Ilkogretim Online - Elementary Education Online, 2020; 19 (4): pp. 155-171
http://ilkogretim-online.org
doi:10.17051/ilkonline.2020.04.118

Psychometric Properties of The Attribution to Homophobia Scale (Eah) In Lgbt Users in Peru

***César Bonilla-Asalde,** *Universidad Privada San Juan Bautista, Perú*, *ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4470-1939*, *cesar.bonilla@upsjb.edu.pe*
Yolvi Ocaña-Fernandez, *Universidad Privada San Juan Bautista, Perú*, *ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2566-6875*
Isabel Menacho Vargas, *Universidad César Vallejo, Perú*, *ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6246-4618*
Walter Aliaga-Gómez, *Universidad César Vallejo, Perú*
Luis Nuñez-Lira, *Universidad César Vallejo, Perú*, *ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3542-9117*
Oriana Rivera-Lozada, *Universidad Privada Norbert Wiener, Perú*, *ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6546-3570*
*Corresponding author

Abstract. The aim of this research was to construct and determine the psychometric properties of the Attribution to Homophobia Scale (EAH) in LGBT users of a non-governmental organization in Lima, 2018. The study design was psychometric-instrumental. The sample was made up of 1000 LGBT users, aged 18 and over. The results showed good reliability with an alpha of 0.986 and evidence of content and construct validity. The factorial structure shows three factors that explain 68.865% of the total variance, in accordance with the initial structure. Thus, the scale was structured in 3 factors; a) factor 1: Attribution to Cognitive Homophobia (21 items), b) factor 2: Attribution to Affective Homophobia (11 items) and c) factor 3: Attribution to Behavioral Homophobia (12 items), as well as no significant differences were found by sexual orientation/gender identity and age. Standardization norms were obtained for the application and scoring of the test. The evidence found shows that the test is useful for practical application as a tool in clinical, forensic and social evaluation. It is concluded that the EAH scale presents adequate psychometric properties.

Keywords: Scale, Attribution to Homophobia, LGBT, validity, reliability.

Received: 05.10.2020	Accepted: 15.11.2020	Published: 05.12.2020

INTRODUCTION

Homophobia is not a current problem, but has been evident over the years. It occurs worldwide, in many countries on different continents, where the numbers of victims of homophobia are increasing, because people in these contexts do not tolerate any other orientation than heterosexuality, as it is against their own religions and behavior patterns (Lozano and Rocha, 2011).

All these homophobic actions are not alien to Peru, because despite living in the 21st century, homosexuals interpret all these manifestations of others, who are mostly conservative, religious, with little information, who have distorted thoughts and a pathological and unacceptable view of homosexuality, which build a barrier of inequality and discriminatory forms aimed at Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals and Transsexuals (LGBT) (Ombudsman's Office, 2016).

We live in an environment where different forms of homophobia are observed and practiced on a daily basis by certain subjects, with these facts being interpreted in one way or another by homosexual persons who are also part of that context. Despite this situation, people belonging to the various LGBT movements struggle every day for the acceptance and respect of their rights, because they are human beings just like everyone else (Noir, 2010).

With respect to the modern designation used by people with homoerotic sexual orientations to group themselves in their different manifestations, "LGBT", it is pertinent to mention that it is an acronym that has been used since the 1990s.

Thus, in its order, the acronym refers to the group made up of Lesbians (women who have an emotional, romantic and sexual attraction to other women), gays (such as a man or woman who has an emotional, romantic and sexual attraction to another subject of the same gender, in some cases referring to gay men or synonymous with homosexual), bisexuals (people who are attracted to people of both

genders) and transgender people (a global term that refers to people whose sense of being male or female is different from their assigned sex at birth), being an expression of self-identification and has been adopted by the vast majority of LGBT communities and media in several countries and recently in Latin America (Mejía and Almanza, 2010).

To better understand this construct, it is necessary to be clear about the theoretical framework that defines it. Gaviria, López and Cuadrado (2013) mention that Attribution refers to the explanation or interpretation that a subject or individual gives to the causes of the behavior or behaviors preferably of others, which occur at a given time and context.

These attributions that people carry out, are explained by the following models: Naive Analysis of Behavior, proposed by Heider in 1968, states that people act as "naive psychologists" who elaborate common sense theories about the causes of human behavior. Theory of Corresponding Inferences, proposed by Jones and Davis in 1965, explains how the conclusion is reached that a behavior corresponds to some internal disposition of the individual. Model of Covariation, proposed by Kelley in 1967 and 1972, examines what factors would covariate with the behavior of others to, from that, determine whether this is due to personal or situational causes and the Attributive Theory, proposed by Weiner in 1979, explains the consequences that the attributions that individuals carry out on their successes or failures have on future behavior (cited in Gaviria et al., 2013).

With respect to the term Homophobia, it was coined around 1970 by psychologist George Weinberg, in his desire to cure the phobia that certain individuals feel towards unorthodox sexualities, that is, towards homosexuality, a phobia that for him is a mental illness (Martínez, 2016). However, other definitions of homophobia are currently emerging, defined as a hostile attitude towards homosexual subjects, whether women or men, feeling hatred, fear and discriminatory actions towards those who do not fit the label of heterosexuality (Gutiérrez, 2013).

However, the study construct "Attribution to Homophobia" is defined as the explanation or interpretation that an individual gives to the behavior or behaviors of others, which occur at a particular time and context. In this context, others show a hostile attitude towards homosexual subjects, whether they are men or women, feeling hatred, fear and performing discriminatory actions towards those who do not fit the label of heterosexuality (Gaviria et al., 2013; Gutiérrez, 2013).

