

Attitudes of Italian Group Toward Homosexuality and Same-Sex Parenting

L. Rollè^{1,2,*}, L. Chinaglia, L. Curti¹, A. Magliano¹, T. Trombetta¹, A.M. Caldarera¹, P. Brustia¹ and E. Gerino¹

¹Department of Psychology, University of Turin, Turin, Italy

²University of Turin, Department of Psychology, Torino, Italy

Abstract: The research investigated (a) the connection between attitudes toward homosexuality and same-sex parenting; (b) the socio-demographic and socio-cultural variables linked to such attitudes; and (c) the knowledge behind these attitudes. The 223 participants completed a self-report questionnaire including the Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men Scale (revised version), an attitudes toward same-sex parenting scale, and a personal data form, and answered some questions about their knowledge of homosexuality. The results showed an association between attitudes toward homosexuality and attitudes toward same-sex parenting, and a connection between socio-demographic variables, knowledge about homosexuality and same-sex parenting, and positivity/negativity levels of attitudes.

Keywords: Homosexuality, Same-sex parenting, Attitudes towards homosexuality, Attitudes towards same-sex parenting.

INTRODUCTION

For many years, the study of sexual orientation has focused on the causes of homosexuality. Historically, two perspectives have been proposed: the essentialist perspective and the social perspective. The essentialist perspective considered homosexuality to have a biological origin or to be caused by some hormonal or genetic factors (Bailey & Pillard, 1991; Blanchard, 1997; Blanchard & Klassen, 1996; Hamer, 1999; Hamer & Copeland, 1995; Hamer, Hu, Magnuson, Hu, & Pattatucci 1993; LeVay, 1991). The social perspective described homosexuality in relation to the personal, social, and historical context, with psychoanalytic and learning theories belonging to this approach (Bailey & Zucker, 1995; Cameron & Cameron, 1995; Churchill, 1967; Eckes & Trautner, 2000; Freud, 1905; Money & Ehrhardt, 1972; Money, Hampson, & Hampson, 1957; Taylor, 1992; Nicolosi, 2002; Rieger, Linsenmeier, Gygax, & Bailey, 2008; Tomeo, Templer, Anderson, & Kotler, 2001). However, none of the studies belonging to these two perspectives give adequate evidence to explain the reason why some people are homosexual and others are not (Anderssen, Amlie, & Ytterøy, 2002; Bailey *et al.*, 1999; Brannock & Chapman, 1990; Byne *et al.*, 2001; Colapinto, 2000; Diamond & Sigmundson, 1997; Gavrillets & Rice, 2006; Parker, 2014; Reiner & Gearhart, 2004; Rice, Anderson, Risch, & Ebers, 1999;

Wellings, Field, Johnson, Wadsworth, & Bradshaw, 1994; Zietsch *et al.*, 2008). Homophobic prejudice concern an higher numbers of gay and lesbians and is possible to find it in many aspects of social life, including political asylum research, access to health care, and the context of sports and education. To what we know only a small number of homophobic aggressions is denounced due to the prejudice and to the stigmatization (Rollè, Brustia, & Caldarera, 2014; Amodeo *et al.* 2018). The attempt to study the homophobic prejudice gives the opportunity to increase the social knowledge on this field and, consequently, increasing the global well-being reducing the minority stress – of lesbian and gay people – and self-perceived stigma.

Same-Sex Parenting and Same-Sex Couples

Same-sex parenting refers to gay, lesbian or bisexual people raising their children as parents or as foster-care parents (Gross, 2003) and the studies on this field have considered since the origin the parental skills of homosexuals (Bigner & Jacobsen, 1989; Flaks, Ficher, Masterpasqua, & Joseph, 1995; Harris & Turner, 1986; Kirkpatrick, Smith, & Roy, 1981; Miller, Jacobsen, & Bigner, 1981; Mucklow & Phelan, 1979; Siegenthaler & Bigner, 2000), the developmental outcomes of children raised with homosexual parents (Massey, Merriwheter, & Garcia, 2013), and the attitudes towards same sex couples/families and their intimate relations (Rollè, Giardina, Caldarera, Gerino, & Brustia, 2018). Several reviews and meta-analyses concerning the latter have been performed to analyze

