

Measuring 'Micro-Attitudes' towards 'Homo-Sexual Orientation and Gender Identities' among University Students in Delhi, India

Maheswar Satpathy

Abstract

Attitudes towards 'Homosexuality' or 'Homosexual Orientation' have been studied extensively in western context. But, it has not been studied as intensively as it should be for understanding the deeper level factors which might be playing a role in the causation of these. Anecdotal evidences, and media representations related to grossly negativistic attitude, prejudice and discrimination, and to certain extent violence towards people displaying homosexual orientation in Indian society exist. This is the first reported study in Indian context related to prejudice in university students related to 'Homosexual Orientation' and 'Gender Identity'. It aimed at studying the micro-attitudes among 165 university students (Mean Age = 22 years) in New Delhi, India. A detailed analysis of types of prejudice, their manifestations, and factors responsible for such a presentation is made. Implications of 'Micro-Attitudes' among student population and how it influences social acceptance of LGBTQIA population is also discussed.

Keywords: Micro-attitudes, prejudice, homosexual orientation, homophobia, India


Introduction

"Suddenly, one day I realized that I have grown up. But what up to? I had never aspired to grow like this, never thought of quenching my thirst for like this...this path which has carried me such a distance on its way has taught me so much.... It has added all the colors to my life, filled every pore of my soul with that enigma which is so sacred and so sweet as the sound of silence...Sometimes I feel I am aberrated, but from what? So, this is my only consolation that I am distinct. I am unique, I am sacred".

This is an account of a distinct so called 'Homosexual' person who describes his life as a process of growth and maturity. So, let us analyze this indecisiveness over attraction or repulsion into the flowing stream of impulses, feelings and emotions, and the object of love circumscribed by standard of society, which has somehow got the label of 'Homosexuality'. So also let us give a glance at the attitudes and prejudices surrounding this distinct search for intimacy and spiritual growth.

Whenever and wherever the topic of love is broached, everybody listens. Some laugh, some cry, some shout for joy, and some are cynical. Love does indeed make the world go' round. But here we promise to tell you a different tale of love. The case where love starts somewhere so subtly in the core of one's heart and dies out because of the societal normative standards. The tiny flower of delicate nature withers away with the hard sunrays; the petals grow pale, gradually dry and then become almost lifeless. This is a process in which one learns to act 'Social', instead of maintaining their idiosyncrasies.

Functionally speaking, homosexuality is the disposition to seek feelings of romantic love and to have



sexual relations with persons of one's own sex in preference to the opposite sex. So, it is the sustained erotic preference for the same sex persons in the presence or absence of a free choice of partner with regard to sex. There are several other attributes which may co-determine erotic attraction towards the other. However, as it appears Homosexuality is much beyond sexual attraction, but can be referred to a range of behaviors and attributes of an individual, which pertain to their identity. It is crucial in dealing with homosexuality to make it clear that a great range of behaviors may be labeled homosexual both in terms of the kinds of behavior as well as the relative frequency of such behaviors (Humphreys, 1970).

It is important to note that the degree of homosexual involvement compared to heterosexual involvement is not an all - or - none phenomenon. The behavioral characteristics of effeminacy and transvestism are not necessarily indicative of homosexuality. Placing a person in a category leads to ascribing to him many characteristics which he may not exhibit in his actual behavior. The effects of being placed in the category may lead to the regularities of behavior, but these regularities are the effects of the categorization rather than the causes of homosexual acts.

This is especially pertinent to note that sexual standards change with time and across context. Sexual practices which may be statistically rare are still in the domain of interpersonal behavior, and if they occur between consenting adults in private then are usually not under the purview of law.


According to Freud, the most striking distinction between the erotic life of antiquity and our own no doubt lies in the fact that the ancient laid the stress upon the instinct itself, whereas we emphasize on object of sex. The people of past glorified the instinct and were prepared on its account to honor even an inferior object; while we despise the instinctual activity itself, and find


excuses for it only in the merit of the object (Freud, 1964, Lessler, 1964; Rappaport & Gill, 1959).

Similarly, the secrecy and the value loaded concept of sexuality in the Victorian era has been best described by Marcus (1974): "But the representation in 'My Secret Life' does something which the pornography cannot. It demonstrates how truly, and literally childish such behavior is; it shows us, as nothing else that I know does, the pathos of perversity, how deeply sad, how cheerless, a condemnation it really is. It is more than a condemnation; it is-or was-an imprisonment for life. For if it is bad enough that we are all imprisoned within our own sexuality, how much sadder must it be to be still further confined within this foreshortened, abridged and parodically grotesque version of it."

