



Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitude towards Homosexuality among Adults

Mr. Obed Riamei*

Mr. Vijay Kumar**

*PG Student Department of Psychology, Garden City University, Bangalore

**Asst. Professor, Department of Psychology, Garden City University, Bangalore

ABSTRACT

The study intends to analyse aspects of Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitude towards Homosexuality among Adults within 18-35 years of age group from the cities Imphal and Bengaluru. The sample includes 50 Adults (21 Females and 29 Males) under study. The study further divided the sample into two age categories according to Eric Erikson's developmental stages; into Young Adulthood (18-25 years) and Adulthood (26-35 years). The tool used for measuring Motivation to control Prejudiced Reactions was Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions (MCPR) by Bridget Dunton & Russell Fazio, (1997) and Attitude towards Homosexuality by Attitudes toward Homosexuality Scale for Indians (AHSI) by Kanika Ahuja, (2017). Descriptive statistics, Pearson's correlation and independent sample *t*-test was used to study the data. The findings showed there was a significant relationship between Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitude towards Homosexuality. The study further revealed the significant difference between Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions among Young Adults and Adults. In addition, the study revealed the significant difference between Attitude towards Homosexuality Reactions among Young Adults and Adults. On the contrary the study revealed no significant difference between Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitude towards Homosexuality among Males and Females.

Key Words: *Motivation to Control Prejudice Reactions, Attitude towards Homosexuality, Adults, Young Adulthood, Adulthood.*

INTRODUCTION

The concept of prejudice in several contexts has been practiced over the years. In a country like India prejudice is still being practiced and could have a negative impact on the individual and the mentality of the country. India has also been extremely against the idea of Homosexuality, due to recent event of the Supreme Court to struck down the IPC section 377 stirring up several emotions, opinions and ideas towards Homosexuality.

We live in a society full of complexes and difficulties and in this situation, change is the only constant. But how much has Indian society really changed after independence? New research, distributed a week ago in the

Economic and Political Weekly, has a frightening however not totally astonishing response to this inquiry. In an article titled 'Explicit Prejudiced Reactions: Evidence from a New Survey', Coffey, Hathi et. al. show just how much people hold on to certain prejudicial attitudes. Some of the most common Prejudices in India include ethnic, racial, religious. Two that do not fall into these most common categories are social class prejudice and prejudice against persons of different sexual orientation.

Prejudice is derived from the Latin word "prajudicare" which means to judge before. According to Gordon Allport, "Prejudice is an aversive or hostile attitude towards a person, who belongs to a group simply because they belong to the group and is therefore presumed to have objectionable qualities ascribed to that group (Allport, 1954)". In simple words Prejudice may be described as negative attitude or observable behaviour towards a certain socially defined group or members of the group.

The world considers India to be this one major nation with consistency in culture and belief system. What they neglect to acknowledge is that from area to district, there is no similarity. The greatest partition would be between the North of India and the South of India. Be that as it may, there are more divisions, despite the fact that the previously mentioned ones are the primary squares. Another division can likewise be seen as to skin shading; with the north alongside the east, being overwhelmingly populated by individuals with darker skin.

Regardless of what individuals think, India is a supremacist nation. Only as of late there were news reports that some African understudies who were concentrating in India were pounded by alcoholic Indians. Lamentably a portion of the assaults happened in the South. This issue of Prejudice is intensified by the media's fixations on the more attractive skin. Films, TV arrangement, commentators and each announcement are one-sided against the Dravidians.

There are even notices for skin creams that will assist individuals with getting more pleasant skin. One of the commercial even shows how the young lady picks a white cleaned kid over the dull cleaned closest companion and the person answering, "Change to a cream which will make your skin more attractive!" Here in India there, is a basic nature in the prejudice. In a general public where relationships are organized, a darker cleaned man of the hour or lady of the hour will consistently be at the base of the rundown. In any event, with regards to film, the south Indian motion pictures are never picked for a global award in light of the fact that the Indian film control board is in the North. At the same time, it is the south Indian motion pictures which get all the basic national honors.

The LGBT people in India are additionally exploited by people due to prejudice. They are either compelled to shroud themselves or are compelled to ask in the city. It is just in the south where they are treated as people. In Kerala, there was even an open kissing day where gay and lesbians were kissing in the city as a dissent against the north of India's fanaticism.

