



Article Info/Makale Bilgisi

✓Received/Geliş:04.11.2021 ✓Accepted/Kabul:18.04.2022

DOI:10.30794/pausbed.1019296

Research Article/Araştırma Makalesi

Karaman, N., Alagöz, R. ve Fidan, A. (2022). "Gender Roles, Religion, and Attitudes Towards Homosexuality and Premarital Sex in Turkey", *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, Sayı 52, Denizli, ss.253-268.

## GENDER ROLES, RELIGION, AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS HOMOSEXUALITY AND PREMARITAL SEX IN TURKEY

Nuray KARAMAN\*, Rezzan ALAGÖZ\*\*, Ahmet FİDAN\*\*\*

### Abstract

Previous studies, conducted in Western societies, have indicated that gender roles and religiosity have a negative influence on liberal sexual relations in Western societies. However, there is a scarcity of research in developing and Muslim countries on this issue. Therefore, by utilizing data from the 2011 World Value Survey (WVS) of Turkey (N=1,605), the main purpose of this study is to examine the effects of traditional gender beliefs and religiosity on attitudes toward homosexuality and premarital sex, which are representatives of liberal sexual attitudes. Based on previous studies that focused on traditional gender roles and religious perspectives, several hypotheses were created and tested. Results from logistic regression models reveal that even though both gender roles and religiosity are significant factors that play an important role in negative attitudes toward homosexuality and pre-marital sex in Turkey, traditional gender roles seem to be the strongest factor of conservative attitudes toward sexual relations. The theoretical implications of the current research were discussed for future studies.

**Keywords:** *Religion, Homosexuality, Premarital sex, Gender roles, Islam, Turkey.*

## TÜRKİYE'DE CİNSİYET ROLLERİ, DİN, EŞCİNSELLİK VE EVLİLİK ÖNCESİ CİNSEL İLİŞKİYE KARŞI TUTUMLAR

### Öz

Daha önce yapılmış çalışmalar, geleneksel cinsiyet inançlarının ve dindarlığın batı toplumlarında liberal cinsiyet ilişkiler üzerinde olumsuz bir etkisi olduğunu göstermiştir. Ancak bu konuda gelişmekte olan ve Müslüman ülkelerde araştırma kıtlığı bulunmaktadır. Bu nedenle, bu çalışmanın temel amacı, 2011 Dünya Değer Araştırmasından (World Value Survey) (N=1,605) elde edilen verileri kullanarak, Türkiye'de geleneksel cinsiyet inançlarının ve dini faktörlerin bireylerin eşcinselliğe ve evlilik öncesi ilişkilere yönelik tutumlar üzerindeki etkilerini incelemektir. Geleneksel cinsiyet rolleri ve dini bakış açılarına odaklanan önceki çalışmalara dayanarak çeşitli hipotezler oluşturulmuştur. Lojistik regresyon analiz modellerinden elde edilen sonuçlar hem geleneksel cinsiyet inançlarının hem de dindarlığı belirleyen faktörlerin Türkiye'de eşcinselliğe ve evlilik öncesi ilişkilere yönelik negatif tutumları arttırdığını göstermektedir. Dahası, özellikle geleneksel cinsiyet rolleri liberal cinsel ilişkilere yönelik muhafazakâr tutumların en güçlü faktörü olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır. Çalışmanın sonuçları ve teorik çıkarımları gelecekteki daha kapsamlı çalışmalar için tartışılmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *Din, Eşcinsellik, Evlilik Öncesi Cinsel İlişki, Cinsiyet Roller, İslam, Türkiye.*

\* Öğr. Gör. Dr., Uşak Üniversitesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü, UŞAK.  
e-posta: nuray.karaman@usak.edu.tr (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9517-0277>)  
\*\* Arş. Gör. Dr., Adıyaman Üniversitesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü, Adıyaman  
e-posta: rezzanalagoz@gmail.com (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7643-648X>)  
\*\*\* Arş. Gör. Dr., Adıyaman Üniversitesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü, Adıyaman  
e-posta: ahmetfidan@adiyaman.edu.tr (ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8992-6875)

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

During the past several decades a growing body of literature on attitudes toward liberal sexual relations in Western countries has been debated in many ways. Some studies showed how attitudes toward these relations have sharply divided and drastically changed (Fetner, 2016; McGee, 2016). For example, while in Western countries, people's attitudes towards homosexuality have become less hostile over the last several decades, the majority still see homosexuals as morally unacceptable, inferior, and less healthy (McGee, 2016). Many studies have shown that although sexuality is unrestrictedly experienced in many societies, heterosexual relations are defined by gender roles and religion (Laner and Laner, 1980; Jackson and Cash, 1985; McCreary, 1994; Roggemans et al., 2015) still maintains their importance. The strong concept of heterosexuality leads to the marginalization, discrimination, and even exclusion of others in many societies. Homophobic activity toward homosexuals in particularly recent years has been closely linked to the deterioration of heterosexual relations (Alden and Parker, 2005; Kite and Whitley, 1996).

In many Western countries, the rise of sexual morality has been linked to the decline of the traditional religious authority (Scott, 1998) which also decreases the effect of the traditional gender roles. Studies, however, show that religion and traditional gender roles still have an impact on attitudes towards sexuality in many countries. With the sexual revolution of recent years, the fact that sexuality is experienced at an early age and increased visibility of homosexuality (Cannon and Long, 1971; Reiss, 2001) have also made it possible to examine how individuals develop attitudes towards sexuality, premarital sex, and homosexuality and how religion (Finlay and Walther, 2003; Adamczyk and Hayes, 2012; Maher, 2013) and traditional gender roles (Harbaugh and Lindsey, 2015; Herek, 2009; Kite and Deaux, 1987; Macdonald and Games, 1974; Whitley, 2001) affect these attitudes. Some studies have shown that traditional gender roles are effective in creating negative attitudes towards homosexuality (Herek, 1986; McCreary, 1994; Whitley and Ægisdóttir, 2000; Whitley, 2001). They even mentioned a significant relationship between traditional gender roles and homophobia/hate crimes against homosexuals (Kerns and Fine, 1994). Other studies have also shown that being a believer in religion also affect the attitudes toward premarital sex and homosexuality in a negative way (Finlay and Walther, 2003; Maher, 2013; Weishut, 2000; Whitley, 2009; Roggemans et al., 2015). Studies have shown that people who adhere to Christianity, Judaism, and Islam develop more negative attitudes towards homosexuality (Roggemans et al., 2015).

Studies on attitudes toward liberal sexual morality (homosexuality and premarital sex) generally appear to be conducted in western societies. Although there has been an increased number of studies about attitudes towards liberal sexual relations in western countries, there is a research gap in Muslim countries where grapple with the issue of homosexuality and premarital relations. Sexual and gender-specific norms are still defined by religion and traditional gender roles which are also determined by men-dominated gender roles in Muslim societies. Even though Turkey is a secular country since the 1920s, the effect of Islam and gender roles is very visible in daily life. As Turkey is a traditional country and the impact of religion in society is strong, traditional gender roles and religion affect attitudes towards homosexuality and premarital sex. Therefore, the present research focuses on the impact of gender roles and religion on liberal sexual relations. To be explicit, in order to determine attitudes towards liberal sexual relations in Turkey, the study examines whether these factors shape attitudes toward homosexuality and premarital sex, representatives of liberal sexual relations. The current research varies from other studies in this regard. We contribute to a comprehensive understanding of the link between religious/traditional gender roles and negative attitudes towards homosexuals/people who have sex before marriage in this article.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1. Gender Roles and Liberal Sexual Morality**

In general, the term gender has been used in social or cultural contexts, in contrast to biological ones. (Deaux and Major, 1987; Diamond, 2002; Fiske, 2017; Lefkowitz et al., 2014; Pichardo, 2011). Gender roles arise in the socialization process and are related to social norms that define men's and women's actions. Gender socialization teaches behaviors that are appropriate to the biological sex of women and men, and the individual learns to act by gender roles to gain a place in society (Harbaugh and Lindsey, 2015; Kite and Deaux, 1987; Risman, 2018; Whitley,

**A. Fidan**

2001). The distinction between beliefs in female and male roles, as stated in studies, is a significant distinction for gender role beliefs. In the traditional construction of femininity and masculinity, all men are expected to display masculine qualities, whereas all women are expected to show feminine qualities (Hussain, Naz, Khan, Daraz, & Khan, 2015; Wong et al., 1999). In many cultures, the roles assigned to men are valued more than the roles assigned to women by the effect of traditional gender roles. In traditional gender roles, it is emphasized that men should conform to high-status job roles, and women to roles that are considered to be of lower status by society, such as domestic jobs. This also strengthens and maintains men's positions in society (Eagly and Steffen, 1984; Risman, 2018). For example, men are working outside the home, and women are engaged in household tasks, such as washing, cooking, and caring for children, which are conventional gender-based practices.