He divides it into 3 dimensions: Attribution to Cognitive, Affective and Behavioral Homophobia. Attribution to Cognitive Homophobia refers to the explanation or interpretation that an individual gives to the set of ideas, prejudices, negative views, beliefs, stereotypes, etc. that others have about the group of lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transsexuals, which occur at a certain time and in a certain context. Attribution to Affective Homophobia refers to the explanation or interpretation that an individual gives to the set of feelings such as fear or dread, shame, rejection, discomfort, disgust, anger, pity, etc.

Attribution to Behavioral Homophobia refers to the explanation or interpretation that an individual gives to the behavior or behaviors of others, who carry out actions that range from exclusion, isolation, verbal aggression to physical aggression towards the LGBT group, which occur at a given time and in a given context (Gaviria et al, 2013; Gutiérrez, 2013).

This construct is based on the contributions of Contemporary Social Psychology, since it favors the generation of knowledge about human beings and their groups. The diverse theoretical achievements of contemporary social psychology promote the vision of the person as a social and active being who interprets, configures or creates reality, as well as the adaptation to different environments, in search of homeostasis and biopsychosocial well-being (Valenzuela, 2009).

Currently there is research that has focused on the design and psychometric properties of instruments that measure the construct of Homophobia, such as the Short Scale for Homophobia of Campo, Oviedo and Herazo (2017), Homophobia Test of Oltra, Huluta, Rodríguez and García (2017), Internalized Homophobia Test (PHI) of Pineda (2016) and the Homophobia Scale (HF) of Moral and Valle (2013).

In Peru there is no research or instrument that measures the attributes that LGBT people have towards the types of homophobia carried out by those around them, and there are only a few adaptations of foreign tests with respect to the Homophobia construct, the most widely used being Raja and Strokes' "Modern Homophobia Scale" (1998).

All of this calls for the construction of a scale that measures the attribution of homophobia in LGBT users by a non-governmental organization in Lima, in order to examine the psychometric performance of the scale in light of evidence of its validity and reliability in this context; this is a psychological contribution that will serve as a basis for future research, both in the revision and improvement of this scale in relation to other contexts and broader samples of LGBT people in our country, with the aim of obtaining an instrument with appropriate psychometric properties that will allow us to know the attributions towards homophobia made by the subjects in their environment.

Likewise, given that assessment constitutes one of psychology's main fields of action, it is essential to have validated and reliable tools that allow us to obtain reliable data, since this will make it possible in the clinical, social, forensic and research fields to diagnose and intervene with those LGBT people who interpret that in their environment the subjects practice different forms of cognitive, affective or behavioral homophobia due mainly to their sexual orientation/gender identity, which triggers many negative consequences at the personal and social levels in that context.

According to what has been expressed, then, through the present investigation, the objective is to construct and determine the psychometric properties of the Scale of Attribution to Homophobia (EAH) in LGTB users of a non-governmental organization in Lima, 2018.

METHOD

Sample

The intentional non-probabilistic sample consisted of 1000 LGBT people from a Lima-based non-governmental organization, aged 18 years and older. The design used was psychometric-instrumental (Montero and León, 2007) with a type of technological study (Sánchez and Reyes, 2006).

Instrument

The constructed instrument called EAH consists of a questionnaire addressed to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender people. The test is made up of 44 items (Appendix 1), the purpose of which is to measure three factors associated with Attribution to Homophobia (Attribution to Cognitive, Affective and Behavioral Homophobia) in LGBT people aged 18 and over. In addition, it can be applied individually or in groups. In approximately 10 or 15 minutes, those evaluated choose between five response alternatives: Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Almost always and Always. The options were coded from 1 to 5, respectively.

Procedure

From the definition of the construction and the dimensions that integrate it, the first version was built, establishing the purpose of the test, the delimitation of the population, the choice and specification of the format, which is of a polytomical type, with 5 alternatives that go from "never" to "always". Initially, 44 items were constructed, which were submitted to the evaluation of ten judges specialized in clinical and social psychology and psychometry.

The judges evaluated the set of items considering criteria of pertinence, relevance and clarity, being analyzed the scores obtained through the Aiken's V Coefficient, showing as a result that all the items that conform the scale were accepted, since the values were between 0.93 to 1 (Aiken, 1980; Escurra, 1988) and in the Binomial test (sig. <0.05).

A pilot study was then carried out with 200 LGBT users aged 18 and over from a non-governmental organization in Lima, which made it possible to evaluate the clarity and understanding of the language of the items and to carry out a statistical analysis by eliminating the items with values of less than 0.30 through the item-test correlation as mentioned by Kline (2000), all of which were accepted because they showed values greater than this criterion.

On the other hand, the reliability of the scale was verified through the internal consistency method, showing in the general Cronbach's alpha coefficient a value of 0.971. With respect to the dimensions, it showed a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.952 in the first dimension, a value of 0.946 in the second dimension and a value of 0.715 in the third dimension, indicating that the scale is reliable for application to LGBT users of this NGO in Lima.

Finally, the test was applied to a sample of 1000 LGBT users from this Lima-based NGO and the results were used for statistical analysis using SPSS v.22. The construct validity was carried out through the item-test correlation, where all items showed values higher than 0.30. Likewise, an internal consistency analysis was performed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient.

Exploratory factor analysis was also used by extracting factors with the main component method, which by criterion should incorporate factors whose variance is greater than 1. Likewise, a factor analysis is considered acceptable when the sum of variances retained is equal to or greater than 50% (Kaiser, 1970; Streiner, 1994).

