

Utilizing Indirect Contact to Reduce Prejudice Toward LGBTI+'s

İbrahim Ray

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science
in
General Psychology

Eastern Mediterranean University
September 2022
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Prof. Dr. Ali Hakan Ulusoy
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in General Psychology.

Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar
Chair, Department of Psychology

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in General Psychology.

Prof. Dr. Şenel Raman
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Prof. Dr. Şenel Raman

2. Asst. Prof. Dr. Pelin Karakuş Akalın

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Reşit Kışlıoğlu

ABSTRACT

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, and plus (LGBTI+) experience a disproportionate amount of prejudice and discrimination. Indirect contact is one of the most effective ways in reducing prejudice toward different stigmatized groups and improving attitudes, including LGBTI+'s. Parasocial contact is a type of indirect contact which is based on media exposure of viewers to an outgroup member(s). Exposure to outgroup-related parasocial contact has been found to enhance positive attitudes and lower prejudice toward outgroups. The current study aimed to test the effects of a parasocial contact intervention on prejudice reduction toward LGBTI+s using three different conditions: emotion-, human rights-, and economy-based parasocial contact as well as a control group. It was hypothesized that parasocial contact interventions would be effective in reducing prejudice against LGBTI+s compared to the control group in the form of more positive attitudes, greater perspective taking, reduced threat perception, increased support for LGBTI+ rights and lowered social distancing while controlling for prior contact, gender, and social dominance orientation. Additionally, it was hypothesized that there will be differences between the three parasocial contact interventions regarding prejudice toward LGBTI+.

A sample of 334 Turkish-speaking young adult university students (234 female and 110 male) at Eastern Mediterranean University completed an online-based survey. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions. Participants then completed the Social Dominance Orientation, Perspective-Taking, Support LGBTI+

Rights, Symbolic threat, Social Distance, Outgroup attitudes scales and demographic information questionnaire respectively.

The findings of the study demonstrated that parasocial contact interventions were found to improve positive outgroup attitudes and increased support for LGBTI+ rights, enhanced perspective-taking, and decreased symbolic threat perceptions compared to the control group. However, parasocial contact interventions were not significant in reducing social distance toward LGBTI+'s. Lastly, there were no significant differences between emotion-, human rights-, and economy-based parasocial contact interventions in reducing prejudice toward LGBTI+. The findings are further discussed within the framework of the limitations and recommendations of this study.

Keywords: Parasocial Contact, Prejudice, Outgroup Attitudes, Social Distance, LGBTI+ Rights.

ÖZ

Lezbiyen, gey, biseksüel, transseksüel, interseks ve artı (LGBTİ+) orantısız şekilde önyargı ve ayrımcılığa maruz kalmaktadır. Dolaylı temas, LGBTİ+'lar da dahil olmak üzere farklı damgalanmış gruplara yönelik önyargıyı azaltmanın ve tutumları iyileştirmenin en etkili yollarından biridir. Parasosyal temas, izleyicilerin bir dış grup üyesine/üyelerine media yoluyla maruz kalmasına dayanan bir dolaylı temas türüdür. Dış grupla ilgili parasosyal temasa maruz kalmanın, olumlu tutumları arttırdığı ve dış gruplara karşı önyargıyı azalttığı bulunmuştur. Mevcut çalışma ile bir parasosyal temas müdahalelerinin LGBTİ+'lara yönelik önyargıyı azaltma üzerindeki etkilerini üç farklı parasosyal temas koşulu; duygu, insan hakları ve ekonomi temelli ve ayrıca bir kontrol grubu kullanarak test etmek amaçlanmıştır. Parasosyal temas müdahalelerindeki grup, kontrol grubuna kıyasla daha olumlu tutumlar, daha fazla perspektif alma, LGBTİ+ haklarına yönelik daha fazla destek, daha düşük tehdit algısı ve daha az sosyal mesafe eğilimi göstereceği cinsiyet, önceki temas ve sosyal baskınlık yönelimi kontrol edildiğinde LGBTİ+'lara yönelik önyargıyı azaltmada etkili olacağı varsayılmıştır. Ayrıca, LGBTİ+'lara yönelik önyargı azaltma konusunda üç parasosyal temas müdahalesi arasında farklılıklar olacağı varsayılmıştır.

Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi'nde Türkçe konuşan 334 genç yetişkin üniversite öğrencisi (234 kadın ve 110 erkek) çevrimiçi tabanlı bir anketi tamamlamıştır. Katılımcılar rastgele dört koşuldan birine atanmıştır. Katılımcılar daha sonra sırasıyla Sosyal Baskınlık Yönelimi, Bakış Açısı Alma, LGBTİ+ Haklarını Destekleme, Sembolik Tehdit Algısı, Sosyal Mesafe, Dış Grup tutumları ölçeklerini ve demografik bilgi formunu doldurmuştur.

Çalışmanın bulguları, parasosyal temas müdahalelerinin, kontrol grubuna kıyasla olumlu dış grup tutumlarını iyileştirdiğini ve LGBTİ+ haklarına desteği artırdığını, bakış açısını geliştirdiğini ve sembolik tehdit algılarını azalttığını göstermiştir. Ancak parasosyal temas müdahaleleri LGBTİ+'lara yönelik sosyal mesafeyi azaltmada anlamlı bulunmamıştır. Son olarak, LGBTİ+'ya yönelik önyargıyı azaltmada duygu, insan hakları ve ekonomi temelli parasosyal temas müdahaleleri arasında önemli bir fark bulunamamıştır. Bulgular, bu çalışmanın sınırlılıkları ve gelecek çalışmalara öneriler çerçevesinde tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Parasosyal Temas, Önyargı, Dış Gruba Karşı Tutumlar, Sosyal Mesafe, LGBTİ+ Hakları.

DEDICATION

To all individuals who have faced prejudice and discrimination.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to start by expressing my very great appreciation to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman for her very valuable and endless support during my thesis and master's in psychology. I am extremely grateful for her encouraging advice, sharing her knowledge, and motivation during my master's education.

I would like to thank the valuable person in my life Erman for their love, motivation, limitless patience, and endless support during my thesis process. Most importantly, I would like to express my appreciation to my mum and sisters in particular for their unconditional love, support, understanding, and trust in me. I thank to my lovely cousin Berna for her inspiring jokes, support, and love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZ	v
DEDICATION	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 LGBTI+ Terminology	2
1.2 Prejudice and Discrimination Toward LGBTI+	3
1.3 Discrimination and Negative Attitudes toward LGBTI+ in Cyprus	5
1.4 LGBTI+ Rights.....	7
1.5 Reducing Prejudice.....	11
1.5.1 Intergroup Contact Theory.....	11
1.5.2 Parasocial Contact.....	14
1.5.3 Factors Influencing Prejudice	16
1.6 The Current Study	20
2 METHOD.....	24
2.1 Participants	24
2.2 Materials	25
2.2.1 Social Dominance Orientation Scale (SDO)	25
2.2.2 Perspective Taking.....	25
2.2.3 Symbolic Threat Perception.....	25
2.2.4 Support for LGBTI+ Rights.....	26
2.2.5 Social Distance Scale.....	26

2.2.6 General Outgroup Evaluation Scale	27
2.2.7 Intergroup Contact	27
2.2.8 Demographic Questionnaire	27
2.3 Design.....	27
2.4 Procedure.....	28
3 RESULTS	31
3.1 Correlation Analysis	31
3.2 Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA)	32
4 DISCUSSION	37
REFERENCES.....	45
APPENDICES.....	70
Appendix A: Consent Form.....	71
Appendix B: Sosyal Baskınlık Yönelimi Ölçeği.....	72
Appendix C: Perspective Taking.....	73
Appendix D: Symbolic Threat Perception	74
Appendix E: Support for LGBTI+ Rights Scale	75
Appendix F: Social Distance Scale	76
Appendix G: General Outgroup Evaluation Scale	77
Appendix H: Demographic Questionnaire	78
Appendix I: Scripts.....	79
Appendix J: Approval Letter from Research and Ethics Committee of Psychology Department of Eastern Mediterranean University.....	83

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Descriptive Statistic for Genders, Group Conditions, and Citizens.....	32
Table 2: Means, Standard Deviations and for Study Variables by Experimental Conditions	35

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

It is known that lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, intersex and pluses (LGBTI+) have faced discrimination and stigma from past till present. Although the dimensions of discrimination and stigma vary from society to society or culture to culture, discriminatory attitudes and behaviors toward LGBTI+s remain present. These attitudes and behaviors were analysed in various scientific fields such as economy, politics, medicine, sociology, and psychology. Due to patriarchal and heteronormative binary gender system LGBTI+s existence were seen as ‘unnatural’, ‘sinful’, ‘criminal’ etc. Similarly, as part of socialization processes, LGBTI+ people and issues were seen as 'perversion', 'immorality' and 'disease'. This binary gender system known as heteronormativity has excluded and marginalized LGBTI+s within social, cultural, and legal spheres. In addition to these, exclusion and invisibility within the society led various rights violations and hate crimes which also restricted the access of LGBTI+s to equal basic human rights (e.g. right to live) which are also reported by civil society organizations here in Cyprus and abroad (Kaos GL, 2020; Queer Cyprus Association, 2021). Further, it is also known that stigma and discrimination have severe negative effects on LGBTI+'s well-being. It was found that sexual minorities report more symptoms of mental health problems (e.g. depression, suicide, and anxiety) than their heterosexual peers (Batejan et al., 2014; Meyer, 2003; 1995). In order to tackle this prejudice and discrimination, Allport (1956) put forward the contact hypothesis. Many studies in the literature reveal that intergroup contact has a significant effect on

prejudice reduction including that directed to sexual and racial prejudice (Schiappa et al., 2006; Husnu et al., 2018; Vezzali et al., 2014; West et al., 2015).

In this thesis, the effect of parasocial contact interventions (emotion-, human rights-, and economy-based) will be tested using video-type parasocial contact exposure. In the following chapters, LGBTI+ terminology and sexual prejudice, and discrimination against LGBTI+s are presented.

1.1 LGBTI+ Terminology

Sex refers to physical attributes that include external and internal reproductive structures, chromosomes, and hormones. It is used to sex assign at birth an individual as male or female, in some cases, combinations of both female and male gender characteristics are known as intersex (APA, 2012). Gender is a concept with multiple dimensions. Gender is the interaction of an individual's birth-assigned sex, their perception of their own gender, and the presentation of gender and behavior outward. The perception of oneself as a man, woman, both, or neither is referred to as gender identity (APA, 2012). Sexual orientation is the term used to refer to the gender of people to whom one is sexually and/or romantically attracted. Sexual orientation diversities are mostly known in various categories: an attraction to members of the opposite genders (heterosexual), and the sexual orientations that are also known as LGB are the attraction to members of one's own gender (gay or lesbian), and attraction to more than one gender (bisexual) (APA, 2012). When a person's gender identification and assigned sex aren't congruent, the person may identify along the transgender (T) spectrum (transman, transwoman, or gender non-conforming) (APA, 2012). In other words, transgenders are people who do not follow traditional gender norms, societal

gender expectations, and gender assigned at birth. Together these are known as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, and plus (LGBTI+) (Kaos GL, 2020).

1.2 Prejudice and Discrimination Toward LGBTI+

Homophobia is the approval of strict notions of traditional gender roles and sexuality, which manifest as prejudice and stigma toward homosexuals, thus justifying discrimination based on sexual minority identities and heterosexual favoritism (Sullivan, 2003). Similarly, transphobia refers to the feeling of disgust directed at those who do not comply with society's gender norms according to Hill (2002). Heterosexual favoritism also called heterosexism refers to expressing an ideological system that is used to define both a cultural context that stigmatizes sexual minorities and denies their full social membership, as well as individual attitudes and behaviors that indicate heteronormativity. Furthermore, heterosexuality is seen as an acceptable and desirable, “natural” and “normal” sexual orientation emphasized by heteronormative ideology (Herek, 2003). According to Herek sexual prejudice: is *“internalized sexual stigma that results in the negative evaluation of sexual minorities”* (Herek, 2009, p. 74). While socially shared understanding of homosexuality's devalued position in society is known as sexual stigma, discrimination describes a situation in which LGBTI+s are treated unfairly because of their gender identity or sexual orientations (Gocmen & Yilmaz, 2017).

All around the world still discrimination and hate crimes happen toward LGBTI+s in different ways. Generally societies have seen LGBTI+'s as sick for years, further, this point of view did not differ in many fields such as psychology and medicine (APA, 1952; 1968). The history of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) as seen in the first DSM defines homosexuality and transvestitism as ‘sexual

deviations' (APA, 1952). This classification and discrimination did not change in the DSM-II published in 1973 (APA, 1980). The American Psychiatric Association in 1973 announced that homosexuals were satisfied with their sexual orientation, that there were no cognitive or psychological impairments implicated in sexual orientation, and hence depathologized homosexuality by excluding it from mental health disorders in the DSM-III edition. Despite this, gender identity disorder is still listed in the version of the DSM-IV (APA, 2015).

Many LGBTI+s does not fit society's norms or expectations regarding sexuality, they face sexual stigma, stereotypes, and discrimination in many areas such as friends, families, social institutions, workplaces, and health services (Mayock et al., 2009; Graham et al., 2011). Previous studies have shown that LGBTI+s face different forms of discrimination as either direct (e.g., verbal, physical violence) or indirect forms (e.g., ignoring, jokes, exclusion). A nationwide survey in the US conducted by Kosciw et al., (2012) showed that in the school environment 71.3% of sexual minority high school students face verbal harassment (e.g., being called a 'fag', or frequently hearing the word 'gay' in a negative way) from other students. A study conducted with 5,000 German sexual minority (LGBT) youth reported 82% of LGBT experienced discrimination because of their sexual orientations or gender identities, whereas 44% in the setting of education or work (Krell & Oldemeier, 2016). Another study conducted in the US by Kosciw et al. (2016) with a wide sample of LGBTI+ students participation showed that 57.6% of students due to their sexual orientation and 43.3% of students due to their perceived gender expression did not feel safe at school. The rate of students who reported they experience discrimination was 66.2%. Further, 70.8% of students experienced verbal abuse, 27% physical harassment, and 13% physical attack as a result of their sexual orientation. The rates of discrimination for

gender expression were reported by respondents as 54.5% verbal, 20.3% physical, and 9.4% sexual respectively.

