

Men, on Homosexuality: Knowledge, Attitudes and Views

MICHAEL B. DIZON

<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2847-819>

mikedizon24@yahoo.com

College of Liberal Arts

Iloilo State College of Fisheries – Main (Tiwi) Campus

Barotac Nuevo, Iloilo 5007 Philippines



ABSTRACT

As education continues to face the challenge of meeting learners' needs, there is an increasingly strong argument for bringing sexuality in the modern age group. There are also conflicting views and attitudes towards homosexuality which affect teacher's performance. This quantitative-qualitative research aimed to find out the knowledge, attitudes and views of male teachers on homosexuality. Complete enumeration of the 381 male teachers of State Universities and Colleges in Iloilo served as the respondents of the study. Data were collected through a sample survey and Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and processed using the Social Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Respondents had an average level of knowledge and favorable attitude which vary according to marital status, religion, family environment and peer influence. No significant association was found between knowledge and attitudes towards homosexuality. Marital status, religion, family environment and peer influence are significant predictors of male teachers' knowledge and attitudes towards homosexuality. The respondents had a better grasp of the concepts of homosexuality which could yield to a better understanding of homosexual behaviors. They are now more accepting, permissive and open minded with the concept of homosexuality and they are more likely to recognize homosexuality as an acceptable behavior in the society.

KEYWORDS

Social Science, homosexuality, quantitative-qualitative research, Iloilo, Philippines, Asia.

INTRODUCTION

Does sexual orientation affect a teacher's performance? As education continues to face the challenge of meeting the needs of the learners, there is an increasingly strong argument for bringing sexuality into the light of day. There are also conflicting views and attitudes towards homosexuality which affect teacher's performance. If this is so, it becomes a problem of administrators and supervisors. If teachers are not sure of their sexual orientation, they would not know how to behave and they themselves might create some problems in the community.

Teachers must understand the concepts of sexuality so that they will make choices and priorities in their preferences as these choices and preferences will greatly influence their performance. And if teachers are clear with their identity whether they are homosexuals or not, then there will be fewer problems probably in their attitudes and behavior.

Section 4 of Republic Act 10354 otherwise known as "The Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act of 2012," specifies gender equality or the principle of equality between women and men and equal rights to enjoy conditions in realizing their full human potentials. It emphasizes that the state shall recognize that all human beings are free and equal in dignity and rights. Gender equality entails equality in opportunities, in the allocation of resources or benefits, or in access to services in furtherance of the rights to health and sustainable human development among others, without discrimination. It entails fairness and justice in the distribution of benefits and responsibilities between women and men, and often requires women-specific projects and programs to end existing inequalities. This concept recognizes that while "reproductive health involves women and men, it is more critical for women's health" (<http://pcw.gov.ph>).

Homosexual teachers are often victims of discrimination in all levels of educational institutions. "The most common abuse is verbal discrimination in the form of lesbian or gay jokes, whispered behind the backs of those in question, often followed by the withholding of information, sexual harassment and/or physical violence, and the fact of being bypassed for any promotion" (<http://webcache.googleusercontent.com>). They are also careful to hide their real identity from their colleagues and students because they fear losing their jobs and/or suffering retaliation from the school community. Although there are homosexual teachers who are open about their identities at school, there are teachers who come out on the job and are met with complaints and/or loss of employment. Because there are no civic employment protections for homosexual people and many countries allow employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity, teachers who are fired for coming out often do not have legal recourse.

How do gay teachers face these professional challenges? What are their views which affect their understanding on certain issues regarding sexual orientation and their

attitude towards homosexuality?

Gender prejudices and biases must be avoided. Irrespective of the sexual orientation of teachers, they must be treated like anybody else by the administration. They must be given the same opportunities without discrimination. If this is so, homosexual teachers should not hide their real identity anymore. But what is happening is there is still a very strong discrimination on the basis of their gender identity, gender expression and sexual orientation in all levels of learning institution. What are the possible reasons of having this kind or problem?

It is now a great challenge to the heads of educational agencies to strengthen the GAD mainstreaming efforts by formulating policies and implementing development programs to eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, and to all levels of education.

In relation to these challenges, school administrators must address issues regarding teachers' sexual orientation. They must have proper orientation and correct attitudes in dealing with these issues. It is for this reason that this study was conducted. It is the intention of the researcher to fill an overlooked gap in the literature by exploring how school leaders view homosexuality in terms of their knowledge, attitudes and views about this issue.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study specifically aimed to: (a) determine the male teachers' level of knowledge about homosexuality and if the level of knowledge varies according to age, marital status, educational attainment, place of residence, religion, family environment and peer influence; (b) determine the attitudes of male teachers towards homosexuality and the variation in these attitudes according to age, marital status, educational attainment, place of residence, religion, family environment and peer influence; (c) determine the relationship between the male teachers' level of knowledge and their attitudes towards homosexuality; (d) determine which among the characteristics of male teachers is the best predictor of their knowledge and attitudes towards homosexuality; and (e) describe the views of the participants on disclosure of sexual orientation, development of homosexuality, homosexual traits and characteristics, and legality of homosexuality.