Homosexuality is sexual attraction or the tendency to direct sexual desire toward another of the same sex. Freud's view on homosexuality came about after explaining bi sexuality as original libido endowment. He believed that humans were born bisexual individuals eventually choose which expression of sexuality is more gratifying, but because of cultural taboos homosexuality is repressed in many people.

Freud stated that 'homosexuality is neither an illness nor anything to be ashamed of, nor should it be a reason to reject a candidate for analysis' (Furman, 1998). The likelihood of suicide attempts is higher in gay males and lesbians, as well as bisexual individuals of both sexes, when compared to their heterosexual counterparts (Steve, 2001).

In September 2018, LGBT individuals in India celebrated after the nation's Supreme Court consistently struck down a provincial period restriction on gay sex. It was a significant minute for LGBT rights that turned around a relic of British abuse as well as requested that LGBT Indians be agreed every one of the insurances of their constitution. This was an invite triumph, yet it doesn't really imply that LGBT individuals in India are completely free or saw as equivalent among their kindred residents—and it underscores how much work stays to be done in the remainder of the world to upset obsolete and oppressive enemy of gay laws. On 6 September 2018, a 5-judge constitutional bench of Supreme Court of India invalidated part of Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code, making homosexuality legal in India.

In spite of the long-term boycott, here and there acknowledgment of gay conduct is profoundly established in Indian culture, referring to as models the positive delineations of same-sex action in the 2,000-year-old Kama Sutra and in the 1,000-year-old sensual figures at the Khajuraho sanctuaries. "Homosexuality started to be disliked when the British Raj restricted gay relations under Section 377 of every 1861" (Ahuja, 2017). However, while Indian culture is happy to acknowledge homosexuality in specific gatherings—particularly among innovative experts in the realm of design or film homosexuality by and large is profoundly slandered, she says. Today, being gay in India can mean being dismissed by family, being excluded by the network and in any event, confronting viciousness. In a little subjective examination, clinicians Apoorva B of Manipal University and Elizabeth Thomas, PhD, of Christ University in Bangalore found that guardians regularly responded to girls' turning out by denying their sexuality or attempting to utilize viciousness to transform them (Journal of Psycho social Research, Vol. 11, No. 2, 2016). Another author also suggests reading "Reinforcing Bridges: A Manual for Counselors to Support Parents of LGBT (Vashisht, 2002)" To manage emotional well-being experts in supporting guardians.

A paper by Besen & Zicklin, 2007 clarifies mentalities towards gays and lesbians, and investigates the unpredictable relationship of strictness, youth, manliness and backing for gay rights. In view of a huge, dependable and broadly agent study (n=1405) from PEW Center did in 2006, we gauge three calculated relapse models foreseeing endorsement for gay marriage, gay appropriation and gays in the military, which encourages us to watch the distinctions. We reason that while strictness and fundamentalism contrarily influence support for every one of the three issues, the relationship fluctuates by age and sex. For the most part, youngsters don't show contrasts in their perspectives on gay marriage, however men, particularly strict, youngsters do show more negative frames of mind than their female partners in help for gay appropriation. At last, men show increasingly uplifting frames of mind towards gays in the military

A Research done by Payne, (2005) proposed that though cliché demeanors might be naturally enacted, the reaction to these generalizations can be controlled. Anything that meddles with self-control may bring about

progressively one-sided conduct. The sense of self quality model guesses that in the wake of applying self-control, resulting self-control execution will endure. Subsequently, consumption of inner self quality may prompt expanded preference. In the 2 examinations, consumption was discovered uniquely to influence people who ordinarily attempt to control their biased reactions. Members who don't typically attempt to control their utilization of generalizations were similarly preferential, paying little mind to their degree of conscience quality. The outcomes have suggestions for preference and stereotyping, just as models of self-control.

There has been interest in the relationship between homosexuality, gender role and suicide risk. The study revealed Steady with desires, cross-sexual orientation job (i.e., character attributes related with the contrary sex) is a one of a kind indicator of self destructive manifestations. Besides, sex job represented a greater amount of the general difference in self-destructive side effects, positive issue direction, peer acknowledgment and backing, than sexual direction. In the wake of representing sex job, sexual direction contributed little to the fluctuation in self-destructive indications, related pathology and critical thinking shortfalls. There was no help for sex job by sexual direction connection impacts. As cited in Fitzpatrick, 2005.