In the Hate Crimes report conducted by Gay and Lesbian Cultural Research and Solidarity Association (Kaos GL), LGBTI+s rights association based in Turkey, it was found that students are exposed to homophobic attitudes, and physiological and psychological bullying due to their sexual orientation and gender identity in their schools. Further, university students experience not only individual discrimination but also institutional discrimination. Some students also had forced to leave their dormitories during their education due to discrimination (Güner et al., 2010). Further, LGBTI+s experience discrimination in different areas such as health services a study conducted by Yılmaz and Göçmen in 2015 with a large sample of LGBTs (N=2,875) indicated that 7.6% of LGBTs did not receive treatment or delayed treatment because of fear of stigma and discrimination. Again, 7.2% of participants were subject to ‘conversion therapy’ to be treated for their sexual orientation and gender identity by health care professionals.

1.3 Discrimination and Negative Attitudes toward LGBTI+ in Cyprus

Recent studies conducted by the Queer Cyprus Association (QCA) an LGBTI+ human rights-based organization in the north of Cyprus reveal the formal and informal discrimination LGBTI+s face in the northern part of Cyprus. According to the QCA’s the Labour Market experiences of LGBTI+ report (Bhatti and Lisanier, 2021), which deals with the workplace experiences of LGBTI+s, 74% of LGBTI+s have to hide their sexual orientations and gender identities to avoid negative attitudes in the workplaces. Furthermore, 4.5% of respondents reported that they were fired due to their identity, while 14.2% of participants changed jobs due to the LGBTI+phobic attitudes they

faced. In addition, LGBTI+s experience wage discrimination as a participant stated that they do not have the same opportunity as their heterosexual colleagues in tax discounts. For instance, heterosexual colleagues who are married may have tax discounts and for each offspring they may have additional discounts, however, LGBTI+'s cannot benefit from this opportunity due to inequality in marriage rights (Bhatti and Lisanier, 2021). Also, transgenders are considered under the 'mental disorder' list by psychologists and psychiatrists in the northern part of Cyprus which is not consistent with the latest version of DSM (Ergün, & Paşa, 2021). In another report conducted by QCA (Şemi et al., 2021) about access to social services, 85.7% of the research participants reported that they experienced violence because of their sexual orientations and gender identity. It was reported that 39.6% of the participants were subjected to physical violence, 32.4% were exposed to sexual violence and 27% to economic violence (Şemi et al., 2021).

In terms of public opinion and general attitudes toward LGBTI+s, in the northern part of Cyprus limited studies have been conducted by QCA (Uluboy, 2017; Husnu, 2021). The existing studies have shown that those residing in the north of Cyprus hold negative attitudes toward LGBTI+, for example, in a survey on attitudes conducted in 2017 when invited by the researchers to participate in the study, some participants tore the survey papers and threw them to the researchers once they understand the topic. Another recent study by QCA (Husnu, 2021) examined the attitudes of the society in the northern part of Cyprus using a large nationally representative sample (N=1002). The findings demonstrated that attitudes toward LGBTI+s was associated with ethnicity, Turkish participants reported more negative attitudes toward LGBTI+s compared to Turkish Cypriots participants. Further, participants who were male, older age, living in a rural area, and highly religious were correlated with more negative

attitudes toward LGBTI+s. Similarly, Uluboy and Husnu (2020) showed that in a sample of Turkish-speaking participants in the north of Cyprus, those who hold rigid binary gender roles hold more negative attitudes toward sexual minority groups. When one turns to the south of Cyprus, attitudes are not very different and people also have negative attitudes toward LGBTI+. Homophobia frequency and normality were linked to the heteronormative family structure, the establishment of national and religious identity, and the conservative nature of the society (Shoshilou & Vasiliou, 2016).

1.4 LGBTI+ Rights

Whereas it is common for social psychological research to look at attitudes in general, issues pertaining to human rights have been less despite the fact that they are closely intertwined. As laws regarding human rights are significant indicators of societal attitudes about same-sex relations or transgender rights, according to Zhang (2014), legislation is a reflection of society that shapes social values and norms. Further, it's been suggested that legislation relating to LGBTI+s rights, such as the recognition of marriage equality of LGBTI+, might enhance respect for LGBTI+ rights by providing the rights given by such legislation more legitimacy, acceptability, and intimacy (Flores & Barclay, 2016; Hanley et al., 2012; Kreitzer et al., 2014). According to a study, the recognition of marriage equality for LGBTI+ increased positive attitudes toward LGBTI+ (Flores & Barclay, 2016). As a result, a person's own support for LGBTI+s might be influenced by the rights provided to LGBTI+ in the country. That's why improving LGBTI+ rights have an important influence at the individual level too. This makes the topic worthy of further investigation.

Turning to the rights of LGBTI+ worldwide, even today most of the countries do not have protective and supportive legislation about sexual orientation and gender identity

explicitly, such that some countries ban or punish homosexual relationships. As of May 2017, there are 124 countries where homosexuality is not illegal, compared to 72 countries where same-sex sexual behavior is illegal (Kenny, & Patel, 2017). In some African and Asian countries, homosexual acts are considered illegal such as Sudan, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen whereby same-sex sexual behaviors have the death penalty according to European Region of the International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Trans, and Intersex Association (ILGA-EU) stated in a world survey of sexual orientation laws report (Carroll, 2016). Further, homosexuality is illegal in many African countries and the African society is the least accepting of homosexual acts in the world (Oberth & Mondry, 2014). Although the fact that LGBTI+ existence is not illegal in Turkey this does not provide LGBTI+s legal protection from prejudice or discriminations because the country lacks protective legislations that comprehensively include LGBTI+ identities. According to the latest report of the ILGA-Europe Rainbow Map and Index 2021, Turkey is ranked 48th out of 49 countries regarding the human rights equality of LGBTI+s (ILGA-EU, 2021). In 2015, Istanbul Governor's Office banned the Istanbul Pride March, which has been held for 13 years, emphasizing that such a march is "immoral and inappropriate" in Ramadan for an Islamic country. Similarly, in 2016 Ankara Governorship banned the pride march justified with "societal sensitivity" and refused to provide security for the march. Despite this ban, those LGBTI+s who tried to march were subjected to police violence in different cities of Turkey (Kaos GL, 2022). In 2022 June pride march was banned once again, and some NGOs complained about this decision. On the other hand, the anti-discrimination law of the European Union explicitly banned discrimination based on sexual orientations (Ellis, 2005). Overall, Western countries' legal progress have become more supportive for LGBTI+ rights and more accepting of same-sex sexual

acts. For example, the Netherlands was the first country to establish same-sex marriage equality in 2000, in addition to that another 15 countries provided this right to same-sex couples (Itaborahy & Zhu 2013, Masci et al., 2013).

Turning to the context of the study, LGBTI+s in the northern part of Cyprus still struggles with some legal challenges. Until 2014 the northern part of Cyprus's legislation criminalized the relationships of same-sex individuals. Sexual intercourse (specifically anal sex) among males were identified as an "unnatural crime" under the criminal code articles 171 and 173, until January 2014, encouraging an environment of discrimination and intolerance (Human Dignity Trust, 2014). The regulations remained as a remnant of British colonial authority after the territory attained independence in the 1960s. The Republic of Cyprus changed its rule in 1998 to be able to be a members of the European Union. This was changed in the north of Cyprus in 2014 (Human Dignity Trust, 2014). However, according to a recent report published by QCA (Ergün & Paşa, 2021) still transgenders are forced to have genital surgery for legally recognition of their gender on their identity cards and on all other legal documents. In terms of other civil rights, same-sex couple does not have marriage equality, nor the adoption right (Ergün & Paşa, 2021). According to a recent report on attitudes toward LGBTI+s in the northern part of Cyprus, society's attitudes regarding adoption rights of LGBTI+, or marriage equality are still negative. In addition, an important percent of participants believed that LGBTI+ do not need laws to increase the protection from or prevention of discrimination (Husnu, 2021).

The prejudice and discrimination toward LGBTI+s have negative consequences on LGBTI+'s well-being. Studies have found lesbian, gay, and bisexuals have a higher risk of mental health problems compared to heterosexuals, these risks are connected

to additional life stressors such as sexual orientation-based discrimination or violence (Meyer, 1995; Meyer, 2003; Sandfort et al., 2001). According to the Minority stress model, sexual minority groups in addition to the daily life stressors, they deal with unique and extra proximal and distal stress factors related to LGBTI+ identities (Meyer, 2003). Distal stress factors are experiences of discrimination from the environment (e.g., heterosexist attitudes, gender roles, and homonegative micro-aggressions), while proximal stress factors are perceptions and emotions that come and are kept as a result of directly and indirectly encountering prejudicial experiences (e.g., internalized homonegativity, anticipated stigma) (Meyer, 2003). A national-based study showed that compared to heterosexuals, LGBTI+s have a higher risk of the prevalence of suicidal ideas and attempts, anxiety, and emotional problems (Gilman et al., 2001). Other research has revealed that gays are more likely to have major depression symptoms and panic attacks, and have greater levels of anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and suicidality compared to heterosexual men (Cochran & Mays, 2000; Jorm et al., 2002; Meyer, 2008). Another piece of evidence showed that bisexual people reported higher mental health problems rate compared to other sexual minority groups due to discrimination exposed to by both heterosexuals and sexual minority groups (i.e., a ‘double discrimination’; Meyer et al., 2008).

These consequences of prejudice and as well as the lack of equal human rights for LGBTI+ have negative effects on LGBTI+s’ mental health. Because of these consequences of prejudice, researchers have looked for ways to reduce prejudice based on sexual orientations and gender identity and enhance support for LGBTI+ rights.

1.5 Reducing Prejudice

1.5.1 Intergroup Contact Theory

An important question raised in the literature is how such discrimination and stigma can be changed and eliminated within societies. The answer to this question comes from contact theory, formulated more than sixty years ago by Allport in 1954, it is the most examined theory that is based on decreasing prejudice and changing attitudes by bringing groups together. According to the intergroup contact hypothesis, prejudice is caused in part by a lack of contact among ingroup and outgroup members. Therefore, it is suggested that personal and positive contact could reduce bias between groups (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Additionally, Allport (1982) stated four essential conditions for effective contact which are equal group status in the circumstances of groups, common purposes, intergroup collaboration, and authority support to be able to reduce the prejudice among ingroups and outgroups. The initial studies were focused on the reducing of racial and ethnic-based prejudice, but the contact hypothesis extended to different minority groups such as sexual minority (see Herek & Capitanio, 1996; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), and not only explicit attitudes but also implicit attitudes (Davies et al., 2011; Turner et al., 2008) as well as future contact intention (Crisp & Husnu, 2011; West et al., 2015).

Much research has since been conducted and confirmed that intergroup contact is an influential and important technique for decreasing prejudice and improving positive relations between ingroup and outgroup (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2004). A large sample meta-analysis study conducted by Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) examined 515 different types of research and showed that 94% of the samples demonstrated that intergroup contacts have effects on prejudice reduction even without Allport's proper conditions

are not “necessary”, they do help to foster good views toward out-group members. Further, the study showed larger effects for sexual minority groups and disabled groups, and for the categories of race, ethnicity, and mentally disabled individuals, a moderate effect was found (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Moreover, Pettigrew and Tropp (2008), conducted another meta-analysis that examined more than five hundred intergroup contact hypotheses and focused on the most studied three mediators. The first one is knowing the outgroups, Allport (1954) proposed that intergroup contact and interactions enhance knowledge thus improving positive attitudes toward outgroups and reducing prejudice. According to the findings, anxiety is the second mediation listed in the analyses. The intergroup contact associates to reduce the intergroup anxiety and threat perception thus leading to prejudice reduction. The third mediator examined in the meta-analysis study is empathy toward outgroups and perspective-taking of outgroups, the findings proved that contact leads to taking perspective and high empathy towards outgroups which in turn decreases prejudice. Further, Pettigrew and Tropp (2008) demonstrated that shifts in emotional indicators especially anxiety and empathy were more successful compared to cognitive variables in prejudice. They observed that high empathy and knowledge about outgroups were negatively associated with anxiety. As a result, there might be a causal chain between these variables; when there is contact, it reduces the anxiety which might increase empathy and knowledge regarding the outgroup. This basis might reduce prejudice toward outgroups (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008).

Intergroup contact has also been shown to be related to increased rights support across nations, specifically for different LGBT policies, demonstrating that the beneficial impacts of interpersonal contact are able to generalize (Earle et al., 2020). Further, studies have shown a negative relationship between prejudice and support of LGBTI+

rights, for instance, one cross-cultural meta-analysis showed that having contact with lesbians, gays, and transgenders was related to stronger support for gay/lesbian/transgender rights (Earle et al., 2020). Furthermore, Herek (2009) stated that the discriminatory legislation reproduces the stigma and discrimination toward sexual minority groups. Moreover, Górska et al. (2017) collected data from 28 different EU-member countries the findings showed that legal protective legislation of LGB enhances the positive attitude toward sexual minority groups by changing the prevalence of intergroup interactions with LGB people, societies with more inclusive LGB-related legislation foster more favorable attitudes about sexual minorities.

Despite these promising findings, a limitation of the theory is that it is not always possible for groups to have direct contact to come together. Therefore, throughout the last few decades, to be able to overcome this limitation, researchers have found new ways of contact. When direct contact is not possible or is not feasible indirect forms of contact may be possible, these methods do not need face-to-face interactions or coming together. The most well-studied indirect contact methods are vicarious-, imagined-, extended-, and parasocial contact (Crisp & Husnu, 2011; Mazziotta et al., 2011; Husnu, & Crisp, 2010; Horton & Wohl, 1956; West et al., 2015; Wright et al., 1997).

Briefly, the imagined contact hypothesis is the “mental simulation of a contact experience” according to Crisp et al. (2010). This imagination has effects on prejudice reduction and breaking stereotypes (Crisp and Turner, 2009). The extended hypothesis is based on knowing that ingroup members have cross-group interactions, and friendships, that are particularly meaningful and encourage both positive relations and tolerance toward the outgroups. The extended hypothesis argues that having

crossgroup friends is not required, and that simply being aware of friendships between in-group and out-group members achieves the same impact (Wright et al., 1997). The focus of the present study is to utilize parasocial contact as an indirect contact method, hence it will be covered in more details in the following chapter.

1.5.2 Parasocial Contact

The term "parasocial contact" was first utilized by Horton and Wohl (1956) to refer that communication media might provide people with "an apparently intimate, face-to-face relationship with a performance" (p. 228). People generally respond to broadcast actors as they would respond to an actual people because the human brain interprets media stimuli similarly to how it perceives "direct personal experience" (Kanazawa, 2002). According to Horton and Wohl (1956), the news media give chances that viewers might otherwise not find the opportunity for within their own social environment. According to the parasocial contact study, mediated contact may replicate Pettigrew's (1998) stated mechanisms of beneficial intergroup relations if a member of the majority group rarely has the chance to connect with individuals of the outgroup, parasocial interactions could be able to fill that gap (Schiappa et al., 2006). People can acquire knowledge about an outgroup through mediated communications and representations. After having a positive experience, one's behavior is changed, and one will often seek out greater parasocial interaction instead of avoiding it. One can form emotional connections with people they only know through media, and whether or not this causes one to reevaluate their opinions about outgroup members, the parasocial connections that result could lead to an alteration in prejudice against the outgroups to which minority group members belong (Pettigrew, 1998; Stephan & Stephan, 1984). Further, Perse and Rubin (1989) suggested that individuals use similar contact related cognitive processes for both of mediated and interpersonal situations,

stating that the media is an alternative means of communication which can meet needs and gratify its viewers in similar ways to actual people. Although parasocial ties are similar to actual social relationships, they differ in that there is no reciprocity (Cohen, 2009).