The concept of secrecy, and a hidden aspect closely intimate with our identities has been made somewhat clearer in the words of Richard Sennet (1977): "Sexuality we imagine defining a large territory of who we are and what we feel...whatever we experience must in some way touch on our sexuality, but sexuality is...we uncover it, we discover it, we come to terms with it, but we do not master it."

The broad understanding of sexuality as private involves other significant dualities, which, while not simple translations of the general division into private and public spheres, do present obvious analogies to it in the minds of those who accept it. Briefly, the sexual sphere is seen as the realm of psychology, while the public sphere is seen as the realm of politics and economics. Marx and Freud are often taken as symbolic of this division. The sexual sphere is considered as the symbolic realm of consumption, the public sphere that of production; the former is sometimes viewed as the site of use value and the latter as that of exchange value. Sexuality is the realm of nature', of the individual, and of biology; the public sphere is the realm of culture, society, and history. Finally, sexuality tends to be identified most closely with the female and the homosexual, while the public sphere is





considered/conceived of as male and heterosexual (Peiss, Simmons & Padgug, 1989).

It is clear that, within certain limits, human beings have no fixed inherited nature. We become humans only in human society. This is true of sexuality in all its forms, from what seems to be the most purely 'Natural' acts of intercourse (Malson, 1972). Sexual reality is variable, and it is so in several senses. The meaning attached to Sexuality changes within individuals, within genders, and within realities of societies, just as it differs from gender to gender, from class to class, and from society to society. (Peiss, Simmons & Padgug, 1989; Dynes & Donaldson, 1992). Even the very meaning and content of sexual arousal varies contextual to these social categories (Davenport, 1977). What Marx suggests for hunger is equally true of the social forms of sexuality : "Hunger is hunger, but the hunger gratified by cooked meat eaten with a knife and fork is a different hunger from that which bolts down raw meat with the aid of hand, nail and tooth" (Marx, 1973).

The forms, content, and context of sexuality always differ. There is no abstract and universal category of the erotic or the sexual universally applicable to all societies. Any view which suggests otherwise is hopelessly mired in one or another form of biologism, and biologism is easily put forth as the basis of normative attitudes towards homosexuality, which if deviated from, may be seen as rendering deviant behavior unhealthy and abnormal. Such views are as unenlightening when dealing with Christian celibacy as when discussing Greek homosexual behavior.

The conversion of acts into personalities, and ultimately into subcultures, cannot be said to be accomplished before at least the 17th century, and as a firm belief and more or less close approximations of reality, the late 19th century. Jeffrey Weeks, in discussing the acts of Henry

VIII of 1533 which first brought sodomy within the preview of statute law, argues that: "The central point was that the law was directed against a series of sexual acts, not a particular type of person. There was no concept of homosexual in law, and homosexuality was regarded not as a particular attribute of a certain type of person but as a potential in all sinful creatures" (Weeks, 1977).


What is prejudice?


Prejudice is basically a social orientation either towards whole groups of people or towards individuals because of their membership in a particular group; prejudice can be both positive as well as negative. The kind of prejudice which besets so many societies in the world today and which so urgently require our understanding is the negative variety: the wary, fearful, suspicious, derogatory, hostile, or ultimately murderous treatment of one group of people by another.

Prejudice may/not be regarded as false or irrational set of beliefs, or faulty generalizations, or is an unwarranted disposition to behave negatively towards another group. So, prejudice will be regarded thus as the holding of derogatory or cognitive beliefs, the expression of negative affect, or the display of hostile or discriminatory behavior towards members of a group. If someone is treated unfairly as a virtue of their group membership, then it not only reflects one's attitudinal (cognitive) components, but also one's emotional latency and behavioral manifestations.

Manifestation of prejudice in various forms towards homosexuality

Homosexuality has become a focus of conflict and struggle in modern society. But it is quite ironical though not surprising that the general views of yesteryear remain somewhat similar to those of today; although many of the half-truths and myths have been dispelled, society at large





has changed little in its generally condemnatory attitude to homosexuality.