METHODOLOGY

Aim: The aim of the study is to analyse of Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitude towards Homosexuality among Adults.

Objective of the study:

The following objectives were framed for the present study

1. To find the relationship between of Motivation to control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitudes towards Homosexuality among Adults.
2. To find the significance difference in Motivation to control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitudes towards Homosexuality among adults.
3. To find the significance difference in Motivation to control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitudes towards Homosexuality young adults and adults

Hypotheses :

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between Motivation to control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitudes towards Homosexuality among Adults.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference in Motivation to control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitudes towards Homosexuality among Adults.

H₀₃: There is no significant difference in Motivation to control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitudes towards Homosexuality among Young Adult and Adults.

H_{03.1}: There is no significant difference in Motivation to control Prejudiced Reactions

among Young Adults and Adults.

H₀3.2: There is no significant difference in Attitudes towards Homosexuality among Young Adults and Adults

Variables :

Independent variable : Prejudice

Dependent variable : Attitude

- 1) Prejudiced is an unjustified behaviour or attitude towards an individual based on individual's membership of a group.
- 2) Homosexuality is characterized as sentimental fascination, sexual fascination or sexual conduct between individuals from a similar gender.
- 3) Attitude is a set of emotions, beliefs, and behaviors toward a particular object, person, things, or events.
- 4) Reactions is a defense mechanism in which a person unconsciously replaces an unwanted or anxiety-provoking impulse with its opposite, often expressed in an exaggerated.

Sampling:

In the present study, purposive sampling method was used to collect data from 50 members of 18-35 years of age. Both male and female were included in the study from which 21 Female and 29 Males from Bangalore and Imphal. The study further divided the sample into two age categories according to Eric Erikson's developmental stages; to Young Adulthood (18-25years) and Adulthood (26-35years). The consent of the participants was taken by providing consent forms to participate in the current study.

Tools Used:

- Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions (MCPR) by Bridget Dunton & Russell Fazio, 1997 published in 2014. It is a 17 item scale with ranging from - 3(strongly disagree) to +3 (strongly agree) with Cornbach's alpha value is .81. Items 2, 5, 8, 16, and 17 were reversed.
- Attitudes toward Homosexuality Scale for Indians (AHSI) by Kanika Ahuja, 2017. It is a 20-item 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree) to assess attitudes toward homosexuality among heterosexuals with the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula a coefficient of .91 and item-total correlations over .70. Cronbach's alpha was .97. Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16 and 17 were reversed.

RESULT AND INTERPRETATION

Table 1

Mean and Standard Deviation of Attitudes towards Homosexuality and Motivation to control Prejudiced Reactions among Adults

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
MCPR	50	51.04	9.134
ASHI	50	57.92	9.053
Valid N (list wise)	50		

Note: MCPR= Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reaction, ASHI=Attitudes Toward Homosexuality Scale for Indians, N= Sample Size, M=Mean, SD=Standard deviation, df= Degree of Freedom

The table shows the Mean and Standard Deviation of Attitude towards Homosexuality was 57.92 and 9.053 respectively. The Mean and Standard Deviation of Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions was 9.134 and 51.04 respectively. Attitude towards Homosexuality has higher Mean and Standard Deviation than Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions.

Table 2

Correlation analysis was used to find out the relationship between two variables. The correlation coefficient is valued in the field of education as the measure of the relationship between two test scores or the other measures of performance.

Correlation between Attitudes towards Homosexuality and Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions among adults.

		MCPR	ASHI
MCPR	Pearson Correlation	1	.348*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.013
	N	50	50
ASHI	Pearson Correlation	.348*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.013	
	N	50	50

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Note- MCPR=Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reaction, ASHI=Attitude Towards Homosexuality Scale for Indians, N= Sample Size, M=Mean, SD=Standard deviation, df=Degree of Freedom

The table 2 shows the correlation was calculated for the two variables i.e. Attitudes towards Homosexual and Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions. The Pearson correlation results showed the Sig. value was .348* level. The r value is .348*, it was found to have low positive correlation between Motivation to control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitudes towards Homosexuality among Adults. The p value = .013 and it is significant at 0.05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. Ho1: There was no significant relationship between Motivation to control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitudes towards Homosexuality among Adults.

