

What predicts the willingness of heterosexual persons to behave in a positive or negative manner towards homosexual persons?

Aleksandra Huić¹, Margareta Jelić, Željka Kamenov

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb

Abstract

While we know much about what determines attitudes towards gays and lesbians, less research attention has been given to the determinants of behavioral intentions towards these sexual minorities. Our goal is to examine the factors associated with one's intention to discriminate against gays and lesbians (negative behavior) and those associated with one's intention to become involved in affirmative behaviors directed toward them (positive behavior). We are interested in whether socio-demographic characteristics, which are known predictors of attitudes, such as gender, age, education, religiosity and political orientation, also predict positive and negative behavioral intentions towards homosexuals. An additional goal is to investigate the role of both direct and indirect contact with gays and lesbians for the prediction of behavioral intentions. The study was conducted online, with 997 exclusively heterosexual participants. Scales, constructed for the purpose of this study, measured the propensity to discriminate against homosexuals, readiness to engage in activities directed towards the amelioration of homosexuals' social status, direct and indirect contact, and socio-demographic characteristics. Results show that our participants are relatively ready to discriminate against homosexual persons in the areas of politics, workplace, and tenant rights. Also, they are not particularly ready to engage in affirmative activities, especially if these include more effort and direct contact with gays and lesbians. Men, older persons, more religious persons, more politically conservative persons, and those who had less direct contact with gays and lesbians were more prone to discriminate against them. Women, less religious persons, more politically liberal persons and those who had more direct and indirect contact with gays and lesbians were more ready to engage in affirmative actions. Results are discussed in light of their practical implications for education and prevention programs directed toward reducing discrimination and increasing affirmative action aimed to increase equality of homosexual persons in today's society.

Keywords: homosexual persons, discrimination, affirmative action, behavioral intentions, contact

¹ Corresponding author: Aleksandra Huić, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences University of Zagreb, e-mail: ahuic@ffzg.hr

INTRODUCTION

Data from large-scale international surveys, such as the European Values Survey, European Social Survey, and the International Social Survey Programme, indicate that the attitudes towards homosexual persons in Croatian society are negative, placing Croatia among the most homophobic countries in Europe (Jugović and Ančić, 2013; Takács and Szalma, 2013). The referendum on the definition of marriage that took place on December 1 2013, and the public discourse that accompanied it, have shown that a good portion of Croatian citizens is not prepared to allow for homosexual persons to enjoy the same rights as heterosexual citizens. Research on specific attitudes towards gay rights shows that even students, whose general attitudes towards this group are relatively positive, are not particularly prone to support certain rights for homosexual persons, such as the right to marry and adopt children (Huić, Jugović, and Kamenov, 2015).

In line with the generally negative social attitudes towards gays and lesbians, the report on the sexual and gender minorities in Croatia notes numerous examples of their discrimination (Juras, 2009), and the gays and lesbians themselves constantly testify to their discrimination based on sexual orientation, in various aspects of their lives (Pikić and Jugović, 2006; FRA, 2013). Apart from hate speech and violence, they are exposed to situations such as refusal to lease apartments, refusal of service, unequal terms of employment, denied opportunities for promotions, and similar. They also perceive societal homophobia as a factor in preventing them from living fulfilled and productive lives (LJPŠ, 2014).

Much of the research so far has been focused on testing the determinants of attitudes and prejudice against homosexuals, and has provided us with valuable findings in this regard. However, these attitudes and prejudices are mirrored in the behaviours towards homosexuals (Morrison and Morrison, 2011; Goodman and Moradi, 2008; Huić, Jelić, and Kamenov, in press), suggesting that it is important to direct the focus of research towards their determinants, as it is precisely this willingness to act in a particular way towards members of sexual minorities that brings about discrimination. Given that the determinants of behaviors towards homosexuals have been accorded

less attention by researchers than the attitudes and prejudices, we have chosen to contribute by remedying this imbalance. Furthermore, even if a society manages to root out negative behaviors such as discrimination, it would still not mean that social status of sexual minorities is equal to those of heterosexuals. Thus, we were also interested in knowing what predicts not only the intent to discriminate, but also what predicts positive behaviors towards sexual minorities. Negative, discriminatory behaviors and positive behaviors, such as assistance and support, towards a particular social group are not two opposing poles of a single dimension, but rather constitute two separate dimensions (Abrams, 2010). In other words, participation in positive activities towards improving the social status of homosexual persons is a step beyond not discriminating, making the research on the predictors of these behaviors very important.

An inquiry into the determinants of intention to behave in a negative or positive manner is additionally important given the negative social context gays and lesbians live in, a context characterized by violence and discrimination, but also by social inequality, all of which are a source of stress, leading to adverse consequences, such as lower level of satisfaction with life and poorer mental health among the sexual minority groups (Cochran, Sullivan and Mays, 2003; Meyer, 2003; Mustanski and Liu, 2013; Newcomb and Mustanski, 2010; Pascoe and Smart Richman, 2009; Pikić and Jugović, 2006; Velez, Moradi and Brewster, 2013). These findings have been tested and confirmed in Croatia as well (Jugović, Pikić and Bokan, 2006; LJPŠ, 2014), making the understanding of factors that correlate with particular behaviors towards gays and lesbians the key elements in devising effective interventions and programs of prevention that seek to reduce discrimination and improve the equality of sexual minorities in society.

The existing international and Croatia-focused research shows that socio-demographic characteristics are important predictors of attitudes towards gays and lesbians (Herek i McLemore, 2013). Namely, more negative attitudes are held by men, particularly towards gay men (Herek, 2002; Huić, Jelić and Kamenov, forthcoming; Huić, Jugović and Kamenov, 2015; Kite and Whitley, 1996; LaMar and Kite, 1998; Tomić and Čepulić, 2013). Attitudes towards homosexuals also correlate with age, with older persons holding more negative positions than the younger ones (Avery et al., 2007). Persons with lower educational attainment are also more prone to negative attitudes (Grapes, 2006; Herek, 1984; Ohlander, Batalova and Treas, 2005). Additionally, the finding of religiosity as a

determinant of negative attitudes towards gays and lesbians is confirmed in multiple instances of research, even if the indicator of religiosity is a simple measure of one's self-reported assessment of importance of religion in their life (Gelbal and Duyan, 2006; Herek, 1988; Huić, Jugović and Kamenov, 2015; Jugović and Ančić, 2013; Olson, Cadge and Harrison, 2006; Tomić and Čepulić, 2013; Whitley, 2009). A significant role is also played by one's political orientation: more politically conservative individuals hold more negative attitudes towards homosexuals than those of a more liberal political orientation. Similarly, the former are also less likely to support rights of homosexual persons (Brewer, 2003; Wood and Bartkowski; 2004).

