The Influence of Declining Homophobia on Men's Gender in the United States:

An Argument for the Study of Homohysteria

Generations of scholars have examined the variety of correlates of attitudes and behaviors of heterosexual men toward gay men. There has also been substantial exploration of the impact of homophobia on gay men and its gendering of heterosexual men. However, less research exists into the effects of the liberalization of sexual attitudes on these groups. In this forum, we call for scholarly engagement with a relatively new arena of masculinities studies: the impact of decreasing homophobia on socially acceptable gendered behaviors among heterosexual males in the U.S. We offer *homohysteria* as a concept to examine the impact of heterosexual male's fear of being thought gay; suggesting that homohysteria is an effective heurism for investigating micro- and macro-level processes relating homophobia to masculinity. Our thesis is that as homohysteria declines, heterosexual males are able to engage in homosocial relationships characterized by a number of positive traits, including: the social inclusion of gay male peers; the embrace of once-feminized artifacts; increased emotional intimacy; increased physical tactility; the erosion of the one-time rule of homosexuality; and a rejection of violence. We focus solely upon heterosexual males and their attitudes toward gay males because these are the demographics of the participants in the empirical research in this area. We then highlight eight key areas where further research could both develop homohysteria as a concept and enhance understanding of social life.

Keywords: gender; heterosexuality; homohysteria; homophobia; masculinities; theory

Introduction

In this paper, we argue that there has been a recent social trend of decreasing homophobia in the U.S. (Baunach 2012; Keleher and Smith 2012) and that this has had a significant impact upon the gendered behaviors of heterosexual males (Adams 2011; Anderson 2009). Whereas homophobia had traditionally restricted heterosexual males' gendered behaviors (McCreary 1994; Whitley 2001), they are now able to engage in once-stigmatized behaviors as attitudes toward homosexuality improve (Anderson 2008a; Gottzén and Kremer-Sadlik 2012). These changes make salient the need for gender scholars to find new ways of theorizing the intersection of masculinities, homophobia and gendered behaviors, as existing theory is insufficient for the task (see McCormack 2012). Accordingly, in this forum, we use the concept *homohysteria* to detail a new way of conceptualizing the power dynamics between homophobia, men's homosociality and the construction of masculinity, in a context of decreasing societal homophobia.

Unlike existing theoretical frameworks (e.g. Connell and Meserschmidt 2005), homohysteria explicates an understanding of the intersection of masculinity and homophobia that is historically situated, contextually nuanced, and able to both document and explain social change. It thus enables a more sophisticated understanding of the stratification of power and privilege between U.S. men. After demonstrating the power of homohysteria to understand social change in the U.S., we call for further research into the utility of the concept for understanding a number of other demographics and cultural contexts. All empirical studies cited are based on U.S. samples unless otherwise noted, and we restrict our focus to heterosexual men and their attitudes toward gay men as these are the groups researched in the empirical literature.

Defining Homophobia

Academics have studied the nature and effects of prejudice and discrimination against sexual minorities in the U.S. for several decades (Meyer 2003; Page and Shapiro 1992; Ryan and Rivers 2003). This has been conceptualized as homophobia (Adam 1998), and was first used to understand prejudice against sexual minorities in the late 1960s (Weinberg 1972). Herek (2004) argued that the term helped change the framing of anti-gay prejudice by "locating the 'problem' of homosexuality not in homosexual people, but in heterosexuals who were intolerant of gay men and lesbians" (p. 8). While it has been critiqued for its psychological implications (Bryant and Vidal-Ortiz 2008), alternative terminology also encounters definitional problems. *Anti-gay* can be deemed to exclude other sexual minorities, and *anti-homosexual* bias relies on the medicalized term homosexual (Plummer 1999). While *prejudice* and *stigma* account for attitudinal components, they do not incorporate behavioral ones (Rivers 2011). *Homonegativity* avoids the psychological implications, but there is definitional uncertainty and slippage in the accuracy of its usage (Lottes and Grollman 2010). Similarly, when *heterosexism* is used to understand behaviors that denigrate homosexuality (Herek 2004), the power to understand the implicit privileging of heterosexuality is weakened (McCormack 2012). Accordingly, and in line with orthodoxy, we continue to use *homophobia*, recognizing its limitations but also its sociological utility.

One of the key benefits of the term *homophobia* is that it refers to both attitudes and behaviors (Plummer 1999). Given that public attitudes play a key role in determining legislation, homophobia has historically been enshrined in U.S. public policy (Burstein 1998). Yet researching these attitudes is complex, as they can pertain to: sexual acts (Keleher and Smith 2012); individuals and sexual identities (Seidman 2002); personal morality (Loftus 2001); and civil rights (Avery et al. 2007). There also exists variance in attitudes pertaining to gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender identities (Worthen 2013), and it is thus important to

examine attitudes toward these groups individually, as well as investigating their intersectionality with other modes of oppression (Crenshaw 1991).

Levels of attitudinal homophobia also depend on socio-demographic factors, including ethnicity, gender and religiosity (Negy and Eisenman 2005; Kohut 2013; Worthen 2012). Negy and Eisenman (2005), for example, document that religiosity and African-American ethnicity are indicators of higher levels of homophobia; that both African-Americans' higher levels of religiosity and distinct ethnic sub-cultures are likely to influence attitudes toward homosexuality. A significant gender gap in attitudes toward homosexuality also exists, with women regularly reporting more positive attitudes toward homosexuality than men (Hinrichs and Rosenberg 2002; Worthen 2012). These studies examined people's attitudes toward homosexuality without discussing whether the attitudes refer to gay males or lesbians, but given that attitudes toward gay males and lesbians are strongly correlated (Herek 2000), these findings will be applicable to attitudes about male homosexuality—the focus of our argument.

Wright, Adams and Bernat (1999) contend that the behavioral component of homophobia is particularly important. This is because homophobic behaviors include social marginalization, homophobic language and physical abuse (Ryan and Rivers 2003) that have palpable effects on gay people (Russell and Joyner 2001). Homophobic behaviors can also be covert—Plummer (1999) defined *implicit homophobia* as when "antihomosexual connotations are not articulated but their connotations are understood" (p. 134).

A significant amount of the research on homophobia has examined gay males and lesbians together. This research has focused on: 1) the prevalence of homophobic attitudes and behaviors among individuals and within institutions (e.g. Herek 1988); 2) its negative impact on sexual minorities (e.g. Russell and Joyner 2001); 3) the mechanisms by which it is reproduced (e.g. Rich 1980; Stein 2005); and, to a lesser extent, 4) the impact on

heterosexuals (Floyd 2000; Griffin 1998). Given that that attitudes toward gay males and lesbians are highly correlated for both heterosexual men and women (Herek 2000), and that heterosexual males traditionally have more negative views than heterosexual females toward male homosexuality (Herek 1988), these findings are relevant to our thesis on heterosexual males' homophobia toward homosexual males.

Research examining the impact of homophobia specifically on heterosexual males concentrates on the ways in which homophobia regulates men's behaviors that are typically associated with masculinity (Whitley 2001) and contributes to the reproduction of a gender binary where gender is restricted to two distinct groups—males and females (Britton 1990). This body of research finds that men desiring to be perceived as heterosexual are required to avoid association with behaviors, symbols or organizations that would socially code them as homosexual (Anderson 2008a; McCreary 1994). Thus, gender normativity becomes a requisite of heterosexuality. Highlighting the social construction of homophobia, both homophobic behaviors and attitudes, implicit and explicit, need to be understood within the sexual and gender context of the broader culture.