A correlational study conducted by Lemm (2006), explored motivation to respond without Prejudiced Reactions on heterosexuals' expression of explicit and implicit (unconscious) bias against gay men. The results are

interpreted to suggest that implicit and explicit Prejudiced Reactions towards Homosexuality may be reduced through motivation coupled with positive contact experiences. A similar study by Graham (2012), found a correlation between motivation to control Prejudiced Reactions and homo negativity. A study by Ratcliff, Lassiter et.al. (2006) work demonstrated that motivation to respond without Prejudiced Reactions importantly contributes to these divergent attitudes. The same study also revealed that women evince higher internal motivation to respond without than do men and that this difference partially mediates the relationship between gender and attitudes toward gay men.

Table 3

Independent Sample t -test of Attitudes towards Homosexuality and among Gender

Note:

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	SE	t	df	p
ASHI	MALE	28	57.00	7.582	1.433	-.808	48	.423
	FEMALE	22	59.09	10.712	2.284	-.776	36.398	.443

MCPR= Motivation to control Prejudiced Reaction, ASHI=Attitudes Toward Homosexuality Scale for Indians, N=Sample Size, M=Mean, SD=Standard deviation, df=Degree of Freedom

The independent sample *t*-test was conducted to compare the difference of Attitudes towards Homosexuality on gender. The results revealed that there was no significant difference between Attitudes towards Homosexual on gender. The obtained Sig. value was (.423, $p>0.05$). Thus the null hypothesis was accepted. Ho2: There is no significant different in Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitudes towards Homosexuality among Adults.

Table 4

Independent Sample t -test of Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions among Gender

	GENDER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	p
MCPR	MALE	28	49.93	10.736	2.029	-0.97	48	0.337
	FEMALE	22	52.45	6.537	1.394	-1.026	45.475	0.31

Note: MCPR=Motivation to Control Prejudice Reaction, ASHI=Attitudes Toward Homosexuality Scale for Indians, N=Sample Size, M=Mean, SD=Standard deviation, df=Degree of Freedom

Table shows the independent sample *t*-test conducted to compare the difference of Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions on gender. The results revealed that there was no significant difference on Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions on gender. The obtained Sig. value was (0.337, $p>0.05$) Thus the null hypothesis

was accepted. There is no significant difference in Motivation to control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitudes towards Homosexuality among Adults.

Table 5

Independent Sample t-test of Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions among Young Adults and Adults.

AGE	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	p
18-25	31	49.97	10.581	1.900	-1.252	45	0.217
M CPR							
26-35	16	53.56	6.077	1.519	-1.477	44.362	0.147

Note: MCPR=Motivation to Control Prejudice Reaction, ASHI=Attitudes Toward Homosexuality Scale for Indians, N=Sample Size, M=Mean, SD=Standard deviation, df=Degree of Freedom

The table shows the independent sample *t*-test was conducted to compare the difference in Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions on Young Adults and Adults. The results found that there was significant difference between Attitudes towards Homosexual and Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions on gender. The obtained Sig. value was (0.217, $p > 0.05$) thus It was no significant. Young adults were found to better compared to adults in Motivation to Control Prejudice. Therefore there was no significant difference between Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions among Young Adults and Adults.

There are few studies found to on the similar lines, they are as follows. A study (Stewart Hippel et.al., 2009), conducted by to check motivation to control Prejudiced Reactions among adults elderly people rely on stereotypes more, and are more Prejudiced Reactions, than younger people because of deficits in the ability to inhibit information. Additionally a study (Gonsalkorale et.al, 2009) conducted in a community based sample; we found that older White adults demonstrated more racial Prejudiced Reactions on an implicit measure, than did younger adults.

A study (Stewart Hippel et.al., 2009), conducted by to check motivation to control Prejudiced Reactions among adults elderly people rely on stereotypes more, and are more Prejudiced Reactions, than younger people because of deficits in the ability to inhibit information. Additionally a study (Gonsalkorale et.al, 2009) conducted in a community based sample; we found that older White adults demonstrated more racial Prejudiced Reactions on an implicit measure, than did younger adults.

Table 6

Independent Sample t-Test of Attitudes towards Homosexuality among Young Adults and Adults.

