

Assessing the Attitudinal Behaviour of Students Within Jos Metropolis Towards Homosexuality and its Implication on Psychological Adjustment

Isaac Peter Chingle

*Department of General Studies,
Plateau State Polytechnic, Jos,
Nigeria*

Article DOI:

10.48028/iiprds/ijsreth.v11.i1.06

Keywords:

Participants;
Frequency,
Hypothesis,
Homosexuality &
Attitude

Corresponding Author:

Isaac Peter Chingle

Abstract

A 2x2 factorial design is adopted for the study, one hundred and twenty (120) participants who are students are drawn from four different schools all within Jos metropolis. University of Jos, Plateau State Polytechnic, Jos campus, College of Heath Technology Zawan and School of Nursing Jos Vom. The participant had age range of between 15-20 years, with frequency 52, representing 43.3%, age range of 21-25 years has frequency 47 representing 39.2%, age range of 26 -30 years has a frequency of 21, representing 17.5%. 58 of the participants are Christians, representing 48.3%, while 62 are Muslims, representing 51.7%. 102 of the participants were singles representing 85%, while 18 were married representing 15%. Males has a frequency of 66, representing 55%, while females are 54, representing 45%. Two instruments are used for the study; the homosexuality attitude scale (HAS) and the psychological adjustment test report scale (PATRS), Three hypothesis were tested in the study. Hypothesis one result show that participants with positive attitude toward homosexuality had higher psychological adjustment than participants with poor attitudes towards homosexuality, $t_{(118)} = -0.266$, $P = 0.789$. The hypothesis was therefore not supported. The second hypothesis result shows that females significantly adjusted psychologically than their male counterparts, $t_{(118)} = 1.118$, $p = 0.020$. The hypothesis was therefore accepted. The third hypothesis result shows that Christian participants had higher psychological adjustment compared to Muslim participants, the hypothesis was not supported. Given the role some society and schools have played against homosexuality especially in regard to negative attitudes, there is an urgent need for the society and relevant agencies to play proactive role in fighting traditional sexual prejudice and the need to identify those who are victims and rehabilitate them through available psychological interventions. The study, therefore, recommend the need to sensitize the general public on building positive attitudes towards homosexuals is sacrosanct. This is because these people are suffering from conscious and unconscious psychological disorders which may prompt them into such negative attitude. Therefore, only a society that understands them and show them love can have a positive influence on them.

Background to the Study

Societal attitude toward homosexuality varies greatly in different cultures and different historical periods, as do attitudes toward sexual desires, actively and relationship in general. All cultures have their own values regarding appropriate and inappropriate sexuality, while others may disapprove of such activities. As with heterosexual behaviour different sets of prescriptions and proscription may be given to individuals according to their gender, age, social status or social class (Murray, 2000). Many countries have also seen rising support for LGBT rights in modern times including the legal recognition of same sex marriages, anti-discrimination laws and other such rights) since the 1970s, much of the world has become more accepting of same sex between partners of legal age (Richard, 2013).

Modern attitudes toward homosexuality have religious, legal, and medical underpinnings. Before the High Middle Ages, homosexual acts appear to have been tolerated or ignored by the Christian church throughout Europe. Beginning in the latter twelfth century, however, hostility toward homosexuality began to take roots, and eventually spread throughout European religious and secular institutions. Condemnation of homosexual acts (and other non-procreative sexual behaviour) as "unnatural," which received official expression in the writings of Thomas Aquinas and others, became widespread and has continued through the present day (Boswell, 2020).

Religious teachings soon were incorporated into legal sanctions. Many of the early American colonies, for example, enacted stiff criminal penalties for sodomy, an umbrella term that encompassed a wide variety of sexual acts that were non-procreative (including homosexual behavior), occurred outside of marriage (e.g., sex between a man and woman who were not married), or violated traditions (e.g., sex between husband and wife with the woman on top). The statutes often described such conduct only in Latin or with oblique phrases such as "wickedness not to be named"). In some places, such as the New Haven colony, male and female homosexual acts were punishable by death (Katz, 1996).

By the end of the 19th century, medicine and psychiatry were effectively competing with religion and the law for jurisdiction over sexuality. As a consequence, discourse about homosexuality expanded from the realms of sin and crime to include that of pathology. This historical shift was generally considered progressive because a sick person was less blameful than a sinner or criminal (Chauncey, 1982; D'Emilio & Freedman, 1988; Duberman, Vicinus, & Chauncey, 1989).

Even within medicine and psychiatry, however, homosexuality was not universally viewed as a pathology. Richard von Krafft-Ebing described it as a degenerative sickness in his *Psychopathia Sexualis*, but Sigmund Freud and Havelock Ellis both adopted more accepting stances. Early in the twentieth century, Ellis (2001) argued that homosexuality was inborn and therefore not immoral, that it was not a disease, and that many homosexuals made outstanding contributions to society (Robinson, 1996).