Regulating Sexuality and Gender

Some scholars have argued that homophobia is a reaction formation against the presence of same-gender sexual desire in the individual (Adams, Wright and Lohr 1996). Sociological research is ambivalent about this argument (see MacInnis and Hodson 2012), stressing instead the social and political rationales for homophobia and its use in regulating sexuality (Herek 2004; Rubin 2012; Weeks 1990). For example, homophobic attitudes increased during the HIV/AIDS crisis of the 1980s, where HIV/AIDS was seen as a disease of gay men and male same-gender sex was perceived as life-threatening (Halkitis 2000). Similarly, Ward

(2008) suggests that heterosexuals deploy homophobia as an othering process to construct their own sexual identities.

Anderson (2008a) describes one of these othering mechanisms by which male heterosexual identities are reproduced through homophobic actions. Drawing on Harris's (1964) one drop theory of race, in which a dominant White culture viewed anyone with any portion of genetic African ancestry as Black, Anderson (2008a) argues that *any* same-gender sexual experience is also equated with a stigmatized homosexual orientation for males. Calling this the "one-time rule of homosexuality" (p. 105), homophobia serves as a cultural mechanism that conflates sexual orientation, sexual desire, sexual identity and the social construction of sexual acts into a binary typology of gay and straight.

The reproduction of homophobia in U.S. culture is also intertwined with the construction of gender identities (McCreary 1994). This is because of the cultural conflation of gender and sexuality, where gender a-typicality is taken as evidence of same-gender sexual desire (Schwartz and Rutter 1990). Thus, gender non-conformity is interpreted as evidence of homosexuality and punished accordingly, and gender non-conforming sexual minorities are particularly victimized (Gordon and Meyer 2007; Schope and Eliason 2003). In this context, homophobia is a powerful policing agent of gender, as individuals regulate their own and others' behaviors to retain heterosexual privilege (Thorne and Luria 1986). Homophobia has therefore been equated with masculinity for U.S. males (Kimmel 1994).

Homophobia regulates masculinities effectively because heterosexual and closeted males go to great lengths to avoid being socially perceived as homosexual (Anderson 2009; McCreary 1994). Male peer group culture is particularly salient in establishing hierarchies of masculinities, and the policing of males' behaviors by other men is central to maintaining a heteromasculine identity (Bird 1996). This includes marginalizing other boys through discursive regulation, homophobic jokes and physical bullying (Thorne and Luria 1986). In

order to demonstrate one's heteromasculinity, males distance themselves from artifacts and behaviors socially coded as feminine or/thus homosexual (Pronger 1990). Consequently, when heterosexual boys and men fear the stigma of homosexuality, they normally conceal both emotional and physical expressions of homosocial intimacy (Pollack 1999).

In addition to avoiding behaviors that can be socially coded as gay, fear of being perceived unmasculine results in many men avoiding both working and playing in feminized terrains (McGuffey and Rich 1999; Williams 1995). The motivations for these behaviors are not out of appreciation or respect of the dominant form of masculinity, but instead through fear of being the subject of homophobic abuse; something Plummer (1999, p. 150) calls "homophobia phobia."

Decreasing Homophobia

A key social trend over the past 30 years is the increasingly positive attitudes toward homosexuality (Baunach 2012; Keleher and Smith 2012). Although levels of homophobia are never uniform, attitudinal homophobia peaked in 1987 (Loftus 2001; Yang 1997), and this was followed by a sustained period in which attitudes toward homosexuality improved. General Social Survey (GSS) data show the proportion of the population condemning homosexuality has declined steadily, and Keleher and Smith (2012, p. 1232) demonstrate that "willingness to accept lesbians and gays has grown enormously since 1990," arguing that "we are witnessing a sweeping change in attitudes toward lesbians and gay men" (p. 1324). GSS data does not differentiate between attitudes toward gays and lesbians, but given the strong correlation between attitudes toward gays and lesbians (Herek 2000), these findings hold for men's attitudes about gay men.

Data from other sources also provide evidence of this shift. For example, a survey of over 200,000 undergraduates finds that 65% of U.S. freshman support same-gender marriage

(Pryor et al. 2011). Most recently, an ABC News/Washington Post opinion poll (Langer 2013) shows support for equal marriage across the U.S. is now at 58%; a shift of 26 percentage points since 2004. Recent PEW (2013, p. 3) research also finds that 70% of "millennials" (those born after 1980) support same-gender marriage in the U.S., and 74% of them believe that "homosexuality should be accepted by society."

While more progressive attitudes toward homosexuality are partly due to generational replacement (Loftus 2001), a statistical analysis of GSS data demonstrates that all age cohorts became more tolerant and at the same rate during this period (Keleher and Smith 2012). While it is possible that survey research reflects social desirability, this would also be evidence of a macro-level shift in relation to attitudes toward homosexuality.

Evidence for the impact of decreasing homophobia is present in qualitative research, too; showing positive effects on the lives of sexual minorities (Cohler and Hammack 2007; Savin-Williams 2005). This includes better representation of gay people in the media (Netzley 2010), an improving environment for gay students in schools and universities (Robinson and Espelage 2011), and more positive experiences for gay males within sports compared to a decade ago (Anderson 2011a). Highlighting the speed of change among youth, Savin-Williams (2005) argues that many gay youth are no longer defined by their sexuality, rejecting a victimhood framework of sexual minority development (see also Cohler and Hammack 2007; Russell 2005).

Weeks (2007) provides an overview of this improved social, political and legal context for gays in the U.S. and the U.K., arguing that:

The momentum is positive, and largely due to one essential feature of this new world: grass-roots agency is central to the direction we are moving in. Increasingly the contemporary world is a world we are making for ourselves, part of the long process of the democratisation of everyday life (p. x).

In the U.S., a 2003 Supreme Court of the United States decision (539 U. S. 558 2003) found unconstitutional the few remaining states with sodomy laws on their books and since then numerous local, state and national measures have been introduced to promote civil and legal equality for sexual minorities, including fifteen states that recognize gay marriage at the time of writing. In 2013, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that Section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act was unconstitutional (570 U. S. 1 2013).

The development of positive attitudes toward gay males is influenced by a range of factors: positive attitudes are correlated to contact with gay people (Basow and Johnson 2000; Smith, Axelton and Saucier 2009), early childhood experiences that normalize homosexuality (Stotzer 2009), the existence of 'ally groups' within a community (Szalacha 2003), and the role of the Internet and improving media conditions (Gray 2009). While some of these studies refer to lesbians and bisexuals as well as gay men, there is no evidence that these factors differ between groups. It is also important to stress that decreasing homophobia is an uneven social process. The visibility of gay people is, for example, still restricted in professional sports, among senior politicians, within organized religions, and among elementary and high school teachers (Anderson 2011a). Notwithstanding this variance, considerable evidence documents a markedly improved environment for gay males (Adams 2011; Robinson and Espelage 2011; Savin-Williams 2005).

Changing Levels of Homophobia and its Relationship to Men's Masculinities
In the following sections, we focus on the intersections of homophobia with heterosexual masculinity and the recent developments in conceptualizing men's masculinities in periods of low homophobia. Using data from both the U.S. and the U.K., Anderson (2009) developed the concept *homohysteria* to explain the power dynamics of changing homophobia on the masculinities of heterosexual men. Theorizing the inter-relations between homosociality,

masculinity and homophobia, Anderson adopted earlier scholarship that demonstrated that high levels of cultural homophobia influence individuals to distance themselves from social suspicion of homosexuality through the avoidance of gender a-typical behaviors (Floyd 2000; Ibson 2002). He augmented this by situating this scholarship within specific social and historical conditions, arguing that homophobia only operates this way in *homohysteric* settings. In other words, homophobia does not necessarily influence males' gendered behaviors, it only does so when specific cultural conditions are met. Homohysteria thus adds a historical analysis to the existing theorizing of the influence of homophobia on male's behaviors and attitudes.

According to Anderson (2009), there are three social conditions that must be met for a homohysteric culture to exist: 1) widespread awareness that male homosexuality exists as an immutable sexual orientation within a significant portion of a culture's population; 2) high levels of homophobia in that culture; and 3) an association of gender a-typicality with homosexuality. These varying levels help explain various social trends concerning masculinities, including: improving attitudes toward homosexuality among heterosexual men (Adams 2011); the changing cultural experiences of gay men (Anderson 2011a); and the various meanings of discourse related to sexualities (McCormack 2011).