Tacit acceptance of the system was by no means general and some authorities were quite vociferous in their criticism, especially in respect of the positive partner who was generally considered to be grossly abnormal. He was often believed to be suffering from a hereditary disorder of the anus which had become the primary erotic zone replacing the genitals (Aristotle). Mettler (1947) quoted Aretaeus who stated that "Impotence....and effeminization resulted from excessive sexual indulgence". It is clear from the context that Aretaeus was referring to homosexuality. The silence of Christians over the issue of homosexuality in middle ages mirrors position of the church, which saw it as a sin so horrible that it should not be put into words by Christians. In the early nineteenth century, basic attitudes towards homosexuality had become more fanciful and dramatic by being its association with masturbation and as such were considered as a kind of insanity. Benjamin Rush (Quoted in Cooper, 1974) provides a good example of the ways in which prejudice and bigotry can fashion medical philosophy. In 1830, he said "If one indulged in undue or a promiscuous intercourse with the female sex or in onanism, it produces seminal weakness.... faulty feminization...and death." Indeed, even the noted liberal sexologist Havelock Ellis (1905) said "In the constitutionally disposed, masturbation may lead not only to neurasthenia but to premature ejaculation, impotence, and aversion to coitus-the latter helping to furnish a soil on which the inverted impulse may develop". Krafft-ebbing and Moreau Block were also numbered among those who believed disapprovingly that masturbation may lead to homosexuality.

Dr. Morrison, a London based consultant righteously referred to homosexuality as being of so detestable a character; it is a consolation to know that it is sometimes the consequence of insanity. The man in the street still regards


homosexuality as deviant and somehow wrong. This is largely because he is incapable of fitting it into his concept of normal sexual behavior. Most people fear the unknown, for example, they are generally afraid to die, so the acceptance of homosexuality depends upon the degree of popular education a society caters.

In the past homosexuality has been equated with evil and debauchery. Discrimination against homosexuals is still rampant although such discrimination is now subtler than in past. Often the homosexual person is non-conformative and does not share the *modus vivendi*. Homosexuality still remains a taboo in our society and conflicts with normal social and cultural values.

To the homosexual, conventional society must appear prejudiced, bigoted and inflexible. It inflicts on the homosexual a sustained trauma which for many is exceedingly difficult to bear. How can we wonder, therefore, that homosexuals become exquisitely sensitive and chary of making normal human relationships for fear of non-acceptance? How can we wonder that other homosexuals compensate for their feelings of inferiority and inadequacy by showing to others a brazen and sometimes highly abrasive front?

Why is it necessary to study prejudice towards homosexuality?

Each individual occupies a unique position in regard to the strength, direction and stability of his sexual behavior and sexual fantasy. The attempt to categorize all humanity into two mutually exclusive and contrasting groups of homosexuals and heterosexuals, a form of them and us, besides being ethically and politically dubious, produces misleading over simplifications. A generation ago, the word homosexuality was best avoided in polite conversation; or referred to in muted terms appropriate to a dreaded and scarcely mentionable disease.





A symbol of taboo

In western, Judea - Christian culture, homosexual behavior has long been considered taboo or sinful. Thus, in the United States and other predominantly Christian cultures, homosexuality has been frowned upon, and homosexuals have been ostracized, being seen as perverted, unnatural, or sick.

Male and female homosexuality in a male dominated society

Throughout the developed world and in most of the underdeveloped countries, the male is dominant and reigns supreme. In western societies, male homosexuality is frequently perceived as a threat to masculinity; the male homosexual is regarded as inferior, and his status approximates to that of a woman.

Persecution of lesbians by society has never been as acute as has been the case for male homosexuals. Lesbians are fewer in number; they are tolerated better; they pose no threat; they are often regarded as eccentrics and objects of pity rather than targets for opprobrium. A male chauvinist and there are still many in society cannot comprehend how a relationship between two women could ever be as satisfying as his own heterosexual indulgences. Thus, the masculine superego is protected, and the conventional wisdom remains content (Lorraine, 1974).

Popular misconceptions about homosexuality


Many of the public remain disgusted by the whole concept of homosexuality. To them it is unnatural, unorthodox, and totally incomprehensible. And until quite recently figures in public life have done little to dispel such subjective and inappropriate emotions. Indeed, in Great Britain, less than 5 decades ago, one of the then conservative governments


home secretary, Lord Kilmuir took a certain relish in designating himself the hammer of the homosexuals and was continuously denouncing the evils of sodomite societies and buggery clubs.