METHODOLOGY

The assessment survey consisted of 381 male teachers of four (4) State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in Iloilo Province namely: Iloilo State College of Fisheries (ISCOF) with 5 campuses, Northern Iloilo Polytechnic State College (NIPSC) with 7 campuses, West Visayas State University (WVSU) with 5 campuses and Western Visayas College of Science and Technology (WVCST) with 5 campuses.

Data were collected using the Knowledge about Homosexuality Questionnaire by Ivkovic, et al. (2012) represented by the total number of correct answers in a 29-item questionnaire on homosexuality and the Attitudes towards Homosexuals Questionnaire by Ivkovic, et al. (2012) consisting of a 20-item questionnaire regarding homosexuals, their lifestyle, and their social position. The data were computer-processed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for MS Windows 17.0 software. The mean, percentage and frequency distribution, z-test, F-test, Gamma and multiple regression analysis were used to analyze the data.

Compliance to research ethics protocol was done through informed consent. Data for the qualitative approach were collected through a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) which was collected in Hiligaynon and English language. Eight (8) participants were chosen purposively to participate in the FGD. They were asked to sign the letter of consent to confirm their participation in the FGD as well as to having the interviews recorded.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Level of Knowledge of Male Teachers on Homosexuality

The data show that a large majority (95.5%) of them had average level of knowledge on homosexuality, only very few had low level of knowledge (3.9%) and high level of knowledge (0.5%) on homosexuality. The mean knowledge score on homosexuality was 13.43. The highest score obtained was 20, out of 29 items while the lowest score was 6. It indicates the average level of understanding and awareness of the respondents regarding homosexuality. Male teachers are capable of identifying social issues relevant to homosexuality which affect individuals.

Table 1. Level of Knowledge of Male Teachers on Homosexuality

| Level of Knowledge on Homosexuality | f | % |
|--------------------------------------|------------|--------------|
| High level of knowledge (20 -29) | 2 | 0.5 |
| Average level of knowledge (10 – 19) | 364 | 95.5 |
| Low level of knowledge (0 - 9) | 15 | 3.9 |
| TOTAL | 381 | 100.0 |
| Mean Score: 13.44 | | |

The Male Teachers' Attitudes towards Homosexuality

The data show that two-thirds (66.7 percent) of them had a favorable attitude towards homosexuality, while a little more than one-fourth (26.0 percent) had unfavorable attitudes towards homosexuality. There were very few who had very favorable (5.5 percent) and had very unfavorable (1.8 percent) attitudes towards homosexuality.

Their mean attitude score on homosexuality is 56.31 which denote a favorable attitude towards homosexuality. This means that male teachers are now more accepting and open-minded regarding the concepts of homosexuality.

Table 2. Attitudes of Male Teachers towards Homosexuality

| Attitudes towards Homosexuality | f | % |
|---|------------|--------------|
| Very Favorable (20-40) | 21 | 5.5 |
| Favorable (40 – 60) | 254 | 66.7 |
| Unfavorable (61 – 80) | 99 | 26.0 |
| Very Unfavorable (81- 100) | 7 | 1.8 |
| TOTAL | 381 | 100.0 |
| Mean Score: 56.31 Favorable Attitude | | |

Variation in the Level of Knowledge of Male Teachers on Homosexuality according to Certain Characteristics

The results show that when male teachers were classified according to age, marital status, educational attainment, place of residence, religion, family environment and peer influence, the biggest proportion of all groups had average level of knowledge about homosexuality. The ANOVA test for differences among means for age, educational attainment and place of residence, yielded F values (2.289, $p = 0.103$; 0.131, $p = 0.877$; 1.197, $p = .303$) which are not significant at 0.05 level. However, when the respondents were classified according to marital status ($F = 8.022$, $p = .000$) and religion ($F = 5.538$, $p = .004$), it was found out that the difference was highly significant.

Table 3. Variation in the Level of Knowledge of Male Teachers on Homosexuality when classified according to Age, Marital Status, Educational Attainment, Place of Residence and Religion