When U.S. attitudes toward homosexuality began to improve in the early 1990s (Loftus 2001), some scholars argued that changes in the gendered behaviors of males did not significantly influence the social organization of men within broader society and the stratifications of male power. Demetriou (2001) argued that styles of gay masculinities were appropriated by heterosexual men with little effect on broader gender hierarchies—citing that this visibility existed alongside continued inequality and oppression (see Walters 2001).

However, recent and profound changes in masculinities in the U.S. (Anderson 2014; Gottzen and Kremer-Sadlik 2012), as well as similar findings in the U.K. (McCormack 2012;

Roberts 2013), discredit these arguments, showing them to be based on a theoretical understanding of masculinities that did not fully appreciate the complexity of the ways homophobia regulates men's gendered behaviors—in particular the link between homophobia, masculinities, homosociality and the fear of being socially perceived as gay. Indeed, homohysteria was developed as the central concept of Anderson's (2009) inclusive masculinity theory—a theory which situates the research on men and masculinities from the 1980s and 1990s within its specific historical and cultural context.

In the following section, we develop Anderson's (2009) historical understanding of masculinities in the U.S. since the second industrial revolution. By shifting focus to homohysteria, we are able to draw out the significance homohysteria has as a sociological concept.

A Brief History of Homohysteria and Masculinities in the U.S.

Anderson (2009) argued that homohysteria is a product of modernity, and that the conditions for a culture to be homohysteric are the result of the discourses of gender and sexuality that emerged from the second industrial revolution (see Cancian 1987). Recognizing that contemporary taxonomies of sexual identity are the result of specific historical, social and intellectual circumstances (Greenberg 1988), Anderson (2009) emphasized the importance of the modern gay identity to notions of homohysteria.

Prior to urbanization, the majority of the population lived in rural areas and males with same-gender sexual desire were unlikely to encounter others with similar desires (Anderson 2009). However, widespread migration to the cities caused by the second industrial revolution provided a population density that enabled same-gender attracted males to organize socially (Spencer 1995). New forms of labor, alongside long working hours, structured men away from their families (Cancian 1987), influencing Freud's (1905)

theorizing of same-gender sexual desires as a form of gender inversion. Near contemporaneously, Westphal, Ulrichs and Krafft-Ebing sought to classify homosexual acts as belonging to a *type* of person—a gender invert (Spencer 1995).

Anderson (2009) highlighted the significance of political developments in the emergence of sexual identities and their ability to regulate gender, citing the 1895 conviction of Oscar Wilde for "gross indecency" in the U.K. (Cocks 2003, p. 17). So extensive was the media coverage around the trial of Britain's celebrated playwright, it became emblematic of the gay male identity. The case consolidated the conflation of gender a-typicality with same-gender attraction (that is, the male homosexual as effeminate). The case was also a high profile example of legal prosecution of homosexual males, and it is reported that many men fled to France after Wilde's conviction (Norton 1992). Thus, the first wide-scale social recognition and awareness of male same-gender sexuality as a static and relatively immutable sexual identity was accompanied by social and legal oppression of same-gender sexual acts (Foucault 1984; Hall 2013)—crucially, it was only male homosexuality that was criminalized. Ibson (2002) provided evidence that this British phenomenon influenced U.S. men's behaviors.

This stigmatization of same-gender sexual identities was also consolidated through the medicalization of homosexuality (Greenberg 1988). Corresponding with an increasing criminalization of male same-gender sex, the medical profession sought to define these acts within a medico-juridical framework (Hamowy 1977), and male homosexuals were considered mentally ill or morally depraved (Greenberg 1988). While male sub-cultures organized around same-gender desires existed in the early 20th Century (Beisel 1998), threat of social and legal censure kept these cultures mostly underground, and the general population was unaware that such cultures existed (Greenberg 1988).

While homophobia was extensive at the time, it was not readily used to police the social interactions of heterosexual males. Men in the latter decades of the 19th century and early part of the 20th wrote florid letters of affection to male friends, and exhibited a great deal of physical intimacy (see Ibson 2002). In other words, these cultures were homophobic, but not homohysteric.

Anderson (2011b) argued that a key development in the emergence of homohysteria in U.S. culture was the publication of Kinsey's (1948) study of males' sexual practice. Occurring during the dawn of the political context of McCarthyism, Kinsey presented homosexuality as a "normal" variation of human sexuality (Weeks 1985), claiming that 10% of the population was homosexual. It was in this period that men began to distance themselves from each other physically and emotionally (Ibson 2002). Partially because Kinsey's research raised awareness of the existence of homosexuality in the U.S., sexual minorities were purged from public office and homosexual men were labeled "sex deviates" (Johnson 2004, p. 147). While this "Lavender Scare" (Johnson 2004, p. 1) could be conceived as evidence of a homohysteric culture, we do not classify it as such because homosexuality was effectively erased. The oppression of male homosexuality was near-total: it was culturally stigmatized, classified as a mental illness, and criminalized with harsh sentencing (Johnson 2004). Thus, most same-gender attracted males remained silent about their desires.

However, the sexual conservatism of the 1950s was contested by increasingly liberal attitudes toward sexuality in the 1960s and 1970s (Spencer 1995). While this liberalization incorporated a range of ideas (e.g. attitudes to casual sex), it was particularly evident for attitudes toward male homosexuality. Political activism regarding male homosexuality split into assimilationists that supported a politics of sameness alongside a more revolutionary politics that parodied masculinity and embraced gender a-typicality to contest homophobia

and heterosexual privilege (Shepard 2009). Even though a growing proportion of the heterosexual population was aware of male homosexuality as a static sexual identity and, while societal attitudes were still largely negative, there was little overt oppression even as legal discrimination persisted (Greenberg 1988).

Despite this liberalizing trend, a combination of social factors led to an upsurge in homophobic attitudes in the 1980s in the U.S. First, HIV/AIDS made visible the notion that male homosexuals were present in the population in large numbers (Shilts 1987), giving cultural credibility to Kinsey's figure of 10%. Iconic figures, like Robert Reed (Mr. Brady of the Brady Bunch) and Rock Hudson, dying as a result of AIDS-related illnesses also highlighted that homosexuality existed in men who seemed to embody masculinity and heterosexuality. In this culture, male homosexuality was pathologized as a danger to physical health (Weeks 1991).

Secondly, fundamentalist Christianity grew increasingly concerned with and opposed to homosexuality, calling same-gender sex a sin, and viewing homosexuality as a threat to the nuclear family and a way to increase donations to the church in an age in which church attendance began to decline (Chaves 1989). This corresponded with an increasingly conservative moral outlook more broadly. As Loftus (2001, p. 765) described, "From the 1970s through the mid-1980s, Americans held increasingly traditional religious beliefs, with more people supporting prayer in school, and believing the Bible was the literal word of God."

Finally, Republican politicians adopted the religious right's culture war against homosexuality, realizing that elections could be won through inspiring socially conservative Christians to vote (see Sherkat et al. 2011). These conservative politicians drew on fears of homosexuality and HIV to foster a moral panic about sexuality, social change and so-called

traditional family values (Lugg 1998). While theses trends pertained to homosexuality in both men and women, the main focus was on male homosexuals (Anderson 2009).

It was in this epoch that attitudinal homophobia reached its apex (Anderson 2009). Evidencing this, GSS data from 1987 document 77% of respondents stating that homosexual sex was *always wrong* (compared to 60% in 1970)—and with attitudes toward gay males more negative than toward lesbians (Herek 1988) it can be inferred that the percentage who would say male homosexual sex was *always wrong* would be even higher. Indeed, in a national survey of male youth aged 15-19 in 1988, 89% of participants found gay sex to be "disgusting" (Marsiglio 1993). Following from the emergence of the gay male identity and the conflation of gender and sexuality, these conditions proved to be a perfect storm for homohysteria.