*Address correspondence to this author at the University of Turin, Department of Psychology, 14, Via Po, Torino, TO 10123, Italy; Tel: +390116703923 (voice); Email: l.rolle@unito.it

the outcomes of the development of children in various dimensions (Allen & Burrell, 1997; Anderssen *et al.*, 2002; Baiocco *et al.*, 2015; Biblarz & Stacey, 2010; Fedewa, Black, & Ahn, 2015; Gartrell, Bos, & Goldberg, 2011; Patterson, 2009; Tasker, 2005; Tasker & Patterson, 2008; Van Gelderen, Bos, Gartrell, Hermanns, & Perrin, 2012), including (a) the cognitive dimension (Flaks *et al.*, 1995; Gartrell & Bos, 2010; Gartrell, Deck, Rodas, Peyser, & Banks, 2005; Patterson, 2006; Puryear, 1983; Speranza, 2015; Steckel, 1985); (b) the affective dimension (Brewaeys, Ponjaert, Van Hall, & Golombok, 1997; Golombok, Perry, Burston, Murray, Mooney-Somers, Stevens, & Golding, 2003; MacCallum & Golombok, 2004; Speranza, 2015; Steckel, 1985; Vanfraussen, Ponjaert Kristoffersen, & Brewaeys, 2003); (c) the social dimension (Brewaeys *et al.*, 1997; Chan, Raboy, & Patterson, 1998; Farr, Forssell, & Patterson, 2010; Gartrell & Bos, 2010; Golombok *et al.*, 2003; Green, Mandel, Hotvedt, Gray, & Smith, 1986; Gartrell *et al.*, 2005; MacCallum & Golombok, 2004; Patterson, 2006; Speranza, 2015; Steckel, 1985); (d) the gender identity dimension (Brewaeys *et al.*, 1997; Green, 1978; Hoeffler, 1981; Kveskin & Cook, 1982; Speranza, 2015); and (e) the sexual development dimension (Chan *et al.*, 1998; Golombok & Tasker, 1996; Green, 1978; Green, 1982; Green *et al.*, 1986; Speranza, 2015; Vanfraussen *et al.*, 2003). These studies reported that there were not significant differences in the development of children raised with either homosexual or heterosexual parents in each of the dimensions examined.

Attitudes and Knowledge Towards Homosexuality and Same-Sex Parenting

Attitude is a psychological tendency, expressed by an evaluation of an entity in a favorable or unfavorable way. In each attitude, cognitive, affective, and behavioral components are identifiable (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). Relying on literature related to attitudes toward homosexuality, Adolfsen and colleagues (2010) identified three distinct categories of attitudes. The first category is that proposed by Kite and Whitley (1996), Yang (1997) and Lewis (2003), characterized by three key concepts: (a) marriage and adoption rights for homosexuals, (b) homosexual people in general, and (c) homosexual behaviors. The second category analyzes attitudes toward homosexuality by subdividing them into two components: cognitive and affective (Herek, 1984; Herek, 2002; Hudson & Ricketts, 1980; Van de Ven,

Bomholt, & Bailey, 1996). The third category identifies the existence of two types of attitudes: traditional and modern (Morrison & Morrison, 2002). Traditional attitudes focus on religious objections, morals condemnations, and pathological connotations of homosexuality, and extend to a pure and explicit condemnation of homosexuality, while modern attitudes exist in hidden and less impactful ways, such as in the denial of the existence of homosexual discrimination (Morrison & Morrison 2002). In light of these studies and of other literature, there are several instruments to detect attitudes toward same-sex parenting in the European context, but most of them do not go very deep: some focus only on children's adjustment in homosexual families (Frias-Navarro & Monderde-i-Bort, 2012; Gato, Freitas, & Fontaine, 2013), while others detect attitudes to homosexuality in general or homosexual marriage (Lannutti & Lachlan, 2007). Vecho and Schneider developed a questionnaire to study attitudes toward same-sex parenting (Vecho & Schneider 2012; Rollè, Dell'Oca, Sechi, Brustia, & Gerino, 2018) as a central factor that also considers children's development and legislative opinions about marriage, adoption, and methods of access to parenthood. Despite the growth in literature and research on attitudes toward same-sex parenting, the beliefs rooted in negative attitudes remain present and widespread in society (Camilleri & Ryan, 2006).

