old*, *dirty*, *weak*, *small*, and *unfriendly*. In addition, the attitude toward male homosexuals receives an appreciable loading. Since this attitude and these attributes toward male homosexual receive the highest loadings on this factor, the factor may be called a *Homosexual Attitude Factor*. In this case, both the stereotype and attitude are negative.

Factor VI receives loadings from *submissive* for all three target groups, *large* for male homosexuals, and *unfriendly* for lesbians. It is clear that the Ss tended to view all three groups of deviants as submissive in nature, thus the factor is best seen as the *Submissive Deviant Factor*.

Factor VII receives its major loadings from the attitude scales toward lesbians and call girls, two attributes of the call girl (*good* and *soft*), and one attribute of the Male Homosexual (*soft*). The loading of the sex variable suggests that males may show a positive attitude toward call girls and lesbians, but are unwilling to approve of homosexual relations between males. Call girls are *good* and *soft*. Male homosexuals are *soft*. Factor VII should thus be named a *Tolerance Toward Opposite Sex Deviance Factor*.

Inspection of the loadings in Factor VIII shows that somewhat negative attitudes towards call girls do not hinder the Ss from admitting the group to be highly potent—call girls being defined as *large*, *fast*, *friendly*, and *active*. The factor shows how in some instances attitudes towards a group may be independent of stereotypes ascribed to the group. Here we have a case of a *Call Girl Potency Factor* being linked to negative attitudes towards the same target group. "I may not like call girls, but I must admit they are a terribly potent group."

Factor IX receives its highest loadings from the Lesbian Attitude variable, three Lesbian scales (*young*, *fast*, and *aggressive*), and one Call Girl scale (*young*). The positive loading of sex

on this factor indicates that females with negative attitudes towards lesbians nevertheless describe the group as *young*, *fast*, and *aggressive*. Results of this factor give support to the interpretation that the sex of the subject does make a difference regarding the manner in which the subject may react to ratings of a target deviant group. Here girls react negatively to a homosexual relationship between girls. There is further indication that a positive attitude is not necessarily tied to a positive stereotype.

U.P. sample. Inspection of the loadings in Factor I reveals a *Negative Stereotype Toward Deviants Factor* pattern toward all three deviant groups. Call girls receive appreciable loadings from the scales *weak*, *bad*, and *foolish*. Male homosexuals and lesbians receive high loadings on the scales *immoral*, *dirty*, *bad*, and *foolish*.

The configuration of loadings on Factor II leads us to define it as an *Impotent Lesbian Factor*, since the major loadings come from seven Lesbian scales (*submissive*, *weak*, *feminine*, *slow*, *soft*, *passive* and *timid*).

Factor III, which receives a negative loading from the sex variable, describes the males in the sample as viewing male homosexuals as *weak*, *feminine*, *slow*, and *soft*, and may best be defined as a *Feminine Bakla Factor*, quite similar in configuration to the *Impotent Lesbian Factor*. It is interesting to note how the adjective scales for male homosexuals are linked to the sex variable. It clearly indicates that the sex of the perceiver makes a difference in determining how the deviant group is to be perceived.

Factor IV receives loadings from the Male Homosexual Attitude Scale, three Call Girl attributes (*strong*, *large*, *passive*), one Male Homosexual attribute (*young*), and two Lesbian attributes (*young* and *large*). However, the interpretation of this configuration of loadings is unclear.

Appreciable attitude loadings on Call Girl and Lesbian attitude variables together with a high loading for the sex variable for Factor V, highlight the male attitude split between same-sex and opposite-sex deviants. Apparently males

do discriminate and distinguish between homosexuals on the one hand, and call girls and Lesbians on the other. Factor V may be defined as a *Male Tolerance Toward Opposite-Sex Deviance Factor*.