There is a large body of evidence that parasocial contact is influential in influencing target audiences within communication studies, this might be in the form of local TV news reporters (Houlberg, 1984; Levy, 1979; Rubin et al., 1985) and also with soap opera actors, celebrities who appear in commercials, radio hosts, and popular TV personalities (Hoffner, 1996; Perse & Rubin, 1990; Rubin & Step, 2000). In terms of social psychological research, parasocial interactions have also been found to improve intergroup relations (Ortiz & Harwood, 2007; Schiappa et al., 2006). For instance, looking at prejudice toward immigrants, Muslims, racial minorities, and those with mental health difficulties, parasocial interaction has been found to be negatively associated with prejudice (Fujioka, 1999; Moyer-Gusé et al., 2019; Visintin et al., 2017). Importantly for this research, a study conducted to examine exposure to gay actors on TV shows found that exposure to gay TV characters led to higher acceptance and was negatively correlated with prejudice (McLaughlin & Rodriguez, 2017). Schiappa et al. (2006) showed that watching TV programs that portrayed positive relationships between heterosexual males and gay males and gender nonconforming people reduced prejudice toward these groups. There is a great opportunity to influence public attitudes toward the LGBTI+ population favorably as the visibility of the LGBT population in digital media expands. In a sample of straight university students, Ortiz and Harwood (2007) showed a negative correlation between exposure to “Will & Grace” (a popular U.S. sitcom with two gay leads) and the perception of social distance between homosexual and heterosexual individuals. Bond and Compton (2015)

investigated straight people's support for the LGBT community by measuring their exposure to homosexual TV characters when controlling for factors including gender, ethnicity, religion, and interpersonal encounters with gay people. The results showed that straight TV viewers endorsed and supported equality for homosexuals based just on their media encounters with them, even in the lack of any interpersonal links with open gays. Moreover, a study found that exposure to gay TV characters improves beliefs about the LGBTI+ community and behaviors toward gays (Sink & Mastro, 2018). Another study concentrated on news as a source of information that could influence perceptions of people about Muslims. Findings revealed that parasocial contact, in the form of amount of news people were exposed to on the media, was associated with positive attitudes toward Muslims (Abrams et al., 2018). Based on the above literature parasocial interactions with different content pertaining to LGTBI+ (emotion-, human rights- & economy-based) were utilized in the current study. It was expected that these interventions will result in the kind of positive attitude change that interpersonal contact can establish.

1.5.3 Factors Influencing Prejudice

A number of factors might be implicated in the effectiveness of intergroup contact as a prejudice-reducing technique. For the current study, the following variables were considered.

Perspective-taking

Perspective-taking refers to *"The ability to understand how a situation appears to another person and how that person is reacting cognitively and emotionally to the situation."* (Johnson, 1975, p. 241). According to reviews the critical component of a successful contact intervention might be that it includes empathy, a closely related component (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2004). Another review paper suggested promoting

perspective-taking might increase the positive effects of interventions for prejudice reduction (Cramwinckel, et al., 2018). It was found that those who report racial outgroup interaction on social media are more likely to indicate perspective-taking and, as a result, more favorable attitudes toward these outgroups (Barker, 2012). Importantly for the current study, perspective-taking can also reduce prejudice and increase the success of campaigns to struggle with the stigma against sexual minorities. Perspective-taking might be improved via sharing personal experiences or information about LGBTI+, sharing coming-out stories, or experiences of discrimination. Additionally, training in perspective-taking might be a sufficient way to reduce prejudice. An experimental study aimed to reduce prejudice toward transgenders showed that talking with someone regarding transgender rights, and inviting others to take the perspective of a transgender person significantly reduced trans prejudice (Broockman & Kalla, 2016).

Social dominance orientation

Support for an inequality-based approach (SDO) can predict both intergroup attitudes and prejudice according to recent research (Harnish et al. 2018; Pratto et al. 1994; Rios, 2013). The principles of the social dominance approach are that individuals have a tendency to construct social hierarchies, which they achieve through developing belief systems that justifying and explain the dominance of certain groups over outgroups (Pratto et al. 1994). They found that social dominance orientation plays a critical role in intergroup relations such that social dominance orientation has been found to be negatively related with empathy, tolerance, and altruism, whereas positively associated to the need of social hierarchies in roles and structures (Pratto et al. 1994). People who hold a higher social dominance orientation utilize legitimizing myths to be able to explain and justify own attitudes that some groups must be more powerful

or dominant compared to others. Studies have found associations between social dominance orientation and political-economic conservatism, negative attitudes towards racial equality, women's movement, and sexual minority rights (Harnish et al., 2018; Pratto et al., 1994; Rios, 2013). Research showed that people who have a high social dominance orientation tend to perceive target groups in more threatening ways, in addition, this tendency led to decreased support for low-status groups and promotes prejudice against them (Eibach & Keegan, 2006; Pratto et al., 2006). Similarly, Nierman (2007) suggested that perceiving LGBT as having an increased status may be seen as a threat to individuals who have a high social dominance orientation. Uluboy and Husnu (2020) examined the attitudes of Turkish speakers toward transgenders, they found that people with higher social dominance orientation tend to have higher transphobia.

Additionally, a longitudinal study found that positive intergroup interactions can reduce the social dominance orientation over time (Dhont et al., 2013). Further, decreasing the inequality-based tendency can increase the positive attitudes and interactions between ingroup and outgroup. Shook et al. (2015) examined first-year university students randomly assigned before the start of the academic year to live with same-race or different-race roommates in university dormitories. Findings showed that students who were in interracial rooms shown lower social dominance orientation and higher positive attitudes toward other racial groups than students who shared rooms with their own race at the end of the semester. Intergroup interactions effects the attitudes of students toward outgroup members, especially general attitudes about social dominance and the need for hierarchy. Another study done by Dhont et al., (2013) revealed that intergroup contact can impact the ideological roots of prejudice,

therefore indirectly affecting the degree of predictors which are expected by social dominance orientation.

Symbolic threat

Intergroup threat refers to when ingroup members believe that specific outgroup members harm them either in a realistic way which is a loss of resources of in-group members, or in a symbolic way which is harmful to their values, morals, traditions, and culture (Stephan & Stephan, 2000). The studies showed that ethnic and racial stereotypes correlated with symbolic threat perceptions such as results of past studies consistently found that symbolic threats are related to racial prejudice (Esses et al., 1993; Greenberg et al., 1990; Stephan et al., 2000). Another study found that non-heterosexual people are potentially perceived as a threat by heterosexuals to their values, norms, and morals of a society that relate to the symbolic threat (Brambilla & Butz, 2013). Further, the symbolic threat was found positively associated with prejudice towards sexual minorities (Rios, 2013). Moreover, scholars revealed that sexual minority groups are associated with threatened perceptions of masculinity and manhood. Thus, men have a higher tendency to promote and support traditional gender roles whilst insulting and marginalizing sexual minority groups than women (Kosakowska-Berezecka et al., 2016). This could be due to heightened sensitivity to masculine threats. The scholars found that men's attitudes toward gays become more hostile once they were threatened because of their gender (Rivera & Dasgupta, 2018; Willer et al., 2013; Talley & Bettencourt, 2008). Furthermore, because of the stated relationship between LGBT and immorality, or because gay and lesbian sexual relationships are believed as a violation to family values, gays and lesbians are viewed as a symbolic threat by society (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005; Vescio & Biernat, 2003). In the context of contact and symbolic threat, symbolic threats have been revealed to

mediate the relation between intergroup interaction and attitudes toward outgroup members (Tausch et al., 2007). Therefore, exposing participants to the emotion-, economy-, and human rights-based parasocial contact might affect people's threat perception toward LGBTI+.

1.6 The Current Study

Based on the aforementioned literature the current study aimed to examine the effectiveness of different parasocial contact interventions which are emotion-, economy-, and human rights-based on attitudes and prejudice toward LGBTI+. Differently to previous research, in the current study, we use social distance as a dependent measure. Social distance which refers to the intentions of heterosexuals' level of physical and social closeness might be an alternative way of examining prejudice in society. For instance, Muraco (2005) found that heterosexual college students who hold more traditional beliefs about gender had a tendency to keep social distance from lesbian and gay peers. Similarly, another study showed that individuals who hold more gender role beliefs presented greater support for segregation according to gender roles in educational settings, and they tend to less support policies that benefit transgenders. Lytle et al., (2016) demonstrated that attitudes toward lesbians and gays are positively correlated to readiness for intergroup interactions and reduced social distance. Therefore, the attitude of people toward LGBTI+ significantly predicts the readiness to interact with them. Further, previous studies investigated that intergroup contact is consistently related to reduced prejudice and social distance between ingroup and outgroups (Barlow et al., 2009; Paolini et al., 2007; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). On the other hand, exposure to overt sexual prejudice was linked to a higher social distance from ingroup identification than exposure to subtle sexual prejudice, according to the findings.

The current study utilized a parasocial contact intervention, namely emotion-, economy-, and human rights-based.

The first manipulation within this study is emotion-based parasocial contact emphasized emotionality. The intervention was about the love of a gay couple and the difficulties of being in a same-sex relationship, how they meet, being in the closet, the effects of LGBTI+phobia on their love. This manipulation aimed to enhance the emotionality by focusing on a more interpersonal gay couple's love. It is assumed that emotion-based interventions will reduce prejudice because emotions such as anxiety, threat, anger, and disgust may be at the root of prejudices and contact can be effective at decreasing these negative emotions (Pagotto & Voci, 2013).

The second manipulation is human rights-based intervention was created with an emphasis on equal human rights for all individuals without making any discrimination. For instance, highlighted that all human rights are universal, indivisible, interconnected, and interdependent, and the international community must respect them equally and fairly on a worldwide scale. Additionally, in the manipulation mentioned the adoption, marriage, gender reassignment, and prohibition of discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. Overall, the manipulation highlighted equal rights and protective legislation for LGBTI+ by modeling protective and supportive laws. This was thought to be effective for prejudice reduction since recent research has demonstrated consistent effects of interpersonal interaction, for example, Garretson (2014) showed that when people enhanced their knowledge about lesbians and gays their attitudes toward LGBTI+ rights were more favorable. Similarly, social media publications affect peoples'

opinions about gay rights (LaCour & Green, 2014). This might be interpreted as that their prejudice decreased toward LGBTI+s.

Final intervention method was based on an economic rationale. This included the economic cost of LGBTI+ prejudice which is explained how prejudice and sexual stigma toward LGBTI+ effects the economy of countries which increases the annual cost of health expenses, decreases the productivity of LGBTI+ workers as well as increases the cost of the companies. For example; members of stigmatized groups are not hired for jobs that best represent their skills and human potential because many employers do not find the abilities of stigmatized group members attractive. Even if they are hired there is a lack of continuity and they are not kept in the company, this might result in a drop in productivity of countries. Furthermore, because stigmatized groups are less likely to get hired and work fewer hours, productivity would drop proportionally. At the same time, the number of young people out of work would increase. In addition, stigma and discriminations have negative effects on mental health problems risks of LGBTI+, and these risks increase the health expenses of countries' budgets. Further, the manipulation included the economic benefits LGBTI+ inclusion such as more welcoming countries will be more attractive for LGBTI+ tourists which will contribute to their economies. This was thought to be effective, as a way to show that there is an economic cost of LGBTI+ prejudice to the economy of governments and this may be used to persuade individuals as well as governments to reduce prejudice and enhance acceptance towards LGBTI+s (Bailey et al., 2016). In line with the above, the hypotheses of this study were as follows:

- I. Participants who are exposed to emotion-, human rights-, or economy-based parasocial contact interventions will show more positive outgroup attitudes,

compared to the control condition when gender, social dominance orientation, and prior contact are controlled.

- II. Participants who are exposed to emotion-, human rights-, or economy-based parasocial contact interventions will show higher perspective-taking, compared to the control condition when gender, social dominance orientation, and prior contact are controlled.
- III. Participants who are exposed to emotion-, human rights-, or economy-based parasocial contact interventions will show lower symbolic threat, compared to the control condition when gender, social dominance orientation, and prior contact are controlled.
- IV. Participants who are exposed to emotion-, human rights-, or economy-based parasocial contact interventions will show higher support for LGBTI+ rights, compared to the control condition when gender, social dominance orientation, and prior contact are controlled.
- V. Participants who are exposed to emotion-, human rights-, or economy-based parasocial contact interventions will report desiring less social distance, compared to the control condition when gender, social dominance orientation, and prior contact are controlled.
- VI. Although no hypotheses have been clearly drawn regarding which type of contact intervention will be most effective on the dependent measures, it is expected that there will be significant differences between emotion-, human rights-, or economy-based parasocial contact interventions on outgroup attitudes, perspective-taking, symbolic threat, support for LGBTI+ rights, and social distance (while controlling for gender, social dominance orientation, and prior contact).

Chapter 2

METHOD

In the following chapters detailed information regarding participants' profile, used materials, design, and procedure that is used will be further explained.

2.1 Participants

In the current study, data were collected from the Eastern Mediterranean University Department of Psychology participant pool and from different faculty students by using convenience sampling and snowballing techniques. 540 university students from the undergraduate and postgraduate programs participated in the study. Further, extra credit was given to students for taking part. This study was designed to focus on heterosexuals' attitudes and attitudes change, hence was only conducted with heterosexual and cisgender participants. Participants who identified their sexual orientation or gender identity as LGBTI+ were therefore removed from the study ($N=32$). The study removed participants who failed the manipulation check or didn't watch the videos ($N=176$). The final number of participants was 334, whereby 32% of participants identified themselves as heterosexual male ($N=110$) and 68% females ($N=234$). The age of the participants was between 18 and 60 years ($M=22.60$, $SD=4.07$). 15.7% of participants ($N=54$) were citizens of TRNC, 83.1% were Turkish citizens ($N=276$) and 1.2% were selected as other citizens ($N=4$). In this study, the online web-based tool Qualtrics is used to collect the data. The appropriate sample size was determined by G*Power analysis. Seven study variables were included in the G*Power analysis (linear multiple regression (R^2 deviation from zero) suggested 80

participants (effect size $f^2 = .20$, $\alpha = .05$, power = .80, number of predictors = 7). Consequently, it was decided that the sample size was appropriate.