Several studies indicate that traditional gender roles continue to impact attitudes toward both premarital sexuality and homosexuality (Harbaugh and Lindsey, 2015; Herek, 2009; Hu & Li, 2019 Sakallı-Uğurlu and Glick, 2013; Whitely, 2001). Those who exhibit the behavioral characteristics of the opposite sex other than the defined characteristics of their biological sex (e.g., gay and lesbian) (Whitely, 2001) and those who exceed the characteristics attributed to each sex (e.g., those who have premarital sex, etc.) are generally perceived negatively.

The relationship between homosexuality and traditional gender roles has been revealed in many studies in the field of social sciences (Cotten – Huston and Waite, 1999; Morgan & Davis-Delano, 2016; Kite and Deaux, 1987; Macdonald and Games, 1974; Warner & Shields, 2013). Heterosexuality is important in traditional sex roles and all other sexual conduct is seen as unhealthy and immoral (Harbaugh and Lindsey, 2015; MacDonald et al., 1973; Morgan & Davis-Delano, 2016). McCreary (1994) mentioned that traditional gender beliefs are still the source of opposition to homosexuality and the perception of lesbians and gay people comes from a heterosexual view that men who have been classified as feminine are gay and women who are defined as masculine are lesbians. Some studies have shown that people want others to maintain a more traditional gender role (Kite and Whitley, 1998; Whitely, 2001). Violations of social gender roles are seen as violations of the roles defined for men and women. At this point, gayness and lesbianism are not welcomed as they violate approved gender roles. "Heterosexuality is equated ideologically with 'normal' masculinity and 'normal' femininity, whereas homosexuality is equated with violating the norms of gender" (Herek, 1992: 27). Some studies have shown that men who embrace traditional gender roles develop a negative attitude towards homosexuals (Herek, 1986; Kite and Whitley, 1998; Worthen, 2013). A number of researchers find out that persons who do not believe in the equality of women and men and who advocate different gender roles for women and men have more negative attitudes toward homosexuals (MacDonald and Games, 1974; Smith, Resick, and Kilpatric, 1980; Weinberg and Milham, 1979; Worthen, 2013). A considerable number of researchers pointed out those negative assumptions regarding women's positions still exist in the traditional gender-based system (Herek, 1988; Fiske, 2017; Kite and Whitley, 1998; Risman, 2018; Whitley, 2001). Some research on homosexuality has shown that heterosexual males, who stress their male identity, develop negative attitudes towards gay men (Davies, 2004; Harbaugh and Lindsey, 2015; Lefkowitz et al., 2014; Weishut, 2000; Whitely, 2001). In the gender belief system, people think that homosexuality violates male norms rather than female norms.

Premarital sex is an important social norm that many scholars are dealing with. Many studies on premarital sex show that attitudes towards premarital sex are different in many societies (Sprecher, Treger, and Sakaluk, 2013). Most of the studies on premarital sex are conducted mainly in Western countries. An important part of this study shows that in Western societies, premarital sexuality is more permissive (Cannon and Long, 1971; Roy, 2021; Smith, Resick, and Kilpatrick, 1980; Widmer, Treas, and Newcomb, 1998). In addition, several of these studies emphasized that younger generations are more open to premarital sex (Sprecher, Treger, and Sakaluk, 2013). Even though attitudes towards premarital sex are more permissive and the effect of traditional gender roles are decreasing mostly in Western countries, in many societies gender concept is still primarily focused on conformity or resistance to prevailing assumptions of gender roles (Jenkins, 2000). Therefore, premarital sex is also affected by the roles that define through gender roles. The traditional gender role promotes that motherhood and marriage are key roles for women (Russo, 1976, cited in MacCorquodale 1984). Women and men are expected to act in accordance with their gender roles. In particular, marriage, which can be defined as the legalization of sexuality, is more important in regulating the sexual life of women. In marriage, where the

virginity of women is an “important social norm” (Zhou, 1989), the premarital sex of women also reveals a lot of bias that can contribute to the exclusion of women. This also highlights the double standard applied to women and men in society (DeLamater, 1981; Morgan & Davis-Delano, 2016; Hussain, Naz, Khan, Daraz, & Khan, 2015; Reiss, 1964). The encouragement of men to have sexual intercourse before marriage in many cultures, but the condemnation of women in such a situation can be seen as an example in many societies. In societies where traditional gender roles are dominant, negative attitudes towards women who have sex before marriage have very important consequences (Ergun, 2007; Sakallı-Uğurlu and Glick, 2013).

Traditional gender roles in many cultures have a major effect on liberal sexual relations. However, tradition is not only the predictor of attitudes toward sexual relations; religion is also affecting the attitudes. As mentioned in several studies, in any religion, traditional gender roles are very important (Duck and Hunsberger, 1999; Roggemans, 2015) to adapt to the norms and values.

## **2.2. Religion and Liberal Sexual Morality**

Religion not only plays a significant role in determining political, economic, social institutions in society but also in influencing people’s beliefs and actions towards gender roles. Religion as a political power forms and distorted the fight for gender equality has shown how ‘private’ situations related to family, sexuality, and fertility have become a topic of public among religious people who want to control them based on their beliefs (Yuksel-Kaptanoglu and Bernhardt, 2018). Besides using religion for personal reasons, people use religion to obtain “security, comfort, status or social support” (Yuksel-Kaptanoglu and Bernhardt, 2018: 252). The main religions tend to provide moral guidelines and to layout, out the aspirations of the society, thus greatly impacting their attitudes. For instance, major religions (e.g. Christianity, Islam, and Judaism) tend to criminalize both male and female homosexuality and pre-marital sexual relations and so, sexual restriction and discourses may be seen in every religion (Petersen and Donnerwerth, 1998). Regardless of what religion they have, more conservative people hold more stringent views about gender roles, homosexual relations, and romantic relations outside marriage (Roggemans et al., 2015). Several studies have researched public opinions to see if there is a link between religiosity, anti-premarital sex sentiments, and homosexuality (Barringer, Gay, and Lynxwiler, 2013; Finlay and Walther, 2003; Maher, 2013; Whitehead, 2010). The studies showed that religious individuals’ attitudes toward pre-marital sex and homosexuality are more negative than non-religious or moderate people (Jäckle and Wenzelburger, 2015; Petersen and Donnerwerth, 1998). Religious fundamentalism has played a crucial role in holding heterosexist attitudes and society (Stefurak et al., 2010). Even though homophobia did not arise directly from heterosexism, heterosexist culture can lead to violence, discrimination, and hatred against homosexuals (Ichwan, 2014).