Inspection of the loadings of Factor VI shows call girls receiving appreciable loadings on the scales *fast, wise, friendly, active, aggressive*; male homosexuals on the scales *submissive, soft, and friendly*; and lesbians on the scales *clean, strong, and friendly*. The configuration suggests that Factor VI may define the deviants as being somewhat extroverted, especially in the case of the *aggressive* call girls and the *strong* lesbians. All three groups are viewed as being *friendly*, giving further support to this notion that the Ss in this sample view deviants as somewhat extroverted individuals.

Factor VII receives appreciable loadings from six variables, all of which are semantic differential scales *happy* and *wise* for the three concepts. Such a "*Contented Deviant*" Factor suggests that Ss, regardless of sex, regard all three deviancies or "perversions" as a way of handling sexual conflict in an acceptable and satisfactory fashion.

Factor VIII appears to deal mainly with the level of activity of the male homosexual. Since the major loadings come from two attributes of the Male Homosexual (*active* and *aggressive*), the factor suggests that the Ss view the male homosexual as a hard-working individual. It is not clear, however, if this activity is related to his deviant behavior.

In Factor IX, the high loading on the sex factor is linked with high loadings on the *young, dirty, bad* and *feminine* scales of Call Girl. The factor may be called a *Male Call Girl Stereotype*. One interpretation of this might be that males look upon call girls as being *bad*, but not in an *immoral* sense. Rather, the "badness" might refer to the inconveniences associated with the heterosexual call girl relationship, e.g., expense. Another explanation could be that call girls are "bad" in the sense that the male might consider another kind of relationship, i.e., a permanent relationship with a girl friend, as more

meaningful than the casual relationship with the call girl. An acceptable solution would be to have a "good" girl friend and to find release for sexual energy via "bad" call girls.

Factor X receives appreciable loadings from the Call Girl scales *dominant, strong, hard, and unfriendly*. The attributes show the factor to be a *Forceful Call Girl Factor*. The homosexual-heterosexual split is further underscored by low loadings on the Male Homosexual and Lesbian scales.

DISCUSSION

One pattern which emerges from both the polarity and factor analyses of both the Baguio and U.P. samples is the homosexual-heterosexual distinction Ss make in perceiving each of the three deviant groups. This can be seen recurring in Factors I and IV of the factor analysis of the Baguio sample, and Factors I, V, VIII, and X of the U.P. sample factor analysis. In the polarity analyses of the scales of the three concepts, the lack of consensus for the lesbians and male homosexuals might be due to this same differential rating of male and female Ss.

A second pattern shows sex of Ss to be a crucial variable in differentiating attitudes towards homosexual same-sex group deviants and homosexual opposite-sex group deviants. Males or females showing positive or negative attitudes (*tolerance*) towards call girls and opposite-sex target variables reveal no appreciable loadings in the same-sex target variable. Males having positive attitudes towards lesbians and call girls do not reveal positive attitudes towards male homosexuals (see Factor VII Baguio sample and Factor V U.P. sample). Females who have negative attitudes towards call girls and male homosexuals do not exhibit the same negative attitudes towards lesbians (see Factor IV Baguio sample).

Sex is also linked to perception of attributes concerning the homosexual same-sex group. It is the males and not the females who attribute to male homosexuals the attributes of feminine *baklá* (see Factor III U.P. sample). It is females

and not males who view lesbians as *young, fast, and aggressive*. It would seem that one develops more easily a stereotype of one's own same-sex homosexual group than that of the opposite-sex homosexual group.

Regardless of sex and attitudinal tolerance, both the U.P. and Baguio sample have a Happy-Wise Factor as a unique dimension for all three deviant groups (Factor III Baguio sample and Factor VII U.P. sample). This would indicate that the respective "perversions" of each deviant group are seen as acceptable ways of handling sexual conflicts. This might explain the observed tolerant and even humorous manner with which Filipinos often behave towards each of the three deviant groups.