2.2 Materials

2.2.1 Social Dominance Orientation Scale (SDO)

The social dominance orientation (SDO) scale consists of 16 items, 8 items were reverse coded, the original scale was developed by Pratto et al. (1994). The social dominance orientation assesses two central domains: group-based dominance, which includes 8 items that represent a desire to dominate other groups (e.g., "other groups must sometimes be kept in their place"), and opposition to equality, which includes 8 items that are reversed and represent a desire for inequality (e.g., "all groups should be given an equal chance in life"). However, the total scale was utilized in the current study. Turkish adaptation of social dominance orientation was done by Akbas in 2010. A higher score on this scale represents higher group-based dominance and higher opposition to equality. The Cronbach's α value was found .92 in this study.

2.2.2 Perspective Taking

The self-report measurement was developed by Batson et al. (1997 also see Davis 1983). The 5 items developed to evaluate individuals' tendency for perspective-taking concerns such as "*When I am upset at someone, I usually try to 'put myself in their shoes' for a while*", "*See things from their point of view*". The scale consisted 5-point Likert type from 1-does not describe me at all to 5-describe me very well, a higher score on this scale is indicative of higher perspective-taking. The Cronbach's α value was found .90 in this study.

2.2.3 Symbolic Threat Perception

The degree of intergroup threat that individuals felt when considering LGBTI+s were evaluated by 5 items, ranging on a seven-point scale that was used by Stathi et al.,

(2017) and adapted for the LGBTI+ population for the current study. Some items that were used in the study were “*Turkish Cypriot and Turkish norms and values are being threatened because of LGBTI+s*” and “*The values of LGBTI+s and heterosexuals are different from each other.*” A higher score on this scale means a higher threat perception level. The Cronbach’s α value was found .86 in this study.

2.2.4 Support for LGBTI+ Rights

The scale assessed support for Lesbian and Gay Human Rights developed by Ellis et al. (2003). A 5-point Likert-type scale was used, with 5 representing the highest support for gay and lesbian human rights, ranging from *1-strongly disagree* to *5-strongly agree*. The Turkish adaptation of this scale is not available. This scale was therefore translated by researchers of the current study using the back-translation method. The 17 items were used in this study, and three items were removed from the scale because some of the items could be triggering for the LGBTI+ participants who fill the survey and out of the date (e.g., “*if we give gays and lesbians the same rights as heterosexuals, than we will have to give them to other “alternative lifestyles” like incest, bestiality, and polygamy.*” The 4., 7., 12., and 16. were reversed items. A higher score on this scale means more support for the human rights of LGBTI+s. The Cronbach’s α value was found .94 in this study.

2.2.5 Social Distance Scale

The original scale of social distance proposes to assess the social distancing tendency of the participants via items created by Bogardus in 1959. The items included questions to assess participants' level of discomfort in several imagined social contacts with LGBTI+s such as working in the same company. Each item was rated from *1-I would not feel comfortable at all* to *5-I would feel extremely comfortable* on the 5-point Likert type scale. The Turkish version of the Social Distance Scale was adapted by Cingöz-Ulu et

al. (2016). Higher rates from this scale indicate lower levels of discomfort with LGBTI+s. The Cronbach's α value was found .98 in this study.

2.2.6 General Outgroup Evaluation Scale

The attitudes toward LGBTI+s were evaluated with the outgroup attitude general evaluation scale. The scale was developed by Wright et al. (1997). Participants were asked to indicate how they feel about lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgenders on 6 bipolar scale items (e.g. *cold-warm, friendly-hostile, disgust-admiration*) anchored from 1 to 7 (Husnu & Paolini, 2018). A higher score means a more positive outgroup evaluation. This six-item semantic differential scale had a Cronbach alpha value is .92 in this study.

2.2.7 Intergroup Contact

We asked participants to complete items assessing contact quantity with LGBTI+s. They answered the questions based on the quantity of contact (e.g., *Do you know anyone who is Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, or Intersex in your environment?, How close are you to these people?*).

2.2.8 Demographic Questionnaire

The researcher and the researcher's supervisor created a demographic questionnaire in order to obtain the required information about the participants of the study. The questions include age, citizenship, gender, and sexual orientation.

2.3 Design

This study consisted of an online survey using an experimental between-subject design (emotion-, human rights-, economy-based parasocial contact vs. control condition). The independent variable was parasocial contact with three different manipulations (emotion-based, economy-based, and human rights-based videos) and one control manipulation (no video). Social dominance orientation, prior contact, and gender were

covariate variables which are controlled for the dependent variables as moderator variables. Because many research revealed that women have more positive attitudes than men toward sexual minority groups (Herek, 2009; Calzo & Ward, 2009; Husnu, 2021; Kosakowska-Berezecka et al., 2016). Similarly, the studies examined the impact of gender on support for LGBTI+ rights such as same-sex marriage or same-sex parenting shown that women tend to be more supportive of LGBTI+ rights than males (Becker, 2012; Lee & Hicks, 2013; Merino, 2013; Todd & Ong, 2012; Webb et al., 2017). Therefore, gender was controlled. According to studies social dominance orientation and attitudes toward outgroups and prejudice are related, and those who hold higher SDO tend to be more likely to show prejudice or to hold negative attitudes toward low-status groups (Ekehammar et al., 2004; Perry & Sibley, 2011). Therefore, it is expected that gender and SDO might influence the relations between parasocial contact intervention and prejudice toward LGBTI+s and hence was controlled for.

2.4 Procedure

In order to recruit participants for this study different techniques, such as receiving course credit and announcements were used. The announcements were posted on some students' WhatsApp groups. At the beginning of the experiment, informed consent was given to all participants. In the informed consent, participants read they were participating in a study 'aimed to evaluate heterosexuals' social attitudes.' Before starting to watch the videos, they read general terminology such as definitions of sexual orientation, gender identity, and the meaning of LGBTI+s which were presented to the participants after the consent form. Then, participants were randomly assigned to either parasocial contact interventions or control condition. For the control condition, participants did not receive any parasocial contact intervention, but simply answered the scales. Those in the experimental conditions received one of three videos

which were based on emotion ($N=84$), economy ($N=86$), and human rights ($N=88$). Also, control condition was no video exposure ($N=86$). The videos were prepared by the researchers with the help of a professional TV speaker, the duration of videos was emotion-based 2.56 min, economy-based 2.49 min, and human rights-based 2.55. The videos presented by the same speaker for three types of interventions. In the manipulation conditions, participants were asked to watch and listen carefully to the video they received. In an attempt to ensure participants had fully watched the video, after the video was shown, participants were asked the question ‘I watched the video to the end’ “Yes or No” to which participants who answered “No” and hence were excluded from the analysis. The second manipulation check question was; for economy-based manipulation “The basic idea to be given in the video; Prejudice and discrimination against LGBTI+s negatively affect the economic development of countries”; emotion-based manipulation check was “The basic idea to be given in the video; For LGBTI+s to show their love, to live with the person they love, brings some challenges.” assessed whether participants understood the main idea of the video with a 5 Likert scale “The main idea is definitely this, the main idea is this, I’m not sure about the main idea, the main idea is not this, the main idea definitely not this.” Participants who said “I’m not sure about the main idea, the main idea is not this, the main idea definitely not this” about the main idea of the interventions were excluded from the analysis. After the manipulations, all participants who participated in the study received the study questionnaire which was the same for the control group. The scales were presented in this order: social dominance orientation, perspective-taking, symbolic threat, support for LGBTI+ rights, social distance scale, general outgroup attitude scale, and demographic information sheet that include intergroup contact questions. At the end of the survey participants were presented with the debriefing

form. The administration of the questionnaire took roughly 20 minutes. The data collection process lasted five months.

Chapter 3

RESULTS

The study's data were examined and reported in this part in respect to aims of the study. Presentation of statistical findings from correlation analysis were done and MANCOVA analyses were given in the below paragraphs.

3.1 Correlation Analysis

Table 1. Pearson Correlation Coefficient Values of the Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Prior Contact	-						
2. Social Dominance Orientation	-.30**	-					
3. Outgroup Attitudes	.48**	-.57**	-				
4. Perspective Taking	.49**	-.50**	.68**	-			
5. Support for LGBTI+ Rights	.48**	-.61**	.78**	.74**	-		
6. Social Distance	.50**	-.46**	.75**	.73**	.78**	-	
7. Symbolic Threat	-.40**	.59**	-.65**	-.64**	-.80**	-.65	-

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

A Pearson correlation coefficient was applied to analyze the association between variables. The simple correlations of the variables are presented in Table 1. Outgroup

attitudes were positively correlated with prior contact, perspective taking, support for LGBTI+ rights, and social distance, whereas negatively correlated with symbolic threat perception toward LGBTI+ and social dominance orientation. Further, social distance positively correlated with prior contact, outgroup attitudes, perspective taking and support for LGBTI+ rights, however negatively correlated with symbolic threat perception.

3.2 Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA)

To assess differences between groups, a Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) was performed with group conditions (emotion-, economy-, human rights-based, and control group) as the independent variables and the five different scales as dependent variables. Gender, prior contact and social dominance orientation were entered as covariates. There was a statistically significant difference between the control, emotion-based, economy-based, and human rights-based experiment groups on the combined dependent variables after controlling for social dominance orientation $F(5, 321) = 26.741, p = .000$, Wilks' $\Lambda = .706$, partial $\eta^2 = .29$, prior contact $F(5, 321) = 8.531, p = .000$, Wilks' $\Lambda = .883$, partial $\eta^2 = .11$ and gender $F(5, 321) = 5.697, p = .000$, Wilks' $\Lambda = .918$, partial $\eta^2 = .082$ as covariates, $F(15, 886) = 2.067, p = .010$, Wilks' $\Lambda = .912$, partial $\eta^2 = .31$. Univariate F tests showed there was a significant difference between group conditions on all the dependent measures apart from social distance ($F(3, 328) = 1.696, p = .16$).

More specifically, there was a significant effect of condition on outgroup attitudes toward LGBTI+, $F(3, 328) = 5.487, p = .001, \eta^2 = .048$; such that post hoc tests yielded significantly more positive attitudes when participants were exposed to the emotion-based ($M = 5.52, SE = 0.12, p=0.00$), economy-based ($M = 5.51, SE = 0.12, p=0.01$)

and human rights-based interventions ($M = 5.23$, $SE = 0.12$, $p=0.03$) compared to the control condition ($M = 4.85$, $SE = 0.13$). However, there were no significant differences between human rights-, emotion-, and economy-based conditions (see Table 2).

For perspective-taking there was a significant effect of condition on taking the perspective of LGBTI+, $F(3, 328) = 4.53$, $p = .004$, $\eta^2 = .040$. Post hoc analyses showed that participants were significantly more willing to take the perspective of LGBTI+ when they were exposed to emotion-based ($M = 3.54$, $SE = 0.10$, $p=0.007$) and economy-based ($M = 3.68$, $SE = 0.10$, $p=0.000$) and human rights-based intervention ($M = 3.46$, $SE = 0.09$, $p=0.02$) compared to control condition ($M=3.13$, $SE=0.10$). However, there were no significant differences between emotion-, human rights-, and economy-based conditions ($p>0.05$).

Further, for the dependent variable of support of human rights for LGBTI+ there was a significant effect of condition, $F(3, 328) = 4.185$, $p = .006$, $\eta^2 = .037$ such that more support for human rights of LGBTI+ was reported when participants were exposed to emotion-based ($M = 3.94$, $SE = 0.07$, $p=0.004$) economy-based ($M = 3.98$, $SE = 0.07$, $p=0.002$) and human-rights-based ($M = 3.93$, $SE = 0.06$, $p=0.005$) compared to control condition ($M= 3.64$, $SE= 0.07$). However, there were no significant differences between human rights-, emotion-, and economy-based conditions ($p>0.05$).

Furthermore, results revealed that there was a significant effect of condition on symbolic threat perception $F(3, 328) = 3.818$, $p = .010$, $\eta^2 = .034$; such that participants had significantly lower threat perceptions when they were exposed to emotion-based ($M = 2.08$, $SE = 0.08$, $p=0.001$) and economy-based interventions ($M = 2.15$, $SE =$

0.08, $p=0.010$) compared to control condition ($M= 2.48$, $SE= 0.08$). However, there were no significant differences between human rights-based ($M = 2.27$, $SE = 0.08$, $p=0.08$) and other conditions.

Lastly, results showed that there was no significant effect of conditions on social distance $F(3, 328) = 1.696$, $p = .168$, $\eta^2 = .015$; participants did not report lower social distance tendency when they exposed emotion-based ($M= 4.06$, $SE= 0.10$), human rights-based ($M= 4.04$, $SE= 0.10$), and economy-based interventions ($M = 4.09$, $SE = 0.10$) compared to control condition ($M= 3.77$, $SE= 0.11$). There were no significant differences between other conditions ($p>0.05$).

Table 2: Means and Standard Deviations for Study Variables by Experimental Conditions

	Control Group (N = 81)		Human Rights- based (N = 85)		Emotion- based (N = 83)		Economy- based (N = 85)			
Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>n</i> ²
Outgroup Attitudes	4.85	0.13	5.23	0.12	5.52	0.12	5.51	0.12	5.48***	.05
Perspective Taking	3.13	0.10	3.46	0.09	3.54	0.10	3.68	0.10	4.53**	.03
Support LGBTI+ Rights	3.64	0.07	3.93	0.06	3.94	0.07	3.98	0.07	4.18**	.03
Social Distance	3.77	0.11	4.04	0.10	4.06	0.10	4.09	0.10	1.69	.01
Symbolic Threat	2.48	0.08	2.27	0.08	2.08	0.08	2.15	0.08	3.81**	.03

Note: * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Chapter 4

DISCUSSION

The current study aimed to examine the effectiveness of different parasocial contact interventions which were emotion-, economy-, and human rights-based interventions via video exposure with the hope of reducing prejudice and improving positive attitudes toward LGBTI+’s in order to improve attitudes as well as enhance equality, and justice. In our society sexual orientation and gender identity diversities are still taboo due to social norms and expectations. From an individual level to an institutional level, rules and regulations force people to follow heterosexual norms and standards (Bhatti & Lisanier, 2021; Husnu, 2021; Uluboy & Husnu, 2020). Therefore, people might have rigid stigma, stereotypes, and biases toward LGBTI+. Using the direct contact method is not a feasible strategy due to difficulties to bring ingroup and outgroup together. Even though direct contact might be the most efficient strategy to improve ingroup-outgroup relations and to reduce prejudice toward outgroups compared to indirect contact methods (Fazio et al., 1983), parasocial contact via media exposure can have mass influences rather than influencing small groups of people (Rubin et al., 1985; Schiappa et al., 2006).