In this homohysteric culture, males distanced themselves socially and attitudinally from homosexuality (Kimmel 1994); instead, aligning their gendered behaviors with idealized and narrow definitions of masculinity. The shift was generally characterized by hyper-masculine behaviors, including: muscularity, symbolic and actualized violence, and emotional stoicism (McCreary 1994).

Males used culturally-endorsed sports to consolidate their masculine standing (Burton-Nelson 1994), and demonstrated masculinity through anger and violence, while denying fear and weakness (Kimmel 1996). They also stopped engaging in homosocial intimacy (Pollack 1999). Evidencing this, Derlega et al. (1989) found undergraduate heterosexual males rated photos of men hugging as significantly more abnormal than photos of men standing alongside each other; conversely, they did not rate mixed-gender couples or women hugging as abnormal.

However, while HIV/AIDS led to the hysteria of the 1980s, it also served as a catalyst for identity politics and more inclusive attitudes. Given the power of social contact in

improving social attitudes (Smith, Axelton and Saucier 2009), the increased numbers of openly gay males that resulted from the visibility of HIV/AIDS began to improve cultural attitudes among heterosexual communities in the early 1990s; a trend which continues today.

The Expansion of Heterosexual Boundaries

As attitudinal homophobia decreases (Keleher and Smith 2012), so does homohysteria (Anderson 2009). This is because heterosexual males are less concerned about being socially perceived as gay in settings where being gay is less stigmatized. We describe such settings as having low levels of homohysteria. Significantly, a growing body of research documents the effects of decreasing homohysteria on heterosexual males gendered behaviors (e.g. Adams 2011; Anderson 2009). While these findings are not applicable to U.S. youth in all contexts (e.g. matters might be different in the 'Bible belt' where more conservative views toward male homosexuality predominate), the erosion of homohysteria has led to a significant expansion of the set of acceptable gendered behaviors for heterosexual males, particularly among middle-class youth (Anderson 2008b). Researchers find adolescent males eschewing the heteromasculinity of the 1980s, and altering once-strong codes of masculinity and heterosexuality (Adams and Anderson 2012; Gottzen and Kremer Sadlik 2012).

Many young heterosexual males are engaging in homosocial relationships characterized by a number of traits. These are: 1) the social inclusion of gay male peers; 2) the embrace of once-feminized artifacts; 3) increased emotional intimacy; 4) increased physical tactility; 5) erosion of the one-time rule of homosexuality; 6) eschewing violence.

1) Social inclusion of gay male peers

In settings of inclusivity, heterosexual men are not afraid to associate with homosexuals: research documents heterosexual males maintaining friendships with gay male peers (e.g. Stotzer 2009). Gay-Straight Alliances are an increasingly common phenomenon in U.S. high

schools (Walls, Kane and Wisneski 2010), and gay males are coming out at younger ages (Riley 2010) and having better experiences when they do (Savin-Williams 2005). Adams and Anderson (2012) provide ethnographic evidence of the support and praise received by a U.S. college athlete who came out as gay to his heterosexual teammates, and both Anderson (2011a) and Michael (2013) find openly gay athletes increasingly accepted on their sporting teams. Dean (2013) also reports heterosexual men attending gay pride marches or gay bars with their gay friends. This indicates that when homohysteria is decreased or even absent, gay males are not ostracized but socially included.

2) Embrace of once-feminized artifacts

The erosion of homophobia has similar effects on the ways in which males embrace artifacts once coded as feminine and thus homosexual. The rise of metrosexuality—defined as the sexual objectification of men (McCormack in press)—in the 1990s corresponded with a decrease in homohysteria. This sees heterosexual appropriation of men's high fashion, including the wearing of clothing accessories and makeup (Berila and Choudhuri 2005; Coad 2008). In an ethnography of a Northeastern university soccer team, Adams (2011) documents adolescent males wearing pink soccer boots, and an Adweek report finds 45% of young heterosexual men engage in body hair removal and 32% have facials (Moses 2013)—behaviors that were once the domain of women now available to heterosexual men (Coad 2008). Gee (2013) argues that the British soccer player David Beckham, who spent several years playing in Los Angeles, presents a model of masculinity that enables men to reconstruct and socially renegotiate their own masculinities to incorporate once-feminized artifacts.

3) Increased emotional intimacy

Whereas Pollack (1999) described heterosexual boys as unable to provide emotional support to each other, a growing body of work documents the ability of heterosexual males to openly value emotional intimacy (e.g. Anderson 2009). Luttrell (2012) documents ethnic minority

boys esteeming love, care and solidarity in their friendships, while Baker and Hotek (2011) demonstrate that heterosexual high school wrestlers frequently provide emotional support to their teammates in caring and intimate ways. Way (2011) also finds young ethnic minority boys esteeming emotional intimacy, and her finding that older boys eschew this can be attributed to the elevated rates of homohysteria in ethnic minority communities in U.S. cities (Negy and Eisenman 2005).

4) Increased physical intimacy

Gentle touch and homosocial intimacy between men is another defining characteristic of heterosexual males in cultures of inclusivity. Anderson (2014) documents the prevalence of hugging and soft touch among U.S. high school students, where heterosexual male youth embrace to provide emotional support and as a sign of friendship. Similarly, Barrett (2013) finds significant levels of bodily touch in friendships between straight and gay men. Adams (2011) also finds heterosexual teammates regularly hugging each other as a greeting in his ethnography of a U.S. soccer team. This is significant because behaviors such as these were once socially categorized as feminine and thus gay, and boys who exhibited these behaviors were socially marginalized (Derlega et al 1989; Floyd 2000).

5) Erosion of the One-Time Rule of Homosexuality

Anderson's (2008a) one-time rule of homosexuality described the prohibition on any same-gender behavior that could be coded as sexual that existed in the U.S. in the 1980s and 1990s—where engaging in such a behavior would result in a heterosexual male being socially perceived as gay. However, the prevalence of this rule has decreased with the result that heterosexual males are able to engage in same-gender sexual acts while still maintaining a heterosexual social identity. For example, Savin-Williams and Vrangalova (2013) discuss the legitimacy afforded to males who occasionally engage in same-gender sexual acts and who identify as 'mostly heterosexual'. Furthermore, Anderson (2008) finds 40% of the

heterosexual male cheerleaders in his study had engaged in some form of sexual practice with another man while still being socially perceived as heterosexual by his peers. Similarly, whereas a male kissing another man on the lips used to be socially interpreted as evidence of same-gender sexual desire, research by Anderson, Ripley and Lick (in press) finds that 10% of heterosexual undergraduate males of the multi-site U.S. study have kissed a straight male friend on the lips and 40% on the cheek. Thus, heterosexual men can publically engage in certain same-gender sexual acts in settings of decreased homohysteria.

6) Eschewing Violence

Heterosexual males are also less likely to fight in a culture of inclusivity. Gottzen and Kremer-Sadlik (2012) show that while maintaining orthodox versions of masculinity in some domestic capacities, the fathers they researched in Los Angeles condemn violence in youth sports or around their children more generally. Anderson (2011c) finds soccer players rejecting the notion that fighting is an effective way to solve problems and thus avoid engaging in violence.

Variation in Homohysteria

It is important to recognize the complexity of homohysteria. We contend that by understanding how the intersections of time, location, and cultural context influence operations of homohysteria, our knowledge regarding the social dynamics of masculinities will be enhanced. It is thus important to recognize that, in relation to homohysteria, there exists: 1) temporal variation within any given culture; 2) variation across cultures; and 3) organizational variance within any given culture.