Factor VIII of the Baguio sample shows a configuration where Ss, irrespective of sex, have a negative attitude towards call girls but admit them to be a highly potent group. Factor IX of the Baguio sample shows female Ss having a negative attitude towards lesbians, but describing them as *young, fast, and aggressive*. Such "negative correlation" between attitudes and stereotypes suggests that such attitudes and stereotypes in some cases may be independent of each other, and that the evaluative factor of the semantic differential does not necessarily tap the attitudinal component.

REFERENCES

- Becker, H. S.
1963 *Outsiders: studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York, Free Press of Glencoe.
1964 *The other side*. New York, The Free Press.
- Cohen, A. K.
1966 *Deviance and control*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Gardner, R. C. and D. M. Taylor
In Press *Ethnic stereotypes: meaningfulness in ethnic group labels*. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*.
- Gardner, R. C., E. J. Wonnacott, and D. M. Taylor
1968 *Ethnic stereotypes: a factor analytic investigation*. *Canadian Journal of Psychology* 22(1):35-44.
- Gardner, R. C., D. M. Taylor, and H. J. Feenstra
1969 *Ethnic stereotypes: attitudes or beliefs? Occasional paper, no. 3*. B. Sibayan, ed. Manila, Language Study Center, Philippine Normal College.
- Goffman, E.
1963 *Stigma: notes on the management of spoiled identity*. England, Penguin Books.
- Katz, D., and K. W. Braly
1935 *Racial prejudice and racial stereotypes*. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 30(2):175-93.
- Lindesmith, A., and A. L. Strauss
1968 *Social psychology*. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Osgood, C. E., G. J. Suci, and P. H. Tannenbaum
1957 *The measurement of meaning*. Urbana, Illinois, University of Illinois Press.
- Taylor, D. M., and R. C. Gardner
1969 *Ethnic stereotypes: their effects on the perception of communicators of varying credibility*. *Canadian Journal of Psychology* 23 (3):161-73.

TABLE 1

Means, Variances, and Tests of Polarity of the Ratings
of the Concepts Call Girls, Male
Homosexuals and Lesbians
Baguio Sample

Scale	Call Girls				Male Homosexuals				Lesbians			
	Mean	Vari- ance	t	Rank	Mean	Vari- ance	t	Rank	Mean	Vari- ance	t	Rank
moral-immoral	5.73	1.52	13.09	1	5.20	1.88	7.39	1	5.27	1.81	8.03	1
rich-poor	4.04	2.02	0.21	24	3.78	1.60	-1.57	14.5	3.95	1.44	-0.42	21
submissive-dominant	3.95	1.84	-0.33	23	4.01	1.61	0.05	24	4.00	1.69	0.0	25
young-old	3.17	1.32	-7.24	8	3.29	1.23	-6.73	3	3.22	1.42	-6.34	3
clean-dirty	5.26	1.76	8.24	6	4.28	1.86	1.76	13	4.01	1.95	0.04	24
intelligent-unintelligent	4.60	1.77	3.95	10	3.99	1.78	-0.05	24	3.82	1.70	-1.22	16
strong-weak	4.18	1.78	1.16	19	4.15	1.75	0.99	19	3.81	1.68	-1.28	15
good-bad	5.29	1.76	8.42	5	4.51	1.88	3.14	6	4.40	1.79	2.56	10
lazy-industrious	2.87	1.84	-7.14	9	3.81	1.72	-1.26	16	3.66	1.62	-2.46	11
dependent-independent	3.99	2.01	-0.09	25	3.99	1.70	-0.05	24	3.98	1.70	-0.15	22.5
large-small	3.84	1.57	-1.21	18	3.99	1.43	-0.06	22	3.80	1.28	-1.83	14
masculine-feminine	5.41	1.80	9.08	3	3.54	1.98	-2.69	9	4.53	2.07	2.97	7
sickly-healthy	3.50	1.86	-3.11	12	4.08	1.64	0.58	20	3.98	1.71	-0.15	22.5
important-unimportant	5.33	1.78	8.69	4	4.80	1.81	5.08	4	4.90	1.67	6.19	4
conforming-nonconforming	4.36	1.84	2.26	15	4.29	1.58	2.13	12	4.43	1.66	3.02	6
fast-slow	3.75	1.70	-1.68	16	4.30	1.50	2.31	11	3.61	1.67	-2.74	8
sad-happy	4.17	1.98	1.01	20	4.25	1.81	1.57	14.5	3.93	1.77	-0.49	20
foolish-wise	3.49	2.20	-2.67	13.5	3.49	2.01	-2.96	8	3.63	2.09	-2.06	13
honest-dishonest	5.07	1.71	7.27	7	4.39	1.81	2.52	10	4.40	1.77	2.63	9
handsome-ugly	4.39	1.69	2.67	13.5	3.95	1.79	-0.34	21	4.13	1.58	0.98	18
soft-hard	4.04	1.53	0.34	21.5	4.17	1.62	1.18	17	4.29	1.48	2.27	12
friendly-unfriendly	3.43	1.87	-3.50	11	3.30	1.87	-4.34	5	3.22	1.75	-5.17	5
passive-active	4.24	1.81	1.52	17	4.17	1.73	1.14	18	4.08	1.68	0.56	19
aggressive-timid	2.69	1.64	-9.26	2	2.94	1.66	-7.37	2	3.09	1.57	-6.72	2
kind-unkind	4.06	2.04	0.34	21.5	3.51	1.83	-3.08	7	3.83	1.78	-1.12	17