The research conducted in controlled conditions with the aim of testing the behaviors towards homosexuals confirm the data on discrimination reported by gays and lesbians themselves. It is less likely that homosexual persons would be provided with assistance in a situation of need, compared to a similar heterosexual person in the same situation (Ellis and Fox, 2001; Gabriel and Banse, 2006; Shaw, Borough and Fink, 1994). They are also likely to receive unequal treatment by retail staff (Walters and Curran, 1996), to be offered fewer employment opportunities (Horvath and Ryan, 2003), and tend to be offered less time to present themselves in job interviews, along with being asked fewer questions in job interviews than heterosexuals are (Hebl et al., 2002).

Some of these research projects also confirm the relevance of the above noted socio-demographic characteristics for discriminatory behaviour. Thus men are less likely to assist a homosexual person in distress (Ellis and Fox, 2001; Gabriel and Banse, 2006), more likely to engage in active discrimination against gays and lesbians (Rey and Gibson, 1998; Schope and Eliason, 2000), and are generally less likely to become involved in the work of organizations that engage in LGBT activism (Calcagno, 2016). The research on determinants of discrimination in hiring found that more religious persons are less willing to offer a job to homosexual than to heterosexual persons (Horvath and Ryan, 2003). Furthermore, it appears that men and religious persons are less likely to reach out towards and assist homosexuals when they witness their discrimination (Schope and Eliason, 2000). In his research of characteristics that make heterosexuals more likely to become involved in the work of organizations that aim to improve the state of rights and equality of homosexuals, Fingerhut (2011) found that education and sex are relevant, with women and more highly educated persons being more likely to engage with these organizations. Swank, Woodford, and Lim

(2013) studied the predictors of the intention to sign a petition which aimed at the improvement of the labor rights for homosexuals, and in line with previous research, found that this behavior was positively correlated with women, more education, and less religiosity.

However, the few existing instances of research on behaviors towards gays and lesbians predominantly focus on one specific behavior, and often base the conclusion of discrimination of homosexuals on data concerning the unwillingness to engage in positive behaviors towards them (e.g. active assistance). This is why our aim was to conduct an overarching study of both negative and positive behaviors. We approached this problem by including both the examples of discrimination from various aspects of life (family, interpersonal relationships, everyday life, workplace, education, politics), and the examples of activities that are aimed at improving the social status of homosexuals, including support by means of casting a vote for rights of homosexuals, signing a petition, and taking part in events and activism.

Furthermore, the existing research has only considered a part of individual socio-demographic characteristics that have been shown to correlate with attitudes towards homosexuals. We have thus wanted to provide an overarching test of predictive ability of gender, age, education, religiosity, and political orientation in models of propensity to discriminate (propensity for negative behavior), and the propensity to engage in activities that seek to improve the social status of gays and lesbians (propensity for positive behavior). A simultaneous test of the relevance of all these socio-demographic characteristics has enabled us to correct the gaps in existing research, and to control for their mutual connections and overlap. When their concomitant contribution to the models of attitudes towards homosexuals is considered, lower religiosity and higher level of political liberalism appear as more important predictors than age and educational attainment (Schwartz, 2010). Based on existing research of determinants of attitudes towards homosexual persons, we expected that men, older persons, those with less education, more religious persons, and those of a more right-wing political orientation would be more prone to engage in discriminatory behaviors against gays and lesbians. Similarly, we expected that women, younger persons, those with more education, as well as those displaying less religiosity and more left-wing political orientation would be more likely to engage in activities aimed at improving the social status of homosexuals.

An additional aim of this project was to test the role that contact with homosexuals has for the intended behavior in their regard. Namely, those who have had more contact with gays and lesbians also hold more positive attitudes towards them (Herek and Glunt, 1993; Hinrichs and Rosenberg, 2002; Huić, Jugović and Kamenov, 2015; Smith, Axelton and Saucier, 2009; Tomić and Čepulić, 2013). Contact between two people opens up the potential for the appearance of factors that reduce prejudice, such as self-revealing to another person, spending time together, equality of status between people, and clear norms of behavior (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006). Furthermore, it appears that, in the case of attitudes and prejudice towards homosexuals, it is enough to have superficial, acquaintance-like contact for the beneficial effects of it to be seen, as reflected in fewer prejudices and more positive attitudes (Herek and McLemore, 2013). However, research that deals with the role of contacts for the intended behavior towards gays and lesbians is very rare.

Furthermore, some research shows that even the so called indirect contact plays a role in attitude formation, so that those whose friends know homosexual persons have more positive attitudes towards them (Dhont and Van Hiel, 2011). The positive effects of this indirect type of contact are particularly important as this finding indicates that individuals will be less prone to discriminate against persons if the norms of behavior in their society justify that sort of behavior (Crandall, Eshleman and O'Brien, 2002), particularly if this norm is very clear and strong (Zitek and Hebl, 2007). Thus an environment in which one has friends who are in contact with gays and lesbians, leading to a lesser inclination to discriminate against them, also makes it more likely that a pro-gay behavioral social norm will be created, i.e. people will become more inclined to engage in positive behaviors (Vezzali et al., 2014).

The existing limited findings note the importance of both direct and indirect contact with homosexual persons for a particular type of behavior toward them. Dasgupta and Rivera (2008) found that those persons who have more direct contact with gays and lesbians are more willing to vote for the legalization of homosexual persons' civil rights. Friendships with gays and lesbians appear to be correlated with a greater likelihood of involvement in collective action aimed at improvement of the gays and lesbians' social status, and a greater likelihood of involvement in collective action that aims to reduce the levels of violence suffered by gays and lesbians in schools

(Calcagno, 2016). Mereish and Poteat (2015) are the only researchers who have tested the effects of both direct and indirect contact on both negative and positive behaviors toward homosexual persons. Their results show that both the indirect and direct friendships with homosexuals are correlated with a lesser likelihood of having discriminated against homosexuals in the past and a greater likelihood of taking part in positive behaviors such as questioning the appropriateness of jokes about gays and lesbians and expressing their own offense at such jokes. However, these instances of research do not test the intended behavior in an overarching manner, and are not controlling for other individual characteristics, such as socio-demographics, which may be important determinants of both attitudes and behaviors.

Aiming to correct the gaps in the literature, we have thus endeavored to test whether direct or indirect contact can predict the propensity to discriminate and the willingness to become involved in positive behaviors that are directed at the improvement of the homosexual persons' social status, even after socio-demographic characteristics are controlled for.

METHODS

Procedure

The data were gathered using the online snowball sample. The invitation to take part in the research project was sent out via personal contacts and social networks to a larger number of email addresses. The persons who received the invitation to participate in this manner were also asked to forward the email to their friends and acquaintances. In this way we have managed to reach a large number of people, and have collected a large and diverse convenience sample of adults. At the top of the email inviting them to take part in the research project, the participants were informed of the purpose of the project, were guaranteed anonymity and were told that the data will be used solely as a collective dataset and for scholarly purposes. The end of the questionnaire

featured a contact email address that the respondents could use to ask any questions they may have for the researchers.