1.   Temporal variation within any given culture

As highlighted earlier, discourses of gender and sexuality are historically situated, and levels of homohysteria are contingent upon these temporal factors. Homohysteria is not a static

dynamic, and will fluctuate according to attitudes toward homosexuality, awareness of non-heterosexual identities and the fear of homophobia (Plummer 1999). Thus, homohysteria helps to explain why levels of homophobia change over time.

2.   Cross-cultural variance

Homohysteria also serves a useful heurism for explaining why homophobia regulates heterosexual males' behaviors in some countries but not in others. For example, Iran is extremely homophobic—as measured by attitudes and behaviors—but heterosexual males exhibit homosocial tactility without being socially regulated (Afary 2009). In Iran, it is not accepted that homosexuality exists as a sexual identity (Zuhur 2005). For example, in 2007, the then-president, President Ahmadinejad, said to an American audience, "In Iran we don't have homosexuals like in your country" (Anderson 2011b). Instead, male homosexuality is posited as a sexual aberration and a Western phenomenon (Frank, Camp and Boutcher 2010). The homophobia is so extreme that male homosexuality is erased from public discussion (Karimi in press).

Given that the definition of a homohysteric culture requires there to be widespread awareness that homosexuality exists as an immutable sexual orientation within that culture, it is clear that Iran is not homohysteric. Thus, homohysteria explains why homophobia regulates heterosexual males' behaviors in the U.S. while it does not regulate heterosexual males' behaviors in Iran; despite Iran having significantly more negative attitudes toward male homosexuals. While further empirical research would be needed to examine this hypothesis in more detail, homohysteria provides an interesting way to understand international differences in how homophobia regulates heterosexual males' gendered behaviors.

3.   Organizational variance

Homohysteria is also contingent upon the social dynamics of organizations within any macro culture. This recognizes that levels of homophobia vary greatly in the U.S. according to a number of demographic variables. Anderson (2005) demonstrates this in his ethnography of competing co-educational university cheerleading associations. Both of these cultures were aware that homosexuality existed as a sexual orientation, but homophobia was only stigmatized in one. The men of universities belonging to one cheerleading association adhered to orthodox notions of masculinity, while the men of universities belonging to an association which supported gay rights celebrated femininity among men. Males in the inclusive association would dance provocatively and be thrown in the air by women without censure, while the conservative teams perceived these behaviors as indicative of homosexuality and thus inconsistent with masculinity. Accordingly, within the same broader culture, and the same sport, one organizational culture was homohysteric while the other was not.

Homohysteria and Future Research

While this article has provided an exposition of homohysteria, there are several areas where the concept can be developed further. In this section, we posit eight key areas where further research could both develop homohysteria as a concept and use it to enhance understanding of social life.

1. Homohysteria developed as a concept from empirical research on White male youth, so further research is needed to examine for the influence of race on the relation between decreasing homophobia and heterosexual males' gendered behaviors. For example, Dean (2013) finds that White heterosexual males' support for their gay male peers is predicated on the prestige of being tolerant, while Black heterosexual males draw parallels with their experiences of racism. Further research investigating

whether this has effects on the softening of masculinity would be of significant interest. Furthermore, given that race influences manifestations of homophobia (Negy and Eisenman 2005), it is possible it will also affect the operations of homohysteria and that homohysteria may have decreased most among White heterosexual males. Supporting this contention, Way's (2011) examination of emotionality among ethnic minority adolescents finds homohysteric views among older participants.

2. This article has focused on the influence that heterosexual males' attitudes toward homosexual males has on their gendered behaviors. Research investigating the influence of heterosexual women's attitudes would be timely and significant, related to the behaviors of both heterosexual males and females. While qualitative research indicates organizational homohysteria exists for females in particular U.S. contexts (Anderson and Bullingham 2013; Hamilton 2007; Rupp and Taylor 2010), it can be inferred from Basow and Johnson's (2000) research that homohysteria has less impact on females' gendered behaviors. It may be that the different histories of gays and lesbians (Spencer 1995), the centrality of dominance to certain stratifications of masculinity (Floyd 2000), or the role of patriarchy means that women do not fear being homosexualized in the same manner or to the same extent as men. Similarly, given the history of women engaging in homosocial acts more than men, a decline in homohysteria may not be as significant for the gendered lives of heterosexual women.

3. Homohysteria has been useful in explicating how decreasing homophobia has expanded the set of gendered behaviors that heterosexual men can engage in (e.g. Anderson 2009), but another important component to this concept is how decreasing homohysteria affects sexual and gender minorities and their behaviors. McCormack, Anderson and Adams (in press) find that there has been a generational cohort effect in

coming out of bisexual males in the U.S., with younger generations having significantly better experiences than older generations. Similarly, given that Connell's (1992) notion of the very straight gay highlighted the relationship between homohysteria and gay men's gendered behaviors in an Australian context, research is needed to investigate the ways in which decreasing homohysteria influences both gay men's gendered behaviors and those of sexual and gender minorities more generally.

4. While homohysteria conceptualizes the links between homophobia and heterosexual men's gendered behaviors, it does not examine the operations of heterosexism or heteronormativity in a culture. If heterosexism conceptualizes the social and structural privileging of heterosexuality, and heteronormativity refers to the normalization of a particular kind of (e.g. White, able-bodied) heterosexual, the intersection of homohysteria with these issues requires further research. It seems unlikely that homohysteria is independent of these mechanisms of heterosexual privilege, yet further qualitative research is needed to understand these intersections.

5. Considerable quantitative research has documented the decrease in homophobic attitudes (Baunach 2012; Keleher and Smith 2012), yet little quantitative research has thus far investigated the link between homophobia and gendered behaviors (see Thompson et al. 2013). A quantitative measure of homohysteria would be a significant development in understanding the intersection of homophobia and gendered behaviors. In developing this measure, academics would need to consider ways of measuring participants' gendered behaviors alongside their attitudes toward homosexuality. We suggest that using the aforementioned six characteristics of inclusive males would be a good foundation for the development of such a measure.

6. While there has been a sustained period of decreasing homophobia in the U.S., a central question regards how embedded this improvement is and whether a

retrenchment is likely. Homohysteria provides a rationale for changing levels of homophobia in the twentieth century, but it does not examine how deeply held the positive attitudes toward homosexuality are. We identified a range of factors that supported the development of inclusive attitudes (such as contact with gay people and the existence of ally groups), but further research is needed to examine whether there are similar factors that determine how entrenched these views are.

7. The decline of homophobia in the U.S. is also found in other countries, most notably Britain (e.g. McCormack 2012; Weeks 2007). However, it is significant that this trend is occurring at the same time as homophobia is becoming more pronounced in other countries (Kohut 2013; Plummer 2011). Further examination of the simultaneity of these processes to provide a comprehensive theory about shifting homophobias in a global context would be a significant development. We suggest that homohysteria would be one conceptual component of a broader social theory.

8. A greater understanding of homohysteria may have political as well as academic benefits. The modern history of masculinities in the U.S. may have utility for understanding Middle Eastern and African cultures and predicting the mobilization of homophobia against citizens in these countries (Karimi in press). Further research into homohysteria would provide important information for those who seek to promote the rights of sexual minorities in these countries. For this to be done with any confidence, however, more research into homohysteria across a range of geographical and cultural contexts is required. Given the heuristic utility of homohysteria in understanding male cultures in the U.S., we think this is an endeavor worth undertaking.

Conclusion

The thesis of this Feminist Forum is that homohysteria advances our theoretical understanding of the intersection of homophobia and men's gendered power by examining two social trends in the U.S.: decreasing homophobia and changing behaviors of heterosexual males. Our own research has explicated the link between these two phenomena (e.g. Anderson 2009; McCormack 2012), and the concept of homohysteria is gaining traction as a useful heurism among a new generation of masculinities scholars (e.g. Adams 2011; Cleland 2013; Dashper 2012; Gottzen and Kremer-Sadlik 2012; Kian et al. 2011; Roberts 2013). By providing an overarching review of the evidence for decreasing homophobia, and how this relates to changes in men's gendered behaviors, we have clarified the usages and utility of homohysteria and developed its sophistication in relation to temporal, cross-cultural, and organizational factors. By identifying eight areas where further research is needed, we hope to stimulate discussion of the usages of homohysteria to understand levels of homophobia, changes in gendered behaviors and how these intersect.