TABLE 2

Means, Variances, and Tests of Polarity of the Ratings
of the Concepts Call Girls, Male
Homosexuals and Lesbians
U.P. Sample

Scale	Call Girls				Male Homosexuals				Lesbians			
	Mean	Vari- ance	t	Rank	Mean	Vari- ance	t	Rank	Mean	Vari- ance	t	Rank
moral-immoral	5.69	1.47	11.27	2	5.32	1.46	8.87	1	5.20	1.53	7.69	2
rich-poor	5.28	1.57	7.97	5	3.65	1.32	-2.63	15	3.63	1.28	-2.80	16
submissive-dominant	3.11	1.87	-4.62	12	3.69	2.00	-1.53	19	4.68	1.85	3.59	12
young-old	2.79	1.32	-8.94	4	3.55	1.34	-3.30	10	3.41	1.25	-4.64	6
clean-dirty	5.14	1.57	7.10	8	4.41	1.70	2.35	16	4.58	1.54	3.71	11
intelligent-unintelligent	4.66	1.65	3.89	15	3.92	1.52	-0.54	22.5	4.18	1.50	1.16	22
strong-weak	4.75	1.66	4.40	13	4.53	1.77	2.94	13	3.84	1.89	-0.81	23
good-bad	5.10	1.36	7.93	6	4.55	1.58	3.43	9	4.68	1.43	4.63	7
lazy-industrious	3.32	1.79	-3.71	16	4.22	1.66	1.29	20	4.31	1.38	2.22	19
dependent-independent	4.31	2.13	1.43	22	3.93	1.84	-0.39	25	4.39	1.89	2.01	20
large-small	3.90	1.28	-0.80	24	4.08	1.07	0.77	21	4.08	1.23	0.66	24
masculine-feminine	5.84	1.16	15.52	1	4.69	2.09	3.22	11	3.53	1.93	-2.38	18
sickly-healthy	3.55	1.65	-2.65	19	3.92	1.50	-0.54	22.5	4.42	1.57	2.59	17
important-unimportant	4.85	1.75	4.79	11	4.70	1.43	4.78	6	4.64	1.56	3.98	10
conforming-nonconforming	4.74	1.65	4.39	14	4.90	1.75	5.02	5	5.12	1.64	6.71	3
fast-slow	3.56	1.34	-3.19	18	4.53	1.63	3.20	12	3.36	1.31	-4.77	5
sad-happy	2.84	1.56	-7.27	7	3.57	1.83	-2.28	17	3.44	1.67	-3.30	15
foolish-wise	3.72	1.82	-1.52	21	3.15	1.62	-5.18	3	3.34	1.61	-4.00	9
honest-dishonest	4.96	1.45	6.47	9	4.25	1.51	1.62	18	4.05	1.56	0.33	25
handsome-ugly	4.14	1.39	0.96	23	3.94	1.35	-0.45	24	4.22	1.23	1.75	21
soft-hard	3.76	1.34	-1.76	20	3.46	1.41	-3.72	8	4.51	1.42	3.52	13
friendly-unfriendly	3.06	1.49	-6.15	10	2.77	1.57	-7.66	2	3.05	1.68	-5.52	4
passive-active	4.58	1.65	3.46	17	4.51	1.74	2.82	14	4.80	1.79	4.38	8
aggressive-timid	2.64	1.48	-9.03	3	3.13	1.69	-5.04	4	2.46	1.49	-10.16	1
kind-unkind	3.92	1.30	-0.63	25	3.42	1.44	-3.92	7	3.52	1.38	-3.39	14