Varimax rotation, designed by Kaiser (1958), is the most widely used orthogonal method, since it produces simpler structures that are easier to interpret (Nunnaly, 1978). In addition, the criterion used to assign items to factors is the common practice of keeping those items that show saturations above 0.30 or 0.40 (Bandalos and Finney, 2010). The Kruskal-Wallis test was taken into account to establish significant differences between sexual orientation/gender identity and age, respectively. Finally, the scales and manual of the test were developed.

RESULTS

Table 1. *Content validity matrix by judges' criteria*

ÍTEMS		PERTINENCE												RELEVANCE												CLARITY												V. AIKEN GENERAL
	J1		J2	J3	J4	J5	J6	J7	J8	J9	J10	S	V. AIKEN	J1	J2	J3	J4	J5	J6	J7	J8	J9	J10	S	V. AIKEN	J1	J2	J3	J4	J5	J6	J7	J8	J9	J10	S	V.AIKEN	
1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
2	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	9	0.9	0.97
3	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
4	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
5	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
6	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
7	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
8	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
9	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
10	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
11	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
12	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
13	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
14	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
15	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00

16	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
17	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	9	0.9	0.97
18	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
19	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
20	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	9	0.9	0.97
21	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
22	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
23	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
24	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
25	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
26	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
27	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
28	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
29	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
30	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
31	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
32	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	8	0.8	0.93
33	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00

34	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
35	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
36	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
37	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
38	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	9	0.9	0.97
39	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
40	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
41	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
42	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	0.9	0.97
43	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1.00
44	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	8	0.8	0.93

As can be seen in Table 1, according to the results of the Aiken's V. coefficient, it can be seen that the 44 items that make up the instrument present values between 0.93 and 1; considering them as acceptable and valid (Aiken, 1980; Escurra, 1988).

Table 2. *Correlation Item - Test of the Attribution to Homophobia Scale (HAS)*

	Total		
	Rho de Spearman		
	Coeficient of Correlation	Sig. (Bilateral)	N
Item1. The others feel sorry when they see me	,828**	.000	1000
Item2. I am a source of ridicule	,758**	.000	1000
Item3. People show astonishment at me	,809**	.000	1000
Item4. The qualities or characteristics attributed to me by others are wrong	,796**	.000	1000
Item5. People are ashamed of me	,785**	.000	1000
Item6. I receive threats	,770**	.000	1000
Item7. Others show rejection of me	,792**	.000	1000
Item8. Other people's idea of my future is negative	,763**	.000	1000
Item9. They express hostile gestures towards me	,763**	.000	1000
Item10. Others have wrong beliefs about me	,719**	.000	1000
Item11. People are uncomfortable with my presence in public places	,730**	.000	1000
Item12. I receive insults	,741**	.000	1000
Item13. Others express discomfort at my presence	,763**	.000	1000
Item14 People think I am a bad influence on society	,771**	.000	1000
Item15. People feel disgusted with me	,812**	.000	1000
Item16. I get hit or physically hurt in some way	,722**	.000	1000
Item17. I perceive expressions of disgust from others	,737**	.000	1000
Item18. . Others judge me before they know me	,684**	.000	1000
Item19. I have been forcibly removed from somewhere	,717**	.000	1000
Item20. Others think I have a mental illness	,733**	.000	1000
Item21. I am prevented from entering places of interest	,734**	.000	1000
Item22. People think I am intellectually incompetent	,785**	.000	1000
Item23. They do not take my opinions into account	,776**	.000	1000
Item24. I perceive expressions of dislike from others	,748**	.000	1000
Item25. Others turn away from me	,792**	.000	1000
Item26. Others think I am inferior to them	,747**	.000	1000
Item27. They have preferred someone else in a job	,756**	.000	1000
Item28. People feel angry when they see me	,780**	.000	1000
Item29. People run away when I am near them	,775**	.000	1000
Item30. People think everything I do is negative	,747**	.000	1000
Item31. Others prevent me from doing any activity	,730**	.000	1000
Item32 People think I am a bad example for children	,718**	.000	1000
Item33 People think I am worthless	,759**	.000	1000
Item34. People have the idea that I am an abnormal person	,742**	.000	1000
Item35. People think I am a strange person in society	,727**	.000	1000
Item36. People think I am a person who is unable to get a job	,726**	.000	1000
Item37. People think my sexual orientation is contagious	,723**	.000	1000
Item38. People think I am an unhappy person	,739**	.000	1000
Item39. People are afraid of me	,721**	.000	1000
Item40. People believe I am a source of sexually transmitted infections such as HIV/AIDS or others	,708**	.000	1000
Item41. Others have negative opinions or concepts about me	,719**	.000	1000
Item42. Others think I am sexually promiscuous	,727**	.000	1000
Item43. Others think I am a bad person	,762**	.000	1000
Item44. People think my future will not be productive	,782**	.000	1000
TOTAL	1.000		1000

It is observed in table 2, according to Spearman's correlation coefficient (Rho), that the items whose item-total correlation coefficients show values between 0.684 and 0.828, being higher than 0.30 which indicates that the correlations are significant (Kline, 2000).