References

Adam, B. (1998). Theorizing homophobia. *Sexualities*, 1, 387-404. DOI:
10.1177/136346098001004001

Adams, A. (2011). "Josh wears pink cleats": Inclusive masculinity on the soccer
field. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 58, 579-596. DOI:10.1080/00918369.2011.563654

Adams, A., & Anderson, E. (2012). Exploring the relationship between homosexuality and
sport among the teammates of a small, Midwestern Catholic college soccer
team. *Sport, Education and Society*, 17, 347-363.
DOI:10.1080/13573322.2011.608938

Adams, A., Anderson, E. & McCormack, M. (2010). Establishing and challenging
masculinity: The influence of gendered discourses in organized sport. *Journal of
Language and Social Psychology*, *29*, 278-300. DOI: 10.1177/0261927X10368833

Adams, H.E., Wright, L.W., & Lohr, B.A. (1996). Is homophobia associated with
homosexual arousal? *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 105, 440-445. DOI:
10.1037/0021-843X.105.3.440

Afary, J. (2009). *Sexual politics in modern Iran*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, E. (2008a). 'Being masculine is not about who you sleep with...:' Heterosexual
athletes contesting masculinity and the one-time rule of homosexuality. *Sex Roles*, 58,
104-15. DOI: 10.1007/s11199-007-9337-7

Anderson, E. (2008b). Inclusive masculinity in a fraternal setting. *Men and Masculinities*, *10*,
604-620. DOI: 10.1177/1097184X06291907.

Anderson, E. (2009). *Inclusive masculinity: The changing nature of masculinities*. London:
Routledge.

Anderson, E. (2011a). Updating the outcome: Gay athletes, straight teams, and coming out in educationally based sport teams. *Gender & Society*, 25, 250-268. DOI: 10.1177/0891243210396872

Anderson, E. (2011b). The rise and fall of western homohysteria. *Journal of Feminist Scholarship*, *1*, 80-94.

Anderson, E. (2011c). Inclusive masculinities of university soccer players in the American Midwest. *Gender and Education*, *23*, 729-744. DOI:10.1080/09540253.2010.528377

Anderson, E. (2014). *21st Century Jocks*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Anderson, E., Adams, A., & Rivers, I. (2012). "I kiss them because I love them": The emergence of heterosexual men kissing in British institutes of education. *Archives of Sexual Behaviors*. 41, 421-430. DOI: 10.1007/s10508-010-9678-0

Anderson, E., & Bullingham, R. (2013). Openly lesbian team sport athletes in an era of decreasing homohysteria. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*. Advance online publication. DOI: 10.1177/1012690213490520

Anderson, E. & McGuire, R. (2010). Inclusive masculinity theory and the gendered politics of men's rugby. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 19, 249-262. DOI:10.1080/09589236.2010.494341

Anderson, E., Ripley, M., & Lick, D.J. (in press). The prevalence and purpose of American undergraduate men's same-sex kissing. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Avery, A., Chase, J., Johansson, L., Litvak, S., Montero, D., & Wydra, M. (2007). America's changing attitudes toward homosexuality, civil unions, and same-gender marriage: 1977–2004. *Social Work*, 52, 71-79. DOI: 10.1093/sw/52.1.71

Baker, P. L., & Hotek, D. R. (2011). Grappling with gender: Exploring masculinity and gender in the bodies, performances, and emotions of scholastic wrestlers. *Journal of Feminist Scholarship*, *1*, 1-15.

Barrett, T. (2013). Friendships Between Men Across Sexual Orientation: The Importance of (Others) Being Intolerant. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, *21*, 62-77. DOI: 10.3149/jms.2101.62

Basow, S. A., & Johnson, K. (2000). Predictors of homophobia in female college students. *Sex Roles*, *42*, 391-404. DOI: 10.1023/A:1007098221316

Baunach, D.M. (2012). Changing same-sex marriage attitudes in America from 1988 through 2010. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 76, 364-378. DOI: 10.1093/poq/nfs022

Beisel, N.K. (1998). *Imperiled innocents: Anthony Comstock and family reproduction in Victorian America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Berila, B., & Choudhuri, D. (2005). Metrosexuality the middle class way: Exploring race, class and gender in Queer Eye for the Straight Guy. *Genders OnLine Journal*, 42. Retrieved from http://www.genders.org/g42/g42_berila_choudhuri.html

Bird, S.R. (1996). Welcome to the men's club: Homosociality and the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity. *Gender and Society*, 10, 120-132. DOI: 10.1177/089124396010002002

Britton, D. M. (1990). Homophobia and homosociality. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 31, 423-439. DOI: 10.1111/j.1533-8525.1990.tb00337.x

Bryant, K. & Vidal-Ortiz, S. (2008). Introduction to retheorizing homophobias. *Sexualities*, 11, 387-396. DOI:10.1177/1363460708091740

Burstein, P. (1998). Bringing the public back in: Should sociologists consider the impact of public opinion on public policy *Social Forces* 77, 27-62. DOI: 10.1093/sf/77.1.27

Burton-Nelson, B. (1994). *The stronger women get, the more men love football: Sexism and the American culture of sports*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Cancian, F.M. (1990). *Love in America: Gender and self-development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cavalier, E.S. (2011). Men at sport: Gay men's experiences in the sport workplace. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 58, 626-646. DOI:10.1080/00918369.2011.563662

Chaves, M. (1989). Secularization and religious revival: Evidence from US church attendance rates, 1972-1986. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 28, 464-477.

Cleland, J. (2013). Discussing homosexuality on association football fan message boards: A changing cultural context. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*. Advance online publication. DOI: 1012690213475437

Coad, D. (2008). *The metrosexual: Gender, sexuality and sport*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Cocks, H.G. (2003). *Nameless offences: Homosexual desire in the 19th Century*. London: I.B. Taurus.

Cohler, B.J., & Hammack, P.L. (2007). The psychological world of the gay teenager: Social change, narrative, and "normality." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *36*, 47-59. DOI: 10.1007/s10964-006-9110-1

Connell, R.W. (1992). A very straight gay: Masculinity, homosexual experience, and the dynamics of gender. *American Sociological Review*, 57, 735-751. DOI: 10.2307/2096120

Connell, R.W., & Messerschmidt, J. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society*, 19, 829-859. DOI: 10.1177/0891243205278639

Crenshaw, K. (1997). Intersectionality and identity politics: Learning from violence against women of color. In M. Shanley & V. Narayan (Eds.), *Reconstructing political theory: Feminist perspectives*, (pp. 178-193). Cambridge: Polity.

Dashper, K. (2012). 'Dressage is full of queens!' Masculinity, sexuality and Equestrian sport. *Sociology*, 46, 1109-1124. DOI: 10.1177/0038038512437898

Dean, J.J. (2013). Heterosexual masculinities, anti-homophobias, and shifts in hegemonic
masculinity: The Identity Practices of Black and White Heterosexual Men. *The
Sociological Quarterly*, 54, 534-560. DOI: 10.1111/tsq.12036

Demetriou, D.Z. (2001). Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity: A critique. *Theory and
Society*, 30, 337-61. DOI: 10.1023/A:1017596718715

Derlega, V. J., Lewis, R. J., Harrison, S., Winstead, B. A., & Costanza, R. (1989). Gender
differences in the initiation and attribution of tactile intimacy. *Journal of Nonverbal
Behavior*, *13*(2), 83-96. DOI: 10.1007/BF00990792

Floyd , K. (2000). Affectionate same-sex touch: The influence of homophobia on observers'
perceptions. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 140, 774-788.
DOI:10.1080/00224540009600516

Foucault, M. (1984). *The history of sexuality, volume 1: An introduction*. (F. Hurley, Trans.).
New York: Vintage.