TABLE 3
 ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX
 Baguio Sample

Variable	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX
Sex	-.16	-.09	.11	.17	.17	.02	-.24	-.07	.26
Attitude Scales									
Male Homosexual	-.16	.10	-.02	-.31	-.25	-.19	.08	-.10	-.19
Lesbian	-.05	-.06	-.01	-.10	-.01	-.18	.30	-.15	-.35
Call Girl	-.16	-.01	.18	-.31	-.09	.02	.30	-.25	-.03
Pro-Homosexual	.01	.00	.23	-.03	-.05	.17	-.03	-.03	.07
<u>Semantic Differential Scales</u>									
<u>Reaction to Call Girls</u>									
moral-immoral	.07	-.03	-.16	.58	.00	.14	-.22	-.05	.02
submissive-dominant	.05	-.08	-.03	-.00	-.06	-.48	.00	.03	.06
young-old	.03	-.08	-.07	-.13	.01	-.11	-.15	-.15	-.46
clean-dirty	.18	.03	.00	.55	.14	.15	-.24	-.15	-.11
strong-weak	.02	.07	-.11	.16	.17	-.11	-.25	-.25	-.10
good-bad	.14	.08	.02	.39	-.04	.22	-.46	-.25	-.07
large-small	-.05	-.06	-.02	-.01	.16	.04	.15	-.51	.04
masculine-feminine	-.15	-.05	.14	.30	.15	.17	-.14	.20	.05
fast-slow	.16	-.13	-.00	.07	-.02	-.08	-.18	-.49	-.21
sad-happy	-.25	-.07	.36	-.10	.15	.01	-.08	.16	-.20
foolish-wise	.06	-.05	.55	-.15	-.07	.01	.05	.22	-.04
soft-hard	.10	-.07	.07	.08	.01	-.02	-.61	-.05	-.01
friendly-unfriendly	.04	.09	-.24	.02	-.05	.09	-.26	-.47	.06
passive-active	.07	-.34	.17	.04	.01	.04	-.01	.32	.05
aggressive-timid	-.06	-.09	.05	-.35	.05	.01	-.00	-.13	-.11

Table 3 (continued)