Yet now the intransigence for the issue persists for, within the narrow conceptual horizons of conformists, there is no room for the thought that a proportion of men and women actually prefer homosexual to heterosexual relationships and that they will persist in such activities in spite of the most strident calls to sexual orthodoxy.

Indeed, the conventional wisdom of society often seems incapable of judging a man or woman by parameters other than his/her sex life. Nor does it apparently ever contemplate the contributions to civilization of avowed homosexuals such as Leonardo da Vinci, Oscar Wilde, John Maynard, Keynes, and Ivor Novello. Another misconception regarding Homosexuality is how it is often confused with pedophilia. Yet there is no objective evidence to suggest that homosexuals are more likely to seduce young children than are heterosexuals.

Many adults are uneasy in the presence of known or obvious homosexuals because they fear they will be seduced. Homosexuality has ever been castigated as a disruptive factor in family life. Yet this whole concept does not stand up to critical examination. For adult's seduction without coercion is rare, and at any rate, homosexuals tend on average to be less violent than their heterosexual counterparts. The populace believes that entertainment world is riddled with homosexuals. However, to equate artistic talents with a propensity for homosexuality is obviously a very dubious procedure. The conventional wisdom of society throws up its hands in horror when marriage between homosexuals is mentioned. As our society tends to hold homosexuality in low esteem, one ought to expect punishments involved in homosexual behavior would outweigh the rewards attached to it.





Furthermore, children growing up with a homosexual parent are statistically unlikely to become homosexual, thus contradictory the notion that homosexual behavior might be learned from others (Green, 1978). There is no relationship between psychological adjustment and sexual preference as it is believed. Bisexuals and homosexuals enjoy the same overall degree of mental and physical health as heterosexuals do. They hold equivalent ranges and types of attitudes about themselves (Feldman, 1997).

Homosexual tragedies

The grievances of homosexuals against the dominant society are many and real. Many a times they are labeled as criminals, weird, sick, pedophiles, and many perceive them as corrupters of young. They suffer from blackmail, extortion without recourse, and violent victimization by thugs in neighborhood. However, Police does not often seem to be cooperative enough, in protecting and defending their interests. They are also being discriminated in every walk of life, including employment (be it military or in civil forms), and are discharged without any reasons in spite of their heroic performances in past. They are also subjected multiple forms of discrimination in employment in terms of increment and promotion.

They are subject to difficulties in finding housing on a par with heterosexuals, to tensions in public accommodations. They are generally subject to slings and arrows of stigma in all its guises, to constant uncertainty about how they will be treated or reacted if they are open to others about their sexual preference; to fear of exposure affecting careers and families. They are subject to all manners of psychological suffering attendant upon real or expected or feared negative reactions from non-homosexuals, to their form of loving and deriving


basic satisfactions than others regard as the birth right of all. They are subject to estrangement, loneliness, isolation, depression, suicidal thoughts or attempts stemming as they it at least, from the desperateness of being a persecuted 'Outsider' in the society in which one lives and wants to live, to repeated assaults on one's dignity as a human being. One's tendency to keep their sexuality hidden and secret might be a preference, or might cause by their day to day experiences which is colored by discrimination, repeated exposure to anti-homosexual prejudices. Therefore, self-disclosure does not seem to be a natural outcome, as it does come with several kinds of outcomes. For the secret deviants, it creates endless strains and difficulties of living in two or more worlds, to the pain of rarely being able to 'be one's own true self'.

For those with this preference as one part of their sexual life and yearning, alongside a differently accented orientation to the opposite sex as well, the pains of living with ambiguity, uncertainty, anxiety and the struggle between the absolutist polar labels, 'Gay' and 'Straight' supported both by the conventional world and the deviant minority subculture of the gays, with neither of these feeling like really fitting or comfortable attire. Contrary to widely prevalent stereotypes, homosexuals can/are to be seen in all kinds of occupations, at all class levels, in all kinds of physique and appearances; they rarely molest students or pupils, don't make passes at coworker cops or fireman, don't infect the military, rarely proselytize.

Homosexuality as abnormality

Homosexuality has been perceived as abnormal from many viewpoints : Inversion of the Judeo-Christian religious tradition, as well as in other religious views, it is regarded as a violation of supernaturally derived moral codes. In the laws of the USA and many other modern nations, specific homosexual acts are crimes prosecutable by the law. It is regarded as





'Deviant' in opposition to commonly held social mores in many modern societies. Some view it as opposed to evolutionary dictates requiring heterosexuality as necessary for the survival of the species.