Frank, D.J., Camp, B., & Boutcher, S. (2010). Worldwide trends in the criminal regulation of
sex, 1945 to 2005. *American Sociological Review*. 75, 867–893. DOI:
10.1177/0003122410388493

Gee, S. (2013). Bending the codes of masculinity: David Beckham and flexible masculinity
in the new millennium. *Sport in Society*, Advance online publication.
DOI:10.1080/17430437.2013.806034

Gordon, A. R., & Meyer, I. H. (2008). Gender nonconformity as a target of prejudice,
discrimination, and violence against LGB individuals. *Journal of LGBT Health
Research*, *3*(3), 55-71. DOI:10.1080/15574090802093562

Gottzén, L., & Kremer-Sadlik, T. (2012). Fatherhood and youth sports: A balancing act
between care and expectations. *Gender & Society*, *26*, 639-664. DOI:
10.1177/0891243212446370

Gray, M.L. (2009). *Out in the country: Youth, media, and queer visibility in rural America*.
New York: New York University Press.

Greenberg, D.F. (1988). *The construction of homosexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago
Press.

Griffin, P. (1998). *Strong women, deep closets: Lesbians and homophobia in sport*.
Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Halkitis, P.N. (2000). Redefining masculinity in the age of AIDS: Seropositive gay men and
the "buff agenda." In. P. Nardi (Ed.) *Gay masculinities* (pp. 130-151). London: Sage.

Hall, L.A. (2013). *Sex, gender and social change in Britain since 1880*. London: Palgrave
MacMillan.

Hamilton, L. (2007). Trading on heterosexuality college women's gender strategies and
homophobia. *Gender & Society*, *21*, 145-172. DOI: 10.1177/0891243206297604

Hamowy, R. (1977). Preventive medicine and the criminalization of sexual immorality in
nineteenth century America. In R. E. Barnett and J. Hagel (Eds.) *Assessing the
criminal: Restitution, retribution and the legal process*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Harris, M. (1964). *Patterns of race in the Americas*. New York: Walker.

Harris, F. (2010). College men's meanings of masculinities and contextual influences:
Toward a conceptual model. *Journal of College Student Development*, 51, 297-318.
DOI: 10.1353/csd.0.0132

Herek, G.M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes towards lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Sex
Research*, 25, 451-477. DOI:10.1080/00224498809551476

Herek, G.M. (2000). Sexual prejudice and gender: Do heterosexuals' attitudes toward
lesbians and gay men differ. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56, 251-266. DOI:
10.1080/00224498809551476

Herek, G.M (2004). Beyond homophobia: Thinking about sexual prejudice and stigma in the twenty-first century. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*, 1, 6-24. DOI: 10.1525/srsp.2004.1.2.6

Herek, G.M. (2007). Confronting sexual stigma and prejudice: Theory and practice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63, 905-925. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2007.00544.x

Hinrichs, D. & Rosenberg, P. (2002). Attitudes toward gay, lesbian, and bisexual persons among heterosexual liberal arts college students. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43, 61-84. DOI:10.1300/J082v43n01_04

Ibson, J. (2002). *Picturing men: A century of male relationships in everyday life*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Books.

Johnson, D.K. (2004). *The Lavender scare: The Cold War persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Karimi, A. (in press). Iranian homosexuals: Social identity formation and question of femininity. *Culture & Psychology*.

Keleher, A., & Smith, E. (2012). Growing support for gay and lesbian equality since 1990. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 59, 1307-1326. DOI: 10.1080/00918369.2012.720540

Kian, E. M., Clavio, G., Vincent, J., & Shaw, S. D. (2011). Homophobic and sexist yet uncontested: Examining football fan postings on Internet message boards. *Journal of homosexuality*, 58, 680-699. DOI:10.1080/00918369.2011.563672

Kimmel, M.S. (1994). Masculinity as homophobia. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.) *Theorizing masculinities* (pp. 119-141). London: Sage.

Kimmel, M.S. (1996). *Manhood in America: A cultural history*. New York: Free Press.

Kinsey, A.C., Pomeroy, W.B., & Martin, C.E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: WB Saunders Co.

Kohut, A. (2013). *The global divide on homosexuality: Greater acceptance in more secular and affluent countries*. Washington, DC: Pew research center.

Langer, G. (2013). *ABC/Washington Post Poll: Gay Marriage: Poll tracks dramatic rise in support for gay marriage*. Washington, DC: Langer Research Associates.

Lawrence et al. v. Texas, 539 U.S. 558-606 (2003).

Loftus, J. (2001). America's liberalization in attitudes toward homosexuality, 1973-1998. *American Sociological Review*, 66, 762-782. DOI: 10.2307/3088957

Lottes, I.L. & Grollman, E.A. (2010). Conceptualization and assessment of homonegativity. *International Journal of Sexual Health*, 22, 219-233. DOI:10.1080/19317611.2010.489358

Lugg, C.A. (1998). The religious right and public education: The paranoid politics of homophobia. *Educational Policy*, *12*, 267-283. DOI: 10.1177/0895904898012003003

Luttrell, W. (2012). Making boys' careworlds visible. *Thymos: Journal of Boyhood Studies*, *6*, 186-202. DOI: 10.3149/thy.0602.186

MacInnis, C. C., & Hodson, G. (2012). Is homophobia associated with an implicit same-sex attraction?. *Journal of Sex Research*, 50, 777-785. DOI:10.1080/00224499.2012.690111

Marsiglio, W. (1993). Attitudes toward homosexual activity and gays as friends: A national survey of heterosexual 15- to 19-year-old males. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 30, 12-17. DOI:10.1080/00224499309551673

McCormack, M. (2011). Mapping the terrain of homosexually-themed language. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *58*, 664-679. DOI:10.1080/00918369.2011.563665

McCormack, M. (2012). *The declining significance of homophobia: How teenage boys are redefining masculinity and homophobia*. New York: Oxford University Press.

McCormack, M. (2014). The intersections of youth masculinities, decreasing homophobia and class: An ethnography. *British Journal of Sociology*. 65(1).

McCormack, M. (in press). Metrosexual(ity). In P. Whelehan and A. Bolin (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Human Sexuality*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

McCormack, M., Anderson, E. & Adams, A. (in press). Cohort effect on the coming out experiences of bisexual males. Manuscript submitted for publication.

McCreary, D.R. (1994). The male role and avoiding femininity. *Sex Roles*, 31, 517-531. DOI: 10.1007/BF01544277

McGuffey, C. S., & Rich, B. L. (1999). Playing in the gender transgression zone: Race, class, and hegemonic masculinity in middle childhood. *Gender & Society*, *13*, 608-627. DOI: 10.1177/089124399013005003

Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*, 674-697. DOI: 10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.674

Michael, B. (2013). 'Just don't hit on me and I'm fine': Mapping high school wrestlers' relationship to inclusive masculinity and heterosexual recuperation. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, Advance online publication. DOI: 10.1177/1012690213501168

Moses, L. (2013, June 19). Millennial guys are turning to makeup. *Adweek*. Retrieved from http://www.adweek.com/news/advertising-branding/millennial-guys-are-turning-makeup-150313

Negy, C. & Eisenman, R. (2005). A comparison of African American and White college students' affective and attitudinal reactions to Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual individuals. *Journal of Sex Research*, 42, 291-298. DOI:10.1080/00224490509552284

Netzley, S.B. (2010). Visibility that demystifies: Gays, gender, and sex on television. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 57, 949-967. DOI:10.1080/00918369.2010.503505

Norton, R. (1992). *Mother clap's molly house: The gay subculture in England, 1700-1830*. London: GMP Publishers.