Clarke (2001) and Lingardi (2013) focus their studies on different key concepts that recur in the attitudes toward same-sex parenting, dividing them into two main groups. In the first group, negative attitudes originate from the same issues presented above in the attitudes toward homosexuality, whereby religious and moral condemnation of same-sex parenting considers it a pathological union that influences the development of children. The second group focuses on the negative outcomes of children's development in relation to sexual identity, gender identity, and relational problems.

Aims

The present study focused on: (a) socio-demographic and socio-cultural variables connected to attitudes, (b) the connection between attitudes toward homosexuality and same-sex parenting, and (c) the correlation between knowledge about homosexuality and attitudes toward homosexuality and same-sex parenting. The following research hypotheses have been formulated:

H1: Socio-demographic and socio-cultural variables associated with positive or negative attitudes toward homosexuality also have an association with attitudes toward same-sex parenting: men, older people, people with a lower level of education, conservative people, and those who are religious have more negative attitudes toward homosexuality and same-sex parenting than women, younger people, people with a higher level of education, liberal people, and those who are not religious;

H2: Attitudes toward homosexuality and attitudes toward same-sex parenting are correlated;

H3: Levels of knowledge about homosexuality and lesbian–gay issues correlate with scores on attitudes toward homosexuality and same-sex parenting.

METHOD

Participants and Procedure

A total of 223 participants over the age of 18 took part in the study. The mean age of the participants was 33 years ($SD = 15.37$), and 34% were male while 66% were female. Participants responded to a questionnaire designed for the study and approved by the Bioethics University Committee. Participation in the study was voluntary and anonymous and recruited by a snowball sampling method. The informed consent and information sheets were added to the questionnaire in first page and collected before the administration of the questionnaire.

Methods

Several types of demographic data were collected, including age (in years), gender of participants (male, female, other), level of education, and political orientation. Regarding religion, five questions were proposed. The first question asked participants if they would profess a religion (yes/no), and the remaining four questions were rated on a five-point Likert scale: “Which level of religious education have you received?” (from “not at all” to “very much”); “How often do you usually go to church or other places of worship?” (from “not at all” to “very much”); “How important is religion in your life?” (from “not at all” to “very much”). The way in which participants define their current relation with religion was also explored by means of a categorical scale (*i.e.* “believer and practicing” or “not believer, not practicing”.)

Table 1: Description of Participants (N=223)

		%	M(DS)
Geographical origin	Northern Italy	61.6%	
	Centre of Italy	12%	
	Southern Italy	22.7%	
	Islands (Sicily and Sardinia)	3.7%	
Sex	Male	34%	
	Female	66%	
Age			33(15.37) years
Marital status	Single	65.3%	
	Married	22.8%	
	Cohabitants	8.7%	
	Divorced	1.4%	
	Widower	0.9%	
Education level	High school	39.9%	
	Bachelor degree	30%	
	Master degree	9.4%	
	Post-graduate	9.8%	
	Other (Primary school-Secondary school)	10.8%	
Political orientation	Right	5.6%	
	Center-right	4.7%	
	Center	5.6%	
	Center-left	25.2%	
	Left	28%	
	Apolitical	30.8%	
Employment situation	Students	49.5%	
	Unemployed	4.1%	
	Stay-at-home	0.9%	
	Employees	34.1%	
	Freelancer	5%	
	Retirees	4.1%	
	Other	2.3%	
	Sexual orientation	Exclusively heterosexual	82.4%
Predominantly heterosexual, only incidentally homosexual		10.4%	
Predominantly heterosexual, but more than incidentally homosexual		1.4%	

	Equally heterosexual and homosexual	1.8%	
	Predominantly homosexual, but more than incidentally heterosexual	0.9%	
	Predominantly homosexual, only incidentally heterosexual	2.3%	
	Exclusively homosexual	0.9%	
Religion	Religious people	41.9%	
	Non-religious people	58.1%	
Current relation with religion	Believer/practicing	15.8%	
	Believer/lapsed	38%	
	Non-believer/lapsed	45.2%	
	Non-believer/practicing	0.9%	
Importance of religion in participants' life	Very important	8.1%	
	Important enough	30.8%	
	Unimportant	25.3%	
	Not at all important	28.5%	
	I don't know	7.2%	

Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men

The Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men Scale, revised version (ATLG-R) (Herek, 1998), is a self-report instrument that measures attitudes toward gay and lesbian people. ATLG-R consists of 10 items, five of which measure attitudes toward gays (ATG), while the other five measure attitudes toward lesbians (ATL). All items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (from "totally agree" [1] to "totally disagree" [5]). A low rating on the ATLG-R scale connotes a low prevalence of negative attitudes. An example of item from the scale is: "I think male homosexuals are disgusting". In the present study, ATLG-R was translated into Italian, and the internal consistency coefficient was $\alpha=.78$ for the ATG subscale, $\alpha=.70$ for the ATL subscale, and $\alpha=.83$ for the ATLG-R scale.

Attitudes Toward Same-Sex Parenting

A self-report instrument validated in France by Vecho and Shneider (2012), translated and adapted for the Italian language (Rollè *et al.*, 2018), was used to measure attitudes toward same-sex parenting. The instrument consisted of 15 items. All items were rated on a five-point scale (from "totally agree" [5] to "totally

disagree" [1]). The score of each subscale consisted of child development with homosexual parents (DE, items 1–6), legislative issues (LAP, items 7–10) and parenting skills of homosexual couples (AP, items 11–15). A low rating in the attitudes toward same-sex parenting scale connotes a low prevalence of positive attitudes. An example of item is: "Homosexual parents are not as good as heterosexual". In this study, the internal consistency coefficient was $\alpha=.96$ for the DE subscale, $\alpha=.90$ for the LAP subscale, and $\alpha=.79$ for the AP subscale.

Knowledge about Homosexuality

Participants were asked to respond to eight items, specifically designed for this study, concerning their knowledge about homosexuality and lesbian–gay issues (e.g. "Homosexuality is a normal variant of human sexuality" or "Is there a valid theory on the origin of homosexuality?") Participants could answer "yes," "no," or "I don't know." The score was calculated by awarding one point for correct answers and zero points for wrong and "I don't know" answers according to the scientific literature.

Data Analyses

Analyses were performed using the IBM SPSS Statistics software (version 22). The data were included in a matrix for a screening procedure. Descriptive statistics (e.g. frequencies, means, and standard deviations) were calculated for demographic variables. One-way analysis of variation (ANOVA) examined differences between groups (e.g. current relation with religion and attitudes). In order to measure the effect sizes we calculated the Omega Squared (ω^2) (Kirk, 1996). Pearson's correlation was used to assess the associations between variables (e.g. age and attitudes). Differences between the mean scores of two independent groups (e.g. gender and attitudes) were analyzed using *t* tests. The scales' internal consistency coefficient was assessed through Cronbach's alpha.

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Descriptive statistics for ATLG-R scores and for scores on the attitudes toward same-sex parenting scale are presented in Table 2.

ATLG-R and Attitudes Toward Same-Sex Parenting

Results showed a significant correlation between attitudes toward homosexuality and attitudes toward

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics ATGL-R and Attitudes Toward Same-Sex Parenting Scale

	N	Min	Max	Mean	DS
ATL	207	5.00	18.00	8.13	3.03
ATG	217	5.00	23.00	9.28	3.79
ATGL	204	10.00	41.00	17.19	6.06
DE	165	6.00	30.00	22.56	6.10
LAP	219	4.00	20.00	13.22	4.75
AP	165	12.00	25.00	21.15	3.34

same-sex parenting (see Table 3). A significant correlation ($p < .001$) was found between the subscales of ATGL-R and the subscales of the attitudes toward same-sex parenting scale. There was a negative correlation between ATGL-R and the DE ($r = -.538$; $p < .001$), LAP ($r = -.538$; $p < .001$), and AP ($r = -.621$; $p < .001$) subscales. There was a negative correlation between the ATL and DE ($r = -.501$; $p < .001$), LAP ($r = -.531$; $p < .001$), AP ($r = -.535$; $p < .001$) subscales. There was a negative correlation between the ATG and DE ($r = -.491$; $p < .001$), LAP ($r = -.557$; $p < .001$), AP ($r = -.591$; $p < .001$) subscales.