Table 3. *Total Explained Variance of the Scale of Attribution to Homophobia*

Component	Auto initial values			Sums of extraction of squared loads			Squared load rotation sums		
	Total	% variance	% cumulative	Total	% variance	% cumulative	Total	% variance	% cumulative
1	27.826	63.242	63.242	27.826	63.242	63.242	12.770	29.023	29.023
2	1.440	3.273	66.514	1.440	3.273	66.514	8.801	20.001	49.025
3	1.034	2.351	68.865	1.034	2.351	68.865	8.730	19.841	68.865
4	.747	1.698	70.563						
5	.685	1.556	72.119						
6	.578	1.315	73.434						
7	.560	1.273	74.707						
8	.511	1.162	75.868						
9	.505	1.149	77.017						
10	.487	1.108	78.125						
11	.465	1.056	79.181						
12	.463	1.053	80.234						
13	.434	.987	81.221						
14	.425	.967	82.188						
15	.407	.925	83.113						
16	.400	.908	84.022						
17	.381	.867	84.888						
18	.367	.835	85.723						
19	.357	.812	86.536						
20	.347	.788	87.323						
21	.325	.738	88.062						
22	.317	.720	88.782						
23	.314	.713	89.495						
24	.308	.699	90.194						
25	.292	.663	90.857						
26	.285	.648	91.506						
27	.281	.638	92.144						
28	.269	.611	92.755						
29	.265	.602	93.357						
30	.249	.565	93.922						
31	.234	.533	94.454						
32	.234	.531	94.985						
33	.226	.513	95.499						
34	.224	.510	96.008						
35	.219	.498	96.506						
36	.207	.470	96.977						
37	.200	.454	97.431						
38	.188	.428	97.859						
39	.177	.402	98.261						
40	.167	.381	98.641						
41	.165	.376	99.017						
42	.155	.352	99.369						
43	.147	.334	99.703						
44	.130	.297	100.000						

In table 3, the results of the principal component extraction analysis are shown, where it is observed that the three principal components obtain a variance ranging from 2.351% to 63.242% which they explain with a total variability percentage of 68.865%.

Table 4. *Matrix of rotated components of the Scale of Attribution to Homophobia*

	Component		
	1	2	3
Item42. Others think I am sexually promiscuous	.730		
Item32. People think I am a bad example for children	.717		
Item34 People have the idea that I am an abnormal person	.715		
Item40. People believe I am a source of sexually transmitted infections such as HIV/AIDS or others	.707		
Item37. People think my sexual orientation is contagious	.706		
Item35. People think I am a strange person in society	.704		
Item36. People think I am a person who is unable to get a job	.702		
Item33 People think I am worthless	.671		
Item44. People think my future will not be productive	.666		
Item38. People think I am an unhappy person	.653		
Item41. Others have negative opinions or concepts about me	.648		
Item43. Others think I am a bad person	.643		
Item14. People think I am a bad influence on society	.637		
Item30. People think everything I do is negative	.615		
Item26. Others think I am inferior to them	.612		
Item18. Others judge me before they know me	.603		
Item4. The qualities or characteristics attributed to me by others are wrong	.600		
Item10. Others have wrong beliefs about me	.600		
Item20. Others think I have a mental illness	.579		
Item22. People think I am intellectually incompetent	.562		
Item8. Other people's idea of my future is negative	.537		
Item3. People show astonishment at me		.733	
Item1 The others feel sorry when they see me		.721	
Item15. People feel disgusted with me		.719	
Item7. Others show rejection of me		.698	
Item5. People are ashamed of me		.675	
Item11. People are uncomfortable with my presence in public places		.615	
Item28. People feel angry when they see me		.608	
Item39. People are afraid of me		.597	
Item13. I perceive expressions of dislike from others		.543	
Item24. I perceive expressions of dislike from others		.497	
Item17. I perceive expressions of disgust from others		.491	
IItem21. I am prevented from entering places of interest			.719
Item16. I get hit or physically hurt in some way			.701
Item19. I have been forcibly removed from somewhere			.677
Item23. They do not take my opinions into account			.620
Item27. They have preferred someone else in a job			.611
Item25. Others turn away from me			.610
Item6. I receive threats			.595
Item12. I receive insults			.593
Item29. People run away when I am near them			.575
Item31. Others prevent me from doing any activity			.564
Item2. I am a source of ridicule			.537
Item9. They express hostile gestures towards me			.489

Homophobia, using the Varimax rotation method. As can be seen, the items that make up each factor correspond to their originally postulated dimensions, showing saturations greater than 0.40. So, the first dimension is made up of 21 items, the second dimension of 11 items and the third dimension of 12 items.

Table 5. *Reliability by Internal Consistency - General Cronbach's Alpha and by dimensions of the Scale of Attribution to Homophobia*

Cronbach's Alpha General and by Dimensions		
	Cronbach's Alpha	N of elements
D1. Attribution to Cognitive Homophobia D2. Attribution to Affective Homophobia D3. Attribution to Behavioral Homophobia	0.986 0.976	44 21
	0.957	11
	0.955	12

In table 5, it can be seen that the 44 items that make up the scale have a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.986, showing excellent reliability in total (George and Mallery, 2003). In addition, Cronbach's alpha can be seen by dimensions, in the first dimension a score of 0.976 was obtained, in the second dimension a score of 0.957 was obtained, in the third dimension a score of 0.955 was obtained; in other words, the three dimensions present excellent reliability (George and Mallery, 2003).

Table 6. *Comparative analysis through the Kruskal-Wallis Test of the Scale of Attribution to Homophobia and its dimensions, according to Sexual Orientation/Sexual-Gender Identity and Age.*

Scale and its Dimensions	Scale and its Dimensions Sexual Orientation/ Gender Identity - Generic	N	sig.	Age	N	sig.	Decision yes/No
Attribution to Homophobia	Lesbian	283	.344	18-24 years	258	.934	NO
	Gay	484		25-39 years	693		
	Bisexual	186		40-49 years	46		
	Transexual	47		50-64 years	3		
Attribution to Cognitive Homophobia	Lesbian	283	.362	18-24 years	258	.781	NO
	Gay	484		25-39 years	693		
	Bisexual	186		40-49 years	46		
	Transexual	47		50-64 years	3		
Attribution to Affective Homophobia	Lesbian	283	.110	18-24 years	258	.856	NO
	Gay	484		25-39 años	693		
	Bisexual	186		40-49 years	46		
	Transexual	47		50-64 years	3		
Attribution to behavioral Homophobia	Lesbian	283	.561	18-24 years	258	.963	NO
	Gay	484		25-39 years	693		
	Bisexual	186		40-49 years	46		
	Transexual	47		50-64 years	3		

In table 6, it can be seen that there are no differences between Sexual Orientation/Sexual Gender Identity and age with respect to the Attribution to Homophobia Scale (sig. > 0.05); likewise, there are no differences between Sexual Orientation/Sexual Gender Identity and age with respect to the three dimensions (Attribution to Behavioral, Affective and Behavioral Homophobia, respectively) (sig. > 0.05).