Sample

The total number of respondents was 1167. A smaller portion of them (3.8%) noted that they are homosexual or bisexual, and were excluded from the sample. Given the research aims, and the recommendations in the literature, showing that sexual orientation is a continuous variable, we have also excluded those respondents who have stated that they are not exclusively heterosexual (10.8%). The final sample thus comprises 997 persons of exclusively heterosexual orientation, with a far larger proportion of women (70.5%) than there are men (29.5%). The age range was between 15 and 79, with the average age of 34.5 ($SD=11.71$), and a much smaller proportion of respondents in the highest age range (6.3%), relative to those who are in their middle age (45.7%) or youth (48%).

The sample is relatively heterogeneous with regard to socio-demographic characteristics. Most of the respondents (79.9%) have completed higher education or more, while 20.1% have completed high school. More details on the educational attainment among the respondents can be found in Table 1. More than one half of them is employed (62.5%), and more than half self-assess their socio-economic status as average or above-average (61.4%). Most of them live in urban areas (87.5%), and far fewer in rural areas (12.5%). Among those living in urban areas, only 59.4% live in Zagreb. About a quarter of respondents (23.5%) spent their youth, until coming of age, in rural areas. Around a third of them grew up in smaller towns (36.4%), while 40% grew up in Zagreb.

Table 1 The prevalence of various education levels, by respondent age (N=987)

		Age categories			
		Under 30	31-54	55+	Total
The highest completed level of education	Elementary School	2	0	1	3
	High School	128	58	8	194
	Associate Degree	39	35	4	78
	University Degree	278	251	29	558
	Postgraduate Degree	27	108	19	154
Total	474	452	61	987	

Instruments

The intention to behave in a negative manner towards homosexuals was measured using the Propensity to discriminate against homosexuals scale, constructed for the purpose of this research project. The items that make up the scale were created based on several sources: (a) instruments that are used to research the way in which homosexual persons perceive their own discrimination in society, i.e. the forms of discrimination they have experienced themselves; (b) the statements from existing scales of attitudes towards homosexuals and their rights, which describe the behavioral component of attitudes; and (c) the experiences from previous research on the propensity to engage in gender discrimination (Kamenov and Galić, 2011) or ethnic discrimination (Jelić, 2009) which showed the yes/no response format to be an efficient way of measuring the propensity to discriminate, and which showed that including examples of discrimination from various areas of life increases validity. The final scale consists of 14 items, each of which describes a particular negative

behavior towards homosexuals in various aspects of life (e.g. *"During a trip, I would prefer to share a room with a heterosexual than with a homosexual person of my gender."*; *"In elections, I would not give my vote to the homosexual candidate, even if this person has the same qualifications and experience as the heterosexual candidate."*). The respondents' task was to reply if they are willing ("Yes.") or not ("No") to behave in the described manner. Our psychometric analysis has shown that the scale has a one-dimensional factor structure, with the one factor explaining 43.9% of the variance of the. Factor saturations are high, and range from .534 to .752. Internal consistency is also high ($\alpha=.89$). The total score is a simple linear combination of all items, and ranges between 0 and 14. A higher score suggests a greater willingness to discriminate against homosexuals.

The intention to behave in a positive manner towards homosexual persons was measured with the Propensity to improve the status of homosexuals in society scale, which was also constructed for the purpose of this study. The statements used are based on those applied in the authors' prior, unpublished project. The inclusion criterion for items was that they reflect activities that affect the homosexual persons' social status. This criterion has limited the potential range of behaviors to very specific activities, which is why this scale comprises fewer statements than the scale measuring the propensity to discriminate. There are 6 statements that make up the scale, all of which describe specific activities in society through which one may advocate the interests and rights of homosexual persons, and engage in action that improves the level of equality and improvement of the social status of gays and lesbians. The claims differ based on the level of involvement they require (e.g. *"Signing a petition for the increase/implementation of rights of homosexuals."*; *"Getting involved with an NGO that advocates for the persons of homosexual orientation."*). The respondents' task was to provide a response, on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 5 (yes, completely), to the question of how willing they would be to engage in each of the six listed activities. Factor analysis has shown a unidimensional structure, with one factor explaining 73.3% of variance, and saturation measures ranging from .802 to .916. As was expected, internal consistency was very high, at $\alpha=.93$. The total score on the scale is calculated as an average result across all the responses, with a higher score indicating a greater willingness and intention to become involved in positive activities that are aimed at improving the social status of homosexual persons.

The extent of contact was measured by means of several questions that were subsequently used to form the *indices of direct and indirect contact with homosexual persons*. In order to measure the extent of direct contact with homosexual persons, we offered the respondents several options: "I have never had any contact with a gay man or a lesbian woman."; "I have an acquaintance (someone you have spoken to several times, but do not consider them as friends)"; "I have a friend (someone you spend time with and whom you can count on, and vice versa)"; "I have an extended family member who is gay/lesbian"; "A close family member is gay/lesbian". The respondents were given the option of marking several answers, with the scores of 1 if they have experienced a particular type of contact, and 0 if they had not. Furthermore, they answered separate questions about contact with gays and lesbians, with a rotated sequence of questions. We have subsequently recoded the responses to the first question, so that those who have never had any contact received the score of 0 on the item. The final score for the direct contact index was formed as a sum of the respondents' answers to all questions, for both gays and lesbians. The theoretical range is from 0 (no contact) to 8 (participant has acquaintances, friends, and close and extended family members who are homosexual). Thus, a higher score on the index indicated a greater extent of contact with homosexual persons.

In order to measure indirect contact with homosexual persons, we asked the respondents if they know how many of their heterosexual friends know people who are homosexual. The respondents provided their answers on a scale from 0 to 4 (0-none, 1-several, 2-about a half, 3- more than a half, 4- most). The final index was formed as a sum of responses for indirect contact with gays and lesbians, with a theoretical range from 0 to 8. A higher score here thus indicates a greater number of heterosexual friends who are acquainted with homosexuals, and a greater extent of indirect contact with homosexuals.

The *general* information about the respondents included questions about their gender, age, sexual orientation, socio-economic and work status, the size of locality they grew up in, and the size of locality they currently live in. In addition to those, we have also asked the respondents to assess the importance of religion in their lives (ranging from 1 - it is not important to me at all, to 7 -it is very important to me), and to state their political leanings on a left-right scale (0- left, 5- center, 10-right).