The current study results revealed that the video-type emotion-, human rights, and economy-based parasocial contact interventions led to an improvement on dependent variables such that it increased positive outgroup attitudes, higher perspective-taking, more support for LGBTI+s rights, and decreased symbolic threat compared to the

control condition while controlling for gender, social dominance orientation, and prior contact. These findings are consistent with the parasocial contact theory and earlier studies on indirect contact interventions (Cohen, 2009; Houlberg, 1984; Kanazawa, 2002; Rubin et al., 1985; Schiappa et al., 2006). Despite this, the parasocial contact interventions were not effective on social distance as a dependent measure compared to the control condition. Additionally, no significant differences between any of the parasocial contact conditions were obtained.

Intergroup contact is an essential and successful strategy for reducing prejudice and developing positive attitudes between groups (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). The analyses of the current study showed that participants who were exposed to emotion-, economy-, and human rights-based parasocial contact reported more positive outgroup attitudes toward LGBTI+ compared to the control group, as mentioned in the hypothesis. These findings are consistent with earlier studies in that indirect contact impacts individuals' attitudes toward outgroup (Fazio et al., 1983). According to Perse and Rubin (1989) parasocial contact reduces prejudice by developing emotional bonds with viewers. Similarly, Pettigrew (1998) showed knowing about the other group is a crucial part of the initial intergroup contact process. Because the process of stereotyping and prejudice includes a classification of a group based on misleading and inadequate knowledge (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998). Theoretically the role of knowledge about sexual minorities were consistently found effective in reducing prejudice toward stigmatized groups. Therefore, an effective information flow on LGBTI+'s might be important for a change in perceptions and attitudes about this group. As proposed by Bailey et al. (2016) showing the economic cost of prejudice could also change attitudes toward minority groups. Therefore, parasocial contact interventions aimed to enhance the knowledge of participants about the economic cost of discrimination and prejudice

on the economic growth of countries. Also, talking about the rights of LGBTI+ might have an influence on increasing knowledge of people and that might lead to improving positive attitudes toward LGBTI+. In line with this, Flores and Barclay (2016) showed that recognition of marriage equality for same-sex couples enhanced positive attitudes toward LGBTI+. Even more importantly, the current study findings demonstrated that parasocial contact interventions were associated with more positive outgroup attitudes among all three groups of intervention respondents. This study's findings demonstrate the broad applicability of parasocial contact as a way to reduce prejudice toward LGBTI+.

Empirical evidence have consistently demonstrated that indirect contact is effective in perspective taking (Barker, 2012; Cramwinckel, et al., 2018). Participants who were exposed to emotion-, economy-, and human rights-based parasocial contact interventions reported higher perspective-taking scores compared to the control group. In line with previous studies, emotionality and knowledge-based interventions enhance participants' empathy level and perspective-taking tendency toward the outgroup (Batson et al., 1997; Schemer, 2012). Similarly, Batson et al. (1997) showed that taking a stand for others, especially fostering empathy for a member of the group who is stigmatized, might positively impact the attitudes of the whole marginalized community. In this study, sharing personal experiences about a gay couple and sharing information related to LGBTI+ individuals might have improved the perspective-taking of participants who were exposed to the interventions compared to the control condition. This is in line with research that has found that indirect contact decreases prejudice via encouraging perspective-taking of sexual minorities (Broockman & Kalla 2016; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). The intervention might have increased perspective-taking allowing for an opportunity to create a social bond with the

LGBTI+ community which led to a change in stereotypical judgments and prejudice (Galinsky, 2005).

Miller et al. (2020) demonstrated that parasocial contact has an impact on viewers to improve policies about minority groups such that they highlighted parasocial contact's critical role of mass media portrayals of the sexual minority in shaping attitudes toward sexual minority rights. In line with the past research, these findings can be useful for LGBTI+s rights advocates for mainstreaming LGBTI+ rights in order to favor and to enhance LGBTI+ rights via parasocial contact.

Further, emotion-, and economy-based parasocial contact interventions were found to be effective in reducing symbolic threat perception toward LGBTI+ compared to control condition, surprisingly there was no significant effect of human rights-based parasocial contact on threat perception toward LGBTI+ compared to control condition. Participants who were exposed to the emotion-, and economy-based parasocial contact interventions reported lower symbolic threat toward LGBTI+s than the control group. This is in line with research conducted by Coninck et al. (2021) who found similar effects of watching news on symbolic threat perception but with a different outgroup-refugees. However, contrary to what we expected, the human rights-based parasocial contact did not significantly impact symbolic threat perception toward LGBTI+s. In the human rights-based conditions participants were exposed to human rights of LGBTI+ and equality issues such as those about adoption rights, marriage rights, or gender reassignment rights which intensely targets societies heteronormative expectations. One very particular belief about LGBTI+ is that this groups' values violate the family structure and society's traditions regarding binary gender roles (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005; Vescio & Biernat, 2003). Therefore, in the current study,

participants might have been more threatened by the human rights-based messages compared to the others which is why it was not effective.

Contrary to what we expected, the current study's findings revealed that the emotion-, human rights-, and economy-based parasocial contact manipulations had no effect on social distance toward LGBTI+, compared to the control condition. However, previous research demonstrated that indirect contact is effective in reducing social distance toward outgroups (Barlow et al., 2009; Ortiz & Harwood, 2007; Paolini et al., 2007; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Vezzali et al., 2018). Despite this, findings have been mixed, for instance one study including indirect contact in the form of watching films that include expert conversations outlining what intellectual disability had a small significant effect on social distance tendency of participants in different study (Walker & Scior, 2013). Given that participants in the parasocial contact interventions were solely exposed to a single message at one time and at a short length of exposure might be one explanation for these results (Gillig & Murphy, 2016; Levina et al., 2000). That might be because the intention for behavior and to take action requires more parasocial contact instead of one with a short duration and single exposure. More positive, sustained and non-superficial contact could enhance knowledge regarding minority groups that might improve and change outgroups' behavioral intentions which can be explained by dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957). Sustained and non-superficial contact are necessary to produce a dissonant situation in which previous prejudicial ideas based on old experiences meet with new positive representations of the outgroup based on positive new experiences thereby leading to intentions to engage in contact (Dovidio et al., 2017; Husnu & Crisp, 2010).

Limitations

One of the limitations for this study was that all participants were university students, specifically psychology department students which can not be generalized to the whole student population. The student sample may be more open minded compared to the general population (Henrich et al. 2010). Although the students were mainly first year students and had not yet received in-depth psychological knowledge, which might allow for some generalizability. Additionally, in this study we did not assess the pre attitudes of students, however we compared with control group. Further studies can take into consideration pre- and post-exposure to the parasocial contacts see attitude change between groups. Furthermore, most of the students got academic credits for being part of the experiment which might motivate them to take part initially but along the experiment they might not take it seriously compared to their voluntary participation. Future research should consider recruiting diverse groups of people to reach a generalizable group.

Another limitation of this study is the duration and frequency of parasocial contact interventions. There is some theoretical support for the assumption that more mediated contact should have a greater impact on prejudice toward outgroups, even if there is disagreement in the research about the ideal quantity of mediated contact required to start changes in prejudice (Schiappa et al., 2006; Bond, 2020). In this study participants were exposed once to the short videos, however, research suggested that amount of exposure to the parasocial contact should be repeated and long term to be able to decrease prejudice and intentions toward outgroups (Schiappa et al., 2006). Therefore, future research should take into consideration the duration and intensity of the exposure to the parasocial contact to be able to assess the effect of different parasocial contact effectiveness. One another limitation of this study is that sexual minorities are considered to be an homogenous group and the attitudes towards lesbians, gays or trans

individuals are not investigated separately. Previous studies have shown that attitudes towards sexual orientation and gender identity diversities might differ (Husnu, 2021; Uluboy & Husnu, 2020). For further research it is suggested that each group can be taken separately in order to see the difference and also to avoid generalisation of the LGBTI+ community.

To further understand the function of parasocial contact on prejudice in outgroup-related rights and attitudes to outgroups, more study is required. Future studies should not only examine the parasocial contact with regard to LGBTI+, but also try to determine how much parasocial contact exposure is necessary to influence people's attitudes because the effects of short-duration exposure likely limited the impact of the contact. For example, the durations and number of the videos that are presented may vary to see in which intervals people's attitudes might change.

Implications

This study's key contribution is to demonstrate how different parasocial contact interventions might improve attitudes toward outgroups. We demonstrated that exposure to the LGBTI+ related parasocial contact interventions has a positive impact on outgroup attitudes. The findings from this research have practical applications despite these drawbacks. This study provides important implications for attitude change toward LGBTI+ and to their rights especially regarding reaching out to the larger community. Even though direct contact might be effective for smaller numbers, parasocial contact can be used to influence the wider society and to change the attitudes of more people without the need of subjects also being exposed to the other group. These applications can be adopted by the authorities and in order to prevent discrimination and achieve equality. Some of the examples to these applications can

be showing these various videos in the education sector or displaying them in public TV programmes. Also, civil society organisations can use these applications to change the attitudes of the decision making bodies in order to convince them to promote inclusivity and diversity. Additionally, future research can study how such videos on LGBTI+s related content on human rights-, emotion- and economy-based can be disseminated and promoted in mass media to enhance positive attitude toward LGBTI+ in our society.

To sum up, prejudice is one of the key factors when tackling with the discrimination towards minority groups including the LGBTI+'s and especially when establishing equality reduction of prejudice plays an important role. Prejudice is also detrimental to the mental health of several minority groups including the LGBTI+s. In terms of prejudice reduction, parasocial contact intervention promises a unique opportunity to tackle prejudice especially when it comes to reaching out to the wider populations via mass media in a practical way.

REFERENCES

- Abrams, J. R., McGaughey, K. J., & Haghighat, H. (2018). Attitudes toward Muslims: A test of the parasocial contact hypothesis and contact theory. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 47(4), 276-292.
- Akbaş, G. (2010). Social identity and intergroup relations: the case of Alevis and Sunnis in Amasya, Unpublished M.A. Thesis, METU, Ankara
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley
- Allport, G. W. (1982). *The nature of prejudice (4th ed.)*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- American Psychiatric Association (1980). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (3rd ed.)*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1952). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, (1st ed)* Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association
- American Psychiatric Association. (1968). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, (2d ed.)* Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association
- American Psychological Association. (2012). Guidelines for Psychological Practice with Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Clients. *American Psychologist*, 67(1), 10–42. doi: 10.1037/a0024659

- American Psychological Association. (2015). Guidelines for psychological practice with transgender and gender nonconforming people. *American Psychologist*, 70, 832–864. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039906>
- Badgett, M. V. L., Nezhad, S., Waaldijk, K., & van der Meulen Rodgers, Y. (2014). *The relationship between LGBT inclusion and economic development: An analysis of emerging economies*. Los Angeles, CA: The Williams InstituteUSAID. Retrieve from <http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/research/international/lgbt-incl-econ-devel-nov2014>
- Bailey, J. M., Vasey, P. L., Diamond, L. M., Breedlove, S. M., Vilain, E., & Epprecht, M. (2016). Sexual orientation, controversy, and science. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 17(2), 45–101. doi:10.1177/1529100616637616
- Barker, V. (2012). A generational comparison of social networking site use: The influence of age and social identity. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 74(2), 163–187. doi:10.2190/ag.74.2.d
- Barlow, F. K., Louis, W. R., & Hewstone, M. (2009). Rejected! Cognitions of rejection and intergroup anxiety as mediators of the impact of cross-group friendships on prejudice. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 48(3), 389–405. doi:10.1348/014466608x387089

- Batejan, K. L., Jarvi, S. M., & Swenson, L. P. (2014). Sexual Orientation and Non-Suicidal Self-Injury: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Archives of Suicide Research*, 19(2), 131–150. doi:10.1080/13811118.2014.957450
- Batson, C. D., Polycarpou, M. P., Harmon-Jones, E., Imhoff, H. J., Mitchener, E. C., Bednar, L. L., Klein, T. R., & Highberger, L. (1997). Empathy and attitudes: Can feeling for a member of a stigmatized group improve feelings toward the group? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 105-118.
- Becker, A. B. (2012). What's marriage (and family) got to do with it? Support for same-sex marriage, legal unions, and gay and lesbian couples raising children. *Social Science Quarterly*, 93, 1007–1029. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2012.00844.x>.
- Bhatti, F. & Lisanier, F. (2021, July). The Access to Employment and Experiences of LGBTI+s in the Labour Market in the northern part of Cyprus. Queer Cyprus Association.
<https://www.queercyprus.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/LGBTIs-in-the-Labour-Market.pdf>
- Bogardus E. S. (1959). *Social Distance*. The Antioch Press, Yellow Springs, OH
- Bond, B. J., & Compton, B. L. (2015). Gay on-screen: The relationship between exposure to gay characters on television and heterosexual audiences' endorsement of gay equality. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 59(4), 717-732.

- Brambilla, M., & Butz, A. D., (20013). Macro-level symbolic threat increases prejudice against gay men. *Intergroup Threat and Outgroup Attitudes*, 5(44), doi:<https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000127>
- Broockman, D., & Kalla, J. (2016). Durably reducing transphobia: A field experiment on door-to-door canvassing. *Science*, 352(6282), 220–224. doi:10.1126/science.aad9713
- Calzo, J. P., & Ward, L. M. (2009). Media exposure and viewers' attitudes toward homosexuality: Evidence for mainstreaming or resonance?. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 53(2), 280-299.
- Cingöz-Ulu, B., Türkoğlu Demirel, B., and Sayılan, G. (2016) “*Kadın Şiddet Mağdurlarına Yönelik Tutumlarda Mağdurun Trans Kimliğinin Etkisi*,” pp. 94–104. <https://hdl.handle.net/11511/76888>.
- Cochran, S. D., & Mays, V. M. (2000). Relation between Psychiatric Syndromes and Behaviorally Defined Sexual Orientation in a Sample of the US Population. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 151(5), 516–523. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a010238
- Cohen, J. (2009). *Mediated relationships and media effects: Parasocial interaction and identification*. In R. L. Nabi & M. B. Oliver (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of media processes and effects* (pp. 223–236). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

- Cottrell, C. A., & Neuberg, S. L. (2005). Different Emotional Reactions to Different Groups: A Sociofunctional Threat-Based Approach to "Prejudice". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(5), 770–789. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.5.770>
- Cramwinckel, F. M., Scheepers, D. T., & van der Toorn, J. (2018). Interventions to Reduce Blatant and Subtle Sexual Orientation- and Gender Identity Prejudice (SOGIP): Current Knowledge and Future Directions. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 12(1), 183–217. doi:10.1111/sipr.12044
- Crisp, R. J., & Husnu, S. (2011). Attributional processes underlying imagined contact effects. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 14(2), 275–287. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430210390721>
- Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2009). Can imagined interactions produce positive perceptions?: Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. *American Psychologist*, 64(4), 231–240. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014718>
- Davies, K., Tropp, L. R., Aron, A., Pettigrew, T. F., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Cross-Group Friendships and Intergroup Attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 15(4), 332–351. doi:10.1177/1088868311411103
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 113–126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.44.1.113>.