Negative attitudes toward homosexuals are prevalent in different parts of the world ranging from American and Canadian societies (Herek & Glunt, 1993) and in many African countries, including Nigeria, there is a strong negative societal attitude towards homosexuals (Bunting, 2010; Dionne, 2013; Mabvurira, 2012; Mellstrom, 2012). In fact, available statistics indicate that more than 50% of African countries have made conscious efforts to criminalize same-sex relationships including gays and lesbians, and 36 out of 54 countries have laws criminalizing homosexuality (ILGA, 2011). Research has shown that in sub-Saharan Africa alone, the percentage of society's rejection of homosexuality is pegged at 98% in Nigeria; 96% in Senegal; 96% in Ghana; 96% in Uganda; 90% in Kenya, and 61% in South Africa where homosexuality has been legalized (Pew Research Center: The Global Divide on Homosexuality, 2013).

Statement of the Problem

The African continent is seen as a highly homophobic continent with low tolerance for homosexuals and non-normative sexualities. In about 37 countries in Africa, homosexual acts are deemed illegal (Ghorbani, Watson, Madani, & Chen, 2016).). Although some countries such as Cape-Verde, Burkina Faso, Guinea-Bissau, amongst others have no explicit laws criminalizing homosexual relations, others such as Nigeria, Benin, Burundi, Cameroun and others have provisions within their laws that make homosexuality illegal and punishable by law¹ (Global Legal Research, ("Laws on Homosexuality in African Nations," 2014). Although this is the case in Africa, but, South Africa became and the first and only country on the continent to legalize gay marriage in 2006 (CBC News, 2006). In Africa and Nigeria in particular, there has been public outrage and outburst against the practice of homosexuality in the form of mass protests, abuse, persecution and killings.

Calzo, & Ward (2009), believe that people still hold negative personal attitude towards homosexuality. However, empirical evidence and professional norms do not support the idea that homosexuality is a form of mental illness or is inherently linked to psychopathology. The foregoing should not be construed as an argument that sexual minority individuals are free from mental illness and psychological distress. Indeed, given the stresses created by sexual stigma and prejudice, it would be surprising if some of them did not manifest psychological problems (Meyer, 2003). This study is therefore aimed at examining the attitudes of undergraduate students towards homosexuality and its implication on psychological adjustment.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study is to assess the attitudinal behaviour of students within Jos metropolis towards homosexuality and its implications on psychological adjustment. Other specific objectives are:

- i. To understand the attitudinal behaviour of students within Jos metropolis towards homosexuality and psychological adjustment.
- ii. To examine how gender differences can affect homosexuality and psychological adjustment.

- iii. To determine how religion can affect homosexuality and psychological adjustment among students within Jos metropolis.
- iv. To determine the effect of age on psychological adjustment among of students within Jos metropolis
- v. To know the effect of marital status on psychological adjustment among of students within Jos metropolis
- vi. To understand how gender and religion on psychological adjustment affect students within Jos metropolis.

Hypotheses: The following hypothesis will guide the study:

- 1. The attitudinal behaviour of students towards homosexuality will significantly determine the level of their psychological adjustment.
- 2. Gender differences among students will significantly determine their views on attitudinal behaviour towards homosexuality.
- 3. Religion beliefs among students will significantly determine their views on attitudinal
- 4. behaviour towards homosexuality and psychological adjustment.

Review of Related Studies

Prior research consistently shows that attitudes towards gay men and women (also called homosexuals in general) have generally tended to be negative (Louderback & Bernard, 1997). This anti-gay prejudice has been distinct and well documented in research done with convenience samples from college students (Herek, 1998, Kite, 1994) as well as large scale, representative surveys (Herek 2000; Herek & Glunt, 1993). Overall, attitudes towards gay men and lesbians seem to be improving consistently over time as Americans become increasingly liberal in their opinions about civil liberties. They have gained social acceptance from some parts of the U.S. population, but face opposition from others (Loftus, 2020).

Wade., Hart, Wade, Bajaj, and Price, (2013), examined attitudes towards lesbians and gay men (referred to in the literature as "sexual prejudice") in a sample of pupils from 70 secondary schools in Brussels. They used items measuring traditional and modern sexual prejudice and support for gay civil rights. We performed a multilevel linear multivariate response analysis to assess both the impact of individual characteristics and school influence on pupils' attitudes. Controlling for socio-demographic variables, second-generation migrants had more prejudice toward homosexuals than pupils from the ethnic majority group. Identification with the receiving society and perception of group-level institutional discrimination, however, mediated the association between ethnic origin and homonegativity. In contrast to traditional sexual prejudice and gay civil rights issues, modern sexual prejudice items were less affected by individual socio-demographic variables. Modern sexual prejudice also remained rather stable across schools; however, schools did appear to affect civil rights issues and traditional sexual prejudice. This contribution sheds light on the relation between ethnic origin and sexual prejudice and on the variation of several sexual prejudice dimensions across social groups and schools.