| Characteristics | Level of Knowledge on Homosexuality | | | | | | | | | Mean |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|----------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|--------------|--|--------------|
| | (Low 0-9) | | Average (10 -19) | | High (20-29) | | Total | | | |
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % | | |
| Age | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 years and below | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 – 45 years old | 5 | 4.6 | 102 | 93.6 | 2 | 1.8 | 109 | 100.0 | | 13.83 |
| 46 years old and above | 3 | 2.8 | 104 | 97.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 107 | 100.0 | | 13.38 |
| | 7 | 4.2 | 158 | 95.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 165 | 100.0 | | 13.22 |
| Total | 15 | 3.9 | 364 | 95.5 | 2 | 0.5 | 381 | 100.0 | | 13.44 |
| | | | F – value 2.289 p = 0.103 | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|------------|----------------------------------|-------------|----------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--|
| Marital Status | | | 105 | 95.5 | 1 | 0.9 | 110 | 100.0 | 14.24 | |
| Single | | | 253 | 95.5 | 1 | 0.4 | 265 | 100.0 | 13.09 | |
| Married | | | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 100.0 | 13.50 | |
| Widowed | | | 2 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 16.50 | |
| Separated | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.6 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 15 | 3.9 | 364 | 95.5 | 2 | 05 | 381 | 100.0 | 13.44 | |
| | | | F – value 8.022* p = .000 | | | | | | | |
| Educational Attainment | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bachelor's Degree | 3 | 2.5 | 116 | 96.7 | 1 | 0.8 | 120 | 100.0 | 13.42 | |
| Master's Degree | 7 | 3.2 | 209 | 96.3 | 1 | 0.5 | 217 | 100.0 | 13.48 | |
| Doctorate's Degree | 5 | 11.4 | 39 | 88.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 44 | 100.0 | 13.30 | |
| Total | 15 | 3.9 | 364 | 95.5 | 2 | 0.5 | 381 | 100.0 | 13.44 | |
| | | | F – value .131 p = 0.877 | | | | | | | |
| Place of Residence | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poblacion | 3 | 2.0 | 143 | 96.6 | 2 | 1.4 | 148 | 100.0 | 13.66 | |
| Outside Poblacion | 8 | 4.5 | 170 | 95.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 178 | 100.0 | 13.26 | |
| City | 4 | 7.3 | 51 | 92.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 55 | 100.0 | 13.45 | |
| Total | 15 | 3.9 | 364 | 95.5 | 2 | 0.5 | 381 | 100.0 | 13.44 | |
| | | | F – value 1.197 p = .303 | | | | | | | |
| Religion | | | | | | | | | | |
| Roman Catholic | 11 | 3.3 | 323 | 96.1 | 2 | 0.6 | 336 | 100.0 | 13.58 | |
| Independent | 1 | 6.3 | 15 | 93.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 161 | 100.0 | 12.38 | |
| Protestant | 3 | 10.3 | 26 | 89.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 29 | 100.0 | 12.38 | |
| Total | 15 | 3.9 | 364 | 95.5 | 2 | 0.5 | 38 | 100.0 | 13.44 | |
| | | | F – value 5.538* p = .004 | | | | | | | |

* Significant at .05 level

In addition, when male teachers were classified according to family environment, it was found out that the difference in the two proportions was significant using the z-test (z – values = -0.5035, 2.1727 and -0.0096). However, when respondents were grouped according to peer influence, it was found out that the difference in the two proportions was not significant (z – values = -0.1478, 0.8220 and -0.0509). The result did not find support in the study of Wagenaar, Sullivan & Stephenson (2012) which showed that in United States, for each ten point increase in the number of gay or bisexual friends known, the odds of scoring low on knowledge decreased 11%. In South Africa, having fewer acquaintances gay or bisexual was associated with lower knowledge, which could

indicate that in peer networks are key avenues where information is shared.

Table 4. Variation in the Level of Knowledge of Male Teachers on Homosexuality when classified according to Family Environment and Peer Influence

| Characteristics | Level of Knowledge on Homosexuality | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Low (0-9) | | Average (10 -19) | | High (2029) | | Total | | Mean |
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % | |
| Family Environment | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Male teachers who have gay or homosexual relatives and members of immediate family</i> | 4 | 1.8 | 216 | 97.7 | 1 | 0.5 | 221 | 100.0 | 13.57 |
| <i>Male teachers who do not have gay or homosexual relatives and members of immediate family</i> | 11 | 6.9 | 148 | 92.5 | 1 | 0.6 | 160 | 100.0 | 13.26 |
| Total | 15 | 3.9 | 364 | 95.5 | 2 | 2 | 381 | 100.0 | 13.44 |
| z - values = -0.5035 2.1727* -0.0096 | | | | | | | | | |
| Peer Influence | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Male teachers who have gay or homosexual friends</i> | 10 | 3.5 | 274 | 96.1 | 1 | 0.4 | 285 | 100.0 | 13.52 |
| <i>Male teachers who do not have gay or homosexual friends</i> | 5 | 5.2 | 90 | 93.8 | 1 | 1.0 | 96 | 100.0 | 13.21 |
| Total | 15 | 3.9 | 364 | 95.5 | 2 | 0.5 | 381 | 100.0 | 13.44 |
| z - values = -0.1478 0.8220 -0.0509 | | | | | | | | | |

*Significant at .05 level

Variations in the Attitudes of Male Teachers towards Homosexuality According to Certain Characteristics

The results show that when male teachers were classified according to age, marital status, educational attainment, place of residence, religion, family environment and peer influence, the biggest proportion of them were found to have favorable attitudes towards homosexuality. The ANOVA test for differences among means yielded F values (1.219, p = 0.297; 0.569, p = 0.567; 1.030, p = 0.358; which are not significant at 0.05 level. However, when the respondents were classified according to marital status (F = 11.41, p = 0.000) and religion (F = 5.538, p = .004), it was found out that the difference was highly significant.