RESULTS

Given that this is the first Croatian research project that considers the full model of the intention/willingness to behave in a particular manner towards homosexuals, we first wanted to know about the descriptive findings in that regard. On average, our respondents were willing to engage in 1 to 2 discriminatory behaviors ($M=1.69$, $SD=2.778$), and were not certain if they would get involved in positive actions that are aimed at improving the social status of homosexual persons ($M=2.87$, $SD=1.285$). We have also conducted an analysis of frequencies to examine which positive and negative behaviors our respondents were most willing to engage in. Table 2 shows that, in spite of the low average score, there is a proportion of the respondents that would engage in each of the negative and positive behaviors. Only for three of the total 14 discriminatory behaviors are there less than 5% of respondents willing to engage in them. Our respondents are least likely to renounce people they are close to (children and friends) if they found out they were gay. They would also not stop supporting a sport personality if they found out that he/she was homosexual. However, one in five of our respondents would not be willing to lease a flat to a homosexual person, would prefer a heterosexual rather than a homosexual person as a work associate, and would not vote for a homosexual candidate even if they had the exact same qualifications and experience as the heterosexual candidate. The largest score on the negative behaviors was attained on the statement concerning sharing a room during a trip, with nearly 40% of respondents stating that they would not share a room with a homosexual person of their own gender if on a trip together.

Table 2 Proportion of affirmative responses to statements concerning the willingness to discriminate against homosexuals

1. If I were selecting an associate for an important and well-paid job, I would prefer to select a heterosexual rather than a homosexual person.	17.9
2. If there were a task that I needed help with in my work, I would prefer to seek assistance from a heterosexual than homosexual colleague.	11.1
3. If I were making decisions about enrollment in university or about job candidates in the workplace, and was presented with two candidates with the same number of points, I would give preference to the heterosexual person.	12.3
4. In elections, I would not give my vote to the homosexual candidate, even if this person has the same qualifications and experience as the heterosexual candidate.	21.6
5. If I needed to select a teammate for a group sport, I would prefer to select a heterosexual person, even if a homosexual one is better at this sport.	6.1
6. During a trip, I would prefer to share a room with a heterosexual than a homosexual person of my gender.	39.5
7. If I were renting out a flat, I would prefer to have a heterosexual than a homosexual person as a tenant.	21.2
8. If I found out that my physician is homosexual, I would seek another one.	7.1
9. If I found out that my child's teacher is homosexual, I would have my child transferred to another class.	12.8
10. If I found out that one of my friends is homosexual, I would stop spending time with her/him.	1.8
11. If I found out that the sport personality I support is homosexual, I would stop supporting her/him.	3.8
12. I would not buy a house or a flat if I found out that the next door neighbors are homosexual.	5.6
13. If a homosexual couple were to sit next to me on a bus, I would move.	7.5
14. I would renounce my child if he/she told me he/she is homosexual.	2

Table 3 contains the proportions of positive responses given on the items concerning positive behaviors towards homosexual persons. It is obvious that, even as there are not too many persons who are willing to discriminate, there are also few among our respondents would engage in positive behavior towards homosexual persons. Only about a half of our respondents would sign a petition for increase in the extent of rights enjoyed by homosexuals or one advocating better implementation of existing rights. The same proportion would vote in favor of said rights and would advocate them in conversations with friends and acquaintances. On the other hand, visiting cultural events, taking part in a gay pride parade, or working with an NGO that specializes in gay rights are behaviors that only about 10% of our respondents are willing to engage in.

Table 3 Proportion of individual responses to statements concerning the willingness to engage in positive behaviors, aimed at improving the social status of homosexuals (N=997)

	Not at all				Yes, certainly
Visiting cultural events (e.g. Queer festival)	39.9	14.2	20.5	15.4	10.01
Signing a petition for the increase in or implementation of rights of homosexual persons	28.2	6.6	8.8	12.7	43.6
Advocating for the equality of homosexual persons in discussions/conversations with friends or acquaintances	16.8	6.9	10.7	16.4	49.2
Taking part in the gay pride parade	56.3	12.6	14	8.9	8.2
Voting to increase or implement the rights of homosexual persons	26.6	7.1	7.9	10.7	47.7
Taking part in the work of NGOs that advocate for the persons of homosexual orientation	44.2	16.4	20.3	11.4	7.7

Table 4 contains the data on the key correlations between the variables of interest in this study. The willingness to discriminate against homosexual persons and the willingness to engage in positive behaviors are negatively correlated, meaning that those who are more willing to discriminate are also less willing to engage in positive behaviors, and vice versa. Correlation of these

two intended behaviors is moderately high, but with just 36% of shared variance, which suggests that the two sets of behaviors are indeed two separate phenomena. Based on this relatively low proportion, one may expect that only a small number of individuals who are inclined not to discriminate would also be likely to engage in positive behaviors. In other words, it makes sense to test the extent to which the same set of independent variables contributes to predicting one and the other type of behavior.

In line with our expectations, nearly all socio-demographic characteristics, as well as both types of contact significantly correlate with the willingness to discriminate and the willingness to engage in positive behaviors. Additionally, all the constructs that correlate positively with the negative behaviors are negatively correlated with the positive behaviors.

Table 4 Correlations between major variables in the research project (N=997)

	Positive behaviors	Gender	Age	Education level	Importance of religion	Political orientation	Direct contact	Indirect contact
Willingness to discriminate	-.603**	-.207**	-.030	-.078*	.381**	.473**	-.278**	-.239**
Positive behaviors		.210**	.116**	.092**	-.544**	-.593**	.338**	.296**
Gender			-.036	.018	.084**	-.076*	.072*	.044
Age				.217**	-.122**	-.183**	-.029	-.076*
Education level					.013	-.044	.148**	.098**
Importance of religion						.545**	-.223**	-.197**
Political orientation							-.234**	-.253**
Direct contact								.517**

Legend: Gender=coded as 1 (men) and 2 (women); * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Since there are significant mutual correlations, we wanted to examine these variables further and have thus included them in two hierarchical regressions, one estimating the willingness to discriminate, and the other estimating the willingness to engage in positive behaviors towards homosexual persons. The first step of each of the hierarchical regressions includes the models with socio-demographics as independent variables, while the second step adds the two variables that are closely related to the substantive matter at hand, i.e. the extent of direct and indirect contact with homosexuals. The results are presented in Table 5.