Therefore, since there are no differences between the Scale of Attribution to Homophobia and its three dimensions (Attribution to Behavioral, Affective and Behavioral Homophobia, respectively) with respect to Sexual Orientation/Sexual-Gender Identity and age, we will proceed to elaborate the scales in a general way.

Table 7. *General scales of the Scale of Attribution to Homophobia and its three dimensions*

Pc	Attribution to Homophobia	Attribution to Cognitive Homophobia	Attribution to Affective Homophobia	Attribution to behavioral Homophobia	Category
1	48	22	11	12	
5	49 a 55	23 a 26	12 a 14	13 a 14	
10	56 a 62	27 a 30	15 a 16	15 a 16	LOW
15	63 a 74	31 a 35	17 a 19	17 a 20	
20	75 a 93	36 a 45	20 a 23	21 a 24	
25	94 a 105	46 a 51	24 a 25	25 a 27	
30	106 a 118	52 a 59	26 a 28	28 a 29	
35	119 a 125	60 a 63	29 a 30	30 a 31	
40	126 a 131	64 a 65	31 a 31	32 a 33	AVERAGE/ MODERATE
45	132 a 136	66 a 68	33	34	
50	137 a 139	69	34	35	
55	140 a 142	70	35 a 36	36	
60	143 a 146	71 a 72	36	37	
65	147 a 148	73	37	38	
70	149 a 150	74	38	39	
75	151 a 154	75	39	40	
80	155 a 157	76 a 77	40 a 41	41	HIGH
85	158 a 162	78 a 79	42	42	
90	163 a 168	80 a 82	43 a 45	43 a 44	
95	169 a 178	83 a 87	46 a 47	45 a 47	
99	179 a 199	88 a 97	48 a 53	48 a 54	
n	1000	1000	1000	1000	
M	128.28	63.02	32.37	32.89	
DS	37.741	18.902	10.124	10.084	

In table 7, the percentile scales of the Scale of Attribution to Homophobia and its three dimensions (Attribution to Cognitive, Affective and Behavioral Homophobia, respectively) are presented, according to the three categories: Low, Moderate and High.

Table 8. *Range of values of the Attribution to Homophobia Scale and its dimensions*

Level	Ranks	Attribution to Homophobia	Attribution to Cognitive Homophobia	Attribution to Affective Homophobia	Attribution to behavioral Homophobia
		Direct scores			
LOW	[1 - 25]	[48 - 105]	[22 - 51]	[11 - 25]	[12 - 27]
MODERATE	[30 - 60]	[106 - 146]	[52 - 72]	[26 - 36]	[28 - 37]
HIGH	[65 - 99]	[147 - 199]	[73 - 97]	[37 - 53]	[38 - 54]
Media		128.28	63.02	32.37	32.89
Standard Deviation		37.741	18.902	10.124	10.084

Table 8 shows the ranges of percentile values according to the direct scores of the Attribution to Homophobia Scale and its three dimensions (Attribution to Cognitive, Affective and Behavioral Homophobia; respectively), according to the three categories: Low, Average and High.

DISCUSSION

Motivated to understand the great problem that constitutes Homophobia, since it is present worldwide in many countries on different continents (Lozano and Rocha, 2011); not being alien to Peru, where its different forms of manifestation are interpreted in one way or another by LGBT people (Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals and Transsexuals), being a serious problem that is observed daily in our country (Noir, 2010).

For this reason, we thought to contribute to countering this problem by constructing and determining the psychometric properties of the Attribution to Homophobia Scale (EAH), as its measurement is considered relevant, awakening academic interest, as this construct is little studied in our country, There is some research that measures the construct of homophobia in heterosexual people, but not the attribution to homophobia in LGBT people, the most widely used instrument in our environment being the Modern Homophobia Scale by Raja and Strokes (1998), adapted by Rodríguez et al. (2013).

Therefore, in view of the problems raised, we will use it as the basis for the construction of this scale, since, as mentioned by Millon (2006), the best treatment starts with an adequate psychological evaluation. This can be achieved if the Attribution to Homophobia Scale (EAH) demonstrates adequate psychometric properties to support its use with LGBT users from a non-governmental organization in Lima.

The Attribution to Homophobia Scale for LGBT users was constructed with a total of 44 items distributed in three dimensions based on the Classical Theory of Testing according to the Linear Classical Model (Muñiz, 2003), as well as the conceptual theory of the Attribution to Homophobia construct (Gaviria et al, 2013; Gutiérrez, 2013), in which it was used as a Likert-type measurement scale with five response options, due to the fact that it measures attitudes or predispositions of each individual in particular social contexts, since the score of each unit of analysis is obtained by means of the sum of responses obtained in each item (Briones, 1985). This is contrasted with the method used in the "Homophobia Test" designed by Oltra et al. (2017) as well as in the "Scale for Homophobia" developed by Campo et al. (2014), which consists of a Likert-type scale with five response options ranging from 1=Totally Disagree to 5=Totally Agree.