Socio-Demographic Data and Attitudes Toward Homosexuality and Same-Sex Parenting

The performed analyses referred to the socio-demographic and socio-cultural variables measured in the association between attitudes toward homosexuality and same-sex parenting.

Gender

Results indicated that males had more negative attitudes than females toward lesbians and gay men (t

$= 2.570$; $p < .05$) and toward same-sex parenting legislative issues ($t = -2.018$; $p < .05$).

Age

Results showed a significant correlation between age and attitudes toward homosexuality and same-sex parenting (see Table 4). A significant correlation ($p < .001$) was found between age and the subscales of ATGL-R and the subscales of the attitudes toward the same-sex parenting scale. In the first analysis, age showed a positive correlation with attitudes toward lesbians ($r = .459$; $p < .001$), attitudes toward gay men ($r = .437$; $p < .001$), and attitudes toward homosexuality in general ($r = .463$; $p < .001$). In the second analysis, age presented a negative correlation with the DE ($r = -.291$; $p < .001$), LAP ($r = -.324$; $p < .001$), and AP subscales ($r = -.401$; $p < .001$).

Level of Education and Political Orientation

One-way ANOVAs with Least Significance Difference (LSD) post-hoc tests revealed statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) between the means of groups with different levels of education and political

Table 3: Pearson Correlations for ATGL-R and Attitudes Toward Same-Sex Parenting Scale

	DE	LAP	AP
ATGL	-.538*	-.538*	-.621*
ATG	-.491*	-.557*	-.591*
ATL	-.501*	-.531*	-.535*

*. $p < .001$

Table 4: Pearson Correlations for Age and the Attitudes Toward Homosexuals and Same-Sex Parenting

	ATL	ATG	ATGL	DE	LAP	AP
Age	.459*	.437*	.463*	-.291*	-.324*	-.401*

*. $p < .001$

orientations (see Table 5). Regarding the level of education, differences arose in each subscale except the DE subscale: ATLG-R ($F_{4,199} = 9.443$; $p < .001$), ATL ($F_{4,202} = 7.409$; $p < .001$), ATG ($F_{4,212} = 10.579$; $p < .001$), LAP ($F_{4,214} = 8.322$; $p < .001$), AP ($F_{4,160} = 3.979$; $p < .05$). Concerning political orientation (see Table 6) results rely to a significant difference between each group: ATLG-R ($F_{5,190} = 5.069$; $p < .001$), ATL ($F_{5,193} = 4.434$; $p < .05$), ATG ($F_{5,202} = 4.127$; $p < .05$), DE ($F_{5,153} = 8.216$; $p < .001$), LAP ($F_{5,204} = 11.905$; $p < .001$), and AP ($F_{5,153} = 3.563$; $p < .05$). The values of the Omega Squared varied from a minimum of .060 to a maximum

of .206 indicating medium or large effects.

Religion

The performed analyses investigated religious belief, current relation with religion, involvement in religious activities, and importance of religion in participants' lives. The difference between the means of believer and non-believer attitudes revealed statistically significant differences ($ps < .05$) in all subscales. Believers had more negative attitudes toward homosexuality in general ($t = 3.314$; $p < .05$), toward lesbians ($t = 2.924$; $p < .05$), toward gay men (t

Table 5: ANOVA Analyses: Level of Education and Attitudes Toward Homosexuals and Same-Sex Parenting

		M	DS	F	p	ω^2
	<i>Level of education</i>					
ATGL				9.443	.001	.142
	Other	21.900	7.490			
	High school	18.193	6.495			
	Bachelor degree	14.000	3.078			
	Master graduation	18.192	6.007			
	Post-graduate	16.692	4.571			
ATL				7.409	.001	.110
	Other	10.300	3.715			
	High school	8.595	3.219			
	Bachelor degree	6.714	1.887			
	Master graduation	8.481	2.708			
	Post-graduate	7.923	3.148			
ATG				10.579	.001	.150
	Other	12.625	4.642			
	High school	9.690	3.838			
	Bachelor degree	7.415	2.256			
	Master graduation	9.704	4.112			
	Post-graduate	8.786	2.225			
LAP				8.322	.001	.118
	Other	10.458	4.727			
	High school	12.770	4.776			
	Bachelor degree	15.615	3.454			
	Master graduation	11.483	5.200			
	Post-graduate	13.286	4.428			
AP				3.979	.05	.060
	Other	18.956	3.612			
	High school	21.309	3.450			
	Bachelor degree	22.409	2.364			
	Master graduation	20.917	3.020			
	Post-graduate	22.333	2.425			