Tablica 5. Rezultati hijerarhijskih regresijskih modela kojima se predviđa namjera pozitivnih i negativnih ponašanja (N=997)

		Willingness to discriminate		Willingness to engage in positive behaviors	
		Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
		β	β	β	β
1	Gender	-.195**	-.184**	.230**	.218**
	Age	.097**	.079**	-.007	.018
	Education level	-.084**	-.054	.073**	.039
	Importance of religion	.263**	.240**	-.382**	-.357**
	Political orientation	.324**	.299**	-.360**	-.326**
2	Direct contact		-.144**		.136**
	Indirect contact		-.018		.059*
Model metrics					
	R	.555**	.574**	.696**	.715**
	Cor. R²	.304**	.324**	.482**	.507**
	ΔR^2		.021**		.026**

Legend: 1= first step of the hierarchical regression; 2=second step in the hierarchical regression; β = standardized beta coefficient; R=multiple correlation coefficient; Cor. R² = corrected squared coefficient of multiple correlation; ΔR^2 = proportion of explained variance due to the addition of new variables in Step 2; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

The set of socio-demographic variables we used explained 30.4% of the variance in the willingness to discriminate against homosexuals, confirming the findings that men, older people, less educated people, those for whom religion is more important, and those who self-placed on the political right are indeed more willing to discriminate against homosexuals. Adding the variables accounting for contact with homosexuals has significantly, but to a lesser extent substantively (2.1%), increased the proportion of explained variance. Here, only direct contact with homosexuals turned out to be a statistically significant predictor. Those who do have more contact with gays and lesbians are also less likely to discriminate against them. Finally, adding the contact variables to the model removed the statistical significance of the variable measuring the respondents' education level.

The same socio-demographic variables explained 48.2% of the variance in willingness to engage in positive actions aimed at improving the social status of homosexuals. These actions are more likely to be undertaken by women, by the more educated respondents, those who find that religion plays a lesser role in their lives, and those who self-placed on the left-wing end of the political spectrum. Interestingly, age was not a statistically significant predictor, and the level of education lost significance after the contact variables were added to the model. Contact has significantly increased the proportion of explained variance in this case as well, though the increase was substantively small (2.6%). However, in the case of willingness to engage in positive activities, both direct and indirect contact were statistically significant predictors. Those who have more contact with gays and lesbians, as well as those whose heterosexual friends have contact with gays and lesbians, are more willing to engage in activities that are aimed at improving the social status of homosexual persons.

DISCUSSION

This project tackled the issue of determinants of intended behaviors towards homosexual persons. We were interested in finding out what predicts one's willingness not to treat homosexuals in the same way as heterosexuals, i.e. what predicts the willingness to discriminate. In line with the extant research (Abrams, 2010), we hypothesized that one's engagement in negative or positive behaviors ought to be studied as two distinct phenomena, which was confirmed by our finding of a weak correlation between the two constructs. Similarly, regardless of our respondents' relative unwillingness to discriminate, we found that they were not automatically willing to engage in activities that are aimed at improving the social status of homosexual persons.

The average level of willingness to engage in negative or positive behaviors has been expected for this sample, as the behaviors are a reflection of one's attitudes and prejudices. As was already noted in the introduction, the Croatian data suggest that the overall attitudes towards gays and lesbians are negative, which also led us to expect that our respondents would be more prone to negative behavior and discrimination, and less likely to engage in positive behaviors. Those expectations are based on the nationally-representative samples. Other research conducted in Croatia, and using samples similar to ours (convenience, online, with more women and highly educated respondents) display overall neutral to mildly positive attitudes towards homosexuals (Huić, Jelić and Kamenov, in press; Tomić and Čepulić, 2013). Thus it was only to be expected that our sample would feature a relatively low level of willingness to engage in negative behaviors and a similarly low level of interest in engaging in positive behaviors. All future research projects ought to be testing the claims concerning behaviors towards homosexuals on nationally-representative samples. We are convinced that such a sample in Croatia would show a greater inclination to act in a negative way than our present sample does.

However, it remains disappointing that even a sample that is biased in favor of more positive attitudes, and is on average not willing to engage in discrimination, still shows a relatively pronounced propensity to place homosexuals in an unequal position in some aspects of life, primarily when it comes to the workplace, politics, and tenants' rights. Around one fifth of our respondents

stated that they would not be willing to rent a flat to a homosexual tenant, that they would prefer a heterosexual person to a homosexual one as a work colleague, and that they would prefer to vote for a heterosexual candidate in an election, even if the homosexual candidate has the same qualifications and experience. This relatively high willingness to discriminate in these aspects of life most likely stems from having less trust in the persons that one finds different from herself.

Nearly 40% of respondents stated that, during a trip, they would not want to share a room with a homosexual person of the same gender. This behavior is the best example of so called hidden heterosexism. One of the key shortcomings of our research is that we rely on self-reported intentions to behave in a particular manner, a method that is susceptible to socially acceptable responses. Our respondents were probably aware that their answers might be seen as admissions of a willingness to place people in a situation of inequality based on their sexual orientation, which is not a socially desirable way to act. However, the example of sharing a room with someone is a far less obvious example of discrimination, which is why we consider it an indicator of hidden heterosexism. Additionally, this example is particularly powerful in evoking emotional responses such as disgust, anger, and fear, which have been shown to be at the basis of stereotypes and prejudice against gays and lesbians (Abrams and Houston, 2006), and thus act as motivators behind someone's rejection of the members of a particular group. It is not surprising, in this case, that the largest number of our respondents is prepared to act in this way.

An encouraging result may be found in the fact that most of our respondents would not be willing to renounce a person that is close to them (a child or a friend) if they found out that this person is homosexual. Future research ought to dedicate some attention to why this is the case. It is possible that a portion of the respondents believes that they may affect change in a loved one's sexual orientation, which leads to a conclusion that they ought not give them up. It is also possible that a feeling of love and closeness that one shares with these persons is strong enough to preserve one's relationship with them, in spite of the one's negative attitude towards their sexual orientation.

With regard to the willingness to engage in activities aimed at improving the social status of homosexuals, our respondents are somewhat willing to become involved in activities that do not require much time or effort, such as voting for the rights of homosexuals, signing petitions, or

advocating for them in conversations with friends and acquaintances. On the other hand, activities that required an investment of time and effort, and also include real contact with homosexual persons, such as visiting cultural events, taking part in gay pride parades, or involvement in the work of NGOs that deal with rights of homosexuals, were something that barely 10% of the respondents would engage in. These findings are, however, expected, and show that research projects on this subject matter truly need to include a wide variety of both negative and positive behaviors, as it is the only way in which we may see a broader, more widely encompassing image of the intention to act in a particular manner towards homosexual persons.

In line with our initial expectations and other findings in the literature, we find that men, older persons, those who find religion more important in their lives, and those of a right-wing self-reported political orientation, as well as those who have little contact with gays and lesbian, are more willing to place homosexuals in a position of inequality, i.e. more willing to discriminate. The opposite is true for women, those who find that religion is less important for their lives, those who self-report as politically leftist, and those who have more contact with gays and lesbians, as they are more willing to become engaged in activities aimed at improving the social status of homosexuals.