Religion has an important impact on the attitudes and views of believers about sexuality. Hunsberger and Jackson (2005) have established a theoretical structure to describe the relationship between religious fundamentalism and sexuality. Specifically, they proposed that people are attracted to religion because it provides them with the means to engage in and extract ideas from society (Hunsberger and Jackson, 2005). As part of this phase, believers of one religion will invariably be subjected to the heterosexism that persists in society. When heterosexism is legitimized by religious institutions, there would be a greater degree of sexual prejudice (Stefurak et al., 2010). They advocate that for a variety of causes, more religious individuals are especially likely to develop high levels of sexual prejudice (Adamczyk and Hayes, 2012; Jäckle and Wenzelburger, 2015; Maher, 2013; Roggemans et al., 2015; Whitehead, 2010).

Sexual stigma permeates social organizations of most societies, including those that affect religious attitudes and gender role expectations (Vincent, Parrott, and Peterson, 2011). Individuals who participate more regularly in religious organizations are also less likely to support views toward homosexuality (Barringer et al., 2013). However, men vary in the degree to which they attribute gender roles and theological ideologies that perpetuate heterosexism (Petersen and Donnerwerth, 1998). Excessive internalization of these prevailing ideologies in the context of rigid obedience to conventional male and female gender norms or religiosity can lead to a negative attitude towards sexual prejudice and non-marital relationships.

Some cross-national research has shown that Muslims and Hindus appear to have more traditional views toward homosexuality and premarital sex than Christians and Jews do (Adamczyk and Hayes, 2012; Jung, 2016).

Sexuality in Islam is not limited to procreation unlike in most other monotheistic religions. Islam distinguishes sexuality between 'legitimate' and 'illegitimate' sexuality dependent on marital status (Smerecnik et al., 2010). Sexuality within marriage is permitted and is accepted socially, legally, religiously by society; sexuality outside marriage is prohibited and socially unacceptable. Sexuality is thus not only subject to moral laws, but also has implications for people's social, economic, and public standing of citizens (Smerecnik et al., 2010). Intolerance of homosexuality is intimately linked to the Islamic faith (Henry, 2020; Yeck & Anderson, 2019). Muslim individuals regard homosexuality as a personal decision, and it is seen as deliberately choosing to violate Allah's will. Therefore, homosexuality is stigmatized as abnormal and banned in Islam (Yeck & Anderson, 2019).

### **2.3. Gender Roles, Religion, and Liberal Sexual Relations in Turkey**

Even though being a homosexual person is not a crime in Turkey, common traditional family values dominate the entire social atmosphere (Oksal, 2007). The Turkish people, primarily due to the social and family system of Turkish society, continue to hold conventional ideas about sexual issues. Although Turkey made important changes due to westernization and industrialization since the early years of the Republic (Yuksel-Kaptanoglu and Bernhardt, 2018), which has culminated in substantial economic and demographic changes, gender inequality and patriarchy remains one of the most permanent problems of Turkish society (Engin and Pals, 2018). The institutions of marriage and the general trend of the Turkish family are highly patriarchal (Sakalli, 2002), therefore, males and females have different roles. For instance, in the family, the role of the men is to be dominant, head of the household and has to protect the family structure while the role of the women is to take care of family members and be in charge of the house as the providers.

In Turkey, individuals are socialized with conventional sexist ideologies. The socialization of gender roles arises in the family, and from an early age, girls and boys learn different gender roles (Sakalli, 2002). In the family, girls are promoted to be dependent and obedient, while boys are encouraged to be more violent and independent (Oksal, 2007). Thus, women who grew up in sexist ideologies recognize the dependence of men on them in interpersonal relationships. Premarital sexual relationships are not allowed, particularly for girls, and the dignity of the family relies on the purity of females in the family (Oksal, 2007). In other words, sex is regarded as taboo, and premarital sexual relations are still considered negative behaviors. Marriage is the only way for a general correct manner of having sexual relations (Sakalli, 2002). The information about Turkish society's view on premarital sexual relations, which are approved only in marriage, also can give us important notions of the society's view on homosexual relations.

Homosexuality, in Turkey, is seen as people who have sexual relationships with individuals of the same sex (Sakalli and Ugurlu, 2001). Homosexuality is not accepted in Turkish society and is seen as abnormal behavior. Most homosexual individuals are refused by their families due to social pressure and are exposed to socially hostile behavior (Sakalli and Ugurlu, 2001). Parents, who have more conventional gender views, in Turkish families, use indirect messages usually from the media to their children about how this kind of sexual relationship is inappropriate and abnormal in daily social life (Oksal, 2007). Since society's negative attitudes and prejudiced behaviors, the majority of homosexual people feel uncomfortable explaining their situation to their families or close relatives. Religious, traditional, and patriarchal families are substantial reasons for homosexual people to communicate with others about their sexual identity. Nevertheless, in late years, some homosexuals in Turkey, particularly in the biggest cities, have started to reveal their sexual identity (Sakalli and Ugurlu, 2001). They have begun to share their situations, have collective demonstrations, and possess meetings to give society a chance for social contact with them.

In Turkey, gendered social structures are undergirded by religion (Islam) and cultural activities. Turkish society is mostly religious and believes in Islam. Therefore, this religious status may be one of the important factors in negative perceptions of premarital sex and homosexuality. Because Islam is totally against sex outside marriage and homosexuality. To support that idea, verses from the Quran, which is the first and most substantial source of Islamic doctrine on familial issues, can be given as proof of disapproving of these kinds of relations (pre-marital sex, homosexuality). First, sex before marriage or any sexual activities outside marriage is strictly prohibited, regardless of whether with a girlfriend/boyfriend. Sex outside marriage is viewed as fornication (Zina) (Bello, 2011). A verse from the Quran states:



“Do not go near adultery, surely it is an indecency, and an evil way [of fulfilling sexual urge].” (17:32)

Second, Islam, likewise pre-marital sex, is completely against homosexuality. In Quran, this kind of sexual relationship is rejected in some verses and these verses mostly come from the story of Prophet Lut (Lot):

“And remember when Lot scolded the men of his people, saying, “Do you commit a shameful deed that no man has ever done before? You lust after men instead of women! You are certainly transgressors.” But his people’s only response was to say, “Expel them from your land! They are people who wish to remain chaste! So, We saved him and his family except for his wife, who was one of the doomed. We poured upon them a rain of brimstone. See what the end of the wicked was!” (7:80-84).

The story of Prophet Lot continues in other verses:

“And the men of his people—who were used to shameful deeds—came to him rushing. He pleaded, “O my people! Here are my daughters for marriage—they are pure for you. So fear Allah, and do not humiliate me by disrespecting my guests. Is there not even a single right-minded man among you?” They answered: you (Lut) know that we are not entitled to your daughters and you know what we want... The angels said, “O Lot! We are the messengers of your Lord. They will never reach you. So travel with your family in the dark of night, and do not let any of you look back, except your wife. She will certainly suffer the fate of the others. Their appointed time is the morning. Is the morning not near? When our command came, we turned the cities upside down and rained down on them clustered stones of baked clay,” (11:78-82).

In another line of the Quran, Prophet Lot reprimands the people of his city due to men’s sexual relations with same-sex instead of women:

“Why do you men lust after fellow men, leaving the wives that your Lord has created for you? In fact, you are a transgressing people.”

As seen in verses from the Quran, homosexuality is not acceptable and is seen as deviant behavior. In addition to these verses, there are many different verses in the Quran that reveal how Islam is against these kinds of sexual relations. Therefore, due to the high religiosity of individuals and tend toward patriarchal and conventional gender roles in society, it is our assumption to find extremely negative attitudes toward liberal sexual tendencies, particularly pre-marital sex and homosexuality, in Turkey.