Stolzenberg, Blair-Loy, & Waite, (1995), examined attitudes toward homosexuals among a broad selection of undergraduates (101 men, 98 women) attending a Canadian university, where a vast majority of the students are from working- or middle-class families of European descent. Attitudes toward gay men were more negative than attitudes toward lesbians. Compared to Science or Business students, students in the faculties of Arts or Social Science had more positive attitudes toward gay men, and women were more positive than men. Attitudes toward gay men also improved with time spent at college, but only for male students. Although attitudes toward lesbians improved with time at college, they were not associated with students' gender or faculty of enrollment. Thus, a college education may promote a reduction in anti-homosexual prejudice among young people, particularly among young men than those of women (Herek, 2002; Herek & Glunt, 1993; Kite, 1984), acceptance of homosexuality also varies as a function of the gender of the homosexual, with attitudes toward gay men being more negative than attitudes toward lesbians (Kite & Whitley, 1998). In some cases, a person's attitude is particularly negative toward homosexuals of their own gender, with males' attitudes toward gay men being the most negative (Herek, 1988; Kite, 1984, 1994; Whitley, 1987, 1988). Because socially constructed concepts of appropriate male behavior or masculinity are more narrowly defined than concepts of appropriate female behavior or femininity (Martin, 1990), departures from the norm (i.e., heterosexuality) tend to be judged more harshly by men than by women, and for male than for female homosexuals. We expected to replicate the gender differences reported in earlier studies. Price, (2010) examined the attitudes of undergraduate students towards same-sex couples adopting using a quasi-experimental design study examines attitudes of 87 undergraduate students in a social science major, towards same-sex couples. The participants were given one of two vignettes describing a couple interested in adopting a 5-year-old child. The vignettes were identical except that the couples' orientation was depicted as either a gay male couple or a heterosexual couple. Using t-tests and an ANOVA test for difference in attitude scores, emotional stability of the parents, quality of parenting, whether the participant felt the child would experience physical, sexual, or emotional abuse, and whether the parents would raise the child with morals and values, with a level of .05, no difference was found between the two groups.

Ghorbani, Watson, Madani & Chen (2016). In a study "Muslim Experiential Religiousness: Spirituality Relationships with Psychological and Religious Adjustment in Iran" using students of Iranian university (N = 153) and Islamic seminary (N = 143) responded to a Muslim Experiential Religiousness measure of spirituality. This instrument correlated positively with Integrative Self-Knowledge, Self-Control, Mindfulness, and Satisfaction with Life. Muslim Experiential Religiousness also displayed direct associations with Muslim Attitudes toward Religion and with Intrinsic and Extrinsic Personal Religious Orientations. At higher levels of Muslim Experiential Religiousness, Muslim Attitudes toward Religion displayed stronger connections with psychological and religious adjustment. Islamic seminarians self-reported higher Islamic spirituality than university students. Overall, Muslim Experiential Religiousness appeared to assess a Muslim form of spiritual self-regulation.

Wade, Riddle, Price, & Dumenci, (2011), examined social support, religious affiliation and educational attainment as predictors of psychological wellbeing among spouses of male prisoners in Nigeria. Their result shows that there was significant difference between the psychological wellbeing of partners with low ($X = 63.62$) social support and High ($X = 72.85$) social support, $t(107) = 6.06$, $P < .001$. The results also showed that religion and education had significant main and interaction influence on psychological wellbeing, $F(4, 99) = 2.67$, $P < .01$.

Siegelman, (1999) carried out research on the Attitudes toward Homosexuals and their adjustment to homosexuality acceptance among students at a Canadian University. They examined attitudes toward homosexuals among a broad selection of undergraduates (101 men, 98 women) attending a Canadian university, where a vast majority of the students are from working- or middle-class families of European descent. According to their findings, Attitudes toward gay men were more negative than attitudes toward lesbians. Compared to Science or Business students, students in the faculties of Arts or Social Science had more positive attitudes toward gay men, and women were more positive than men. Attitudes toward gay men also improved with time spent at college, but only for male students. The finding also revealed that even though attitudes toward lesbians improved with time at college, they were not associated with students' gender or faculty of enrolment. They concluded that a college education may promote a reduction in anti-homosexual prejudice among young people, particularly among young men. Recent studies support the idea that a person's attitude towards homosexuality is influenced by several factors including religious affiliation, religiosity, mass media, family, peers, a person's gender, and overall contact with homosexual individuals (Riaz, 2006). Exactly how these factors intersect with one another to form a college student's overall attitude towards homosexuality is not fully understood, though associations between religion and family have been greatly recognized. Homosexuality is defined as sexual desire or behaviour directed toward a person or persons of one's own sex (Webster, 2001).

Olson (2006), examined if religious practices influenced a person's attitude toward homosexuality. This study found that a person's religiosity and religious affiliation had a significant influence on their opinions about homosexuality. Congregation members that were heavily involved in the church and its social networks were likely to be less accepting of homosexuality. Traditionally, homosexuality is opposed by most religious affiliations and there tends to be a clear message from the congregational leader that homosexual behaviour is not accepted. When congregations express concern about moral values, individuals are much more likely to oppose gay marriage. All American religion is not entirely opposed to homosexuality and peoples' opinions toward homosexuality do tend to vary according to one's degree of religiosity. This article demonstrated that one's religiosity influences a person's opinion but is not the only factor in forming attitudes towards homosexuality.

One of the most central factors in attitudes towards homosexuality is the sex of the respondent. Many studies show that men on average have more negative attitudes towards gays and lesbians than women (Herek & Glunt, 1993; Rice & Friberg, 2012; Louderback & Whitley, 1997). However, even though this sex difference is well documented, few attempts have been made to explain it (Herek, 1998). Further inquiries also show that attitudes towards gay men and women differ based on the sex of the target in interaction with the respondent's sex (Kite & Whitney, 1996). Kite and Whitley (1996) show that men are more negative towards gay men than women are while there are no differences between men and women in their attitudes towards lesbian women.