- De Coninck, D., Solano, G., Joris, W., Meuleman, B., & d'Haenens, L. (2021). Integration policies and threat perceptions following the European migration crisis: New insights into the policy-threat nexus. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 62(4), 253-280.
- Dhont, K., Van Hiel, A., & Hewstone, M. (2013). Changing the ideological roots of prejudice: Longitudinal effects of ethnic intergroup contact on social dominance orientation. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 17(1), 27–44. doi:10.1177/1368430213497064
- Dovidio, J. F., Love, A., Schellhaas, F. M., & Hewstone, M. (2017). Reducing intergroup bias through intergroup contact: Twenty years of progress and future directions. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 20(5), 606-620.
- Earle, M., Hoffarth, M. R., Prusaczyk, E., MacInnis, C., & Hodson, G. (2020). A multilevel analysis of LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender) rights support across 77 countries: The role of contact and country laws. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 60(3), 851–869. doi:10.1111/bjso.12436
- Eibach, R. P., & Keegan, T. (2006). Free at last? Social dominance, loss aversion, and white and black Americans' differing assessments of racial progress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(3), 453–467. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.3.453>

- Ekehammar, B., Akrami, N., Gylje, M., & Zakrisson, I. (2004). What matters most to prejudice: Big five personality, social dominance orientation, or right-wing authoritarianism?. *European journal of personality*, 18(6), 463-482.
- Ellis, S. J., Kitzinger, C., & Wilkinson, S. (2003). Attitudes Towards Lesbians and Gay Men and Support for Lesbian and Gay Human Rights Among Psychology Students. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 44(1), 121–138. doi:10.1300/j082v44n01_07
- Ergün, R., and Paşa, F. D. (2021). The right of access to the legal recognition of gender and gender compatibility within international human rights protection mechanisms.
<https://www.queercyprus.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Cinsiyetin-Hukuken-Taninmasi-Raporu.pdf>
- Essess, V. M., Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1993). *Values, stereotypes, and emotions as determinants of intergroup attitudes*. In D. M. Mackie and D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception* (pp. 137- 166). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- European Region of the International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Trans, and Intersex Association (ILGA-Europe). (2021, May). Rainbow Map 2021: Reflecting the legal and policy human rights situation of lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, and intersex (LGBTI) people in Europe. <https://www.ilga-europe.org/report/rainbow-europe-2021/>

- Fazio, R. H., Powell, M. C., & Herr, P. M. (1983). Toward a process model of the attitude–behavior relation: Accessing one's attitude upon mere observation of the attitude object. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(4), 723.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance* (Vol. 2). Stanford university press.
- Flores, A. R., & Barclay, S. (2016). Backlash, consensus, legitimacy, or polarization: The effect of same-sex marriage policy on mass attitudes. *Political Research Quarterly*, 69(1), 43–56. [https:// doi.org/10.1177/1065912915621175](https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912915621175)
- Fujioka, Y. (1999). Television portrayals and African-American stereotypes: Examination of television effects when direct contact is lacking. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 76(1), 52-75.
- Galinsky, A. D., Ku, G., & Wang, C. S. (2005). Perspective-taking and self-other overlap: Fostering social bonds and facilitating social coordination. *Group processes & intergroup relations*, 8(2), 109-124.
- Garretson, J. J. (2014). Exposure to the Lives of Lesbians and Gays and the Origin of Young People's Greater Support for Gay Rights. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 27(2), 277–288. doi:10.1093/ijpor/edu026
- Gillig, T., & Murphy, S. (2016). Fostering support for LGBTQ youth? The effects of a gay adolescent media portrayal on young viewers. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 23.

- Gilman, S. E., Cochran, S. D., Mays, V. M., Hughes M., Ostrow, D., & Kessler, R. C. (2001). Prevalences of *DSM-III-R* disorders among individuals reporting same-gender sexual partners in the National Comorbidity Survey. *American Journal of Public Health*, 91, 933–939.
- Gocmen, I. & Yilmaz, V. (2017). Exploring perceived discrimination among LGBT individuals in Turkey in education, employment, and health care: Results of an online survey. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 64(8), 1052-1068. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2016.123698>
- Górska, P., van Zomeren, M., & Bilewicz, M. (2017). Intergroup contact as the missing link between LGB rights and sexual prejudice. *Social Psychology*, 48(6), 321-334. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000313>
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(2), 366–385. doi:10.1037/a0021847
- Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., Rosenblatt, A., & et al. (1990). Evidence for terror management theory II: The effects of mortality salience on reactions to those who threaten or bolster the cultural worldview. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(2), 308–318. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.58.2.308
- Güner et al., (2011, February). Türkiye’de cinsel yönelim veya cinsiyet kimliği temelinde ayrimciliğin izlenmesi raporu. Kaos GL.

https://dspace.ceid.org.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1/1038/Cinsel_Yonelim_veya_Cinsiyet_Kimligi_Izleme_Raporu.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=yb

Hanley, J., Salamone, M., & Wright, M. (2012). Reviving the schoolmaster: Reevaluating public opinion in the wake of *Roe v. Wade*. *Political Research Quarterly*, 65, 408–421. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912911404564>

Harnish, R. J., Bridges, K. R., & Gump, J. T. (2018). Predicting economic, social, and foreign policy conservatism: The role of right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, moral foundations orientation, and religious fundamentalism. *Current Psychology: A Journal for Diverse Perspectives on Diverse Psychological Issues*, 37(3), 668–679. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-016-9552-x>

Kaos GL, (2020, May). Hate Crimes Report based on Homophobia and Transphobia (2020). <https://kaosgldernegi.org/images/library/2020nefret-suclari-raporu-2019-kucuk.pdf>

Kaos GL, (2022, June). Government waged war against LGBTI+s: 10 bans and at least 530 detainees in 37 days. *Turkey*. <https://kaosgl.org/en/single-news/government-waged-war-against-lgbti-s-10-bans-and-at-least-530-detainees-in-37-days>

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world?. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 33(2-3), 61-83.

- Herek, G. M. (2003). *The psychology of sexual prejudice*. In L. D. Garnets & D. C. Kimmel (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on lesbian, gay, and bisexual experiences* (pp. 157–164). Columbia University Press.
- Herek, G. M. (2004). Beyond “homophobia”: Thinking about sexual prejudice and stigma in the twenty-first century. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy: Journal of NSRC*, 1(2), 6-24.
- Herek, G. M. (2009). *Sexual stigma and sexual prejudice in the United States: A conceptual framework*. In D. A. Hope (Ed.), *Contemporary perspectives on lesbian, gay, and bisexual identities: The 54th Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (pp. 65–111). New York, NY: Springer.
- Herek, G. M., & Capitanio, J. P. (1996). “Some of my best friends”: Intergroup contact, concealable stigma, and heterosexuals’ attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 412-424.
- Herek, G. M., & Capitanio, J. P. (1996). “Some of My Best Friends” Intergroup Contact, Concealable Stigma, and Heterosexuals’ Attitudes Toward Gay Men and Lesbians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(4), 412–424. doi:10.1177/0146167296224007
- Hill, D. B. (2002). *Genderism, transphobia, and gender bashing: A framework for interpreting anti-transgender violence*. In B. Wallace, & R. Carter (Eds.), *Understanding and dealing with violence: A multicultural approach* (pp. 113–136). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Hoffner, C. (1996). Children's wishful identification and parasocial interaction with favorite television characters. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 40(3), 389-402.
- Horton, D., & Richard Wohl, R. (1956). Mass communication and para-social interaction: Observations on intimacy at a distance. *Psychiatry*, 19(3), 215-229.
- Houlberg, R. (1984). Local television news audience and the para-social interaction. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 28(4), 423-429.
- Human Dignity Trust, (2014, September). Reform of discriminatory sexual offences laws in the commonwealth and other jurisdictions case study of Northern Cyprus.
https://www.humandignitytrust.org/wp-content/uploads/resources/HDT-TRNC-Report_web.pdf
- Husnu, S. R. (2021, December). Attitudes toward sexual orientation and gender diversity in a locally representative sample in the northern part of Cyprus. Queer Cyprus Association. <https://www.queercyprus.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Attitude-Survey-2021.pdf>
- Husnu, S., & Crisp, R. J. (2010). Imagined intergroup contact: A new technique for encouraging greater inter-ethnic contact in Cyprus. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 16(1), 97–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10781910903484776>

- Husnu, S., & Paolini, S. (2018). Positive imagined contact is actively chosen: Exploring determinants and consequences of volitional intergroup imagery in a conflict-ridden setting. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. doi:10.1177/1368430217747405
- Husnu, S., Mertan, B., & Cicek, O. (2018). Reducing Turkish Cypriot children's prejudice toward Greek Cypriots: Vicarious and extended intergroup contact through storytelling. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 121, 178–192. doi:10.1177/ 1368430216656469
- International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association: Carroll, A., State Sponsored Homophobia 2016. (May, 2016). A world survey of sexual orientation laws: criminalisation, protection and recognition.
- Itaborahy LP, & Zhu J. (2013). A world survey of laws: criminalisation, protection and recognition of same-sex love. London: International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association.
- Johnson, D.W. & Johnson, R.T. (1975). Learning together and alone: cooperation, competition and individualization. Engle-wood Cliffs. NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Jorm, A. F., Korten, A. E., Rodgers, B., Jacomb, P. A., & Christensen, H. (2002). Sexual orientation and mental health: results from a community survey of young and middle – aged adults. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 180(05), 423–427. doi:10.1192/bjp.180.5.423

- Kenny, C., & Patel, D. (2017). "Norms and Reform: Legalizing Homosexuality Improves Attitudes." CGD Working Paper 465. Washington, DC: Center for Global Development. <https://www.cgdev.org/publication/norms-and-reform-legalizinghomosexuality-improves-attitudes>
- Kosakowska-Berezecka, N., Besta, T., Adamska, K., Jaśkiewicz, M., Jurek, P., & Vandello, J. A. (2016). If my masculinity is threatened I won't support gender equality? The role of agentic self-stereotyping in restoration of manhood and perception of gender relations. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 17(3), 274–284. doi:10.1037/men0000016
- Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, e. A., Bartkiewicz, M. J., Boesen, M. J., & Palmer, N. A. (2012). The 2011 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools. New York, NY: GLSEN.
- Kosciw, J., Greytalk, E., Giga, N., Villenas, C., & Danischewski, D. (2016). National School Climate Survey 2015: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer youth in our nation's schools.
- Kreitzer, R. J., Hamilton, A. J., & Tolbert, C. J. (2014). Does policy adoption change opinions on minority rights? The effects of legalizing same-sex marriage. *Political Research Quarterly*, 67, 795–808. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912914540483>

- LaCour, M. J., & Green, D. P. (2014). When contact changes minds: An experiment on transmission of support for gay equality. *Science*, 346(6215), 1366–1369. doi:10.1126/science.1256151
- Lee, T.-T., & Hicks, G. (2013). An analysis of factors affecting attitudes toward same-sex marriage: Do the media matter? *Journal of Homosexuality*, 58(10), 1391–1408. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2011.614906>.
- Levina, M., Waldo, C. R., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2000). We're Here, We're Queer, We're on TV: The Effects of Visual Media on Heterosexuals' Attitudes Toward Gay Men and Lesbians 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30(4), 738-758.
- Levy, M. R. (1979). Watching TV news as para-social interaction. *Journal of Broadcasting*, 23, 69-80.
- Lytle, A., Dyar, C., Levy, S. R., & London, B. (2016). Essentialist beliefs: Understanding contact with and attitudes towards lesbian and gay individuals. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 56(1), 64–88. doi:10.1111/bjso.12154
- Masci, David, Sciupac, E., & Lipka, M. (2013). Gay Marriage around the World. Washington, DC: Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life.
- Mayock, P., Bryan, A., Carr, N. & Kitching, K. (2009). Supporting LGBT lives: A study of the mental health and well-being of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender People. Dublin: Gay and Lesbian Equality Network (GLEN) and BeLonG To Youth Service

- Mazziotta, A., Mummendey, A., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Vicarious intergroup contact effects. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 14(2), 255–274. doi:10.1177/1368430210390533
- McLaughlin, B., & Rodriguez, N. S. (2017). Identifying with a stereotype: The divergent effects of exposure to homosexual television characters. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 64(9), 1196-1213.
- Merino, S. M. (2013). Contact with gays and lesbians and same-sex marriage support: The moderating role of social context. *Social Science Research*, 42(4), 1156–1166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2013.02.004>.
- Meyer, I. H. (1995). Minority Stress and Mental Health in Gay Men. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 36(1), 38. doi:10.2307/2137286
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.674>
- Meyer, I. H., Schwartz, S., & Frost, D. M. (2008). Social patterning of stress and coping: Does disadvantaged social statuses confer more stress and fewer coping resources? *Social Science and Medicine*, 67(3), 368–379.
- Miller, P. R., Flores, A. R., Haider-Markel, D. P., Lewis, D. C., Tadlock, B., & Taylor, J. K. (2020). The politics of being “Cait”: Caitlyn Jenner, transphobia, and

parasocial contact effects on transgender-related political attitudes. *American politics research*, 48(5), 622-634.

Morsink, J. (2010). The universal declaration of human rights. In *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. university of Pennsylvania Press.

Moyer-Gusé, E., Dale, K. R., & Ortiz, M. (2019). Reducing prejudice through narratives: An examination of the mechanisms of vicarious intergroup contact. *Journal of media psychology: Theories, methods, and applications*, 31(4), 185.

Muraco, A. (2005). Heterosexual evaluations of hypothetical friendship behavior based on sex and sexual orientation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 22(5), 587–605. doi:10.1177/0265407505054525

Nierman, A. J. (2007). What happens when low status groups start moving up? Prejudice and threat to group position (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas).

Oberth, G., and L. Mondry, (2014). Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex Human Rights in Southern Africa. Auckland Park Johannesburg: Hivos Local Office in South Africa.