### **3.METHOD**

#### **3.1.Sample and Data**

Data for our study were obtained from the 2011-2014 World Value Survey (WVS) the case of Turkey that was carried out between June 2011 and August 2011 by the Bahcesehir University (WVS, 2012). This is the 6<sup>th</sup> wave of the survey, which was performed between 2010 and 2014, included a total of 60 countries (Inglehart et al., 2014). The main reason we used the 6<sup>th</sup> wave of the WVS instead of the 7<sup>th</sup> wave is that the 6<sup>th</sup> wave is the latest wave that included both attitudes toward homosexuality and premarital sex in Turkey. WVS is one of the most comprehensive research projects on human values in the world. The WVS aims to assist scientists and policymakers in interpreting changes in people’s attitudes, principles, and motives around the world. The research program was initiated by an international team of scholars, with the WVS association and secretariat headquartered in Stockholm, Sweden. The survey was conducted through face-to-face interviews at respondents’ place of residence, and answers were recorded in a paper questionnaire or by Computer Assisted Personal Interview. The sixth wave of Turkey is representative of the adult population aged 18+ and the sample size is 1,605. However, after cases with missing values in attitudes toward sexual relations and independent variables of the study were deleted, the final sample of this data analysis is less than the original sample.

#### **3.2.Variables**

Two dependent, four independent variables, and six control variables are included for the conceptualization of the present research.

### **Dependent Variables**

The WVS includes some items intended to measure the valuation of liberal sexual morality. Each respondent was required with a statement that reads, "Please tell me for each of the following actions whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified." We focus on two items that can be the measure of liberal sexual morality, which are attitudes toward homosexuality and sex before marriage. Each dependent variable is a ten-point scale (from 1 never justifiable to 10 always justifiable).

### **Independent Variables**

Gender roles: This variable was created as a compound of two variables of WVS, which are "On the whole, men make better political leaders than women do" and "On the whole, men make better business executives than women do." These two variables were recoded as 0 = disagree and 1 = agree. Then both were combined and a scale of 3-point was created the index possessed a cronbach's alpha that its value was equal to 0.668.

Subjective religiosity: Subjective religiosity is measured by way of an item that asks, "Independently of whether you go to religious services or not, would you say you are a religious person, not a religious person, or a convinced atheist?" Because of the lower percentage of self-reported convinced atheists in the sample, we recoded and created a dichotomous variable with 0 = not a religious person/a convinced atheist and 1 = a religious person.

Prayer: Related to social religiosity, prayer practice was developed by the WVS as a scale variable and the index value range from 1 = never, practically never to 8 = several times a day.

Importance of religion (religious salience): The measurement of religious salience is a way of a Likert-type scale item that asks the respondents a question that states, "For each of the following aspects, indicate how important it is in your life." Possible responses for the importance of "religion" are in a Likert-type scale format and we recoded it for facilitating interpretation with a greater score representing higher importance placed on religion with 0 = not at all important, 1 = not very important, 2 = rather important, 3 = very important.

### **Control Variables**

Based on the earlier studies, six demographic variables were included in the analysis to determine the estimated net effects of independent variables on the dependent variables. Age is a three-interval dummy variable with the youngest group is used as the reference category (0 = 18-29 years, 1 = 30-49 years, 2 = 50 or more years). In the current research, gender is coded as a binary variable reverberating 0 = female and 1= male. Two variables are aimed to catch family dynamics. First, marital status is a dichotomous variable reflecting 0 = non-married and 1 = married. Second, the number of children is measured by asking, "How many children do you have?" Nine ordered categories represent certain numbers of children with a range starting at 0 = no children through 8 = 8 or more children. Educational level was created by WVS by asking, "What is the highest educational level you have attained?" Possible response categories were maintained from original data and an 8-point scale variable (1 = no formal education to 8 = university with degree) for the level of education included in our data analysis. WVS included regions of Turkey and these regions were coded as Marmara Region (reference category), Aegean Region, Middle-Anatolia Region, Mediterranean Region, Black Sea Region, East Anatolia Region, and South-East Anatolia Region.

### **3.3.Hypotheses**

H1: Tend to traditional gender roles will be associated with a lower level of justification for liberal sexual attitudes including homosexuality and premarital sex.

H2: Personal religiosity will be related to a lower level of justification for liberal sexual attitudes including homosexuality and premarital sex.

H3: The greater practice of prayer will be linked to a lower level of justification for liberal sexual attitudes including homosexuality and premarital sex.

H4: Higher given importance to religion (religious salience) will be related to a lower level of justification for liberal sexual attitudes including homosexuality and premarital sex

#### **4.RESULTS**

##### **4.1.Sample Characteristics**

Table 1 summarizes the sample characteristics of Turkey. The majority of respondents were in the group of 30-49 years old (45.8%). More than half of the respondents were male (50.7%). The majority of the respondents were married (69.2%) while more than 30% were single or never married. The mean level of the number of children was 1.84 on a 9-point scale (SE=.045). The mean level of education was 4.86 on a 9-point scale (SE=.061). The majority of respondents were living in the Marmara region (31.5%) while the less populated region was East Anatolia among seven regions. The mean of gender roles was 1.37 on a 3-point scale (SE=.020). Regarding religious factors, 85% of respondents identify themselves as religious persons. Nevertheless, 15% is a high number of being non-religious among the population in Turkey. The mean of the practice of prayer was 6.65 on an 8-point scale (SE=.045). Additionally, the mean of religious salience was 2.58 (SE=.017). In the context of dependent variables, the mean of support for homosexuality was 1.66 (SE=.041) while that support was slightly higher for premarital sex at 1.78 (SE=.047).

##### **4.2.Multivariate Analysis**

By using weighted data, Table 2 exhibits the results of six linear regression models predicting the net effects of gender roles, religious factors, and control variables on attitudes toward homosexuality. In this table, first, a control model (see Model 1) was run, and age, education, and living in the Southeast Anatolia region were positively linked while being male, married, and living in other regions (except East Anatolia) were negatively associated with support for homosexuality. The mean level of support for homosexuality is .268 higher for individuals in the age group of 30-49 than their counterparts in the age group of 18-29 ( $p < .05$ ,  $t = 2.36$ ). As one unit increases in educational level, the expected support for homosexuality increases by a factor of .114 ( $p < .001$ ,  $t = 5.40$ ). The mean level of support for homosexuality is .410 higher for people who live in the Southeast Anatolia region than individuals who live in the Marmara region ( $p < .05$ ,  $t = 2.48$ ). On contrary, the mean level of support for homosexuality is .223 lower for males than females ( $p < .01$ ,  $t = -2.67$ ) and is .232 lower for married people than non-married ( $p < .05$ ,  $t = -2.21$ ). Compared to the Marmara region, there is lower support for homosexuality in the Aegean Region, Middle-Anatolia Region, Mediterranean Region, and Black Sea Region.

Model 2 indicates that tending to more traditional gender roles was negatively associated with support for homosexuality. As one unit increases in traditional gender roles, the expected support for homosexuality decreases by .301 units ( $p < .001$ ,  $t = -5.69$ ). In this model, after adding gender roles, the effect of gender loses statistical significance. Model 3 discloses that subjective religiosity is negatively and significantly linked to support for homosexuality. Holding all other variables constant, the mean level of support for homosexuality is .443 lower for individuals who identify themselves as religious than non-religious or convinced atheists ( $p < .001$ ,  $t = -3.73$ ). In this model, when subjective religiosity is entered into the model, the effect of marital status loses statistical significance. Model 4 demonstrates that the practice of prayer is also negatively and significantly related to support for homosexuality. As one unit increases in prayer practice, the expected support for homosexuality decreases by a factor of .085 ( $p < .001$ ,  $t = -3.51$ ). Model 5 found that there is not any statistically significant relationship between religious salience and support for homosexuality. The full model (see Model 6) includes all independent and control variables. In this model, gender roles ( $b = -.287$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and subjective religiosity ( $b = -.387$ ,  $p < .01$ ) remain statistically significant while prayer practice loses its statistical significance.