Calzo, & Ward, (2009), explain this difference based on gender belief systems. Gender belief systems define appropriate behaviours for men and women: people use these gender stereotypes to define what is feminine and masculine, and form opinions about others depending on how well they conform to them. They suggest that attitudes towards homosexuals are shaped by these existing gender belief systems. Because society has stricter expectations of masculinity than femininity (Herek & John, (1995), men who display feminine traits receive more negative reaction than women who display masculine traits. We would therefore expect that gay men who violate male gender stereotypes to receive more negative reaction than gay women who violate female gender stereotypes. Furthermore, the more one is invested in the gender belief system, the more one is likely to have a negative view of gays and lesbians because they deviate from the gender norm, possibly forcing one to question the system itself. An additional explanation could be found in men's traditional definitions of masculinity.

Although men's attitudes toward homosexuals tend to be more negative than those of women (Herek, 2000; Herek & John, 1996); Herek & Glunt, 1993; Kite, 1984; Kite & Whitley, 1998), acceptance of homosexuality also varies as a function of the gender of the homosexual, with attitudes toward gay men being more negative than attitudes toward lesbians (Harkins, Price & Braith, 1989).). In some cases, a person's attitude is particularly negative toward homosexuals of their own gender, with males' attitudes toward gay men being the most negative (Herek, 2000; Kite, 1994; Whitley, 1987). Because socially constructed concepts of appropriate male behaviour or masculinity are more narrowly defined than concepts of appropriate female behavior or femininity (Martin, 1990), departures from the norm (i.e., heterosexuality) tend to be judged more harshly by men than by women, and for male than for female homosexuals.

There are three ways in which 'religion' can influence heterosexuals' attitudes towards homosexuality. It is unclear which is the most influential. First, whether a person is religiously affiliated or is not religious has been shown to affect their attitude towards homosexuality. Religious persons are generally more prejudiced against homosexuals than non-religious persons (Herek, & John, 1999). For example, Melzack, & Casey (1998). found that 44% of Christians in Britain believed that homosexuality was 'always wrong' compared with 28% of non-religious people. There is some evidence, however, that the attitudes of non-practicing Christians may now be similar to the attitudes of nonreligious

people (Herek, & John 1999). Tolerance is increasing at the same rate in religious and non-religious populations (Herek, & John, 1999).). Secondly, the type of religion or religious denomination to which an affiliated person belongs influences the extent to which they accept homosexuality. People belonging to fundamentalist or evangelical Protestant denominations, including Baptists, tend to hold the most negative attitudes towards homosexuality, followed by Catholics, Jews and those belonging to more liberal Protestant denominations, such as Presbyterians, Methodists and Melzack, & Casey, (1998). Fundamentalist Christians may be more intolerant because they are more likely to subscribe to Biblical literalism and to have authoritarian personalities, which lead them to conform to the values of (religious) authorities (Mazur, & Tara 2002) note that it is possible that religions do not instill these conservative values, but rather that conservative people are attracted to religions that reflect those values. Melzack, & Casey, (1998). suggest that the gap between the views of liberal and evangelical Christians appears to be widening, as does the gap between the views of younger and older Christians. Young Anglicans and Presbyterians are no more likely to be homophobic than nonreligious young people, but their negative attitudes increase more sharply with age, such that older Christians are significantly more homophobic than nonreligious people of the same age. Thirdly, the person's 'religiosity', that is, the frequency with which they attend church and/or the extent to which religion is integral to their lives, has a significant impact upon their attitude towards homosexuality.

The research generally suggests that those who attend church more regularly are more prejudiced against gays and lesbians (Mazur, & Tara, 2002). However, Mazur, & Tara (2002) found that frequency of worship was significantly related to antigay attitudes only among those belonging to antigay denominations, and not to the attitudes of those belonging to 'gay tolerant' religions. Those attending church regularly might be more intolerant because they are more frequently exposed to antigay messages, and also because they tend (once again) to have more authoritarian personalities (Murray, 2000). People with an 'intrinsic' religious orientation, that is, those who consider their faith to be an end in itself, and who try to live by it, are more prejudiced towards gays and lesbians than those with an 'extrinsic' orientation, who use religion as a means to an end, for example, to gain social standing. Price, McGrath, Rafii, & Buckingham (2003) found that the theory that those with an intrinsic orientation might 'hate the sin but love the sinner' was not supported. They found that intrinsic were as rejecting of homosexual people as they were of homosexual behaviour (Verweij, Shekar, Zietsch, Eaves, Bailey, Boomsma, & Martin, 2008).

Religion is likely to have considerably less influence on attitudes towards homosexuality in Australia. Australia is a more secular society than the United States (Mazur, & Tara (2002)), and the religiously active population is declining. The percentage of the population claiming no religion climbed from 12.9% in 1991 to 16.6% in 1996, dropping slightly to 15.5% in 2001. In 2001, people in the 18-24 years' age group were most likely to state that they had no religion (20%). The percentage of the population claiming a Christian affiliation is declining slowly, while those belonging to religions other than

Christianity have grown in number (Australian Bureau of Statistics). No research has been conducted into the impact that affiliation with non-Judeo-Christian religions may have on attitudes towards homosexuality (Finlay & Walther 2003).

