

Introduction

•48% of Americans believe that transgender people should use the bathroom that corresponds to their sex assigned at birth (Gallup, 2017).

•Arguments surrounding the support of bathroom bills often lack scientific support. •People evaluate arguments of persuasive messages significantly more favorably if the arguments support pre-existing attitudes (Lord, Ross, & Lepper, 1979; Munro & Ditto, 1997).

- -There may be individual differences that would mediate the biases found in previous research
- -This research focuses on the potential of open-mindedness to reduce biases
- –We also investigated narcissism and scientific reasoning

Participants

<u>N = 260 Ages 18 to 71 (M = 22, SD = 9.38):</u>

- **80% Female**, 18.8% as Male, 0.8% choose not to identify, 0.4% "Other".
- 66% White/European-American, 18.1% Black/African-American, 7.5% Asian/Asian-American, 3.5% Latina/o/Hispanic, and 5% Mixed/Biracial
- Recruited using *Towson University's Research Pool* website as and through *multiple internet portals*.

Measures

Scientific Reasoning Scale [SRS]: (Drummond & Fischhoff, 2015)

Narcissism Personality Index Scale [NPI]: (Raskin & Hall, 1979)

Open-Minded Cognition Scale [OMC]: (Price, Ottati, Wilson, & Kim, 2015)

Active Open-Minded Thinking Scale [AOT]: (Stanovich & West, 2007)

Fake scientific article: opposed or supported transgender bathroom use consistent with gender identity regardless of assigned sex at birth

Emotion and Article Opinion Measures(Munro & Ditto, 1997)



Biases and Their Impact on Opinions of Transgender Bathroom Usage Zakary A. Clements, Geoffrey D. Munro, Alexa B. Mendel, & Sharon S. Rostosky Towson University & The University of Kentucky

Procedure:

Initial attitudes su "Transgender people Measures: should use the bath SRS corresponding to the NPI at birth" OMC AOT **Pro-Use Article:** Anti-Use Article: "The results showed the "The results showed the percentage of sexual assault percentage of sexual assault occurring in bathrooms in nonoccurring in bathrooms in nondiscrimination states (5.3%) was discrimination states (1.2%) significantly higher than the was <u>significantly lower</u> than the prohibitory state sample (5.6%) prohibitory state sample (1.2%)as well as the general as well as the general population population (2.6%) during the (2.6%) during the one year sample. The researcher six month sample. The researchers concluded that **non**concluded that **non**discrimination laws do not discrimination laws perpetuat sexual assault on women in perpetuate sexual assault on women in bathrooms." bathrooms."

Mea

Article Opinion Measures:

CHANGE Index **QUALITY** Index **EMOTION** Index

| le room eir sex | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | |
| IS | | |
| n | | |
| te | | |
| | | |
| asures: RS IPI DMC OT | | |
| | | |

| Mismatch | | |
|--------------|------------------------------|--|
| IV | Multivariate Regr Results | |
| OMC | 0.368 | |
| | (0.196) | |
| AOT | 0.367 | |
| | (0.238) | |
| SRS | -0.154* | |
| | (0.074) | |
| NPI | 0.017 | |
| | (0.031) | |
| Observations | 104 | |
| R-squared | 0.112 | |
| F | 3.167 | |
| | | |

| Match | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|
| IV | Multivariate Reg Results | |
| OMC | 0.098 | |
| | (0.164) | |
| AOT | 0.442* | |
| | (0.194) | |
| SRS | 0.073 | |
| | (0.065) | |
| NPI | -0.026 | |
| | (0.024) | |
| Observations | 101 | |
| R-squared | 0.118 | |
| F | 3.250 | |
| DV: Quality Index Standard errors in parenthesis | | |

Standard errors in parenthesis *p<0.05



Conclusions

- A 2 (match: article congruent x article incongruent) x 2 (attitude: pro-transgender rights vs. antitransgender rights) between-groups factorial ANOVA was conducted on the index measuring participants perceptions of the quality of the article. Replicating past research (Lord et al., 1979; Munro & Ditto, 1997), participants evaluating a study congruent with their preexisting attitudes evaluated it more favorably (M = 6.12, SD = 1.54)than participants evaluating a study incongruent with their pre-existing attitudes (M = 5.50, SD = 1.80), $F(1, 204) = 5.46, p = .02, \eta^2 = .03.$
- Higher levels of Scientific **Reasoning** predicts stronger aversion to information that is incongruent with pre-existing opinions.
- Bias reduction is necessary to function in a world where scientific facts are called into question on a consistent basis, therefore this study attempted to isolate distinct characteristics that may be influencing biased assimilation
- **Open-mindedness** can potentially lead to a less biased view of others' opinions

Contact Information

Zakary A. Clements Doctoral Student Counseling Psychology University of Kentucky zakary.alexander@uky.edu