**Table 1. Sample Characteristics for Turkey (n = 1,605).**

	N	%		
18-29 years (Ref.)	450	28.0		
30-49 years	735	45.8		
50 and over years	420	26.2		
Female (Ref.)	791	49.3		
Male	814	50.7		
Non-married (Ref.)	494	30.8		
Married	1,111	69.2		
Marmara Region (Ref.)	506	31.5		
Aegean Region	243	15.1		
Middle-Anatolia Region	319	19.9		
Mediterranean Region	182	11.3		
Black Sea Region	121	7.6		
East Anatolia Region	106	6.6		
South-East Anatolia Region	127	7.9		
Non-religious (Ref.)	237	15.0		
Religious	1,340	85.0		
	<b>M</b>	<b>SE</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>
Number of Children	1.84	.045	0	8
Education	4.86	.061	1	9
Gender Roles	1.37	.020	0	2
Prayer	6.65	.045	1	8
Religious Salience	2.58	.017	0	3
Justify Homosexuality	1.66	.041	1	10
Justify Premarital Sex	1.78	.047	1	10

Table 3 presents the results of six logistic regression models that predict the net effects of gender roles, religion determinants, and demographic variables on support for premarital sex. The unstandardized coefficients and model fit indicate a significant impact of gender roles and religious determinants on attitudes toward premarital sex. The overall effect size of religious factors suggests a higher level of illustrative power-on support for premarital sex than support for homosexuality. As the literature cited above reveals that Islamic societies are rigid, therefore, this finding is important. Religiosity seems to play a robust role in attitudes toward premarital sex in Turkey.

Model 1 shows that, among control variables, age and educational level were significantly and positively linked to support for premarital sex whereas the number of children compared to Marmara region living in the different regions of Turkey was negatively associated with sex before marriage. The mean level of support for premarital sex is .476 greater for individuals in the age group of 30-49 and .423 higher for individuals in the age group of 50 and over years than their counterparts in the age group of 18-29 respectively ( $p < .001$ ,  $t = 3,71$ ) and ( $p < .01$ ,  $t = 2,70$ ). As one unit increases in educational level, the expected support for premarital sex increases by a factor of .130 ( $p < .001$ ,  $t = 5.47$ ). On the contrary, for one person increase in the number of children, the expected support for premarital sex decreases by .080 units ( $p < .05$ ,  $t = -2.30$ ). Additionally, living in other regions (except the Black Sea region) shows more support for premarital sex than in the Marmara region.

Model 2 reveals that tending to more traditional gender roles was negatively associated with support for premarital sex. As one unit increases in traditional gender roles, the expected support for homosexuality decreases by a factor of .299 ( $p < .001$ ,  $t = -4.99$ ). In this model, after gender roles are added to data analysis, the negative effect of regions on the support for premarital sex increases, and the Black Sea region also becomes negatively and statistically significant. Model 3 demonstrates that subjective religiosity is negatively and significantly associated with support for premarital sex. The mean level of support for premarital sex is .799 lower for individuals who identify themselves as religious than non-religious people ( $p < .001$ ,  $t = -6.06$ ). Model

***A. Fidan***

4 shows that the practice of prayer is also negatively and significantly related to support for premarital sex. As one unit increases in prayer practice, the expected support for premarital sex decreases by a factor of .134 ( $p < .001, t = -4.96$ ).

Unlike Table 2 (support for homosexuality), in this table, Model 5 denotes that religious salience was negatively and significantly associated with support for premarital sex. As one unit increases in religious salience, the expected support for premarital decreases by a factor of .251 ( $p < .001, t = -3.75$ ). Model 6 (full model), in this table also, includes gender roles variable, all religious covariates, and control variables in the equation. Gender roles, subjective religiosity, and prayer practice remain statistically significant although their effect on attitudes toward premarital sex decreases. After gender roles and all religious predictors were entered into the regression analysis, religious salience lost its statistical significance. These results provide strong evidence of a net effect of gender roles and subjective religiosity on attitudes toward homosexuality and premarital sex in Turkey. Differences in Adjusted R2 statistics across models suggest that gender role predictor has the strongest effect on both attitudes toward homosexuality and premarital sex. Taken together, Hypothesis 1, Hypothesis 2, and Hypothesis 3 are supported, Hypothesis 4 is partially supported by the data.

**Table 2. Linear Regression: Parameter Estimates (Control Variables and Independent Variables) for Attitudes toward Homosexuality.**

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B(SE)	B(SE)	B(SE)	B(SE)	B(SE)	B(SE)
30-49 years	.26(.11)*	.25(.11)*	.23(.114)*	.27(.11)*	.27(.11)*	.21(.11)
50 and over	.21(.14)	.18(.14)	.18(.139)	.206(.140)	.21(.13)	.15(.14)
Male	-.22(.08)**	-.14(.08)	-.25(.08)**	-.242(.08)**	-.22(.08)**	-.18(.08)*
Married	-.23(.10)*	-.25(.10)*	-.197(.10)	-.212(.10)*	-.22(.10)*	-.21(.10)*
Children	-.03(.03)	-.03(.03)	-.025(.03)	-.025(.03)	-.03(.03)	-.02(.032)
Education	.11(.02)***	.09(.02)***	.10(.021)***	.10(.02)***	.11(.02)***	.08(.02)***
Aegean	-.35(.12)**	-.31(.12)*	-.37(.12)**	-.39(.12)**	-.37(.12)**	-.36(.13)**
M. Anatolia	-.48(.11)***	-.46(.11)***	-.47(.11)***	-.43(.11)***	-.45(.11)***	-.42(.12)***
Mediterranean	-.47(.14)**	-.48(.14)**	-.43(.13)**	-.45(.14)**	-.46(.13)**	-.43(.14)**
Black Sea	-.47(.16)**	-.57(.16)**	-.39(.16)*	-.46(.16)**	-.46(.16)**	-.50(.17)**
East Anatolia	-.03(.17)	-.19(.18)	.01(.17)	.02(.17)	-.01(.17)	-.11(.18)
SE. Anatolia	.41(.16)*	.43(.16)*	.41(.16)*	.44(.16)**	.44(.16)**	.44(.17)**
Gender Roles		-.30(.05)***				-.28(.05)***
S. Religiosity			-.44(.12)***			-.38(.12)**
Prayer				-.08(.02)***		-.04(.02)
Religious S.					-.10(.06)	-.03(.06)
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.054	.077	.061	.061	.056	.086
Weighted N	1,593	1,515	1,566	1,566	1,588	1,475

Notes: \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

**Table 3. Linear Regression: Parameter Estimates (Control Variables and Independent Variables) for Attitudes Toward Premarital Sex.**

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B(SE)	B(SE)	B(SE)	B(SE)	B(SE)	B(SE)
30-49 years	.47(.12)***	.52(.13)***	.41(.12)**	.49(.12)***	.48(.12)***	.47(.13)***
50 and over	.42(.15)**	.45(.16)**	.38(.15)*	.42(.15)**	.42(.15)**	.42(.15)**
Male	.04(.09)	.10(.09)	.01(.09)	.02(.09)	.05(.09)	.06(.09)
Married	-.14(.11)	-.17(.12)	-.09(.11)	-.11(.11)	-.13(.11)	-.11(.12)
Children	-.08(.03)*	-.09(.03)**	-.06(.03)*	-.06(.03)*	-.07(.03)*	-.06(.03)*
Education	.13(.02)***	.11(.02)***	.10(.02)***	.11(.02)***	.11(.02)***	.08(.02)**
Aegean	-.42(.14)**	-.43(.14)**	-.52(.14)***	-.52(.14)***	-.47(.14)**	-.60(.14)***
M. Anatolia	-.69(.13)***	-.68(.13)***	-.69(.12)***	-.60(.13)***	-.62(.13)***	-.61(.13)***
Mediterranean	-.58(.15)***	-.61(.16)***	-.51(.15)**	-.55(.15)***	-.57(.15)***	-.53(.15)**
Black Sea	-.30(.18)	-.37(.19)*	-.15(.18)	-.28(.18)	-.28(.186)	-.23(.18)
East Anatolia	-.46(.19)*	-.62(.21)**	-.38(.19)*	-.36(.19)	-.42(.19)*	-.47(.21)*
SE. Anatolia	-.41(.18)*	-.49(.19)*	-.44(.18)*	-.36(.18)*	-.39(.18)*	-.48(.19)*
Gender Roles		-.29(.06)***				-.27(.06)***
S. Religiosity			-.79(.13)***			-.67(.14)***
Prayer				-.13(.02)***		-.06(.02)*
Religious S.					-.25(.06)***	-.13(.02)
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.062	.082	.081	.076	.070	.107
Weighted N	1,594	1,514	1,566	1,567	1,589	1,474

Notes: \*p < .05. \*\*p < .01. \*\*\*p < .001.