Table 5. Variation in the Attitudes of Male Teachers towards Homosexuality when classified according to Age, Marital Status, Educational Attainment, Place of Residence and Religion

| Characteristics | Attitudes towards Homosexuality | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Very Favorable (20-40) | | Favorable (41-60) | | Unfavorable (61-80) | | Very Unfavorable (81-100) | | Total | | Mean |
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % | |
| Age | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 years and below | 9 | 8.3 | 69 | 63.3 | 28 | 25.7 | 3 | 2.8 | 109 | 100.0 | 55.09 |
| 36– 45 years old | 8 | 7.5 | 66 | 61.7 | 32 | 29.9 | 1 | 0.9 | 107 | 100.0 | 57.07 |
| 46 years old and above | 4 | 2.4 | 119 | 72.1 | 39 | 23.6 | 3 | 1.8 | 165 | 100.0 | 56.62 |
| Total | 21 | 5.5 | 254 | 66.7 | 99 | 26.0 | 7 | 1.8 | 381 | 100.0 | 56.31 |
| F – value = 1.219 p = 0.297 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Marital Status | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Single | 19 | 17.3 | 70 | 63.6 | 18 | 16.4 | 3 | 2.7 | 110 | 100.0 | 51.93 |
| Married | 1 | 0.4 | 180 | 67.9 | 80 | 30.2 | 4 | 1.5 | 265 | 100.0 | 58.20 |
| Widowed | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 100.0 | 0 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 100.0 | 53.75 |
| Separated | 1 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 52.00 |
| Total | 21 | 5.5 | 254 | 66.7 | 99 | 26.0 | 7 | 1.8 | 381 | 100.0 | 56.31 |
| F – value = 11.41* p = 0.000 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Educational Attainment | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bachelor's Degree | 5 | 4.2 | 80 | 66.7 | 31 | 25.8 | 4 | 3.3 | 120 | 100.0 | 57.10 |
| Master's Degree | 14 | 6.5 | 145 | 66.8 | 56 | 25.8 | 2 | 0.9 | 217 | 100.0 | 55.89 |
| Doctorate's Degree | 2 | 4.5 | 29 | 65.9 | 12 | 27.3 | 1 | 2.3 | 44 | 100.0 | 56.23 |
| Total | 21 | 5.5 | 254 | 66.7 | 99 | 26.0 | 7 | 1.8 | 381 | 100.0 | 56.31 |
| F – value = 0.569 p = 0.567 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Place of Residence | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poblacion | 6 | 4.1 | 104 | 70.3 | 36 | 24.3 | 2 | 1.4 | 148 | 100.0 | 56.52 |
| Outside Poblacion | 10 | 5.6 | 120 | 67.4 | 44 | 24.7 | 4 | 2.2 | 178 | 100.0 | 55.67 |
| City | 5 | 9.1 | 30 | 54.5 | 19 | 34.5 | 1 | 1.8 | 55 | 100.0 | 57.82 |
| Total | 21 | 5.5 | 254 | 66.7 | 99 | 26.0 | 7 | 1.8 | 381 | 100.0 | 56.31 |
| F – value = 1.030 p = 0.358 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Religion | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Roman Catholic | 18 | 5.4 | 237 | 70.5 | 77 | 22.9 | 4 | 1.2 | 336 | 100.0 | 55.58 |
| Independent | 2 | 12.5 | 7 | 43.8 | 6 | 37.5 | 1 | 6.3 | 16 | 100.0 | 58.06 |
| Protestant | 1 | 3.4 | 10 | 34.5 | 16 | 55.2 | 2 | 6.9 | 29 | 100.0 | 63.86 |
| Total | 20 | 5.5 | 254 | 66.7 | 99 | 26.0 | 7 | 1.8 | 381 | 100.0 | 56.31 |
| F – value = 5.538* p = .004 | | | | | | | | | | | |

*Significant at .05

When respondents were grouped according to family environment, it was found out that the difference in the two proportions was not significant (z-values = 0.7106, 0.8246, -1.2570, - 0.1064). Also, no significant differences were observed for those who had strong favorable, unfavorable and strong unfavorable attitudes towards homosexuality. However, when male teachers were classified according to peer influence, it was found

out that the difference in the two proportions was significant using the z-test (z-values = infinity, 2.5200, -2.3816, -0.3897). Whereas, for those with very favorable, unfavorable or very unfavorable attitudes towards homosexuality, no significant difference in the proportions was observed.