Some simply see it as statistical anomaly; it is practiced by only a small minority of the population. Still another view sees it as abnormal in the sense of opposed to standards of psychological health i.e. as 'Sick'. Homosexuality as a crime is the negative evaluation of homosexuality derived from the Judeo-Christian religious tradition translated into the laws of various countries and states. These are clear cases of religious mores relating to emotionally held views of the perniciousness of 'Unnatural' sexual acts, without any foundation in demonstrable damage to other persons, at least in the case of consensual adult homosexual acts, or to society in general.

Homosexual behavior is seen as deviant. This is a common rubric in sociological discussion of homosexual behavior: it is deviant in the sense and to the extent that the behavior in question violates strongly held mores of the population in which this occurs. So, these terms are formed by anti-homosexuals in reference to a society. Thus, the sociologist who deals with it, they go along with popular prejudices to the effect that homosexuality is wrong, immoral, unnatural, against the interest of society, and the like.


Homosexuality as a sickness

Homosexuality has been historically considered as abnormal, and a form of manifesting psychopathology, to an extent that modern psychiatry used to treat homosexuality as a psychological disorder until 2000. Psychoanalysts have done the most harm in vilifying and derogating gays as 'Sick'. However, there is no intrinsic connection between homosexual preference and psychological sickness or impairment.

Reading the medical and psychological literature on homosexuality written before 1970 can be a jarring experience. Relevant articles included 'Effeminate homosexuality: a disease of childhood' and 'On the cure of Homosexuality. During the first half of the 20th century, those who didn't believe that homosexual people were mentally ill and in need of treatment tended to believe that they were criminals in need of incarceration (Bayer, 1981). British and American culture had long taken punitive approaches to homosexual behavior.

Although homosexuals and heterosexual subjects typically don't differ in psychological adjustment, there is some evidence that homosexual people do have higher rates of alcoholism and depression (Saghir and Robbins, 1973). However, it is likely that these elevated rates of alcoholism and depression are a consequence of the prejudice and stigmatization that they often still experience rather than being a consequence of having a homosexual orientation per se.

The word 'Pathological' is applicable where it is the exclusive or strongly preferential sexual object choice, i.e. where the person must have a sexual partner of the same sex, or such partner is strongly preferred to one of opposite sex. The gender object choice may be the only way in which this individual varies from what psychoanalysis regards as optimal psychological functioning, from optimal psychic health in the psychoanalytic sense of the term. Stoller, a psychoanalyst has made the thing very clear that though homosexuality itself shouldn't be considered a separate clinical entity, but still it is a condition combining all kinds of disordered persons engaged in. In his own words: "There is homosexual behavior; it is varied. People with all sorts of personality types prefer homosexuality as their sexual practice; people without overt neurotic symptomatology, schizophrenics, obsessive-compulsives, alcoholics, people with other perversions-almost every category in the nomenclature" (Stoller, 1975).





The issue of gay marriage

There is a heavy controversy regarding the fragility and short-livedness of gay marriages by the heterosexual commentators. There is also general lack of structural or cultural support from society at large for any kind of enduring homosexual relationship. The hostility to male-male coupling, particularly in the form of cohabitation, seems to be greater than that given to female-female couplings. We find a lack of social structural support i.e. there is no established social structure for married couple for homosexuals, or any related structures, such as definite in-law relationship and the lack of cultural support such as exists in abundance for heterosexual marriage.

Margaret Mead's studies on homosexuality in the Manus tribes of New Guinea found a prejudicial view: "homosexuality occurs in both sexes, but rarely. Natives recognize, and take only a laughing count of it, if it occurs between unmarried boys, sometimes exploited publicly in the boy's houses. Sodomy is the only form.... Homosexual relations between women are rare.... Boys away from home, on plantation work, are likely to turn to homosexuality" (Mead, 1930, 2001:102). This shows how a structure or conception is fitted in the minds of people regarding homosexuality. Robert Suggs points out that homosexual behavior is strongly disapproved, particularly between two adult males. There is a strongly stigmatized label, 'Mahu' for any male who has more than fleeting sexual contact with other males. There is a very small number of such males and still smaller number of male homosexual transvestites who do feminine domestic chores (Suggs, 1966).