Oldemeier, K., & Krell, C. (2016). „Coming-out – und dann ...?!“. *Handbuch Kindheits-Und Jugendsoziologie*, 1–19. doi:10.1007/978-3-658-05676-6_30-1

- Ortiz, M., & Harwood, J. (2007). A social cognitive theory approach to the effects of mediated intergroup contact on intergroup attitudes. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 51(4), 615-631.
- Öz, Y. (2020, May). Human rights of LGBTI+ people in Turkey: 2019 report. Kaos Gay and Lesbian Cultural Research and Solidarity Association. <https://kaosgldernegi.org/images/library/2020human-rights-of-lgbti-people-2019-report-1.pdf>
- Pagotto, L., & Voci, A. (2013). Direct and mass-mediated contact: The role of different intergroup emotions. *TPM: Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 20, 365–381. <https://doi.org/10.4473/TPM20.4.5>
- Paolini, S., Hewstone, M., & Cairns, E. (2007). Direct and indirect intergroup friendship effects: Testing the moderating role of the affective-cognitive bases of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(10), 1406–1420. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207304788>
- Perry, R., & Sibley, C. G. (2011). Social dominance orientation: Mapping a baseline individual difference component across self-categorizations. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 32(2), 110.
- Perse, E. M., & Rubin, A. M. (1990). Chronic loneliness and television use. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 34(1), 37–53. doi:10.1080/08838159009386724

- Perse, E. M., & Rubin, R. B. (1989). Attribution in social and parasocial relationships. *Communication Research*, 16(1), 59-77.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual review of psychology*, 49(1), 65-85.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751>
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38(6), 922–934. doi:10.1002/ejsp.504
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., & Levin, S. (2006). Social dominance theory and the dynamics of intergroup relations: Taking stock and looking forward. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 17(1), 271–320. doi:10.1080/10463280601055772
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(4), 741–763. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741>
- Rios, K. (2013). Right-wing authoritarianism predicts prejudice against “homosexuals” but not “gay men and lesbians”. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49(6), 1177-1183.

- Rivera, L. M., & Dasgupta, N. (2018). The detrimental effect of affirming masculinity on judgments of gay men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 19(1), 102–116. doi:10.1037/ men0000074
- Rubin, A. M., & Step, M. M. (2000). Impact of motivation, attraction, and parasocial interaction on talk radio listening. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 44(4), 635-654.
- Rubin, A. M., Perse, E. M., & Powell, R. A. (1985). Loneliness, parasocial interaction, and local television news viewing. *Human Communication Research*, 12, 155-180.
- Sandfort, T. G. M., de Graaf, R., Bijl, R. V., & Schnabel, P. (2001). Same-Sex Sexual Behavior and Psychiatric Disorders. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 58(1), 85. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.58.1.85
- Schemer, C. (2012). The Influence of News Media on Stereotypic Attitudes Toward Immigrants in a Political Campaign. *Journal of Communication*, 62(5), 739–757. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01672.x
- Schiappa, E., Gregg, P. B., & Hewes, D. E. (2006). Can one TV show make a difference? Will & Grace and the parasocial contact hypothesis. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 51, 15–37. doi:10.1300/J082v51n04_02
- Şemi, B.E., Uluçaylı, S., and Yılmaz, O. (2021). Mapping study on the access of lgbti+s' to existing social services in the northern part of Cyprus. *Queer Cyprus*

Association. <https://www.queercyprus.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Mapping-Study-On-ACCESS-OF-LGBTIs-TO-EXISTING-SOCIAL-SERVICES-IN-THE-NORTHERN-PART-OF-CYPRUS.pdf>

Shook, N. J., Hopkins, P. D., & Koech, J. M. (2015). The effect of intergroup contact on secondary group attitudes and social dominance orientation. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 19(3), 328–342. doi:10.1177/1368430215572266

Shoshilou, P. A., & Vasiliou, E. (2016). Teachers reflect on homophobia in the Cypriot education system: A qualitative study. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 13(1-2), 89-111. doi:10.1080/19361653.2015.1087928

Sink, A., & Mastro, D. (2018). Mediated contact with gay men as a predictor of modern homonegativity: An analysis of exposure to characters appearing on television between 2000 and 2015. *Communication Reports*, 31(2), 78-90.

Stathi, S., Husnu, S., & Pendleton, S. (2017). Intergroup contact and contact norms as predictors of postconflict forgiveness. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 21(1), 20–39. <https://doi.org/10.1037/gdn0000060>

Stephan, C. W., & Stephan, W. G. (2000). The measurement of racial and ethnic identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24(5), 541–552. doi:10.1016/s0147-1767(00)00016-x

- Stephan, C. W., Stephan, W. G., Demitrakis, K. M., Yamada, A. M., & Clason, D. L. (2000). Women's Attitudes Toward Men: an Integrated Threat Theory Approach. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24(1), 63–73. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2000.tb01022.x
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1984). The role of ignorance in intergroup relations. *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation*, 229-255.
- Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., & Bachman, G. (1999). Prejudice toward immigrants. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29(11), 2221–2237. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1999.tb00107.x>
- Sullivan, M. K. (2003). Homophobia, history, and homosexuality: Trends for sexual minorities. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 8(2), 1-13. doi:10.1300/J137v8n02_01
- Talley, A. E., & Bettencourt, B. A. (2008). Evaluations and aggression directed at a gay male target: The role of threat and antigay prejudice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38(3), 647–683. doi:10.1111/jasp.2008.38.issue-3
- Tausch, N., Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J., & Cairns, E. (2007). Individual-level and group-level mediators of contact effects in Northern Ireland: The moderating role of social identification. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 46(3), 541–556. doi:10.1348/014466606x155150

- Todd, N. R., & Ong, K. S. (2012). Political and theological orientation as moderators for the association between religious attendance and attitudes toward gay marriage for white Christians. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 4(1), 56–70. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025142>.
- Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2004). *Intergroup Contact and the Central Role of Affect in Intergroup Prejudice*. In L. Z. Tiedens & C. W. Leach (Eds.), *The social life of emotions* (pp. 246–269). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511819568.014>
- Turner, R. N., Hewstone, M., Voci, A., & Vonofakou, C. (2008). A test of the extended intergroup contact hypothesis: The mediating role of intergroup anxiety, perceived ingroup and outgroup norms, and inclusion of the outgroup in the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(4), 843–860. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0011434>
- Uluboy, Z. (2017). Study On Homophobia and Transphobia In The Northern Part Of Cyprus Population Study, Queer Cyprus Association. 1-55. http://www.queercyprus.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/survey_stage-1.pdf
- Uluboy, Z., & Husnu, S. (2020). Turkish Speaking Young Adults Attitudes toward Transgender Individuals: Transphobia, Homophobia and Gender Ideology. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 1–19. doi:10.1080/00918369.2020.1813510

- Vescio, T. K., & Biernat, M. (2003). Family Values and Antipathy Toward Gay Men. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33(4), 833–847. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb01927.x
- Vezzali, L., Di Bernardo, G. A., Stathi, S., Visintin, E. P., & Hewstone, M. (2018). Using intercultural videos of direct contact to implement vicarious contact: A school-based intervention that improves intergroup attitudes. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. doi:10.1177/1368430218809885
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2014.982948>
- Visintin, E. P., Voci, A., Pagotto, L., & Hewstone, M. (2017). Direct, extended, and mass-mediated contact with immigrants in Italy: Their associations with emotions, prejudice, and humanity perceptions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 47(4), 175-194.
- Voci, A., & Pagotto, L. (2010). Mediated moderation in the relation between contact and prejudice reduction: The role of intergroup anxiety and prototypicality. *Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 17, 37–49.
- Walker, J., & Scior, K. (2013). Tackling stigma associated with intellectual disability among the general public: A study of two indirect contact interventions.

Research in Developmental Disabilities, 34(7), 2200–2210. doi:10.1016/j.ridd.2013.03.024

Webb, S. N., Chonody, J. M., & Kavanagh, P. S. (2017). Attitudes toward same-sex parenting: An effect of gender. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 64(11), 1583–1595. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2016.1247540>.

West, K., Husnu, S., & Lipps, G. (2015). Imagined contact works in high-prejudice contexts: Investigating imagined contact's effects on anti-gay prejudice in Cyprus and Jamaica. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy: A Journal of the NSRC*, 12(1), 60–69. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-014-0172-7>

Willer, R., Rogalin, C. L., Conlon, B., & Wojnowicz, M. T. (2013). Overdoing gender: A test of the masculine overcompensation thesis. *American Journal of Sociology*, 118(4), 980–1022. doi:10.1086/668417

Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(1), 73–90. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.73>

Zhang, Q.F. (2014). Transgender Representation by the People's Daily Since. *Sexuality & Culture* 18, 180–195. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-013-9184-3>

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Consent Form

“Sosyal Tutum Araştırması”

Değerli katılımcı, Araştırmaya katılmayı kabul etmeden önce, lütfen araştırma ile ilgili aşağıda bulunan bilgileri dikkatlice okumak için birkaç dakikanızı ayırınız. Araştırma ile ilgili herhangi bir sorunuz varsa, aşağıda iletişim bilgileri olan araştırmacıyla iletişim kurabilirsiniz. Bu araştırma Genel Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi İbrahim Ray (19500581@emu.edu.tr) tarafından, Prof. Dr. Shenel Hüsnü Raman denetimi altında yürütülmektedir. Araştırmanın amacı LGBTİ+ olmayan kendini heteroseksüel olarak tanımlayan kişilerin LGBTİ+’lara karşı önyargı ile ilişkili bazı faktörlerini ortaya koymak. Çalışma en fazla 20-25 dakikanızı alacaktır. Çalışmaya katılımınız zorunlu değildir ve katılmayı reddetme hakkına sahipsiniz. Çalışmadan, istediğiniz bir anda, açıklama yapmaksızın çekilme hakkına sahipsiniz. Araştırmadan çekilmeniz durumunda, yanıtlarınız kaydedilmeyecektir ve araştırmada kullanılmayacaktır. Eğer araştırmaya katılmayı ve tamamlamayı kabul ederseniz, cevaplar ve anketler gizlilikle korunacaktır. Veriler, araştırma tamamlandıktan sonra en çok altı yıl boyunca muhafaza edilecektir. Verilerin analizinden sonra, araştırma ile ilgili bir rapor yayınlanabilir. Gönüllü katılımınızı belirtmek için, lütfen aşağıda bulunan bilgilendirilmiş onam formunu imzalayınız.

BİLGİLENDİRİLMİŞ ONAY FORMU

Araştırmanın Başlığı: Sosyal Tutum Araştırması

Araştırmacıların Adları: İbrahim Ray, Prof. Dr. Şenel Raman

Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi, GaziMağusa, Kuzey Kıbrıs

Her ifadeye katıldığınızı belirtmek için lütfen yanda bulunan kutuları işaretleriniz.

1. Bilgileri okuyup anladığımı ve soru sorma fırsatımın olduğunu onaylıyorum. ☐
2. Katılımımın gönüllü olduğunu ve açıklama yapmaksızın, istediğim bir anda araştırmadan çekilebileceğimi anlıyorum. ☐
3. Bu araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorum. ☐

Tarih

İmza

Araştırmanın etiği ile ilgili bir endişeniz var ise, endişenizi detaylı bir şekilde açıklayan yazılı bir metin ile Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Araştırma ve Etik Komitesi Başkanı, Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman ile iletişime geçebilirsiniz (shenelhusnu.raman@emu.edu.tr).

Appendix B: Sosyal Baskınlık Yönelimi Ölçeği

Lütfen aşağıdaki maddeleri okuyunuz. Ne derecede katıldığınızı veya katılmadığınızı belirtiniz.

1-Hiç katılmıyorum

5-Tamamen katılıyorum.

1. Gelirleri olabildiğince eşit hale getirmek için çabalamalıyız.
2. İstedığımızı elde etmek için bazen diğer gruplara karşı güç kullanmak gerekir
3. Bazı grupların hayatta diğerlerinden daha fazla şansa sahip olması kabul edilebilir bir şeydir.
4. Toplumda hiçbir grup baskın olmamalıdır.
5. Eğer belirli gruplar yerlerini bilselerdi, daha az sorunumuz olurdu.
6. Belirli grupların üstte, diğer grupların ise altta olması iyi bir şeydir.
7. Daha alttaki gruplar yerlerini bilmelidir.
8. Farklı grupların koşullarını eşitlemek için elimizden geleni yapmalıyız.
9. Tüm gruplar eşit olabilseydi iyi olurdu.
10. Bazen diğer gruplara hadleri bildirilmelidir.
11. Toplumda gruplar arası eşitliği arttırmalıyız.
12. Eğer farklı gruplara daha eşit davransaydık daha az sorunumuz olurdu.
13. Bazı gruplar diğerlerinden daha üstündür.
14. Grupların eşitliği idealimiz olmalıdır.
15. Hayatta öne geçmek için bazen diğer grupların üstüne basmak gereklidir.
16. Tüm gruplara hayatta eşit şans verilmelidir.

Appendix C: Perspective Taking

Lütfen aşağıdaki her bir cümle için size ne kadar iyi tanımlayıp tanımlamadığını işaretleyiniz.

1-beni hiç tanımlamıyor

5-beni çok iyi tanımlıyor.

1. Olaylara LGBTİ+'ların bakış açısından bakabilme...
2. Kendini LGBTİ+'ların yerine koyabilme...
3. LGBTİ+ birinin özelini paylaşması durumunda onunla bağ kurabilme...

Appendix D: Symbolic Threat Perception

Aşağıdaki cümlelere ne derecede katıldığınızı veya katılmadığınızı belirtiniz.

1. Çok fazla LGBTİ+ olduğu için heteroseksüeller tehdit altındadır.

Hiç Katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Çok Katılıyorum

2. LGBTİ+'lardan dolayı Kıbrıs Türk ve Türk örf, adet ve değerler tehdit altındadır.

Hiç Katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Çok Katılıyorum

3. LGBTİ+'lar Kıbrıs Türk ve Türk kültürüne bir tehdittir.

Hiç Katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Çok Katılıyorum

4. LGBTİ+'ların ve Heteroseksüellerin değerleri birbirinden farklıdır.

Hiç Katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Çok Katılıyorum

5. LGBTİ+'ların yaşam tarzları Kıbrıslı Türk ve Türk aile geleneklerinden farklıdır.

Hiç Katılmıyorum 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Çok Katılıyorum

Appendix E: Support for LGBTI+ Rights Scale

1. LGBTİ+'lar nefret suçu yasaı ile korunmalıdır.
2. Eşcinsellerin evlat edinmelerine izin verilmelidir.
3. Eşcinsellerin evlenmelerine izin verilmelidir.
4. Eşcinsellik bu ÷lkede yasa dııı olmalıdır.
5. LGBTİ+'lar kamusal alanlarda partnerlerine karşı duygularını ifade edebilmelidirler.
6. LGBTİ+'lar yürüyüş yaparak veya törenler düzenleyerek eşcinselliklerini kamusal alanda sergilemelerine izin verilmelidir.
7. Hükümetin eşcinsellikle ilgili dergileri, gazeteleri veya diğler basılı materyalleri sansür etmesine izin verilmelidir.
8. LGBTİ+ öğretmenlerin okul çağındaki çocuklara öğretmenlik yapmasına izin verilmelidir. (R)
9. Halk kütüphanelerinde eşcinsellik ile ilgili kitapların bulundurulmasına izin verilmemelidir. (R).
10. Sosyal medyada LGBTİ+'larla ilgili paylaşımlar bulunmalıdır.
11. Bir ev sahibinin LGBTİ+ birine ev kiralamasını reddetmesine izin verilmemelidir.
12. Bir askerin gay olduğı anlaşılırsa o kişinin askerlik görevine son verilmelidir.
13. İş arayan birinin işe alınması kararında kişinin eşcinselliğı sorun olmalıdır.
14. "Eşcinsel hakları hareketi" bu ÷lkede ahlakta bir düşüşe işaret ediyor.
15. Hükümetin gey ve lezbiyenlerin özel rızaya dayalı cinsel yaşamlarına müdahale etme hakkı yoktur.
16. Eşcinsel seks için rıza yaşı, heteroseksüel seks için rıza yaşından büyük olmalıdır.
17. Gey ve lezbiyenlerin insan haklarını savunmak, diğler herkesin insan haklarını savunmaya da yardımcı olur.