## 5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In the present study, we examined the role of traditional gender roles and religiosity in explaining attitudes toward liberal sexual relations in Turkey. In general, gender roles and three aspects of religion were disclosed as significant determinants of attitudes toward premarital sex while one of the religious factors (religious salience) was not associated with attitudes toward homosexuality. Below we discuss the suggestions for the findings of our study, explain the limitations, and consider the recommendations for future research. First, tend to traditional gender roles was a significant and strong factor compared to other factors in explaining attitudes toward both liberal sexual relations. Thus, coherent with the results of previous studies, people who tend to more traditional gender roles had more negative attitudes toward liberal sexual relations (Whitely, 2001; Herek, 2009; Sakallı-Uğurlu and Glick, 2013; Harbaugh and Lindsey, 2015). This finding was as expected in a country where families and society's structures are highly patriarchal. In other words, highly societal and familial conservative perceptions in Turkey, have a negative effect on the approval of homosexuality, and sex before marriage. Although in the last decade, debate on liberal relations has attracted attention in the society, particularly among gays and lesbians, members who grew up in traditional or conservative Turkish families remain to have quite negative attitudes toward these kinds of relations. Because homosexuality and pre-marital sex are seen as the elements that humiliate the dignity and honor of the family.

Second, there is a lack of research in religious studies, which focuses on an altitudinal variation on familial and sexual preferences issues in non-Christian environments. Therefore, it is important to note that the present study adds to the literature substantial findings that demonstrate the association between religious tenets and

**A. Fidan**

liberal sexual relations in Turkey, where a mainly Muslim society is pervasive. Although Turkish families and all areas of society have experienced and overcome Westernization and modernization since the beginning of the Republic, the members of this society are still influenced by radical religious concepts of Islam (Acevedo, Ellison, and Yilmaz, 2015). Thus, investigating the attitudes toward liberal sexual relations, in the context of religion, in a secular, Westernized, and Islamic Turkey is essential.

The findings of our study predominantly support the research hypotheses related to religiosity. Turkish people who identify themselves as religious and those who show a higher level of prayer practice are more likely to have negative attitudes toward both homosexuality and pre-marital sex. Religious salience was not associated with attitudes toward homosexuality while individuals who give more importance to their religion have conservative attitudes toward pre-marital sex. These findings from negative attitudes toward homosexuality can be explained by that the most plausible perspective is that the Islamic faith views homosexuality as a sin (Oksal, 2007). Therefore, there is no doubt to state that, in Islamic doctrine, homosexual preference and homosexual practices are not permissible either. This remark obtained support from earlier studies that have indicated that religious beliefs and practices are significant determinants of conservative attitudes toward homosexuality (Chadee et al., 2013; Cotten-Huston and Waite, 1999; Roggemans et al., 2015; Whitley, 2009).

In the context of attitudes toward sex before marriage, patriarchal families members, who hold traditional gender roles, particularly parents, hold quite conservative attitudes toward pre-marital sex. Because virginity until marriage is seen as something blessed and pure in Turkish families and society (Sakallı-Uğurlu and Glick, 2013). This view also is rooted in Islamic religious tenets. Because having sexual relationships before marriage is seen as adultery in Islam, and, therefore, it is considered one of the biggest sins (Islamweb, 2020). One of the important messages of Islam to families is that keep their children and away from adultery. Given the effect of religion on individuals' attitudes toward sex before marriage, it is possible to say that traditional and religious Turkish families have conservative attitudes toward pre-marital sex regardless of gaps in generations. This view is also supported by previous studies that found that religion is one of the important factors that have a negative influence on attitudes toward pre-marital sex (Cochran and Beeghley, 1991; Cochran et al., 2004; Jung, 2016).

The findings of the present study make several contributions. First, the present research enlarges the literature by using a cross-national sample to examine the link between traditional gender roles, religious factors, and attitudes toward homosexuality and pre-marital sex. The findings of the current study propose that the negative association between traditional gender roles, religion, and attitudes toward homosexuality and pre-marital sex in Turkish contexts may apply in other parts of the Islamic countries. Second, building on more than one perspective, our research moves beyond previous studies, which focused on religiosity alone. As Turkish society predominantly has traditional families, it is important to add conservative gender roles to assess their influence on attitudes toward liberal sexual morality. Third, many of the previous studies focused on only one type of liberal sexual relations. Our study contributes to prior research by focusing on attitudes toward homosexuality and pre-marital sex separately.

Our research has some limitations to incite future studies. Although our data, WVS, is one of the important surveys on many aspects of societies, it includes only a few religious elements in the last wave of Turkey. Several practices of Islam such as fasting, reading the Quran, and giving Zakat are not available in the data. Moreover, questions about beliefs in Islam, such as belief afterlife, heaven are also not included in the data. Therefore, the variables we used in our research may not demonstrate the results totally in Islamic settings. As patriarchal beliefs and conservative gender roles are highly surplus in Muslim countries, more questions to represent these roles need to be included in the data. Finally, there is a necessity for more questions, which measure more items for liberal sexual relations. The use of more factors could increase the reliability of measures of both dependent and independent variables in the current research.

Despite the limitations that we have arrayed above, the current research contributes to the literature on traditional gender roles, Muslim religiosity, and attitudes toward sexual morality in the non-Christian world. Our study investigated the a priori association between gender roles, religious aspects, and attitudes toward homosexuality and pre-marital sex in Turkey. The study's findings demonstrate a significant link between increased traditional gender roles, religiosity, and negative attitudes toward liberal sexual relations. Therefore, it is important to note the similarities between our findings and previous research conducted on Western societies.

Such similarities will open doors for future studies. The current study has the potential to contribute to the literature and will be relevant for future studies to pay more attention to the improvement of the body of scientific research on the issues of attitudinal differences in Muslim societies on liberal sexual relations.