The Homophobias

In spite of these scientific data, many heterosexuals (especially males) still harbor negative feelings about homosexuality. This phenomenon is called homophobia. Some of this fear, disgust, and hatred are attributable to


the incorrect belief that many homosexuals are child-molesters. In fact, 90% of the pedophiles are heterosexuals. Another source of homophobia is the fear of Acquired Immuno-Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS). This deadly sexually transmitted disease is more easily transmitted through anal intercourse than through vaginal intercourse and thus has spread more rapidly among homosexuals than heterosexual.

A homosexual's self-identification however means nothing to a homophobe. Homophobia is an assertion of control over the category 'Homosexual'. Homophobes try to seize the power of definition. The attitudinal expression is a blank-full of blank anger or discomfort, or a tautological spinning of the definitional wheels. What is directed at homosexuals is not a standard, stereotyping adjective but the charge 'he or she is homosexual'. The category itself-and whatever it means to the individual using it-is the main accusation: "faggot!", "dyke!" is supposed to be pejorative (Young-Bruehl, 1996, 2000).

Homophobia is mainly a category accusation because it is primarily directed at acts and what acts represent in fantasy, and only secondarily at the people who commit those acts, even though this century has given those people a distinct name. This is the one ideological prejudice that aims at doing, not being. The Christian homophobic fundamentalists currently rail against the 'Homosexual lifestyle', which they held to be immoral and unnatural and they are willing to tolerate homosexuals as long as the homosexuals don't declare themselves or engage in homosexual acts. In other words, homophobes hate acts that they themselves can and usually do engage in, so, to repudiate these acts they must assign them clearly to another category of people. The category is all that stands between them and those acts.

There are many psychologists who view it as a male's denigration of the femaleness and





femininity in other men and in himself. Richard Isay (1989) has even argued that fear of homosexuality per se is secondary in homophobic men to their fear and hatred of what they perceive as feminine in other men and in themselves (Young-Bruehl, 1996, 2000). In some aspects homosexuality can be viewed as a minority problem; but this is largely because an ignorant majority has historically reacted towards it with prejudice heavily tinged with emotions (and perhaps more heavily so than in relation to other questions, because of the social components), seeking to exorcise the strange and the different which the more extreme regard with repugnance.

Dispelling some myths

The notion that most male homosexuals behave effeminately and most female homosexuals (lesbians) are aggressively masculine dies hard in the absence of any substantial and significant proof. Many male homosexuals have typically masculine interests, attitudes and mannerisms and like to assert their maleness with clothes that accentuate their masculine physique. They enjoy a firmly masculine self-image or 'Gender identity' dislike being thought effeminate because of their homosexual inclination and would be horrified to be afforded the possibility of surgical interference to alter the sex of their genitals.

The prejudice is manifested in several forms and one of them is expressed through the laws passed by the community or the given society. In addition to their felony laws, most of the states also have a multiplicity of misdemeanor statutes against 'Outrageous conduct'. 'Lewd behavior', 'Vagrancy' and the like which they use to suppress homosexual behavior or solicitation.

From the ocean of negative feelings towards feelings of people towards those who assert and proclaim their freedom, independence and nonconformity these are few of them. In order to make more vivid and clearer the concept of

prejudice of people towards homosexuality and homosexuals, a small study was conducted. The study is only an assessment of the value judgments of the people and the opinion sorting.

Objectives of the study

- To understand prejudice among University students for people with homosexual orientation.
- To explore reasons, find the origin and the prevalence of these Micro-attitudes.
- To identify the nature of these Micro-attitudes, resulting in stronger prejudice.


Method of study

The research study adopted a survey technique for data collection, besides Focused Group Discussions (FGDs).

Sampling: The sample size was 165 males. It was conducted using a 'Micro-attitude questionnaire'. The respondents were all post-graduate students of a reputed University in Delhi, India.

Tools and Materials

The total check-list contains 50 questions (items) referring to 10 broad dimensions measuring micro-attitudes, stereotypes and prejudice. The broad dimensions included ethical evaluation and value attachment; destructive and disruptive aspects for the individual and society; dispositional aspects; deficiency factors; general attitudes towards males; attitude toward homosexual life pattern; etiological factors; experiential factors; expectations from society; behavioral expectation from a Self-identified Homosexual individual. Then under each dimension the group data was measured. Then degrees of attitude in group were assessed. The mode of answering (response mode) was bimodal i.e. yes/no.





Discussion

From the study, it was found that each person has a differential viewpoint regarding the issue of homosexuality. The attitude can be first assessed from the item aspect. Then the dimension discussion will reveal the group's attitude toward that dimension in the test.