The overwhelming evidence against same sex marriage in Nigeria points to the fact that Nigerian moral context does not welcome the practice. Wiredu (1999), described moral context as those paradigms and specialized language of ethical theories that bind our thinking and the observance of rules for the harmonious adjustment of the interests of the individuals in a giving society. Same sex marriage is one of the difficult situations in which ethics, morality and law are all pulling in different directions. The initial challenge is an ethical one. Same sex couples want the same rights as heterosexual couples, and by classic reciprocity principles, this is something all citizens can understand: We would want the same thing, and thus the same sex couples have the Golden Rule on their side.

The moral systems of many Nigerians declare homosexual relations to be an absolute wrong, and thus conduct that should not and cannot be approved by legislation. So, there is an absolutist analysis that opposes same sex marriage, and a utilitarian analysis that says it is wrong as well. That analysis concludes that the institution of marriage, the stability of the family, and the welfare of society generally will suffer if marriage is expanded to include same sex couples; in classic utilitarian terms, the unequal treatment of gays is necessary to ensure a larger societal good. This absolute condemnation of homosexuality has old roots: it arose from the classic "if everybody does it" standard, at a time in antiquity when the survival of a tribe, a race, or a community depended on procreation between men and women (Mbiti, 1969). If everybody was homosexual, society was doomed, so it made sense to evolve strict taboos against the conduct. In the absence of any concrete documentation of factors justifying the withholding of equal treatment, granting the rights was the right approach.

In the Nigerian moral context, same sex marriage has been described as an oxymoron, meaning the terms are incompatible upon considering marriage's inherent nature. Two constituent parts reside within marriage. The first is unitive, when two become one. Homosexuals cannot, by definition, satisfy this requirement. Secondly, marriage includes openness towards procreation. Homosexual sex violates the law of complementarity, whereby male and female, while sexually different, are indeed complementary (Turaki, 2001).

Theoretical Framework

The study adopted the Functional Attitude Model (FAM). This suggests that beliefs and attitudes are influential to various psychological functions. Attitudes can be influential on many processes such as being utilitarian (useful), social, relating to values, or a reduction of cognitive dissonance. They can be beneficial and help people interact with the world. In the late 1950s when psychoanalysis and behaviourism reigned supreme as the foci of psychological studies, Weingarten, (1995) developed typologies of human attitudes in relation to the functions to which they believed the attitudes served. This

theory proposes that attitudes are held by individuals because they are important and integral to psychological functioning. The function of an attitude is more important than whether the attitude is accurate or correct.

Katz (1990) and Waite, (1995), originally set out to discover the purpose of varying attitudes, determining that attitudes exist to serve a variety of functions necessary to individuals' physical, emotional, and social needs. Their functional attitudes theory sparked a wave of research in the 1980s that was able to consistently empirically link function-matched appeals and arguments to increased persuasion when presented to individuals perceived to be in that attitude function. This matching hypothesis has been replicated, but studies attempting to prove the link behind it have not. While future research is needed to determine the cause of the matching effect, as well as to develop consistent attitude and personality measurements, FAT is a practically applicable theory that allows social influencers to accurately predict what type of functional appeal should be used when persuading an audience about a product or idea. This theory will therefore be used in this study to show how beliefs and attitudes are influential to various psychological functions and psychological adjustments.

Methodology

A 2x2 factorial design is adopted for the study, the rationale behind the design is that it has one independent variable, attitude and the dependent variable is psychological adjustment the independent variables have two levels, positive and negative. The dependent variables also have two levels which is high and low.

One hundred and twenty (120) participants who are students are drawn from four different schools all within Jos metropolis. University of Jos, Plateau State Polytechnic, Jos campus, College of Health Technology Zawan and School of Nursing Jos Vom. The participant had age range of between 15-20 years, with frequency 52, representing 43.3%, age range of 21-25 years has frequency 47 representing 39.2%, age range of 26 -30 years has a frequency of 21, representing 17.5%. 58 of the participants are Christians, representing 48.3%, while 62 are Muslims, representing 51.7%. 102 of the participants were singles representing 85%, while 18 were married representing 15%. Males has a frequency of 66, representing 55%, while females are 54, representing 45%.

Two instruments are used for the study; the homosexuality attitude scale (HAS) developed by Kite & Deaux (1986). The HAS scale assesses people's stereotypes, misconceptions, and anxieties about homosexuals. The measure contains a unidimensional factor representing a favourable or unfavourable evaluation of homosexuals. The scale has excellent internal consistency (alphas > .92). The scale has a good test-retest reliability ($r = .71$). It is equally reliable for gay male and for lesbian target. The scale also has a convergent validity, it correlates ($r_s = .50$) it also has 21 items which measures the intensity of the respondent attitude towards homosexuality, which has the level of agreement of the item using the following strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree.