From this, the validity of the content of the scale was determined, through the Aiken V Coefficient under the rules of relevance, relevance and clarity of the 44 items originally proposed, after being evaluated by 10 expert judges in Clinical and Social Psychology and Psychometry. The values obtained from the 44 items range from 0.93 to 1, being considered as acceptable and valid, showing agreement with the criteria of Aiken (1980) and Escurra (1988), since the values are higher than 0.80.

After the analysis of the items, later modifications were made to the grammatical structure of 6 items. Then, to corroborate this content validity, the answers of the judges for each item were analyzed by means of the Binomial Test, obtaining as a result that the reagents that conform this scale are pertinent, relevant and clear since they show a significance of .000 (sig. <0.05) (Berlanga y Rubio, 2012).

These results are similar to those found in Pineda's research (2016), since the 9 items that make up the "Internalized Homophobia Test" (PHI) were submitted to the judgment of six judges who are experts in psychometry, sexual health, and sexually diverse population issues.

To determine the validity of the construct, the correlation item - test, item - dimension and dimension - test was analyzed. The evidence in the item-test correlation showed that the 44 items obtained values between 0.684 and 0.828. Regarding the item-dimension correlations, in the first dimension "Attribution to Cognitive Homophobia" and its 21 proposed items present values between 0.730 and 0.848, in the second dimension "Attribution to Affective Homophobia" and its 11 proposed items present values between 0.745 and 0.846, in the third dimension "Attribution to Behavioral Homophobia" and its 12 proposed items present values between 0.752 and 0.828. Furthermore, in the correlation dimension - test, it was observed that the dimensions 1, 2 and 3 show correlation values of 0.953, 0.936 and 0.930; respectively, with the construct. From what was mentioned before, it is contrasted with Kline's (2000) criterion, because all the values are higher than 0.30, indicating that the items proposed present good correlation with their respective dimensions and the construct Attribution towards Homophobia.

Likewise, it corroborates that this scale shows construct validity, since it conforms to the postulate of Nunnally and Bernstein (1995), who refer that construct validity is established by the degree of correlation between the items and the construct. Therefore, these results are contrasted with the international research of Rodríguez et al. (2013); and with the national studies of Cipra (2017), Iglesias (2017) and Rosales (2016), since each of them used the "Modern Homophobia Scale" in their research, obtaining as a corrected item-total correlation of all their items values above 0.30.

With respect to the exploratory factorial analysis, the authors Pérez et al. (2000) were taken into consideration, who mentions that this process has the objective of delimiting a wide number of factors,

which are intended to measure the construct. This made it possible to verify whether the structure of this scale is consistent with the proposed theoretical foundation.

So, the Kaiser - Meyer - Olkin (KMO) sample adequacy test was performed showing a value of 0.988, being considered as excellent according to Kaiser's criterion (1974), in Bartlett's sphericity test a significance of 0.000 ($p<0.05$), which indicates a very significant relationship between the items of the variable which allowed continuing with the factorial analysis (Bartlett, 1951).

Regarding the extraction of factors, the principal components method was used, obtaining as a result 3 extracted factors that explain 68.865% of the total variance, being adequate (>50%) according to the criteria of Kaiser (1970) and Streiner (1994). Likewise, the orthogonal rotation method, Varimax (Kaiser, 1958; Nunnally, 1978), was used, where the items are grouped in each of the three dimensions, showing saturations greater than 0.40, being acceptable according to the criteria of Bandalos and Finney (2010).

This empirical factorial structure contrasts with the original structure, where the first dimension is made up of 21 items, the second dimension of 11 items and the third dimension of 12 items. So, these results are similar to the research of Rodriguez et al. (2013), because the instrument they used "Modern Homophobia Scale" presented in the KMO test a value of 0.95, in Bartlett's test a value of 208.24, $p=0.00$; it also showed a 3-factor structure, using the principal components method. However, in the investigations of Campo et al. (2017), Oltra et al. (2017), Campo et al. (2014) and, Moral and Valle (2013) there are differences with respect to the factor structure of their instruments that measure "Homophobia", since they presented a one-dimensional scale (a factor) of 4, 33, 7 and 8 items, respectively.

Another characteristic that was determined of the HAS is the reliability, starting from the authors Meneses et al. (2013), who mention that it is that property that estimates the consistency and precision of the measurements, by means of the method of internal consistency, using Cronbach's alpha statistic, where it evidences a value of 0.986 in the general scale conformed by 44 items.

While in the first dimension made up of 21 items it obtains a value of 0.976, in the second dimension made up of 11 items a value of 0.957 and in the third dimension made up of 12 items a value of 0.955. Likewise, these values shown in Cronbach's alpha both in the General Scale and by dimensions conform to George and Mallery's (2003) criteria, considering them as excellent reliability. Therefore, these results are contrasted with the international research of Oltra et al. (2017), where the design of their instrument "Test of Homophobia" shows a Cronbach's alpha of 0.99, showing excellent reliability

On the other hand, the study of the differences between the scores of the total scale and by dimensions according to the variables of Sexual Orientation/Sexual-Gender Identity (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender) as well as by age was carried out. It is possible to establish these differences between them by means of the Kruskal-Wallis Test (Berlanga and Rubio, 2012), its use being relevant since the sample does not fit a normal distribution, according to the data shown in the Normality Test by means of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic.

The results showed that there are no significant differences for the total scale and its dimensions according to Sexual Orientation/Sex Identity - generic (Total scale: $p=3.326$, D1: $p=3.201$, D2: $p=6.030$ and D3: $p=2.057$), as well as in age (Full scale: $p=0.431$, D1: $p=1.082$, D2: $p=0.773$and D3: $p=0.285$), since the significance was greater than 0.05, contrasting with the criteria of Berlanga and Rubio (2012). However, these results show certain differences with respect to the research of Oltra et al. (2017), since they carried out a differentiation of scores of the "Test of Homophobia" by means of the parametric test ANOVA according to the variables of sex, social class and age in residents of Spain, obtaining significant differences between sex and social classes, but not according to age.