Under dimension one, i.e. ethical evaluation and value attachment 40.8% people are found to have negative attitudes towards homosexuality, basically due to the ethical values attached with it. This shows the effects of moral constraints and value indoctrination and its strength. Under the second dimension, i.e. the destructive and disruptive aspect for the individual and the society, 43.3% people reported having prejudiced viewpoints which is due to their beliefs in the ability of homosexuality to create adverse effects. Under dimension number three, i.e. dispositional aspects, 28 % of the sample reported that they believe that some innate and inherent factors in homosexuals cause them to engage in this abnormal activity.


Under the fourth dimension, i.e. deficiency factors, 68 % of the sample reported having a viewpoint that some of the deficiencies in homosexual people make them to resort to homosexual behavior. Under the fifth dimension, i.e. general attitudes toward males, 38 % of the sample considered that the experience with homosexual people makes them to generalize that feeling in some contexts. They have a slightly average attitude towards males in general. Under the sixth dimension, i.e. attitude towards homosexual life pattern, 41 % of the sample reported having negative attitude towards the life patterns and living styles and the way of coping with the demands of life by homosexuals.

Under the seventh dimension, i.e. etiological factors, 69 % people have the idea that homosexuality results from inborn, innate subjective factors. Under the eighth dimension,

i.e. experiential factors, 63 % of the sample reported that they have no knowledge of any homosexual person and they never want to acknowledge the presence of homosexuality nor homosexuals. Under the ninth dimension, i.e. expectation from society, 67% of the sample reported that homosexuals never deserve any kind of sympathy or favorableness from the society. Under the tenth dimension, i.e. behavioral expectation from an individual towards homosexuality 68 % of the sample reported having a very negative attitude towards cohabiting, sharing, and living with a homosexual individual.

Conclusion

This phase of the study can unearth the attitude which is prevalent towards the differential orientation by the educated youths. From this study, we can infer that even among the educated youths, the preparedness has not come to accept a liberal, non-confirmative, alternative and substitutive orientation in the search of love, intimacy and spiritual growth. By looking at a long history of widely abhorred kind and uncertain future we can just pass on the message that the way for getting out of the closed box or confined arena, 'A configured paradigm' is not paved by anyone. This is mainly due to the contentment with the conservative mode of living and lack of desire and curiosity to experiment upon, to explore the sundry aspects of life which has never been traded before, the path on which the persons have never taken any strong initiative to go by. But looking at the categorization of homosexuals into a kind of alien being, and a defiled creature is ironical and so also dubious. The stigmatization towards a minority has always been a problem on the face of humanity. So, what is needed is to create at least a feeling of sympathy, amity and a respect for each other's individuality and distinct proclivities and colorful idiosyncrasies. So, the situation now calls for an attitude which is as transparent as truth and as liberal as life. The philosophy which is to be followed is '**Live and let live**'.



References

Primary References:

1. Humphreys, L.(1970). Trans-action 7: 10. Originally: Tearoom Trade: Impersonal Sex in Public Places.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02812336>
2. Rapaport, D., & Gill, M. M. (1959). The points of view and assumptions of metapsychology, the collected papers of David Rapaport (Ed. M. M. Gill). New York: Basic.
3. Freud, S. (1964). An outline of psychoanalysis, the standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud (Vol. XXIII). London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis.
4. Lessler, K. (1964). Cultural and Freudian dimensions of sexual symbols. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 28(1), 46-53.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0046451>
5. Marcus, S. (1974). *The Other Victorians*, New York: New American Library.
6. Sennett, R. (1970). *The fall of Public Man*, New York.
7. Peiss, K. Simmons, C. & Padgug, R.A. (1989). *Passion and Power: Sexuality in History*, Temple University Press: Philadelphia.
8. Marx, K.H. (1973). *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
9. Weeks, J. (1977). *Coming Out: Homosexual Politics in Britain from the Nineteenth Century to the Present*, Quartet Books.
10. Loraine, J.A. (1974). *Understanding Homosexuality: Its Biological & Psychological Bases*, Medical and Technical Publishing Co. Ltd.
11. Mettler, C.C.(1947). *History of Medicine*. Philadelphia: Blakiston.
12. Cooper, A.J. (1974). Aetiology of Homosexuality. In: Loraine J.A. (eds) *Understanding Homosexuality: Its Biological and Psychological Bases*. Springer, Dordrecht
13. Ellis, H. (1905). *Sexual Selection in Man. Studies in the Psychology of Sex, Volume 4* by Havelock Ellis at Project Gutenberg
14. Green, R. (1978). Sexual identity of 37 children raised by homosexual or transsexual parents. *American Journal of Psychiatry*;135(6):692-7.
15. Bayer, R. (1981). *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry*, Princeton University Press.
16. Saghir, M.T. & Robins, E.(1973). *Male & female homosexuality: A comprehensive investigation*. Williams and Wilkins.
17. Stoller, R.J. *Perversion: The erotic form of hatred*, Pantheon Books.
18. Mead M., (1930, 2001). *Growing Up in New Guinea: a comparative study of primitive education* (1st Perennial Classics ed.). New York: Harper Collins.
19. Young-Bruehl, E. (1996). *The Anatomy of Prejudices*, Harvard University press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, (p.p. 43 - 57, 137-162)
20. Young-Bruehl (2000). Beyond "The Female Homosexual, *Studies in Gender and Sexuality*, 1(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15240650109349150>
21. Feldman, R.S. (1997). *Understanding Psychology* (4th Edition), Tata McGraw Hill Edition (P.P. 356-394).
22. Suggs, R.C. (1966). *Marquesan Sexual Behavior*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World