Page, B., & Shapiro, R. Y. (1992). *The rational public: Fifty years of opinion trends*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

PEW. (2013). *Growing support for gay marriage: Changed minds and changing demographics*. Washington, D.C.: PEW Research Center.

Plummer, D. (1999). *One of the boys: Masculinity, homophobia and modern manhood*. New York: Harrington Park Press.

Plummer, D. (2011). Masculinity + HIV = risk: exploring the relationship between masculinities, education and HIV in the Caribbean. In J.F. Klot and V-K. Nguyen (Eds.), *The fourth wave: Violence, gender, culture & HIV in the 21st Century* (pp. 139- 156). Paris, France: UNESCO.

Pollack, W. (1999). *Real boys: Rescuing our sons from the myths of boyhood*. New York, NY: MacMillan.

Pryor, J, DeAngelo, L., Blake, L.P., Hurtado, S. & Tran, S. (2011). *The American freshman: National norms fall 2011*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Rich, A. (1980). Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 5, 631-660.

Riley, B.H. (2010). GLB adolescent's "coming out". *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing*, 23, 3-10.DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6171.2009.00210.x

Rivers, I. (2011). *Homophobic bullying: Research and theoretical perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, S. (2013). Boys will be boys...won't they? Change and continuities in contemporary young working-class masculinities. *Sociology*. 47, 671-686. DOI: 10.1177/0038038512453791

Robinson, J. P. & Espelage, D. L. (2011). Inequities in educational and psychological outcomes between LGBTQ and straight students in middle and high school. *Educational Researcher*, 40, 315-330. DOI: 10.3102/0013189X11422112

Rubin, G. (2012). Introduction: Sex, gender and politics. In G. Rubin (Ed.) *Deviations* (pp. 1-32). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Rupp, L. J., & Taylor, V. (2010). Straight girls kissing. *Contexts*, *9*, 28-32. DOI:10.1525/ctx.2010.9.3.28

Russell, S.T. (2005). Beyond risk: Resilience in the lives of sexual minority youth. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education*, *2*(3), 5-18. DOI:10.1300/J367v02n03_02

Russell, S.T., & Joyner, K. (2001). Adolescent sexual orientation and suicide risk: Evidence from a national study. *American Journal of Public Health*, 91, 1276-1281. DOI: 10.2105/AJPH.91.8.1276

Ryan, C., & Rivers, I. (2003). Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth: Victimization and its correlates in the USA and UK. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*,*5*, 103-119. DOI:10.1080/1369105011000012883

Savin-Williams, R.C. (2005). *The new gay teenager*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Savin-Williams, R.C. & Vrangalova, Z. (2013). Mostly heterosexual as a distinct sexual orientation group: A systematic review of the empirical evidence. *Developmental Review*, 33, 58-88. DOI:10.1016/j.dr.2013.01.001

Schope, R. D., & Eliason, M. J. (2003). Sissies and tomboys: Gender role behaviors and homophobia. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, *16*(2), 73-97. DOI:10.1300/J041v16n02_05

Schwartz, P., & Rutter, V. (1998). *The gender of sexuality*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Seidman, S. (2002). *Beyond the closet: The transformation of gay and lesbian life*. London: Routledge.

Shepard, B. (2009). History, narrative and sexual identity: Gay liberation and postwar movements for sexual freedom in the United States. In P.L. Hammack and B.J. Cohler (Eds.). *The story of sexual identity: Narrative perspectives on the gay and lesbian life course* (pp. 23-48). New York: Oxford University Press.

Sherkat, D. E., Powell-Williams, M., Maddox, G., & De Vries, K. M. (2011). Religion, politics, and support for same-sex marriage in the United States, 1988–2008. *Social Science Research*, *40*, 167-180. DOI:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.08.009

Shilts, R. (1987). *And the band played on: People, politics, and the AIDS epidemic*. New York: St. Martins.

Smith, S. J., Axelton, A. M., & Saucier, D. A. (2009). The effects of contact on sexual prejudice: A meta-analysis. *Sex Roles*, *61*, 178-191. DOI: 10.1007/s11199-009-9627-3

Spencer, C. (1995). *Homosexuality in history*. Florida: Harcourt Brace.

Stein, A. (2005). Make room for Daddy: Anxious masculinity and emergent homophobias in neopatriarchal politics. *Gender & Society*, *19*, 601-620. DOI: 10.1177/0891243205277309

Stotzer, R. L. (2009). Straight allies: Supportive attitudes toward lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals in a college sample. *Sex Roles*, 60, 67–80. DOI:10.1007/s11199-008-9508-1

Supreme Court of the United States (2003). Lawrence et al. v. Texas. 539 U. S. 558-606. Downloaded from Supereme.Justia.com.

Supreme Court of the United States (2013). United States v. Windsor. 570 U.S. 1-17. Downloaded from Supreme.Justia.com

Szalacha, L. (2003). Safer sexual diversity climates. *American Journal of Education* 110: 58-88. DOI: 10.1007/s11199-008-9508-1

Thompson, E.M., Sinclair, K.O., Wilchins, R. & Russell, S.T. (2013). It's how you look or what you like: Gender harassment at school and its association with student adjustment. In R. Brooks, M. McCormack & K. Bhopal (eds.) *Contemporary Debates in the Sociology of Education*. (pp. 149-167). London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Thorne, B. & Luria, Z. (1986). Sexuality and gender in children's daily worlds. *Social Problems*, 33, 176-190. DOI: 10.1525/sp.1986.33.3.03a00020

Tremblay, M., Paternotte, D., & Johnson, C. (2011). *The lesbian and gay movement and the state: Comparative insights into a transformed relationship*. London: Ashgate.

United States v. Windsor, 570 U.S. 1-17 (2013).

Walls, N. E., Kane, S. B., & Wisneski, H. (2010). Gay-straight alliances and school experiences of sexual minority youth. *Youth & Society*, *41*, 307-332. DOI: 10.1177/0044118X09334957

Walters, S.D. (2001). *All the rage*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Ward, J. (2008). Dude sex. *Sexualities*, 11, 414-434. DOI: 10.1177/1363460708091742

Way, N. (2012). *Deep secrets*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Weeks, J. (1985). *Sexuality and its discontents*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Weeks, J. (1990). *Coming out: Homosexual politics in Britain from the nineteenth century to the present*. London: Quartet.

Weeks, J. (1991). *Against nature: Essays on history, sexuality and identity*. London: Rivers

Oram Press.

Weeks, J. (2007). *The world we have won*. London: Routledge.

Weinberg, G. (1972). *Society and the healthy homosexual*. New York: St Martin's.

Whitley, B.E. Jr. (2001). Gender role variables and attitudes toward homosexuality. *Sex

Roles*, 45, 691-721. DOI: 10.1023/A:1015640318045

Williams, C. L. (1995). Hidden advantages for men in nursing. *Nursing Administration

Quarterly*, 19(2), 63-70.

Worthen, M.G.F. (2012). Understanding college student attitudes toward LGBT individuals.

Sociological Focus, 45, 285-305. DOI:10.1080/00380237.2012.712857

Worthen, M.G.F. (2013). An argument for separate analyses of attitudes toward lesbian, gay,

bisexual men, bisexual Women, MtF and FtM transgender individuals. *Sex Roles*, 68,

703-723. DOI: 10.1007/s11199-012-0155-1

Wright, L.W., Adams, H.E. & Bernat, J. (1999). Development and validation of the

homophobia scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 21, 337-

347. DOI: 10.1023/A:1022172816258

Yang, A. S. (1997). Trends: Attitudes toward homosexuality. *The Public Opinion

Quarterly*, *61*, 477-507 DOI: 10.1086/297810

Zuhur, S. (2005). Gender, sexuality and the criminal laws in the Middle East and North

Africa: A comparative study. *Women for Women's Human Rights* 1-76.