Variable	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	
<u>Reaction to Male Homosexuals</u>										
moral-immoral	.35	.02	.22	.53	.17	-.09	-.12	-.16	.10	
submissive-dominant	.00	.06	.11	-.04	-.17	-.46	-.11	.17	-.22	
young-old	.11	-.01	-.00	.00	.51	.05	.01	-.02	-.05	
clean-dirty	.62	-.03	-.08	.22	.38	-.12	-.14	-.05	.17	
strong-weak	.02	.09	-.11	.06	.46	-.07	-.12	-.06	-.28	
good-bad	.51	-.16	-.05	.23	.38	-.08	-.17	-.03	.06	
large-small	.17	.09	-.03	-.16	.26	-.32	.05	-.10	.00	
masculine-feminine	-.38	-.07	.10	.08	.03	-.17	.02	-.14	-.10	
fast-slow	-.08	.16	-.16	.20	.23	-.15	-.15	.03	-.26	
sad-happy	-.29	.01	.57	.17	-.11	-.07	.07	-.14	-.00	
foolish-wise	-.15	.07	.44	-.39	-.11	.25	.03	.01	-.02	
soft-hard	.26	-.24	-.08	.10	.20	.01	-.41	.17	-.10	
friendly-unfriendly	.48	-.10	-.15	.11	.41	.01	-.01	-.03	-.01	
passive-active	.00	-.29	.27	-.10	.07	-.14	-.18	-.04	.07	
aggressive-timid	-.09	-.17	.12	-.32	.11	.20	-.24	-.17	-.20	
<u>Reaction to Lesbians</u>										
moral-immoral	.32	-.26	.04	.61	-.05	-.01	-.03	-.11	.09	
submissive-dominant	.07	-.03	.02	-.05	.10	-.34	.03	-.10	-.05	
young-old	.01	.10	-.10	-.00	.06	-.03	.11	.15	-.53	
clean-dirty	.63	-.24	-.07	.22	.11	-.12	.01	-.11	-.23	
strong-weak	.59	.12	-.24	.06	.03	.07	.04	-.09	-.17	
good-bad	.64	-.28	-.17	.31	-.00	.02	-.10	-.03	-.07	
large-small	.21	-.22	.04	-.19	.10	.08	.25	.02	-.02	
masculine-feminine	.48	.05	.12	.11	-.06	.00	-.16	.10	.04	
fast-slow	.41	.14	.04	.08	.14	-.11	.02	-.11	-.35	
sad-happy	-.11	.03	.60	.04	-.00	-.14	-.03	.17	.22	
foolish-wise	-.02	.13	.34	-.46	-.22	-.17	-.08	.04	-.07	
soft-hard	.04	-.56	-.16	.13	.02	-.02	-.04	-.04	.01	
friendly-unfriendly	.20	-.21	-.24	.19	.21	.35	-.01	-.08	-.26	
passive-active	-.12	-.46	.23	-.12	-.24	-.06	.04	-.04	.24	
aggressive-timid	.01	.07	.11	-.14	.08	.16	-.09	-.06	-.47	

TABLE 4
 ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX
 U.P. Sample

Variable	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
Sex	.15	.02	-.25	-.13	-.36	-.18	-.09	-.14	-.31	-.00
Attitude Scales										
Male Homosexual	-.15	-.14	-.18	-.31	.19	.15	.01	-.13	.00	-.04
Lesbians	-.18	.07	-.12	-.16	.60	.11	.19	-.00	.13	.07
Call Girl	.00	-.02	-.00	-.07	.73	.04	.12	.03	.03	-.03
Pro-Homosexual	-.13	.28	-.12	-.08	.14	.08	.01	-.10	.06	.03
<u>Semantic Differential Scales</u>										
<u>Reaction to Call Girls</u>										
Moral-Immoral	.26	-.10	.03	-.23	-.68	.06	.02	-.01	.17	.07
submissive-dominant	-.20	-.05	-.00	-.12	.08	-.10	.00	.00	-.20	.50
young-old	-.09	.45	.03	-.04	.01	-.02	.19	.04	-.42	.08
clean-dirty	.10	-.02	.13	-.28	-.56	.03	-.01	.16	.39	.02
strong-weak	.30	-.29	.07	-.33	.01	-.18	-.06	.04	.18	-.36
good-bad	.41	.09	.04	.05	-.28	-.14	-.05	.04	.42	.09
large-small	.08	-.08	.02	-.47	-.18	.03	.01	.04	-.15	.13
masculine-feminine	.07	-.43	-.08	-.10	.08	.21	-.00	-.26	.35	-.27
fast-slow	.13	.11	.05	.06	-.08	-.59	.08	-.09	-.08	.04
sad-happy	-.03	.06	-.10	-.11	.15	-.02	.64	-.05	-.14	.03
foolish-wise	-.37	-.04	.21	-.00	.26	.33	.46	-.13	-.20	-.03
soft-hard	.06	.04	-.10	.07	-.06	-.01	-.01	.00	.08	.61
friendly-unfriendly	.20	.03	-.06	-.11	-.02	-.34	.02	-.18	.08	.44
passive-active	-.14	-.13	-.07	-.42	-.02	.44	.01	-.09	-.03	-.05
aggressive-timid	-.13	.03	.17	.18	.37	-.44	.10	-.05	-.09	-.03