It is interesting to note that age has been a statistically significant predictor of the intention to discriminate, but it was not significant in predicting the willingness to engage in positive behaviors. Older persons are generally more rigid in thought and have a tendency to have more negative attitudes towards groups that are different from themselves. Additionally, they grew up and formed their attitudes at a time when homosexuality was not socially visible, and the social norms had clearly cast judgment on homosexuality, which is not the case nowadays. This makes the relationship between age and the willingness to engage in negative behaviors an expected one. However, the puzzle is why we have not found the opposite relationship to be significant for positive behaviors. One of the solutions of this quandary may be that age is really not relevant, or that the effect is very small and thus unstable. Another explanation might be that the mechanism of effect of age is complex, so that age is not directly affecting behavior, but is acting through some mediating variables. The effect of age could also be nonlinear, which our analysis was not able to uncover. It should also be noted that, at the level of plain bivariate correlations, age was inversely related to the positive, but not the negative behaviors. This reversal of results between bivariate

correlations and regression analysis nevertheless confirms the relevance of controlling for the combined effects of particular socio-demographic characteristics in order to reach more precise conclusions. Future research ought to pay closer attention to this relationship, most notably due to important practical implications and the need for prevention programs to focus on appropriate target groups.

The level of education was a statistically significant predictor of both the intention to behave in a positive and in a negative manner, but only in the first step of the hierarchical regression, with higher education correlating with less propensity to discriminate, and a greater willingness to engage in positive actions. However, adding the variables accounting for contact in the second step meant that the education variable lost its statistical significance. This finding may indicate that there is a potential mediating effect of contact in the relationship between education and the intention to behave in a particular way. Namely, education is generally associated with critical thinking and lesser susceptibility to conformism, which makes it a factor that promotes tolerance towards all minority groups, including homosexuals (Ohlander, Batalova and Treas, 2005). Alternatively, it is also possible that this same openness to difference actually brings about more opportunities to engage in contact with homosexual persons, which in turn leads to a lesser inclination to discriminate and a greater willingness to engage in positive behaviors. Future research ought to address these mechanisms in more detail. In any case, our findings show that it is important to simultaneously test for the power of various predictors so that controlling for them provides a more accurate picture of the role they play.

In accordance with this recommendation, as was the case for the predictors of attitudes towards gays and lesbians (Schwartz, 2010), we too have found that self-reported importance of religion in one's life and the political orientation make for the most important independent predictors of behavior towards gays and lesbians. According to many religions' teachings, homosexuality is in opposition to the value systems they promote, and homosexuals are condemned because they are in breach of these traditional norms related to faith (Whitley, 2009). It is thus not surprising that the role of religion is reflected in the intention to discriminate against homosexuals, and in the lesser willingness to engage in activities that aim to improve their social status. Furthermore, more right-wing political options, which are characterized by conservative, traditionalist value

ideology, in extreme cases publicly advocate not supporting equality for homosexuals in society. In less extreme cases, they simply choose to maintain the existing social status quo by not passing legislation and stalling decisions that touch upon the status of sexual minorities. It is thus hardly surprising that the persons that share this political orientation are not willing to engage in positive behaviors towards homosexuals, and are more likely to discriminate against them. An additional explanation can be found in the findings of the research on determinants of attitudes towards homosexuals, which show that gays and lesbians are perceived as a particular threat to traditional order of the family, and traditional gender roles (Kite and Whitley, 1996; Whitley, 2001). The importance of this ideology is confirmed in the work by Goodman and Moradi (2008), who found that the acceptance of a traditional gender ideology is correlated with a greater propensity to discriminate and a lesser inclination towards positive behaviors towards gays and lesbians. This same type of gender traditionality is also correlated with right-wing conservative political options, which further explains our findings.

As was previously found in the literature, we have confirmed the important protective role that contact plays in the willingness to discriminate against gays and lesbians. Those individuals who personally know gays and lesbians are less likely to discriminate against them, and are more willing to take part in activities that seek to improve their social status. To reiterate what we noted above, contact with members of other social groups brings about more of mutual sharing of information, more shared experiences and more reciprocity among members, more trust, better information about the other group, a reduction in stereotyping, and ultimately results in more positive attitudes and behaviors (Abrams, 2010). It is important to note that our findings show that direct contact also reduces the likelihood that someone will be prone to discriminate and increases the likelihood that they will engage in positive behaviors, making this segment of our results important for educational or preventive activities.

However, it does appear that the role of different types of contact for different types of behavior is not straightforward. According to our results, indirect contact predicts only a willingness to become involved in activities that aim to improve the social status of homosexual persons, but the same is not true when it comes to the likelihood of discriminating against them. It is possible

that the mechanisms through which direct and indirect contact work are different. In this regard, Mereish and Poteat (2015) find that direct contact reduces anxiety brought about by homosexual persons, which in turn leads to more positive attitudes and fewer homophobic and violent behaviors toward them. Indirect contact has also been found to lead to less anxiety, but only contributed to positive behaviors if the individuals in question also held very strong positive attitudes. In other words, the strength of attitudes has been shown to be a powerful mediator and moderator in the case of positive, but not in the case of negative behaviors. Future research should be directed at testing the potential mediators and moderators of the relationship between direct and indirect contact, particularly with regard to their potential importance for educational and preventive programs.

Finally, we should mention the methodological limits of our project, some of which we have already touched upon. Our results have been acquired using a correlation design on a convenience online sample, thus requiring greater caution in generalizing. Furthermore, this shortcoming does not allow for a causal interpretation of our findings. For example, the correlation between contact and intention to behave in a particular way can mean that more contact leads to more of positive (or negative) behavior, but it could also mean that more of positive (or negative) behavior brings about more contact with homosexual persons. Only future experimental or longitudinal research can provide an answer to the question of direction of the causal link. Furthermore, our findings cannot be generalized to the whole of Croatian population, as the sample includes more women, more of highly educated persons, and less of elderly individuals. As we have already noted, our sample is disproportionately composed of individuals whose characteristics, as found in existing research, make them more likely to have positive attitudes towards homosexuals and thus less likely to discriminate against them. These characteristics of our sample are also a consequence of the fact that the data were gathered online, and the only ones that could have been sampled were those who have internet access and the related skills that allow them to effectively use it. It should also be noted that our sample is nevertheless relatively heterogeneous with regard to socio-demographic characteristics, making it useful in spite of the lack of full representativeness. Additionally, it is a sample of adults, and not a sample of students, who tend to be the target population of much of similar research.

Even when these limitations are taken into account, our project still provides valuable information concerning the predictors of the intention to behave in a particular way towards homosexuals. We have provided an overarching test of the role of various socio-demographic characteristics, and have confirmed that gender, age, education, religiosity and political orientation are all important predictors of not just attitudes towards homosexuals, but of the intention to behave in a particular way towards them as well. Additionally, we have also provided a test of the willingness to discriminate against homosexual persons in a wide array of areas of life. Given that the negative discriminatory behaviors are not just the opposite end of the scale of behaviors, we have also contributed to the literature by including a measure of willingness to take part in activities that are aimed at improving the social status of gays and lesbians. This wide-ranging approach to examining the predictors of various types of behaviors, such as socio-demographic characteristics and direct and indirect contact with homosexual persons, has made it possible for us to control for their roles in the models and to contribute to the scientific study of the determinants of willingness to behave in a particular way towards gays and lesbians.