This result is in consonance with the study of Schellenberg, et al. (1999), Blaauw (2012) and Papadaki, et al (2014), which said that interpersonal contact with gay men and lesbians is associated with improved attitudes toward homosexuals. A more homo friendly peer group reduces the chance of being homo negative. Having friends who think positive about homosexuality leads to less homonegative attitudes. In other words, positive friends make more positive about homosexuality.

Table 6. Variation in the Attitudes of Male Teachers towards Homosexuality when classified according to Family Environment and Peer Influence

| Characteristics | Attitudes towards Homosexuality | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Very Favorable (20-40) | | Favorable (41-60) | | Unfavorable (61-80) | | Very Unfavorable (81-100) | | Total | | Mean |
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % | |
| Family Environment <i>Male teachers who have gay or homosexual relatives and members of immediate family</i> | 19 | 8.5 | 152 | 68.8 | 47 | 21.3 | 3 | 1.4 | 221 | 100.0 | 54.36 |
| <i>Male teachers who do not have gay or homosexual relatives and members of immediate family</i> | 2 | 1.3 | 102 | 63.8 | 52 | 32.5 | 4 | 2.5 | 160 | 100.0 | 59.01 |
| Total | 21 | 5.5 | 254 | 66.7 | 99 | 26.0 | 7 | 1.8 | 381 | 100.0 | 56.31 |
| z-values = 0.7106 0.8246 -1.2570 -0.1064 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Peer Influence <i>Male teachers who have gay or homosexual friends</i> | 21 | 7.4 | 204 | 71.6 | 58 | 20.4 | 2 | 0.7 | 285 | 100.0 | 54.26 |
| <i>Male teachers who do not have gay or homosexual friends</i> | 0 | 0.0 | 50 | 52.1 | 41 | 42.7 | 5 | 5.2 | 96 | 100.0 | 62.42 |
| Total | 21 | 5.5 | 254 | 66.7 | 99 | 26.0 | 7 | 1.8 | 381 | 100.0 | 56.31 |
| z-values = --- 2.5200* -2.3816 -0.3897 | | | | | | | | | | | |

*Significant at 0.05 level

Relationship between the Level of Knowledge of Male Teachers on Homosexuality and their Attitudes towards Homosexuality

The results show that regardless of the male teachers' level of knowledge, they tended to have favorable attitudes towards homosexuality. This finding supports the result of Gamma test for association ($G = 0.738$, $p = 0.461$) which showed no significant relationship between level of knowledge and attitudes towards homosexuality. This result is consistent with the results of the studies of Langer-Most and Langer, Snyder and Zweig, and Luketich as cited by Jacobson (2013) which showed no significant relationship between knowledge and attitudes. This result, however, does not agree with Quinn-Krach & Van Hoozer as cited by Jacobson (2013); Eriksson & Grundin (2010); and Strong (2013) which found a significant correlation between higher knowledge scores and more permissive attitudes. They found that attitudes tend to increase when higher level of knowledge is present. Conversely, the level of attitudes tends to decrease as the level of knowledge.

Table 7. Relationship between the Level of Knowledge of Male Teachers on Homosexuality and Attitudes towards Homosexuality

| Attitudes towards Homosexuality | Level of Knowledge on Homosexuality | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
| | Low (0-9) | | Average (10 -19) | | High (20-29) | | T | otal |
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| Very Favorable (20-40) | 1 | 6.7 | 21 | 5.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 22 | 5.8 |
| Favorable (41-60) | 8 | 53.3 | 249 | 68.4 | 1 | 50.0 | 258 | 67.7 |
| Unfavorable (61-80) | 4 | 26.7 | 89 | 24.5 | 1 | 50.0 | 94 | 24.7 |
| Very Unfavorable (81-100) | 2 | 13.3 | 5 | 1.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 7 | 1.8 |
| Total | 15 | 100.0 | 364 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 381 | 100.0 |

Gamma = - 0.738 p = 0.461

Predictors of the Level of Knowledge of Male Teachers on Homosexuality

The results of the regression analysis showed that among all independent variables included in the analysis, only marital status and religion were found to be significant predictors of respondents' level of knowledge on homosexuality. Age, educational attainment, place of residence, family environment, and peer influence were not significant predictors of respondents' level of knowledge on homosexuality.