Table 4 (continued)

Variable	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
<u>Reaction to Male Homosexuals</u>										
moral-immoral	.64	.06	.01	-.12	-.32	.09	.02	-.12	-.03	-.17
submissive-dominant	-.01	-.23	-.28	-.16	.04	-.36	.05	.30	-.04	.06
young-old	.10	.30	-.12	-.49	.09	-.08	-.03	.15	.02	.10
clean-dirty	.60	.11	.12	-.25	-.18	-.03	-.14	-.03	-.14	-.08
strong-weak	.10	-.03	.49	-.04	-.00	-.12	-.00	-.17	.04	-.27
good-bad	.69	.04	.07	.07	-.04	-.28	-.00	-.02	-.00	.01
large-small	-.10	.18	.24	-.14	-.08	-.13	-.15	.01	.04	.29
masculine-feminine	-.10	.00	.63	-.05	-.02	.13	-.18	.10	-.20	-.00
fast-slow	.21	.04	.54	.02	-.11	-.11	.04	-.12	.10	.02
sad-happy	-.18	-.05	-.16	.00	.15	-.03	.67	.24	.04	-.08
foolish-wise	-.62	-.06	.00	-.01	-.03	-.05	.23	-.13	-.21	.07
soft-hard	.08	.19	-.57	-.01	-.06	-.34	.04	.23	-.10	-.04
friendly-unfriendly	.17	.19	-.25	-.03	-.22	-.59	-.13	.00	.06	.07
passive-active	-.15	-.13	-.08	-.02	.05	.00	.05	.51	-.00	.08
aggressive-timid	-.12	.09	.11	-.03	.06	-.04	.02	-.65	-.03	.18
<u>Reaction to Lesbians</u>										
moral-immoral	.57	-.14	-.01	-.25	-.25	-.08	.04	-.16	.06	-.04
submissive-dominant	-.18	-.47	.06	-.08	-.10	-.08	.01	.28	.06	.10
young-old	-.02	.28	.16	-.47	.03	-.07	-.09	.10	.16	-.23
clean-dirty	.49	-.01	.06	-.25	-.00	-.34	-.17	.11	-.15	.02
strong-weak	.20	.36	.00	-.13	-.10	-.39	-.24	-.09	.01	-.03
good-bad	.62	-.00	.01	.01	-.11	-.19	-.14	-.13	.04	.16
large-small	.15	.07	.10	-.56	-.08	-.06	.10	-.12	.00	.00
masculine-feminine	.05	.43	-.39	.12	.02	.00	.29	-.06	.00	.12
fast-slow	.12	.56	.04	.07	-.13	-.24	-.01	-.06	.16	.02
sad-happy	-.21	.00	-.00	.06	-.01	.04	.69	-.01	.07	-.01
foolish-wise	-.60	-.19	.22	-.08	-.08	.05	.36	-.11	-.14	-.02
soft-hard	-.08	-.57	.03	.02	-.00	.05	-.07	-.05	.02	.12
friendly-unfriendly	.14	-.02	-.02	-.28	.08	-.46	-.08	.08	.08	.18
passive-active	-.09	-.54	-.06	.11	-.07	.06	.15	.14	.06	-.19
aggressive-timid	-.25	.49	.00	-.14	.03	-.28	-.11	-.24	.00	.08