Of course, our project has not been able to fully address all possible predictors of these behaviors. Future work ought to be directed at testing the role of different traits and beliefs that have been shown to be important determinants of attitudes, or important moderating and mediating variables, particularly when it comes to the role of contact with gays and lesbians. Here, we are referring to traits and attitudes such as authoritarianism, traditional attitudes regarding gender roles, essentialist beliefs, and similar. Furthermore, our research has only been focused on the intention and willingness to engage in a particular behavior, but not on the actual behavior towards gays and lesbians. Future work ought to consider what predicts actual behaviors, as well as the situational determinants of these behaviors.

The finding that the predictors of both positive and negative behavior are similar, and that they are the same as those that account for attitudes towards gays and lesbians, is encouraging, as it means that future educational and preventive programs can simultaneously be directed at both attitudes and behaviors, while touching upon the problems of improving the social status of homosexuals. What we know so far about the effectiveness of programs suggests that it is important

to have clearly formulated organizational (i.e. at school or university level) policy on zero tolerance towards teasing and bullying, unequal treatment, or violence against the persons of homosexual orientation. Only in this way can a positive organizational or educational climate be achieved, and a feedback loop that reduces the incidence of negative behaviors can be put into place (e.g. Birkett, Espelage and Koenig, 2009). A particularly effective tool has been the formation of the so called gay-straight alliances, which provide a platform for learning facts about sexual orientation in general and for raising awareness about the negative effects of violence and discrimination for homosexual persons (GLSEN, 2007). This type of alliance is potentially an excellent springboard for involvement in a whole range of positive behaviors that aim to improve the status of homosexuals.

Our findings further show that these programs should be directed towards persons who are more religious and more conservative, as well as men, the elderly, and the less educated. However, if the individuals in question are not motivated for them, these educational and preventive programs will not lead to a change in negative attitudes, nor will their willingness to discriminate be reduced. The question thus becomes that of how heterosexuals can be motivated to change their attitudes and behaviors. Numerous instances of research, along with the findings we present here, show that close relationships and more contact with homosexuals provide a motivational context in which heterosexuals can increase their knowledge and become psychologically strengthened to change their attitudes and behaviors (Herek, 2007). In line with this, educational and preventive programs should include opportunities for positive contact with homosexuals, or at least a realization of the fact that people close to us are in contact with gays and lesbians.

REFERENCES

- Abrams, D. (2010): Processes of prejudice: Theory, evidence and intervention. Equality and Human Rights Commission.
- Abrams, D., Houston, D. M. (2006): Equality, diversity and prejudice in Britain: Results from the 2005 national survey. Report for the Cabinet Office Equalities Review. Kent: University of Kent Center for the Study of Group Processes.
- Avery, A., Chase, J., Johansson, L., Litvak, S., Montero, D., Wydra, M. (2007): America's changing attitudes toward homosexuality, civil unions, and same gender marriage. *Social Work*, 52, 71–79.
- Birkett, M., D. Espelage, Koenig, B. (2009): LGB and questioning students in schools: The moderating effects of homophobic bullying and school climate on negative outcomes. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 38 (7), 989–1000.
- Brewer, P. R. (2003). Values, political knowledge, and public opinion about gay rights. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 62, 173–201.
- Calcagno, J. (2016): Transforming Straight Guilt Into Collective Action for LGBs via Close Cross-Group Friendships A Gender-Moderated Process. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, published online ahead of print
- Cochran, S. D., Sullivan, J. G., Mays, V. M. (2003): Prevalence of mental disorders, psychological distress, and mental health services use among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults in the United States. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71(1), 53-61.
- Crandall, C. S., Eshleman, A., O'Brien, L. (2002): Social norms and the expression and suppression of prejudice: the struggle for internalization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(3), 359-378.

- Dasgupta, N., Rivera, L. M. (2008): When social context matters: The influence of long-term contact and short-term exposure to admired out-group members on implicit attitudes and behavioral intentions. *Social Cognition*, 26(1), 112-123.
- Dhont, K., Van Hiel, A. (2011): Direct contact and authoritarianism as moderators between extended contact and reduced prejudice Lower threat and greater trust as mediators. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 14(2), 223-237.
- Ellis, J., Fox, P. (2001): The effect of self-identified sexual orientation on helping behavior in a British sample: Are lesbians and gay men treated differently? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31, 1238-1247.
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) (2013): EU LGBT Survey, Results at a glance. Available at http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/eu-lgbt-survey-results-at-a-glance_en.pdf
- Fingerhut, A. W. (2011): Straight Allies: What Predicts Heterosexuals' Alliance With the LGBT Community? 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41(9), 2230-2248.
- Gabriel, U., Banse, R. (2006): Helping Behavior as a Subtle Measure of Discrimination Against Lesbians and Gay Men: German Data and a Comparison Across Countries 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(3), 690-707.
- Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN) (2007): Gay - Straight Alliances: Creating safer schools for LGBT students and their allies. (GLSEN Research Brief). New York Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network
- Gelbal, S. Duyan, V. (2006): Attitudes of university students toward lesbians and gay men in Turkey. *Sex Roles*, 55, 573-579.
- Goodman, M. B., Moradi, B. (2008): Attitudes and behaviors toward lesbian and gay persons: Critical correlates and mediated relations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 55(3), 371-384.
- Grapes, K. (2006): Ignorant discrimination: How education levels affect attitudes toward homosexuality and gay rights. *Sociological Viewpoints*, 22, 51-59.

- Hebl, M. R., Foster, J. B., Mannix, L. M., Dovidio, J. F. (2002): Formal and interpersonal discrimination: A field study of bias toward homosexual applicants. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(6), 815-825.
- Herek, G.M. (1984): Beyond "homophobia": A social psychological perspective on attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 10, 1-21.
- Herek, G. M. (1988): Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 24, 451-477.
- Herek, G. M. (2002): Gender gaps in public opinion about lesbians and gay men. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 66(1), 40-66.
- Herek, G. M. (2007): Confronting sexual stigma and prejudice: Theory and practice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63(4), 905-925.
- Herek, G. M., Glunt, E. K. (1993): Interpersonal contact and heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men: Results from a national survey, *Journal of Sex Research*, 30, 239-244.
- Herek, G. M., McLemore, K. A. (2013): Sexual prejudice. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, 309-333.
- Hinrichs, D. W., Rosenberg, P. J. (2002): Attitudes toward gay, lesbian and bisexual persons among heterosexual liberal arts college students. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43, 61-84.
- Horvath, M., Ryan, A. M. (2003): Antecedents and potential moderators of the relationship between attitudes and hiring discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. *Sex Roles*, 48(3-4), 115-130.
- Huić, A., Jelić, M., Kamenov, Ž. (forthcoming): Essentialist beliefs about homosexuality and the propensity to discriminate against homosexuals. *Suvremena psihologija*
- Huić, A., Jugović, I., Kamenov, Ž. (2015): Stavovi studenata o pravima osoba homoseksualne orijentacije [Students' attitudes towards the rights of homosexual persons]. *Revija za socijalnu politiku*, 22(2), 219-244.