Given that there are no differences between the scores of the HAS and its dimensions according to the variables of sexual orientation/gender identity and age, this was used to elaborate the general scales of the total scale and its three dimensions based on percentiles, showing contrast with what was mentioned by Meneses et al. (2013), the scale refers to the transformation of a set of scores that helps to give meaning to a value according to the behavior of a set of observations, using the percentiles to call each direct score a percentage score. Hence, the scores on this scale were grouped into three categories that are Low, Moderate and High.

Likewise, regarding the theory of Attribution, it is contrasted with the Attributive Model of Corresponding Inferences, proposed by Jones and Davis in 1965 (cited in Gaviria et al., 2013), which explains how the conclusion is reached that a behavior corresponds to some internal disposition of the individual. It is relevant because it leaves aside the process that leads to the attribution of external causes, emphasizing the inferences about the characteristics or dispositions of the individual that may have originated the action or conduct of others. In this way, LGBT people, being in constant interaction with their environment, interpret or explain the different cognitive, affective or behavioural manifestations of the subjects with whom they interact, who have negative ideas, beliefs, prejudices, stereotypes, negative

views; as well as negative feelings such as fear or dread, pity, shame, discomfort, disgust, rejection, anger and even perform behaviors ranging from isolation, exclusion to verbal and physical aggression against them, mainly due to their sexual orientation / gender identity (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transgender person).

In other words, LGBT people interpret or explain that the subjects in their environment show such expressions of Cognitive, Affective or Behavioral Homophobia mainly due to their Sexual Orientation/Sexual-Gender Identity, causing them various difficulties in interacting with them.

Furthermore, according to the evidence in the results, the empirical or statistical part of the HAS fits the theory proposed by the authors (Gaviria et al., 2013; Gutiérrez, 2013), who conceptually describe the construct "Attribution to Homophobia", being finally conformed by the 44 items initially proposed. Likewise, regarding the dimensions, they maintain their initial structure composed by three dimensions: "Attribution to Cognitive Homophobia"- 21 items, "Attribution to Affective Homophobia" - 11 items and "Attribution to Behavioral Homophobia" - 12 items, respectively.

As can be seen, in Peru there is no scale created or validated to measure Attribution to Homophobia, and the construction of this scale is relevant because, in comparison to other research, the sample of LGBT users is taken into account, and in that order this acronym refers to the group made up of Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals and Transsexuals, being an expression of self-identification in several countries and recently in Latin America (Mejía and Almanza, 2010).

With regard to the limitations of this research, we can mention the type of non-probabilistic sampling of an intentional nature and the representativeness of the sample, as this scale will only be applicable to the 1000 LGBT users of this Lima-based NGO, but we cannot generalize the use of this scale with good statistical and psychometric rigor in relation to other LGBT people in different contexts in our country. For this reason, the results obtained are not conclusive, and further research is needed to improve this scale by taking into account probabilistic samples in order to determine greater evidence of validity and reliability, examining the psychometric performance of HEA in different contexts of LGBT people in our country.

Finally, based on all the evidence presented, it can be stated that HEA has adequate psychometric properties of validity and reliability, as well as general scales of the total and its three dimensions for measuring the construct of Attribution to Homophobia in LGBT people in that context.

In conclusion, the analysis of the psychometric properties of the EAH test, which are essential to the construction of any psychological assessment instrument, supports the idea that it is an instrument that can be used to measure the Attribution to Homophobia in LGBT users of a non-governmental organization in Lima.

REFERENCES

Aiken, L. (1980). Content Validity and Reliability of Single ltems or Questionnaire. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 40, 955-959.

Bandalos, D. & Finney, S. (2010). Factor Analysis: Exploratory and Confirmatory. En G. R. Hancock y R. O. Mueller (Eds.), *Reviewer's guide to quantitative methods*. Routledge: New York.

Bartlett, M. (1950). Tests of significance in factor analysis. *British Journal of Psychology*, *3*, 77-85.

Bartlett, M. (1951). A further note on tests of significance. *British Journal of Psychology*, *4*, 1-2.

Berlanga, V. y Rubio, M. (2012). Clasificación de pruebas no paramétricas. Cómo aplicarlas en SPSS. *REIRE, Revista d'Innovació i Recerca en Educació*, *5 (2)*. Recuperado de http://www.ub.edu/ice/reire.htm

Briones, G. (1985). *Métodos y Técnicas para las Ciencias Sociales*. 2ª. reimp., Ed. Trillas, México.

Campo, A., Oviedo, H. y Herazo, E. (2014). Desempeño Psicométrico de la Escala para Homofobia en estudiantes de medicina. *Revista Ciencias Biomédicas*. Recuperado de http://www.revista.cartagenamorros.com/pdf/5-2/13Desempe%C3%B1o.pdf

Campo, A., Oviedo, H. y Herazo, E. (2017). Escala breve para Homofobia en estudiantes de Medicina de dos universidades colombianas: resultados de un proceso de refinamiento. *Revista Colombiana de Psiquiatría, 46(*1*)*. Recuperado de http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/806/80651120005.pdf

Cipra, C. (2017). *Propiedades Psicométricas De La Escala De Homofobia Moderna En Estudiantes Universitarios De La Provincia Del Santa*. (Tesis de Licenciatura). Recuperada de http://repositorio.ucv.edu.pe/bitstream/handle/UCV/10284/cipra_vc.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Defensoría del Pueblo (2016). Derechos humanos de las personas LGBTI: Necesidad de una política pública para la igualdad en el Perú. Recuperado de http://bvs.minsa.gob.pe/local/MINSA/3821.pdf

Escurra, L. (1988). Cuantificación de la Validez de Contenido por el Criterio de Jueces. *Revista de Psicología de la PUPC, 6(*1-2*), 103-111*.