Table 8. Regression Analysis on the Predictors of Knowledge of Male Teachers on Homosexuality

| Characteristics | Level of Knowledge on Homosexuality | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---------|
| | Beta Coefficient | p-value |
| Age | 0.012 | 0.306 |
| Marital Status | | |
| Single | | |
| Married* | | |
| Widowed | 0.516 | 0.658 |
| Separated | 3.537 | 0.034** |
| Educational Attainment | | |
| Bachelor's Degree | -0.046 | 0.862 |
| Master's Degree* | | |
| Doctorate's Degree | -0.041 | 0.917 |
| Place of Residence | | |
| Poblacion | 0.438 | 0.086 |
| Outside Poblacion* | | |
| City | 0.250 | 0.489 |
| Religion | | |
| Roman Catholic* | | |
| Independent | -1.261 | 0.034** |
| Protestant | -1.344 | 0.003** |
| Family Environment | | |
| Male teachers <i>who have</i> gay or homosexual relatives and members of immediate family* | | |
| Male teachers <i>who do not have</i> gay or homosexual relatives and members of immediate family | -0.263 | 0.314 |
| Peer Influence | | |
| Male teachers who have gay or homosexual friends* | | |
| Male teachers who do not have gay or homosexual friends | -0.153 | 0.603 |

*= Reference; ** = Significant at .05 level

Predictors of the Attitudes of Male Teachers towards Homosexuality

The result of the regression analysis showed that only religion, family environment and peer influence were significant determinants of the respondents' attitudes towards

homosexuality when all other variables were controlled. Age, marital status, educational attainment, and place of residence found to be not significant predictors of respondents' attitudes towards homosexuality.

Table 9. Regression Analysis on the Predictors of Attitudes of Male Teachers towards Homosexuality

| Characteristics | Attitude towards Homosexuality | |
|--|--------------------------------|---------|
| | Beta Coefficient | p-value |
| Age | -0.012 | 0.789 |
| Marital Status | | |
| Single | | |
| Married* | | |
| Widowed | 2.423 | 0.600 |
| Separated | 9.713 | 0.139 |
| Educational Attainment | | |
| Bachelor's Degree | -0.633 | 0.544 |
| Master's Degree* | | |
| Doctorate's Degree | 0.871 | 0.575 |
| Place of Residence | | |
| Poblacion | -0.207 | 0.837 |
| Outside Poblacion* | | |
| City | -1.059 | 0.459 |
| Religion | | |
| Roman Catholic* | | |
| Independent | -2.768 | 0.237 |
| Protestant | -7.923 | 0.000** |
| Family Environment | | |
| <i>Male teachers who have gay or homosexual relatives and members of immediate family*</i> | | |
| <i>Male teachers who do not have gay or homosexual relatives and members of immediate family</i> | -2.171 | 0.036** |
| Peer Influence | | |
| <i>Male teachers who have gay or homosexual friends*</i> | | |
| <i>Male teachers who do not have gay or homosexual friends</i> | -7.076 | 0.000** |

* = Reference; ** = Significant at .05 level

THEMES

THE PERCEIVED MORALITY OF HOMOSEXUALITY

The issue on the preference of homosexual teachers not to disclose their sexual orientation might have been motivated by the most prominent code of ethics for teachers in the Philippines – the Code of Ethics for Professional Teachers. To quote one statement:

“...others prefer not to disclose because of their profession, they want respect and they are afraid to be bullied”

These statements give meaning to the preamble of the Code of Ethics for Professional Teachers which begins “Teachers are duly licensed professionals who possess dignity and reputation with high moral values as well as technical and professional competence in the practice of their noble profession, they strictly adhere to, observe, and practice this set of ethical and moral principles, standards and values.”

To return to the moral argument, another thing is that homosexuality is wrong because the Bible says so. The participants mentioned the provision of 10 commandments as basis regarding what the Bible is saying about moral issues of homosexuality. Conversely, there was a reinterpretation of the scripture. The following is a sample remark how teachers interpreted homosexuality in the context of what the Bible is saying about the Ten Commandments: “...Biblically nasunog ang Sodom and Gomorrah...wala man nabutang sa 10 commandments nga dili ka maghilawas...” (Biblically Sodom and Gomorrah were burned. However, sexual intercourse was never mentioned in the 10 commandments)

The teachers’ interpretation of the specific provision of the law about sexual desire is accurate like the fact that Sodom and Gomorrah fell because of homosexuality and the last commandment given to the children of Israel is accurate. However, their scriptural basis on how they understand homosexuality did not confirm to what the Bible is really saying about homosexual behavior.

Another consideration is the objectivist principles to evaluate the morality of homosexuality in any given situation. To quote one response: “...eventually, anhon mo kay amo na iya nga balatyagon. Kun kaisa kuno dapat pairalon naton mind naton over the heart kay ang temptation ara dira. What if nagbeat na ini for someone? Budlay nga ang focus mo is with her but ang gusto mo is with him.”(Eventually, you cannot just ignore if that is how he feels. Sometimes, we would say that it is mind over heart but what if it already beats for someone? It is hard if your focus is with her however, what you want is with him)

According to some scholars, the homosexuals do not have much to stand on when it comes to promoting their practice based on moral issues. Instead, they have used misdirection of the main issue, misrepresentation of the opposing viewpoints, and

misapplication of civil rights to further their cause. School administrators and educators need to be aware of this and deal not only with the so-called legal rights issues but also the moral ones when dialoguing with homosexuals and pro-homosexuals.