The second instrument used is the psychological adjustment test report scale (PATRS), it was developed by the western psychological service version 3.000 1989 by Western Psychological Service it has a ten-item questionnaire design to measure perception of psychological adjustment. Each item is a question that solicit the five-part answer not at all, a little bit, moderately, quite a bit, extremely. The scale also indicate that the measure was highly reliable, both in times of internal consistency (coefficient a ranging from .89 to .94) and test-retest reliability over a 1-year period ($r = .73$). convergent validity for the scale was indicated by significant correlations with other measures of adjustment. The questionnaire has three section A, B and C. The section A consist of the personal data of the participant age, gender, religion and marital status. The section B consist of 21 item questions base on attitude towards homosexuality. The section C consist of ten item questions base on perception on psychological adjustment.

The researcher introduced himself to the students, introduced the research study, and reviewed the pages of the instrument of study with the participants and subsequently seek for their consent if they are willing to continue with the research. The researcher then gives the participants some space to provide confidentiality and to reduce any potential pressure on the participants. All 120 participants fill out the questionnaire and the researcher collect back the entire questionnaires.

Presentation of Results

The result of the study will be presented based on the stated hypotheses, tested using t-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The results are presented below:

Hypothesis 1:

Attitudinal behaviour of students towards homosexuality will significantly determine the level of their psychological adjustment.

Table 1: t-test for Attitudes toward homosexuality and psychological adjustment.

	N	Mean	Std.Dev	T	Df	F	P
Poor Att.	54	32.48	5.74	-.266	118	4.63	0.789
Good Att.	66	32.82	7.62				

$P < 0.05^*$

Result from table 1 show that participants with positive attitude toward homosexuality had higher psychological adjustment than participants with poor attitudes towards homosexuality, Means: 32.48 (SD 5.74) and 32.82 (7.62). However, the differences in means were not statistically significant. $T = -.266$ (118), $F = 4.63$, $P = 0.789$. The hypothesis was therefore not supported.

Hypothesis 2

Gender differences among students will significantly determine their views on attitudinal behaviour towards homosexuality.

Table 2: t-test for Gender and Psychological Adjustment

	N	Mean	Std.Dev	T	Df	F	P
Male	66	31.36	6.19	-2.36	118	209	0.020
Female	54	34.26	7.25				

P<0.05*

Result from the table 2 above shows that females significantly adjusted psychologically than their male counterparts. 34.26 (SD 7.25), 32 (SD 6.17) respectively this was statistically significant $t(118) = -2.36, p = 0.020$. The hypothesis was therefore accepted.

Hypothesis 3

Religion beliefs among students will significantly determine their views on attitudinal behaviour towards homosexuality on psychological adjustment.

Table 3: t-test for Religion and Psychological Adjustment

	N	Mean	Std.Dev	T	Df	F	P
Christianity	58	33.19	6.12	.870	117	3.34	0.386
Islam	61	32.10	7.46				

P<0.05*

Result from the table above shows that Christian participants had higher psychological adjustment compared to Muslim participants. Means; 33.19 (SD 6.12) and 32.10 (SD 7.46). However, the difference was not statistically significant. $T(117) = 0.870, P = 0.386$. The hypothesis was not supported.

Discussion of Findings

This study investigated the attitude of students towards homosexuality and its implication on psychological adjustment. Six hypotheses were tested. The first hypothesis shows that participants with positive attitude toward homosexuality had higher psychological adjustment than participants with poor attitudes towards homosexuality, However, the differences in means was not statistically significant and the hypothesis was not supported. This result is supported with the findings of Stolzenberg, Blair-Loy, & Waite, (1995), who examined the attitudes of undergraduate students towards same-sex couples. Result shows that there was no difference in attitude scores and psychological adjustment.

The second hypothesis shows that females significantly adjusted psychologically than their male counterparts supporting findings by: (Herek & John, (1995), who showed that

there was gender differences in psychological adjustment, where females had higher psychological adjustment compared to their male counterparts; Prior, Herek, (2002), Herek & Glunt, (1993), Kite, (1984), also found that Boys were significantly more likely to have problems with adaptive behavior and social competence and to show behavior problems of the hyperactive and aggressive type, as rated by mothers. (In comparing male and females on typical adjustment in young to middle-aged career survivors, (Herek, & John 1999).

The third hypothesis shows that Christian participants had higher psychological adjustment compared to Muslim participants, however, the difference was not statically significant. This result is consistent with other researchers who found that both Christians and Muslims score almost the same on the psychological adjustment scale (Melzack, & Casey, 1998).

Conclusion

Given the role some society and schools have played against homosexuality especially in regards to negative attitudes, there is an urgent need for the society and relevant agencies to play proactive role in fighting traditional sexual prejudice and promoting gay rights, one cannot boldly claim that school is a 'deeply heterosexist institution' (Buston & Hart, 2001), therefore, the need to identify those who are victims and rehabilitate them through available psychological interventions. As a result of this study, it is hoped that gender difference will be recognized as a significant factor regarding students' attitudes toward homosexuality and how these attitudes are formed. The research hopes that more professionals will recognize and be sensitive to the important of students' perceptions toward homosexuality. Homophobia and discrimination towards homosexuals' individuals is apparent in our society, even in highly educated individuals. Result showed that there is a significant mean difference between gender and attitude toward homosexuality. Researchers hope sensitivity education and awareness training is provided, especially for female students. The researcher hopes that providing these additional resources to students can increase awareness and reduce homophobic attitudes. Resource should not only be provided at the universities and high school level but also throughout the educational experience.