#### REFERENCES

- Alden, H. L., & Karen F. Parker. (2005). Gender role ideology, homophobia and hate crime: Linking attitudes to macro-level anti-gay and lesbian hate crimes. *Deviant behavior*, 26(4), 321- 343. doi.org/10.1080/016396290931614
- Arat, Y. (2008). Religion, politics and gender equality in Turkey: implications of democratic paradox? *Third World Quarterly*, 31(6), 869-884. doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2010.502712
- Acevedo, G. A., Christopher G. E., & Yilmaz, M. (2015). Religion and child-rearing values in Turkey. *Journal of Family Issues*, 36(12), 1595–1623. doi.org/10.1177/0192513X13504921
- Adamczyk, A., & Hayes B. E. (2012). Religion and sexual behaviors: Understanding the influence of Islamic cultures and religious affiliation for explaining sex outside of marriage. *American Sociological Review*, 77(5), 723-746. doi.org/10.1177/0003122412458672
- Barringer, M. N., Gay, D. A., & Lynxwiler, J. P. (2013). Gender, religiosity, spirituality, and attitudes toward homosexuality. *Sociological Spectrum*, 33(3), 240-257. doi.org/10.1080/02732173.2013.732903
- Bello, A. H. (2011). The punishment for adultery in Islamic law and its application in Nigeria. *Journal of Islamic Law and Culture*, 13(2-3), 166-182. doi.org/10.1080/1528817x.2012.733132
- Cannon, K. L., & Long, R. (1971). Premarital sexual behavior in the sixties. *Journal Of Marriage And Family*, 33(1), 36-49. doi.org/10.2307/350156
- Chadee, D., Joseph, C., Peters, C., Sankar, V. S., Nair, N., & Philip, J. (2013). Religiosity, and attitudes towards homosexuals in a Caribbean environment. *Social and Economic Studies*, 62(1), 1-28.
- Cochran, J. K., & Beeghley, L. (1991). The influence of religion on attitudes toward nonmarital sexuality: A preliminary assessment of reference group theory. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 30(1), 45-62. doi.org/10.2307/1387148
- Cochran, J. K., Chamlin, M. B., Beeghley, L., & Fenwick, M. (2004). Religion, religiosity, and nonmarital sexual conduct: An application of reference group theory. *Sociological Inquiry*, 74(1), 70-101. doi:10.1111/j.1475-682x.2004.00081.x
- Cotten-Huston, A. L., & Waite, B. M. (1999). Anti-homosexual attitudes in college students: Predictors and classroom interventions. *Journal of homosexuality*, 38(3), 117-133. doi.org/10.1300/J082v38n03\_07
- Davies, M. (2004). Correlates of negative attitudes toward gay men: Sexism, male role norms, and male sexuality. *Journal of Sex Research*, 41(3), 259-266. doi.org/10.1080/00224490409552233
- DeLamater, J. (1981). The social control of sexuality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 7(1), 263-290. doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.07.080181.001403
- Deaux, K., & Major, B. (1987). Putting gender into context: An interactive model of gender related behavior. *Psychological Review*, 94(3), 369. doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.94.3.369
- Diamond, M. (2002). Sex and gender are different: Sexual identity and gender identity are different. *Clinical child psychology and psychiatry*, 7(3), 320-334. doi.org/10.1177/1359104502007003002
- Duck, R. J., & Hunsberger, B. (1999). Religious orientation and prejudice: The role of religious proscription, right-wing. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 9(3), 157-179. doi.org/10.1207/s15327582ijpr0903\_1
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 46(4), 735. doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.46.4.735
- Engin, C., & Pals, H. (2018). Patriarchal attitudes in Turkey 1990–2011: The influence of religion and political conservatism. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 25(3), 383-409. https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxx021
- Ergun, M. A. (2007). Social determinants of attitudes towards women’s premarital sexuality among female Turkish university students. *Sexuality and Culture*, 11(3), 1-10. doi.org/10.1007/s12119-007-9005-7
- Finlay, B., & Walther, C. S. (2003). The relation of religious affiliation, service attendance, and other factors to homophobic attitudes among university students. *Review of Religious Research*, 44(4), 370–93. doi.org/10.2307/3512216



- Fiske, S. T. (2017). Prejudices in cultural contexts: Shared stereotypes (gender, age) versus variable stereotypes (race, ethnicity, religion). *Perspectives on psychological science, 12*(5), 791-799.
- Harding, D. J., & Jencks, C. (2003). Changing attitudes toward premarital sex: Cohort, period, and aging effects. *The Public Opinion Quarterly, 67*(2), 211-226.
- Harbaugh, E., & Lindsey, E. W. (2015). Attitudes toward homosexuality among young adults: Connections to gender role identity, gender-typed activities, and religiosity. *Journal of homosexuality, 62*(8), 1098 -1125. doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2015.1021635
- Henry, H. M. (2020). Internalized sexual stigma as an internal minority stress: The Egyptian gay experience. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health, 24*(2), 174-189.
- Herek, G. M. (1986). On heterosexual masculinity: Some psychical consequences of the social construction of gender and sexuality. *American behavioral scientist, 29*(5), 563-577. doi.org/10.1177/000276486029005005
- Herek, G. M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences. *Journal of sex research, 25*(4), 451-477. doi.org/10.1080/00224498809551476
- Herek, G. M. (1992). Psychological heterosexism and anti-gay violence: The social psychology of bigotry and bashing. In G. M. Herek & K. T. Berrill (Eds.), *Hate crimes: Confronting violence against lesbians and gay men* (pp. 149–169). New York: Sage Publications.
- Herek, G. M. (2009). Sexual stigma and sexual prejudice in the United States: A conceptual framework. In Debra A. Hope (Ed.), *Contemporary perspectives on lesbian, gay, and bisexual identities* (pp. 65-111). New York: Springer.
- Hu, K., & Li, X. (2019). The effects of media use and traditional gender role beliefs on tolerance of homosexuality in China. *Chinese Sociological Review, 51*(2), 147-172.
- Hunsberger, B., & Jackson, L. M. (2005). Religion, meaning, and prejudice. *Journal of social issues, 61*(4), 807-826. doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2005.00433.x
- Hussain, M., Naz, A., Khan, W., Daraz, U., & Khan, Q. (2015). Gender stereotyping in family: An institutionalized and normative mechanism in Pakhtun society of Pakistan. *SAGE Open, 5*(3), 2158244015595258.
- Jackson, L. A., & Cash, T. F. (1985). Components of gender stereotypes: Their implications for inferences on stereotypic and nonstereotypic dimensions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 11*(3), 326-344. doi.org/10.1177/0146167285113008
- Jäckle, S., & Wenzelburger, G. (2015). Religion, religiosity, and the attitudes toward homosexuality—A multilevel analysis of 79 countries. *Journal of homosexuality, 62*(2), 207-241. doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014.969071
- Ichwan, J. (2014). The Influence of Religion on the Development of Heterosexism in Indonesia. *Religion e incidencia publica, 2*(1), 192-223.
- Ilkcaracan, P. (2001). Islam and women's sexuality: A research report from Turkey. In M. Hunt, P. B. Jung and R. Balakrishnan (Eds.), *Good sex: Feminist perspectives from the world's religions* (pp.1-11). New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Inglehart, R., Haerdfer, C., Moreno, A., Welcl, C., Kizilova, K., Diez-Medrano J., Lagos, M., Norris, P., Ponarin, E. & Puranen, B. et al. (eds.). 2018. World Values Survey: Round Six - CountryPooled Datafile. Madrid, Spain & Vienna, Austria: JD Systems Institute & WVSA Secretariat. doi.org/10.14281/18241.8
- Islamweb. (2019). Fornication and adultery: Major sins in Islam. Accessed December 1 2020 <https://www.islamweb.org/en/article/186409/fornication-and-adultery-major-sins-in-islam>
- Jung, J. H. (2016). A cross-national analysis of religion and attitudes toward premarital sex: Do economic contexts matter?. *Sociological Perspectives, 59*(4), 798-817. doi.org/10.1177/0731121415595428
- Kite, M. E., & Deaux, K. (1987). Gender belief systems: Homosexuality and the implicit inversion theory. *Psychology of women quarterly, 11*(1), 83-96. doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1987.tb00776.x
- Kite, M. E., & Whitley Jr, B. E. (1996). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexual persons, behaviors, and civil rights a meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*(4), 336-353. doi.org/10.1177/0146167296224002
- Laner, M. R., & Laner, R. H. (1980). Sexual preference or personal style? Why lesbians are disliked. *Journal of homosexuality, 5*(4), 339-356. doi.org/10.1300/J082v05n04\_01