THE LEGALITY OF HOMOSEXUALITY

Analyzing the different views of the participants will help us understand the fixed point of morality among people particularly those in the academe. From the result, here's one response that reflected the majority of opposition to same-sex marriage:

“As Roman Catholic, I am not in favor for gay marriage kay the civil code or constitution does not provide for same-sex marriage”

Other related responses were:

“Same sex marriage or homosexual relationships should not be allowed because of the law”

“First and foremost, the church cannot perform marriage between man and another man ...unless we change the law...but then marriage will not happen in the church because of the separation of the church and the state...”

“I am not in favor of same sex marriage because of what the law provides. But in my point of view, how I wish there is. Since it's not yet legal in the Philippines, therefore, I am not in favor.”

The real motivation of this perception on same-sex marriage is legal issue over homosexuality. This explains the idea that homosexual relationship violates natural law and the objective norm of morality.

“For me, sa marriage, it is not the ritual but kun бага solem niya ina ya with God. It means solemnity or sanctity of marriage with God. So for me, I'm not in favor.” (For me, in marriage, is not the ritual but it is your soberness with God. It means solemnity or sanctity of marriage with God. So for me, I'm not in favor)

This is one of the important reasons why others said that same-sex marriage must be opposed. They even mentioned how God punished Sodom and Gomorrah for the sin of homosexuality. This idea speaks that gay marriage is an abomination and God doesn't approve this gay right.

Some views on same-sex marriage rely on the Bible for its moral truth. But others rely on humanistic morals upon which it builds ethical structure, to quote:

“...pero as liberal man, gusto ko ya may gay marriage. So indi mo na na ya mapunggan. With this kind of culture that we have, you cannot stop this kind of culture sa aton nga sosyodad” (But as a liberal man, I want to have gay marriage. So, you cannot stop it. With this kind of culture that we have, you cannot stop this kind of culture in our society)

“I am not in favor of same-sex marriage because of what the law provides. But in my point of view, tani eh...” (I am not in favor of same-sex marriage because of what the law provides. But in my point of view, I hope there is)

Therefore, the issue on morality regarding same-sex marriage and homosexual relationship is based largely on the moral law, the Bible and humanistic morals.

SENSE OF ACCEPTANCE: KEY FACTOR IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF HOMOSEXUALITY

Sense of acceptance is one of major functions of social abilities underlying social learning. This study found out that it is the key factor in the development of homosexuality. To quote response:

“...acceptance sang isa ka society. Baton nagid man lang sila sa sosyodad mo, ano pa naggululuha nagid man lang sila.” (Acceptance of the society. They are now accepted in the society that is why they started to show who they really are)

“...it is acceptable now in the society compared before nga daw salat ka sa kabuhi” (It is acceptable now in the society compared before that gays are mistreated)

“For me, like what they have said, one cause is acceptance of the group of his environment”

“One factor is sense of acceptance. Kay once ang learning sang isa ka bata towards this sex orientation, tapos may grupo siya nga readily accepted siya...nadarayunan na lang.” (One factor is sense of acceptance. Once the learning of the person is toward this sex orientation, then he is accepted by his group, he would have the great chance to become gay)

In the concept of social learning, sense of acceptance promotes behavior through emotional changes. It also influences social behavior through psychological contact. In this study, sense of acceptance was found to be the key factor in the development of homosexuality which creates change in thinking among gay people and promotes new social behavior.

The exposure of homosexuals in many public places today and the increase in the percentage of homosexuals in the past years might indicate that the society is more accepting this kind of social behavior.

Other factors mentioned by the participants were family, permissiveness, experience, social media, religion, and heredity. These statements contribute to the development of homosexuality as social behavior.

“IT IS NOT THE PERSON BUT RATHER THE ACT”

It was observed that there were conflicting views as to how teachers interpret homosexuality and how it was conceptually defined as sexual behavior. The following were the remarks of the participants:

“...it is not a sin. Kun mag-ubra ka ya sang sala, amo na ya...”(It is not a sin. If you did something wrong, then that is a sin)

“Homosexuality is not a sin. An act is a sin. Ang act na sin na na ya. Homosexuals are not sinners.”(Homosexuality is not a sin. An act is a sin. Homosexuals are not sinners)

“...for me, homosexuality is not a sin. But then the act is a sin. As simple as that”

“Therefore, looking at the perspective of what the Bible is saying or what God is saying, it is not the person but rather the act.”

“...homosexuals are not sinners unless they act a sin...”

“...sa akon ya, it is not a sin man. Pero ang act lang.”

This means that teachers interpreted homosexuality not a sin but rather the homosexual behavior or the act. However, it was said that homosexuality is learned behavior therefore we are definite that it is an act and a sin.