Gaviria, E., López, M. y Cuadrado, I. (2013). *Introducción a la Psicología Social*. (2.ª ed.). Madrid, España: Sanz y Torres.
George, D. & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference 11.0 update*. (4.ª ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
Gutiérrez, X. (2013). *La Homofobia*. Recuperado de http://www.unfpa.org.ni/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/LA-HOMOFOBIA.pdf
Iglesias, P. (2017). *Propiedades psicométricas de la Escala Homofobia Moderna en adolescentes de la localidad de Cartavio*. (Tesis de Licenciatura). Recuperada de http://repositorio.ucv.edu.pe/bitstream/handle/UCV/305/iglesias_pp.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
Kaiser, H. (1958). The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, *23*, 187-200.
Kaiser, H. (1970). A second generation Little Jiffy. *Psychometrika*, *35*, 401-415.
Kaiser, H. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, *39*, 31-36.
Kline, P. (2000). *The handbook of psychological testing.* (2nd Ed.). London - New York: Rutledge.
Lozano, I. y Rocha, T. (2011). La homofobia y su relación con la masculinidad hegemónica en México. *Revista Puertorriqueña de Psicología*, *22*. Recuperado de http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/2332/233222354002.pdf
Martínez, R. (2016). *La Cultura de la Homofobia y como acabar con ella*. (3.ª ed.). Barcelona-Madrid, España: Egales.
Mejía, J. y Almanza, M. (2010). Comunidad LGBT: Historia y reconocimientos jurídicos. *Revista Justicia, 17*. Recuperado de http://www.observatoriolgbt.org.bo/assets/archivos/biblioteca/f4683d85cdc45097242c94730f00d873.pdf
Meneses, J. et al. (2013). *Psicometría*. Barcelona, España: UOC.
Millon, T. (2006) *Trastornos de la Personalidad en la Vida Moderna*. (2.ª ed.). Barcelona – España: Masson.
Montero, I. & León, O. (2007). A guide for naming research studies in psychology. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, *7*(3). Recuperado de http://www.aepc.es/ijchp/articulos_pdf/ijchp-256.pdf
Moral, J. y Valle, A. (2013). Propiedades psicométricas de la Escala de Evaluación de la Homofobia Externalizada en estudiantes de ciencias de la salud mexicanos. *Revista Salud & Sociedad*, *4*(3). Recuperado de http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/pdf/salsoc/v4n3/4n3a02.pdf
Muñiz, J. (2003). *Teoría Clásica de los test*. Madrid, España: Pirámide.
Noir, R. (2010). Sobre el Movimiento LGHBT (Lésbico-Gay y Homosexual-Bisexual-Transgénero). *Revista Electrónica de Psicología Política*, *8*(22). Recuperado de http://www.psicopol.unsl.edu.ar/abril2010_Nota8.pdf
Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
Nunnally, J. y Bernstein, I. (1995). *Teoría psicométrica*. México: McGraw-Hill.
Nunnally, J. y Bernstein, I. (1995). *Teoría psicométrica*. México: McGraw-Hill.
Oltra, J., Huluta, E., Rodríguez, A. y García, E. (2017). Desarrollo de un test de Homofobia. *Revistas de la Universidad de Oviedo_Versión electrónica.* Recuperado de https://www.unioviedo.es/reunido/index.php/Rema/article/view/11861/10958
Pérez, J., Chacón, S. y Moreno, R. (2000). Validez de constructo: El uso del análisis exploratorio-confirmatorio para obtener evidencia de validez. Universidad de Sevilla. *Psicotema, 12(*2*),* 442-446. Recuperado de https://www.unioviedo.es/reunido/index.php/PST/article/view/7727/7591
Pineda, C. (2016). Propiedades psicométricas de una prueba de homonegatividad internalizada en varones homosexuales y bisexuales colombianos. *Revista de Psicología desde el caribe, 1*(33). Recuperado de http://rcientificas.uninorte.edu.co/index.php/psicologia/article/viewFile/6545/8074
Raja, S. & Stokes, J. (1998). Assessing Attitudes Toward Lesbian and Gay Men: The Modern Homophobia Scala. *Journal of Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Identity, 3 (*2*),* 113-134.
Rodríguez, Y., Lameiras, M., Carrera, V. y Vallejo, P. (2013). Validación de la Escala de Homofobia Moderna en una muestra de adolescentes. *Revista anales de psicología*, *29(*2*).* Recuperado de http://scielo.isciii.es/pdf/ap/v29n2/psico_adolescencia6.pdf
Rosales, M. (2016). *Propiedades Psicométricas De La Escala De Homofobia Moderna En Estudiantes Del Distrito De Independencia – Huaraz.* (Tesis de Licenciatura). Recuperada de http://repositorio.ucv.edu.pe/bitstream/handle/UCV/524/rosales_om.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
Sánchez, H., y Reyes, C. (2006*). Metodología y Diseños en la investigación Científica*. Lima: Visión universitaria.

Streiner, D. (1994). Figuring out factors: the use and misuse of factor analysis. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, *39*,135-140.

Valenzuela, J. (2009). Género y Homofobia: Una revisión desde la psicología social contemporánea. Recuperado de http://www.bdigital.unal.edu.co/10245/1/G%C3%A9nero%20y%20Homofobia%20%28PDF%29%202009.pdf