AGE	N	Mean	Std Deviation	Std error Mean	t	df	p
ASHI 18-25	31	57.03	7.116	1.278	-0.791	45	0.433
26-35	16	59.31	12.721	3.18	-0.665	19.975	0.513

Note: MCPR=Motivation to Control Prejudice Reaction, ASHI=Attitudes Toward Homosexuality Scale for Indians, N=Sample Size, M=Mean, SD=Standard deviation, df=Degree of Freedom

The independent sample *t*-test was conducted to compare the difference in Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions on Young Adults and Adults. The results found that The results revealed that there was significant difference between Attitudes towards Homosexual and Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions on gender. The obtained Sig. value was (0.433, $p>0.05$) thus It was no significant. Young Adults were found to better compared to Adults in Attitudes towards Homosexuality. Therefore there was no significant difference between Attitudes towards Homosexuality among Young Adults and Adults.

Studies show the difference in Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitude towards Homosexuality among Young Adults and Adults .A similar Cross sectional data on the attitudes of Canadian university students, and their parents, indicate attitudes toward Homosexuality have become increasingly tolerant and accepting over the past 14 years. Various experimental findings and self-attributions indicate the major cause of this change is increased contact with persons known to be Homosexuality. A similar study by Cheng (2012), in which data from three waves of the World Values Survey collected in 1995, 2006, and 2012 were used and the findings show that overall social tolerance has increased, which is mainly due to cohort succession and partly to intro-cohort changes in attitudes.

CONCLUSION

The results interpreted showed there was a significant relationship between of Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitude towards Homosexuality among Adults. Also this study showed there was no significant difference in of Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitude towards Homosexuality between Males and Females among Adults However, the study showed there was a significant difference in of Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions and Attitude towards Homosexuality among Adults.

References

1. Ahuja, K. K. (2017). Development of Attitudes Toward Homosexuality Scale for Indians (AHSI). *Journal of homosexuality*, 64(14), 1978-1992.
2. Allport, G. W., Clark, K., & Pettigrew, T. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*.
3. Besen, Y., & Zicklin, G. (2007). Young men, religion and attitudes towards homosexuality. *Journal of Men, Masculinities and Spirituality*, 1(3), 250.
4. Cheng, Y. H. A., Wu, F. C. F., & Adamczyk, A. (2016). Changing attitudes toward homosexuality in Taiwan, 1995–2012. *Chinese Sociological Review*, 48(4), 317- 345
5. Dragovic, B., Greaves, K., Vashisht, A., Straughair, G., Sabin, C., & Smith, N. A. (2002).
6. Fazio, R. H., & Hilden, L. E. (2001). Emotional reactions to a seemingly prejudiced response: The role of automatically activated racial attitudes and motivation to control prejudiced reactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(5), 538-549.
7. Fitzpatrick, K. K., Euton, S. J., Jones, J. N., & Schmidt, N. B. (2005). Gender role, sexual orientation and suicide risk. *Journal of affective disorders*, 87(1), 35-42. Furman, R. A. (1998). Freud's Views on Homosexuality. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 46(2), 645-648.
8. Furman, R. A. (1998). Freud's Views on Homosexuality. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 46(2), 645-648

9. Gabriel, U., Banse, R., & Hug, F. (2007). Predicting private and public helping behavior by implicit attitudes and the motivation to control prejudiced reactions. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 46(2), 365-382.
10. Glaser, J., & Knowles, E. D. (2008). Implicit motivation to control prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(1), 164-172.
11. Gonsalkorale, K., Sherman, J. W., & Klauer, K. C. (2009). Aging and prejudice: Diminished regulation of automatic race bias among older adults. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(2), 410-414.
12. Graham, c. C. (2012). Teachers' explicit and implicit attitude toward homosexuality: the role of internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice.
13. Hausmann, L. R., & Ryan, C. S. (2004). Effects of external and internal motivation to control prejudice on implicit prejudice: The mediating role of efforts to control prejudiced responses. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 26(2-3), 215-225.
14. Payne, B. K. (2005). Conceptualizing control in social cognition: How executive functioning modulates the expression of automatic stereotyping. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 89(4), 488.
15. Ratcliff, J. J., Lassiter, G. D., Markman, K. D., & Snyder, C. J. (2006). Gender differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians: The role of motivation to respond without prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(10), 1325-1338.
16. Russell, S. T., & Fish, J. N. (2016). Mental health in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) youth. *Annual review of clinical psychology*, 12, 465-487.
17. Stewart, B. D., von Hippel, W., & Radvansky, G. A. (2009). Age, race, and implicit prejudice: Using process dissociation to separate the underlying components. *Psychological Science*, 20(2), 164-168.