Recommendations

The following are recommendations from this study:

1. The need to sensitize the public on building positive attitudes towards homosexuals is sacrosanct. This is because these people are suffering from conscious and unconscious psychological disorders which may prompt them into such negative attitude. Therefore, only a society that understands them and show them love can have a positive influence on them.
2. The study shows some correlates of psychological adjustments among both faiths, as both Christians and Muslims forbid the act of homosexuality, as such, having the knowledge of that comes with tolerance to its adherences so as not to indulged in such weird behaviour.

3. It is advisable that the general public should be made to be aware of homosexuals so as to understand how to adopt to them within the communities, having such knowledge in mind, one can develop some adjustment coping skills in dealing with such unwholesome behaviour within the communities.
4. Those who practice such unwholesome behaviour should be made to change their behaviour as it is ungodly and must people resent such behaviour and usually see those who indulged in it as people with psychological disorders who are mostly disregarded in the society.

References

- Boswell, J. (2020). *Christianity, social tolerance and homosexuality*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bruce-Jones, E., & Paoli, L. (2011). *State-sponsored Homophobia: A world survey of laws criminalizing same-sex sexual acts between consenting adults*.
- Bunting, M. (2010). African homophobia has complex roots, *The Guardian*.
- CBC News. (2006). *South Africa passes same-sex marriage bill*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/world/south-africa-passes-same-sex-marriage-bill-1.616073>
- Chauncey, G., Jr. (1982/1983). From sexual inversion to homosexuality: Medicine and the changing conceptualization of female deviance. *Salmagundi*, 114-146.
- Calzo, J. P., & Ward, L. M. (2009). Media exposure and viewers' attitudes toward homosexuality: evidence for mainstreaming or resonance? *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, (2), 280-299.
- D'Emilio, J., & Freedman, E. B. (1988). *Intimate matters: A history of sexuality in America*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Dionne K. Y. (2013). Attitudes toward homosexuality in sub-Saharan Africa, Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2250130>
- Duberman, M. B., Vicinus, M., & Chauncey, G., Jr. (1989). *Hidden from history: Reclaiming the gay and lesbian past*, New York: New American Library.
- Ellis, H. (2001). *Studies in the psychology of sex: 2: Sexual inversion*, Philadelphia: F.A. Davis.
- Ghorbani, N., Watson, P. J, Madani M. & Chen, Z. J. (2016). In a study Muslim experiential religiousness: Spirituality relationships with psychological and religious adjustment in Iran, *Journal of Spirituality in Mental Health*. (4), 77-89

- Harkins, S. W., Price, D. D., & Braith, J. (1989). *Effects of extraversion and neuroticism on experimental pain, clinical pain, and illness behaviour*. *Pain* (2), 209–218. [PubMed]
- Herek, G. M. & Glunt, E. K. (1993). Interpersonal contact and heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men: Results from a national survey, *J. Sex Res*, 239-244.
- Herek, G. M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences, *Journal of Sex Research*, 451-477.
- Herek, G. M. (2000). Sexual prejudice and gender: Do heterosexuals' attitudes toward Lesbians and Gay Men Differ?' *Journal of Social Issues* (2), 251-166.
- Herek, G. M. (2000). The psychology of sexual prejudice, *Current Directions in Psychological Science* (1), 19-22.
- Herek, G. M. (2002). Gender gaps in public opinion about Lesbians and gay men, *Public Opinion Quarterly* 66, 40-66.
- Herek, G. M. (2002). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward bisexual men and women in the United States, *Journal of Sex Research* 39(4), 264-274.
- Herek, G. M. & Eric, K. (1993). Interpersonal contact and heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men: Results from a national survey, *Journal of Sex Research* 30(3), 239-244.
- Herek, G. M. & John, P. (1995). Black heterosexuals' attitudes toward Lesbians and gay men in the United States, *The Journal of Sex Research* 32(2), 95-105.
- Herek, G. M. & John, P. (1996). Some of my best friends: Intergroup contact, concealable stigma, and heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men and Lesbians, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 22(4), 412-424.
- Herek, G. M. & John, P. (1998). Symbolic prejudice or fear of infection? A functional analysis of AIDS-related stigma among heterosexual adults, *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 20(3) 230-241.
- Herek, G. M. & John, P. (1999). AIDS stigma and sexual prejudice, *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 42(7) 1130-1147.
- Herek, G. M. & John, P. (1999). Sex differences in how heterosexuals think about Lesbians and gay men: Evidence form survey context effects, *Journal of Sex Research*, 36(4), 348-360.
- Katz, D. (1990). The functional approach to the study of attitudes, *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 24, 163–204. doi:10.1086/266945.