- Lefkowitz, E. S., Shearer, C. L., Gillen, M. M., & Espinosa-Hernandez, G. (2014). How gendered attitudes relate to women's and men's sexual behaviors and beliefs. *Sexuality & Culture, 18*(4), 833-846. doi.org/10.1007/s12119-014-9225-6
- Maher, M. J. (2013). Homophobic Bullying in Catholic High Schools: Five US Studies in Heterosexism, Authority, Masculinity, and Religion. In Z. Gross, L. Davies, A. Diab (Eds.), *Gender, Religion and Education in a Chaotic Postmodern World* (pp. 271–84). New York: Springer.
- McCreary, D. R. (1994). The Male Role and Avoiding Femininity. *Sex Roles, 31*(10), 517–531Ç doi:10.1007/BF01544277.
- MacDonald, A. P., Huggins J., Young S., & Swanson R. A. (1973). Attitudes toward homosexuality: Preservation of sex morality or the double standard? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 40*(1), 161. doi.org/10.1037/h0033943
- MacDonald, Jr, A. Po, & Games R. G. (1974). Some characteristics of those who hold positive and negative attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality, 1*(1), 9-27. doi.org/10.1300/J082v01n01\_02
- Morgan, E. M., & Davis-Delano, L. R. (2016). How public displays of heterosexual identity reflect and reinforce gender stereotypes, gender differences, and gender inequality. *Sex Roles, 75*(5), 257-271.
- Newman, B. S. (1989). The relative importance of gender role attitudes to male and female attitudes toward lesbians. *Sex Roles, 21*(7-8), 451-465.
- Oksal, A. (2008). Turkish family members' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Sex Roles, 58*(1), 514–525. doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9370-6
- Parla, A. (2001). The “honor” of the state: Virginitiy examinations in Turkey. *Feminist studies, 27*(1), 65-88. doi.org/10.2307/3178449
- Petersen, L. R., & Donnerwerth G. V. (1998). Religion and declining support for traditional beliefs about gender roles and homosexual rights. *Sociology of Religion, 59*(4), 353-371. doi.org/10.2307/3712122
- Pichardo, J. I. (2011). We are family (or not): Social and legal recognition of same-sex relationships and lesbian and gay families in Spain. *Sexualities, 14*(5), 544-561.
- Reiss, I. L. (1964). The scaling of premarital sexual permissiveness. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 26*(2), 188-198. doi.org/10.2307/349726
- Reiss, I. L. (2001). Sexual attitudes and behavior. In N. J. Smelser & B. Baltes (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (pp. 21-13969). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Risman, B. J. (2018). Gender as a social structure. In *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender* (pp. 19-43). Springer, Cham.
- Roggemans, L., Spruyt, B., Droogenbroeck, F. V., & Keppens, G. (2015). Religion and negative attitudes towards homosexuals: An analysis of urban young people and their attitudes towards homosexuality. *Young, 23*(3), 254-276. doi.org/10.1177/1103308815586903
- Roy, D. (2021). Premarital Sexual Permissiveness. In *Encyclopedia of Evolutionary Psychological Science* (pp. 6148-6153). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Sakalli, N. (2002). The relationship between sexism and attitudes toward homosexuality in a sample of Turkish college students. *Journal of homosexuality, 42*(3), 53-64. doi.org/10.1300/J082v42n03\_04
- Sakalli, N., & Ugurlu, O. (2002). Effects of social contact with homosexuals on heterosexual Turkish university students' attitudes towards homosexuality. *Journal of homosexuality, 42*(1), 53-62. doi.org/10.1300/J082v42n01\_03
- Sakalli-Uğurlu, N., & Glick, P. (2003). Ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward women who engage in premarital sex in Turkey. *Journal of Sex Research, 40*(3), 296-302. doi.org/10.1080/00224490309552194
- Scott, J. (1998). Changing attitudes to sexual morality: A cross-national comparison. *Sociology, 32*(4), 815-845.. doi.org/10.1177/0038038598032004010
- Sprecher, S., Treger, S., & Sakaluk, J. K. (2013). Premarital sexual standards and sociosexuality: Gender, ethnicity, and cohort differences. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 42*(8), 1395-1405. doi.org/10.1007/s10508-013-0145-6
- Smerecnik, C., Schaalma, H., Gerjo, K., Meijer, S., & Poelman, J. (2010). An exploratory study of Muslim adolescents' views on sexuality: Implications for sex education and prevention. *BMC public health, 10*(1), 1-10. doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-10-533

**A. Fidan**

- Smith, A. D., Resick, P. A., & Kilpatrick, D. G. (1980). Relationships among gender, sex-role attitudes, sexual attitudes, thoughts, and behaviors. *Psychological Reports, 46*(2), 359-367. doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1980.46.2.359
- Stefurak, T., Taylor, C., & Mehta, S. (2010). Gender-specific models of homosexual prejudice: Religiosity, authoritarianism, and gender roles. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality, 2*(4), 247.-261. doi.org/10.1037/a0021538
- The Quran. (2020). Retrieved from: <https://quran.com/7> and <https://quran.com/11>
- Weinberger, L. E., & Millham, J. (1979). Attitudinal homophobia and support of traditional sex roles. *Journal of Homosexuality, 4*(3), 237-246. doi.org/10.1300/J082v04n03\_02
- Warner, L. R., & Shields, S. A. (2013). The intersections of sexuality, gender, and race: Identity research at the crossroads. *Sex roles, 68*(11), 803-810.
- Weishut, D. J. (2000). Attitudes toward homosexuality: An overview. *Israel Journal of Psychiatry and Related Sciences, 37*(4), 308-319.
- Whitehead, A. L. (2010). Sacred rites and civil rights: Religion's effect on attitudes toward same-sex unions and the perceived cause of homosexuality. *Social science quarterly, 91*(1), 63-79. doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2010.00681.x
- Whitley, B. E., & Ægisdóttir, S. (2000). The gender belief system, authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Sex Roles, 42*(11), 947-967. doi.org/10.1023/A:1007026016001
- Whitley, B. E. 2001. Gender-role variables and attitudes toward homosexuality. *Sex roles, 45*(11), 691-721. doi.org/10.1023/A:1015640318045
- Whitley Jr, B. E. (2009). Religiosity and attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: A meta-analysis. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 19*(1), 21-38. doi.org/10.1080/10508610802471104
- Widmer, E. D., Treas, J., & Newcomb, R. (1998). Attitudes toward nonmarital sex in 24 countries. *Journal of sex research, 35*(4), 349-358. doi.org/10.1080/00224499809551953
- Wight, D. (2014). *Premarital Sex, Young People's. Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research, 5036–5039.* doi:10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5\_3413
- Wong, F. Y., McCreary, D. R., Carpenter, K. M., Engle, A., & Korchynsky, R. (1999). Gender-related factors influencing perceptions of homosexuality. *Journal of Homosexuality, 37*(3), 19-31. doi.org/10.1300/J082v37n03\_02
- Worthen, M. G. (2013). An argument for separate analyses of attitudes toward lesbian, gay, bisexual men, bisexual women, MtF and FtM transgender individuals. *Sex Roles, 68*(11), 703-723.
- WVS. (2012). Turkey 2012. Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/pc/Downloads/F00007753-WV6\_Results\_Turkey\_2011\_v20180912.pdf
- Vincent, W., Parrott, D. J., & Peterson, J. L. (2011). Effects of traditional gender role norms and religious fundamentalism on self-identified heterosexual men's attitudes, anger, and aggression toward gay men and lesbians. *Psychology of men & masculinity, 12*(4), 383. doi.org/10.1037/a0023807
- Yeck, A. T., & Anderson, V. N. (2019). Homosexuality as haram: Relations among gender, contact, religiosity, and sexual prejudice in Muslim individuals. *Sex Roles, 81*(3), 192-207.
- Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu, İ., & Bernhardt, E. (2018). Education, religious practice and gender ideology in Turkey. *Stockholm Research Reports in Demography 16*(1): 3-31. doi.org/10.17045/sthlmuni.6281342.v1
- Zhou, X. (1989). Virginity and premarital sex in contemporary China. *Feminist Studies, 15*(2), 279-288. doi.org/10.2307/3177788

**Beyan ve Açıklamalar (Disclosure Statements)**

1. Bu çalışmanın yazarları, araştırma ve yayın etiği ilkelerine uyduklarını kabul etmektedirler (The authors of this article confirm that their work complies with the principles of research and publication ethics).
2. Yazarlar tarafından herhangi bir çıkar çatışması beyan edilmemiştir (No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors).
3. Bu çalışma, intihal tarama programı kullanılarak intihal taramasından geçirilmiştir (This article was screened for potential plagiarism using a plagiarism screening program).