Appendix F: Social Distance Scale

Aşağıdaki ifadeleri dikkatlice okuyunuz.

1 Hiç Rahat Hissetmezdim

7 Çok Rahat Hissederdim

Aşağıda LGBTİ+'lar ile girebileceğiniz çeşitli durumlarda kendinizi ne ölçüde rahat veya rahatsız hissedeceğinizi belirtmenizi istiyoruz:

1. Eğer LGBTİ+ biri sizin bir akrabanız olsaydı, onunla görüşmek konusunda kendinizi ne ölçüde Rahat hissederdiniz?
2. Eğer LGBTİ+ biri sizinle arkadaş olmak isteseydi, kendinizi ne ölçüde rahat hissederdiniz?
3. Eğer LGBTİ+ biri sizinle aynı iş yerinde olsaydı, onunla iş ortamında görüşmek konusunda kendinizi ne ölçüde rahat hissederdiniz?
4. Eğer LGBTİ+ biri sizin komşunuz olsaydı, onlarla komşuculuk yapma konusunda kendinizi ne ölçüde rahat hissederdiniz?
5. Eğer LGBTİ+'lar sizinle aynı ülkenin vatandaşı olsaydı, onlarla iletişime girmek konusunda kendinizi ne ölçüde rahat hissederdiniz?
6. Eğer LGBTİ+'lar ülkenize turist olarak ziyaret etse, onlarla iletişime girmek konusunda kendinizi ne ölçüde Rahat hissederdiniz?

Appendix G: General Outgroup Evaluation Scale

Aşağıdaki ölçeği kullanarak lütfen LGBTİ+'lar hakkındaki genel duygularınızı belirtiniz.

<i>Soğuk</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>Sıcak</i>
<i>Olumlu</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>Olumsuz</i>
<i>Arkadaşça</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>Düşmanca</i>
<i>Kuşkucu</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>Güven dolu</i>
<i>Saygılı</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>Saygısız</i>
<i>Takdire değer</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>İğrenme</i>

Appendix H: Demographic Questionnaire

1. Yaşınız:

2. Cinsiyet: Kadın, Erkek, İntersex, Transkadın veya transerkek.

3. Cinsel yönelim: Heterseksüel, Lezbiyen, Gey, Biseksüel, diğer.

4. Devam ettiğiniz sınıf: 1. sınıf, 2. Sınıf, 3. Sınıf, 4. Sınıf, Diğer (....)

5. Eğitim görmekte olduğunuz bölümünüz:

6. Uyuşunuz: TC, KKTC, diğer (...)

7. Çevrenizde tanıdığınız LGBTİ+ kimse var mı: Evet, Hayır

8. Bu kişi/kişilere ne derece yakınsınız?

Hiç yakın değilim-1

Çok yakınım-5

Appendix I: Scripts

A-Human right-based script:

İnsan Hakları Evrensel Beyannamesi'nin 2. Maddesinde "Herkes, hiçbir ayırım (dil, din, cinsiyet, cinsel yönelim, cinsiyet kimliği) gözetilmeksizin bu Bildirge'de ilan edilen bütün hak ve özgürlüklere sahiptir." denilmektedir. Benzer şekilde, Birleşmiş Milletler Şartı 1 Bölüm I, Madde 1'de "herkes için ayırım gözetmeksizin insan haklarına ve temel özgürlüklere saygı gösterilmesini" teşvik eder. Tüm insan hakları evrenseldir, bölünmezdir, birbirine bağlıdır ve birbiriyle ilişkilidir. Uluslararası toplum, insan haklarına küresel olarak adil ve eşit bir şekilde, aynı temelde muamele etmelidir. Bütün insanlar hür, haysiyet ve haklar bakımından eşit doğarlar ve herkes, Evrensel Beyannamesi'nde belirtilen tüm hak ve özgürlüklere sahiptir. İnsan Hakları, ırk, renk, cinsiyet, cinsel yönelim, cinsiyet kimliği, dil, din, siyasi veya başka bir görüş, ulusal veya sosyal köken, mülkiyet, doğuş veya başka bir durum gibi herhangi bir ayırım gözetmeksizin eşit haklara sahiptir (Morsink, 2010). LGBT kişileri şiddet ve ayrımcılığa karşı korumak, yeni bir takım LGBTI+’lara özgü hakların oluşturulmasını veya yeni uluslararası insan hakları standartlarının oluşturulmasını gerektirmez. Devletlerin LGBTI+ bireylerin insan haklarını korumaya yönelik yasal yükümlülükleri, İnsan Hakları Evrensel Beyannamesi ve ardından üzerinde anlaşmaya varılan Uluslararası İnsan Hakları anlaşmaları temelinde uluslararası insan hakları hukukunda iyi bir şekilde oluşturulmuştur. Cinsiyet, cinsel yönelim veya cinsiyet kimliğine bakılmaksızın tüm insanlar, yaşam hakkı, kişi güvenliği ve özel hayatın gizliliği dahil olmak üzere uluslararası insan hakları hukukunun sağladığı korumalardan yararlanma hakkına sahiptir. Keyfi tutuklama ve gözaltı, ayrımcılığa uğramama hakkı ve ifade özgürlüğü, örgütlenme ve barışçıl toplanma özgürlüğü gibi

haklara her insan eşit düzeyde sahiptir. Geçmişteki yasaların aksine eşcinsel birliktelikler suç veya doğaya aykırı olarak görülmemekte, bugün birçok ülke LGBTİ+'lara evlenme hakkı, evlat edinme hakkı, kimlikteki cinsiyeti yeniden belirleme (öz-belirlenim hakkı) tanımaktadır (ILGA EU, 2021). Örneğin; Türkiyede eşcinsellik hiçbir zaman hukuken yasaklanmamıştır. Kıbrıs'ın kuzeyinde 2014 yılında ceza yasasında yapılan değişiklikle eşcinsellik yasak olmaktan çıkarıldı yerine eşcinselleri koruyucu yasalar eklendi. Ayrıca birçok ülkede transların en temel hakkı olan cinsiyet değişim ameliyatları desteklenmekte ve daha erişilebilir kılınmak için çalışmalar yürütülmektedir (Egün & Paşa, 2021).

B-Emotion-based script:

Daha önce onu sosyal medyada görmüştüm fakat bu hislere imkan veremediğim zamanlardı, oyuzden hiç yazmayı bile düşünmedim. Neden mi? Çünkü iki erkeğin birbirinden hoşlanması, birbirini sevebilmesi pek de hoşnut olunan bir durum değildi. Toplumda sürekli utandırılan, ayıplanan, hor görülen bir gruptu geyler, lezbiyenler, biseksüel ve translar. Bu sebeple o zamanlar LGBTİ+'larla anılmak istemezdim bunu gözler önüne seremezdim. Kendime de! O gün tüm cesaretimi toplayıp onu sosyal medyadan ekledim. Sonrasında ilk adımı ondan bekledim sonuçta o korkmuyor kendini gizlemek zorunda kalmıyordu. Oysa ben yıllarca kendimi olmadığım biri gibi göstermeye çalıştım, ergenlik yıllarım bir kız arkadaşım olsun diye uğradığım zorbalıklarla geçti ailem, yakın arkadaşlarım, öğretmenlerimden bile. Sürekli kendimi bastırmak veya kontrol altında tutmak zorundaydım. Bir Akşam Üstüydü İlk mesajı o yazdı 'Merhaba tanışıyor muyuz?' yüreğim ağzımda ne yazacağımı bilememenin heyecanıla mesajı defalarca okudum, sonrasında ona yazdım. Sohbet etmeye başladık, henüz beni görmemişti (profil fotoğrafım yoktu) kendimi gösteremezdim neden mi? Çünkü korkuyordum sokakta her gün şiddete uğrayan, televizyon ve gazete

sayfalarında, sosyal medya platformlarında aşağılanan yüzlerce lezbiyen, gey, biseksüel, trans oluyordu. Yüzümü gördükten sonra beni arkadaşlarıma ifşa eder mi, bana zarar verir mi, beni tehdit eder mi, aileme LGBTİ+ kimliğimi söyler mi, bütün bunları düşünürken diğer yandan her LGBTİ+ diye internette aradığımda önüme düşen sayfalar şiddete uğrayan, sokakta öldürülen ve hesabı dahi sorulamayan, ifşa edilen, işinden kovulan, evinde ailesi tarafından rencide edilen insanların hayatlarıydı aklıma gelen. Bu kez her şeyin farklı olacağına inanıyordum. Hislerimin peşinden gidiyordum uzun sohbetler ediyorduk beni yakından tanımak benimle görüşmek istiyordu. Hayatımda ilk defa açıkça duygularımı ifade edebildiğim biriyle görüşecektim, kararlıyım. Görüşmelerimiz sıklaşıyordu, her seferinde derin konulara giriyor uzun uzun sohbetlerimiz oluyordu. Birlikte sevdiğimiz aktiviteleri yapıyorduk; doğa gezmeleri, konserler, kamp maceralarımız, uzun yollara çıkışlarımız. Bütün bunlar yaşanırken aramızdaki bağ gün geçtikçe daha da güçleniyordu. Hayatımda hiç olmadığım kadar emindim kendimden sevgimden, hislerimden... İki insanın birbirini sevmesi kadar güzel bir şey olabilir mi, ne kötülük gelebilir ki iki insanın birbirini sevmesinden? Neden ölümle sonuçlansın, cezalandırılsın, hor görülsün veyahut yasaklansın? Sevmenin karşısında neden nefret dursun? Hiç hayal etmezdim bugün onunla 6. yılımızı kutlayacağımızı.

C-Economy-based script:

Lezbiyen, gey, biseksüel, trans ve interseksler toplumda olumsuz şekilde damgalanmış gruplardır. Damgalanmış grupların üyeleri genellikle yeteneklerini ve niteliklerini en iyi yansıtabilecekleri pozisyonlarda işe alınmamaktadırlar. Bu durum LGBTİ+'ların niteliklerinin birçok şirket ve işveren tarafından cezbedici bulunmamasından ve nitelikli LGBTİ+'ların elde tutulmamasından kaynaklanmaktadır. Bunun sonucu üretimde düşüşe sebep olabilmektedir.

Üretkenlikteki düşüşe ve verimliliğin azalmasına sebep olan bu durum aynı zamanda birçok şirketin ücret kaybı yaşamasına neden olmaktadır (Bailey, 2019). Ayrıca verimlilikteki kayıplar, çalışma saati başına daha düşük ürün veya hizmet dolaylı olarak daha düşük toplam üretime neden olacaktır. Yani damgalanmış gruplar/LGBTİ+'lar istihdam döngüsünde daha az tercih edilmelerinin sonucunda daha az çalıştıkları için üretimde aynı oranda azalacaktır. Aynı zamanda ülkelerin işsiz genç insan oranı artacak ve gelişmekte olan ülkelerin ekonomilerine olumsuz şekilde yansımaya sebep olacaktır. Örneğin, bir Dünya Bankası araştırması, cinsel yönelim ve cinsiyet kimliği temelinde yaşanan ayrımcılığın Hindistan'a yılda 30 milyar dolar ücret kaybına sebep olduğunu ortaya koydu. Çünkü çalışan LGBTİ+'ların önyargıya dayalı daha fazla stress yaşamalarından kaynaklanan kötü sağlık koşulları düşük üretkenliğe sebep olduğu ortaya kondu. Ayrıca LGBTİ+'lara karşı önyargı ve stigma sonucu düşük turizm gelirleri nedeniyle ülkenin yılda 30 milyar dolar kayıp yaşadığı saptanmıştır (Patel, 2004). Akılda tutulmalı ki LGBTİ+'ları kapsayıcı ve hoşgörülü olan ülkeler birçok LGBTİ+ için cazibe merkezi olabilmektedir ve ülkelerin turizm alanında büyümesine önemli katkılar sağlamaktadır. Amerika Birleşik Devletleri Uluslararası Kalkınma Ajansı (USAID) için 39 ülke üzerinde yürütülen bir başka araştırma ise, eğitim ve istihdamda yaşanan ayrımcılık, polis şiddeti, ve yetersiz sağlık hizmetlerine erişim yoluyla deneyimlenen eşcinsel karşıtı önyargının ülkelere maliyetinin bir ülkenin gayri safi yurtiçi hasılasının %3'ü kadar olduğunu ileri sürmektedir. Sonuçlar LGBTİ+'ların maruz kaldığı ayrımcılığın sonucunda ülkelerin kalkınmasında olumsuz sonuçlar doğurabileceğini açıkça göstermektedir. Bu bulgulara dayanarak, eşcinsel karşıtı önyargının ekonomik maliyetlerini görebiliriz, dolayısıyla cinsel yönelim ve cinsiyet kimliklerine karşı hoşgörü ile ilişkili ekonomik faydalar ülkelerin kalkınmasında faydalar doğurabilmektedir (Badgett et. al., 2014).

Appendix J: Approval Letter from Research and Ethics Committee of Psychology Department of Eastern Mediterranean University



Reference No: ETK00-2022-0071

07.02.2022

Subject: Your application for ethical approval.

Re: İbrahim Ray & Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman

Faculty of Arts and Sciences

EMU's Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Board (BAYEK) has approved the decision of the Ethics Board of Psychology (date: 01.02.2022, issue: 22/03) granting İbrahim Ray and Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to pursue their work titled "Utilizing Indirect Contact to Reduce Prejudice Toward LGBTI+'s".

Best Regards

Prof. Dr. Yücel Vural

Chair, Board of Scientific Research and Publication Ethics - EMU

YV/ek.