- Katz, J. N. (1996). *Gay American history: Lesbians and gay men in the USA*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.
- Kite, M. E. & Bernard, E. W. Jr (1998). Do heterosexual women and men differ in their attitudes toward homosexuality: A conceptual and methodological analysis' in Gregory M Herek (ed),
- Stigma and Sexual Orientation: Understanding Prejudice Against Lesbians, *Gay Men and Bisexuals*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, 39-61.
- Laws on Homosexuality in African Nations. (2014). *Law Library of Congress*.
- Loftus, J. (2020). America's liberalization in Attitudes Toward Homosexuality, 1973-1998', *American Sociological Review*, 66(5) 762-782.
- Louderback, L. A. & Bernard, A.W. (1997) 'Perceived erotic value of homosexuality and Sex-Role attitudes as mediators of sex differences in heterosexual college students' Attitudes Toward Lesbians and gay men, *The Journal of Sex Research*, 34(2)
- Mabvurira V (2012). Attitudes, knowledge and perceptions about homosexuality among undergraduate social work students at the University of Zimbabwe, School of Social Work, *Res. J. Soc. Sci. Manag.* 2(8), ISSN: 2251-1571.
- Martin, N. G. (2008). Genetic and environmental influence on individual differences in attitudes toward homosexuality: An Australian twin study, *Behaviour genetics*, 38(3), 257-269.
- Mazur, M. A. & Tara, M. E. (2002). The effect of movie portrayals on audience attitudes About nontraditional families and sexual orientation, *Journal of Homosexuality* 44(1), 157-179.
- Mbiti, J. (1969). *African religions and philosophy*, London: Longman. Love and marriage in African. 3rd impression
- Mellstrom, J. (2012). *Intolerance towards homosexuality in Africa: How can attitudes towards homosexuality in Africa be explained?* A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of bachelors thesis, department of government, development studies, Uppsalla University.
- Melzack, R. & Casey, K. L. (1998). *Sensory, motivational, and central control of determinants of pain*. In: Kenshalo DR, editor, *The Skin Senses*. Springfield, Ill, USA: Charles C. Thomas; 423.

- 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.
- Murray, S. O. (2000). *Homosexuality*, University of Chicago Press.
- Olson, L. R., Cadge, W., & Harrison, J. T. (2006). Religion and public opinion about same-sex marriage, *Social Science Quarterly*, (2), 340-360.
- Pew Research Center: The Global Divide on Homosexuality (2013). Retrieved from <http://www.pewglobal.org>
- Price, D. D. (2016). *Psychological and neural mechanisms of the affective dimension of pain Science*, 2, 88(5472):1769-1772. [PubMed]
- Price, D. D., McGrath, P. A., Rafii, A., & Buckingham, B. (2003). *The validation of visual analogue scales as ratio scale measures for chronic and experimental pain Pain*, 1), 45-56. [PubMed]
- Raiz, L. (2006). College students' support of rights for members of the gay community, *Journal of Poverty*, (2), 53-75.
- Rice, W. & Friberg, W. (2012). Homosexuality as a consequence of epigenetically canalized sexual development, *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, ;343-368.
- Richard, S. (2013). *Can epigenetics explain homosexuality?* The Scientist.
- Robinson, P. (1996). *The modernization of sex*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Siegelman, M. (1999). Psychological adjustment of homosexual and heterosexual men: A cross-national replication, *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*. (1), 1-11 |
- Smith, M. B., Bruner, J. S., & White, R. W. (1956). *Opinions and personality*, New York: Wiley. doi:10.1177/001654925700300325
- Stolzenberg, R. M. M., Blair-Loy, T. J., & Waite, L. J. (1995). Religious participation over the life course: age and family life cycle effects on church membership, *American Sociological Review*; 60, 84-103.
- Verweij, K. J. H., Shekar, S. N., Zietsch, B. P., Eaves, L. J., Bailey, J. M., Boomsma, D. I., & Martin, N. G. (2008). Genetic and environmental influences College Students' Attitudes towards Homosexuality *Journal of Student Research on individual differences in attitudes toward homosexuality: An Australian twin study, Behavior Genetics*, 38(3), 257-269.

- Wade, J. B., Hart, R. P., Wade, J. H., Bajaj, J. S., & Price, D. D. (2013). The relationship between Marital Status and Psychological Resilience in Chronic Pain, (3), 200 - 220.
- Wade, J. B., Price, D. D., Hamer, R. M., Schwartz, S. M., & Hart, R. P. (1990). *An emotional component analysis of chronic pain*. *Pain* 40(3), 303-310. [PubMed]
- Wade, J. B., Riddle, D. L., Price, D. D., & Dumenci, L. (2011). Role of pain catastrophizing during pain processing in a cohort of patients with chronic and severe arthritic knee pain. *Pain* 152(2), 314-319. [PubMed]
- Waite L. J. (1995). Does marriage matter? Demography, *Pain Res Treat*, 32(4), 483-507. [PubMed] Webster's unabridged dictionary (2nd ed.). (2001). New York: Random House.
- Weingarten, H. R. (1985). Marital status and well-being: A national study comparing First-Married, currently divorced, and remarried adults, *Journal of Marriage and Family* (3) 653-662.
- Wiredu, K. (1996). *Philosophy and African culture* Cambridge university press, Wiredu, Kwame 'cultural universal and particulars: An African perspective' Bloomington: Indiana up, 81-104.