- Jelić, M. (2009). Is self-esteem predictor of in-group bias and out-group discrimination? *Review of Psychology*, 16(1), 9-18.
- Jugović, I., Ančić, B. (2013): Effects of religiosity and spirituality on gender roles and homonegativity in Croatia and Slovenia. In N. Furlan Štante & M. Harcet (Eds.), *Spirituality of Balkan women breaking boundaries: The voices of women of ex-Yugoslavia* (pp. 91-115). Koper: Univerzitetna založba Annales.
- Jugović, I., Pikić, A., Bokan, N. (2006): Lesbians, gays and bisexuals in Croatia: How the stigma shapes lives. *Beyond the pink curtain: Everyday life of LGBT people in Eastern Europe*, 345-363.
- Juras, S. (2009): Izvještaj o stanju ljudskih prava seksualnih i rodni manjina u 2009. godini u Republici Hrvatskoj. Zagreb: Lezbijska grupa Kontra.
- Kamenov, Ž., Galić, B. (2011): Rodna ravnopravnost i diskriminacija u Hrvatskoj: Istraživanje "Percepcija, iskustva i stavovi o rodnoj diskriminaciji u RH" [Gender equality and discrimination in Croatia: Research on the Perceptions, Experiences and Attitudes related to Gender Discrimination in Croatia]. Zagreb: Ured za ravnopravnost spolova Vlade RH
- Kite, M. E., Whitley, B. E. (1996): Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexual persons, behaviors, and civil rights a meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(4), 336-353.
- LaMar, L., Kite, M. (1998): Sex differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians: A multidimensional perspective. *Journal of Sex Research*, 35(2), 189-196.
- Ljetna psihologijska škola (2014): Problemi i izazovi s kojima se suočavaju seksualne manjine u Hrvatskoj [Problems and challenges faced by sexual minorities in Croatia], unpublished results.
- Mereish, E., Poteat, V. P. (2015): Effects of heterosexuals' direct and extended friendships with sexual minorities on their attitudes and behaviors: intergroup anxiety and attitude

strength as mediators and moderators. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 45(3), 147-157.

Meyer, I. H. (2003): Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological bulletin*, 129(5), 674-697.

Morrison, M. A., Morrison, T. G. (2011): Sexual Orientation Bias Toward Gay Men and Lesbian Women: Modern Homonegative Attitudes and Their Association With Discriminatory Behavioral Intentions¹. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41(11), 2573-2599.

Mustanski, B., Liu, R. T. (2013): A longitudinal study of predictors of suicide attempts among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth. *Archives of sexual behavior*, 42(3), 437-448.

Newcomb, M. E., Mustanski, B. (2010): Internalized homophobia and internalizing mental health problems: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical psychology review*, 30(8), 1019-1029.

Ohlander, J., Batalova, J., Treas, J. (2005): Explaining educational influences on attitudes toward homosexual relations. *Social Science Research*, 34, 781-799.

Pascoe, E. A., Smart Richman, L. (2009): Perceived discrimination and health: a meta-analytic review. *Psychological bulletin*, 135(4), 531-554.

Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R. (2006): A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 90(5), 751-783.

Pikić, A., Jugović, I. (2006): Violence against lesbians, gays and bisexuals in Croatia: research report. Zagreb: Kontra.

Rey, A. M., Gibson, P. R. (1998): Beyond high school: Heterosexuals' self-reported anti-gay/lesbian behaviors and attitudes. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, 7(4), 65-84.

- Olson, L. R., Cadge, W., Harrison, J. T. (2006): Religion and public opinion about same-sex marriage. *Social Science Quarterly*, 87, 340–360.
- Schope, R. D., Eliason, M. J. (2000): Thinking versus acting: Assessing the relationship between heterosexual attitudes and behaviors toward homosexuals. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, 11(4), 69-92.
- Schwartz, J. (2010): Investigating differences in public support for gay rights issues, *Journal of Homosexuality*, 57, 748-759
- Shaw, J., Borough, H., Fink, M. (1994): Perceived sexual orientation and helping behavior by males and females: The wrong-number technique. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality*, 6(3), 73-81.
- Smith, S. J., Axelton, A. M., Saucier, D. A. (2009): The effects of contact on sexual prejudice: A meta-analysis. *Sex Roles*, 61(3-4), 178-191.
- Swank, E., Woodford, M. R., Lim, C. (2013): Antecedents of pro-LGBT advocacy among sexual minority and heterosexual college students. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 10(4), 317-332.
- Takács, J., Szalma, I. (2013): How to measure homophobia in an international comparison?. *Družboslovne razprave*, 29(73), 11-42.
- Tomić, I., Čepulić, D. B. (2013): Predviđanje homofobije: uloga demografskih obilježja, kontakta s homoseksualnom populacijom i ambivalentnih stavova prema ženama i muškarcima. [Predicting homophobia: the role of demographic characteristics, contact with homosexuals, and ambivalent attitudes towards men and women.] Unpublished. Odsjek za psihologiju Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
- Velez, B. L., Moradi, B., Brewster, M. E. (2013): Testing the tenets of minority stress theory in workplace contexts. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 60(4), 532-542.
- Vezzali, L., Hewstone, M., Capozza, D., Giovannini, D., Wölfer, R. (2014): Improving intergroup relations with extended and vicarious forms of indirect contact. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 25(1), 314-389.

Aleksandra Huić, Margareta Jelić, Željka Kamenov: What predicts the willingness of heterosexual persons to behave in a positive or negative manner towards homosexual persons?

Zitek, E. M., Hebl, M. R. (2007): The role of social norm clarity in the influenced expression of prejudice over time. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43(6), 867-876.

Walters, A. S., Curran, M. C. (1996): "Excuse Me, Sir? May I Help You and Your Boyfriend?": Salespersons' Differential Treatment of Homosexual and Straight Customers. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 31(1-2), 135-152.

Whitley Jr, B. E. (2001): Gender-role variables and attitudes toward homosexuality. *Sex Roles*, 45(11-12), 691-721.

Whitley Jr, B. E. (2009): Religiosity and attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: A meta-analysis. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 19(1), 21-38.

Wood, P. B., Bartkowski, J. P. (2004): Attribution style and public policy attitudes toward gay rights. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85(1), 58-74.