This statement shows that there is a strong connection between our country's religiosity and views about homosexuality. Teachers' views reflect that their interpretation about the moral truths in the Bible serve as a foundation of their beliefs and attitudes towards homosexuality. The Divine Law is always considered a point of reference in the issue of morality.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the findings of this study, it is reasonable to conclude that:

1. The average level of knowledge on homosexuality of male teachers means that they have a better grasp of the concepts of homosexuality, and a better understanding of homosexual behaviors or what it means to be gay or homosexual.
2. Male teachers had favorable attitudes towards homosexuality, which means that male teachers are now more accepting, permissive and open minded on the concept of homosexuality. They are therefore more likely to recognize homosexuality as a normal behavior in the society.
3. Male teachers differ in their level of understanding about homosexuality in terms of their marital status, religion, and family environment. This means that there is a variation in the level of understanding of the concepts of homosexuality among respondents in terms of being single or married, their religious beliefs and encounter with gay or homosexual members of the family. Male teachers who are single, married and Roman Catholic are more knowledgeable about homosexuality than those who were widowed, separated, Protestant and Independent.
4. Attitudes of male teachers towards homosexuality vary according to marital status, religion, and peer influence. This means that the degree of their attitudes varies in terms of being single or married, their religious beliefs and encounter with gay or homosexual friends. Male teachers who are single, married and Roman Catholic and have gay friends and members of immediate family had more favorable attitudes towards homosexuality.
5. The level of knowledge of male teachers on homosexuality is not associated with their attitudes towards homosexuality. This means that irrespective of their level of knowledge, their attitudes towards homosexuality remain favorable.
6. The level of Knowledge of male teachers on homosexuality is best predicted by marital status and religion. Being single, married, widowed or separated affects the way male teachers understand the concepts of homosexuality. The foundation of spirituality and faith also affects the way they understand the concept of homosexuality.
7. Male teachers' attitudes towards homosexuality are best predicted by religion, family environment and peer influence. The foundation of their faith, having gay family members, relatives and friends affect their perspective towards the concept of homosexuality.
8. Homosexual teachers prefer not to disclose their sexual orientation because they are afraid to lose their jobs and positions, and family support. Acceptance of their family, friends, and society in general, is the key factor that they will become more open about their sexual orientation.

9. In the context of morality and legality of homosexuality, the participants have a different interpretation of what the Bible is saying about morality. There is also a need to clarify among the participants that homosexuality is a learned behavior and homosexual behavior is an act. Therefore, it is a sin based on the scripture.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researcher would like to praise and thank God for paving the way so that he could finish this research work. Indeed, in spite of the hardships along the way, He made the way easy for him, for He allowed his loved ones, friends and colleagues as His instruments of help along the way.

LITERATURE CITED

- Blaauw, J. (2012). *Attitudes towards homosexuality-a study on contextual explanations of general and specific homonegativity among Dutch secondary school students*. Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research. (2) 3. P-ISSN 2350-7756. E-ISSN 23508442. Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/OwNeR/Downloads/attitudes towards_homo sexuality_thesis_joris_blaauw_rmcs%20(1).pdf
- Ivković, M. et Al. (2014). Knowledge: a possible tool in shaping medical professionals' attitudes towards homosexuality. Retrieved December 18, 2014 from http://www.hdbp.org/psychiatria_danubina/pdf/dnb_vol24_no2/dnb_vol24_no2_143.pdf
- Papadaki, V. et al. (2014). *A comparison of attitudes towards lesbians and gay among students of helping professions in Crete, Greece - the cases of social work psychology, medicine and nursing*. Journal of Homosexuality (Impact Factor: 0.78). 12/2014; doi: 10.1080/00918369.2014.999493.
- Jacobson, S. A. (2013). Older adult sexuality: measuring healthcare provider knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors. Abstract retrieved from <http://www.pqdtopen.proquest.com/doc/1467469104.html?FMT=AI>.
- Sullivan, K. M. (2013). *The experience of senior housing for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender seniors: an exploratory study*. Abstract retrieved from <http://www.pqdtopen.proquest.com/doc/875565629.html?FMT=ABS>
- Eriksson, L. & Grundin, R. D. (2010). *Nursing students' knowledge and attitudes towards people with HIV/AIDS*. Retrieved from <http://rkh.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:406047/FULLTEXT01.pdf>

Schellenberg, et al. (1999). *Attitudes toward homosexuals among students at a Canadian university – a brief report*. Plenum Publishing <http://pcw.gov.ph/law/republic-act-10354> (Retrieved January 15, 2015) <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:98Qe7T3X4J:download.eiie.org/docs/IRISDocuments/Human%2520and%2520Trade%2520Union%2520Rights/Gays%2520and%2520Lesbians/Triennial%2520Survey%2520on%2520LGBT%25202006/2008-00125-01-E.doc+%&cd=5&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ph>.