Inc. xviii, pp - 251.

23. Isay, R. (1989). Being Homosexual: Gay Men and Their Development. Farrar, Straus and Giroux. p. 159.

24. Dynes, W.R., Donaldson, S. (1992). Studies in Homosexuality in Asian Homosexuality (Vol.3), Taylor & Francis.

Secondary References:

1. Adams, H.E., Sutker, P.B. (1984). Comprehensive Handbook of Psychopathology, Plenum Press, New York (P.P. 780 -785).

2. Allport, F.H. (1923). Social Psychology, Houghton And Mifflin Co.

3. Baron, R.A., Byrne, D. (1995). Social Psychology: Understanding Human Interaction (7th Edition) Prentice Hall of India Ltd (P.P. 214 – 258).

4. Bonnie Strickland (2001). The Gale Encyclopedia of Psychology (2nd Edition)-, Gale Group Detroit.

5. Brown R. (1995). Prejudice, Its social Psychology, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford UK & Cambridge, USA.

6. Carson, R.C., Butcher, J.N., Mineka, S. (2003). Abnormal Psychology and Modern Life (11th Edition) (P.P. 419 – 461, Ch- 11) Pearson Education, New Delhi.

7. Cassidy, J., Shaver, P.R. (1999). Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research and Clinical Applications, The Guilford Press.

8. Endleman, R. (1981). Psyche and Society – Exploration in Psycho-Analytic Sociology, Colombia University Press.

9. Freedman, A.M., Kaplan, H.I., Saddock, B.J. (1976). Modern Synopsis of Comprehensive Textbook of Psychiatry (Vol- 2, 2nd Edition),

(P.P. 757 – 762), The Williams And Wilkins Co., Baltimore, USA.

10. Garber, M. (2000). Bisexuality and the Eroticism of everyday life, Routledge Publishers, New York.

11. Harre, R., Lamb, R. (1983). The Encyclopedic Dictionary of Psychology (P.P. 278-79), Basil Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

12. Kretch, D., Crutchfield, R.S. (1947). Theory and Problems of Social Psychology, Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Co.

13. Magill, F.M. (1996). International Encyclopedia of Psychology (Vol-1), Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.

14. Nye, R. D. (2000). Sexuality, Oxford University Press.

15. Parker, R., Aggleton, P. (1999). Culture, Society and Sexuality- A Reader, UCL Press, Taylor And Francis.

16. Rueben, D. (1972). Everything You Always Wanted to Know About Sex (But Were Afraid to Ask).

17. Tannahill, R. (1992). Sex in History New York: Scarborough House.

18. Ullman, L. P., Krasner, L. (1975). A Psychological Approach to Abnormal Behaviour (2nd Edition)- Prentice Hall, Inc Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey (p.p. 417 – 442).

19. Weinrich, J.D. (1987). Sexual Landscapes: Why We Are What We Are, Why We Love Whom We Love, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons

20. West, D.J. (1977). Homosexuality Re-Examined, Duckworth Publications.

21. Zimbardo, P.G., Weber, A.L. (2003). Psychology (2nd Edition) - (P.P. 318 - 323) Longman, an Imprint of Addison Welsey Longman Inc.