Table 6: ANOVA Analyses: Political Orientation and Attitudes Toward Homosexuals and Same-Sex Parenting

		M	DS	F	p	ω^2
	<i>Political orientation</i>					
ATGL				5.096	.001	.095
	Liberal	15.000	3.923			
	Centre-liberal	17.939	6.777			
	Centre	21.545	6.684			
	Centre-conservative	18.111	8.922			
	Conservative	22.454	6.532			
	Apolitical	16.576	5.437			
ATL				4.434	.05	.079
	Liberal	6.897	2.125			
	Centre-liberal	8.551	3.096			
	Centre	9.545	3.560			
	Centre-conservative	9.222	4.265			
	Conservative	10.454	3.142			
	Apolitical	8.164	3.051			
ATG				4.127	.05	.070
	Liberal	8,220	2.847			
	Centre-liberal	9.741	4.296			
	Centre	12.000	3.950			
	Centre-conservative	8.889	5.110			
	Conservative	12.167	3.973			
	Apolitical	8.794	3.375			
DE				8.216	.001	.185
	Liberal	26.149	4.787			
	Centre-liberal	21.737	5.750			
	Centre	18.625	4.897			
	Centre-conservative	17.500	8.018			
	Conservative	17.100	4.581			
	Apolitical	22.375	5.848			
LAP				11.905	.001	.206
	Liberal	15.915	3.789			
	Centre-liberal	11.926	4.111			
	Centre	10.417	4.144			
	Centre-conservative	10.100	5.043			
	Conservative	7.917	3.260			
	Apolitical	13.714	4.719			
AP				3.563	.05	.074
	Liberal	22.458	2.673			
	Centre-liberal	20.553	3.318			
	Centre	19.714	2.690			
	Centre-conservative	20.125	3.399			
	Conservative	18.700	4.191			
	Apolitical	21.271	3.305			

= 3.316; $p < .05$), and toward same-sex parenting in the DE ($t = -3.797$; $p < .001$), LAP ($t = -5.467$; $p < .001$),

and AP ($t = -3.730$; $p < .001$) subscales than non-believers.

Table 7: T-Test: Religion Belief and Attitudes Toward Homosexuals and Same-Sex Parenting

		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p
ATL	Yes	82	8.878	3.221	2.924	.004
	Not	125	7.640	2.809		
ATG	Yes	89	10.337	4.356	3.316	.001
	Not	127	8.543	3.174		
ATGL	Yes	81	18.876	6.592	3.314	.001
	Not	123	16.073	5.418		
DE	Yes	73	20.616	6.068	-3.797	.000
	Not	92	24.108	5.704		
LAP	Yes	91	11.274	4.659	-5.467	.000
	Not	127	14.629	4.327		
AP	Yes	72	20.083	3.253	-3.730	.000
	Not	93	21.967	3.191		

Regarding the current relation of participants with religion (see Table 8) and the attribution of importance of religion in participant's life (see Table 9), One-way ANOVAs with LSD post-hoc tests revealed statistically significant differences ($ps < .001$) between the means of the groups. In the first analysis (current relation of participants with religion), differences emerged among each group: ATLG-R ($F_{3,198} = 16.854$; $p < .001$), ATL ($F_{3,201} = 16.010$; $p < .001$), ATG ($F_{3,211} = 14.777$; $p < .001$), DE ($F_{3,161} = 10.795$; $p < .001$), LAP ($F_{3,214} = 19.031$; $p < .001$) and AP ($F_{3,161} = 10.644$; $p < .001$). In the second analysis (the attribution of importance of religion in participant's life), similarly, significant differences were found: ATLG-R ($F_{4,197} = 8.140$; $p < .001$), ATL ($F_{4,200} = 6.347$; $p < .001$), ATG ($F_{4,210} = 9.040$; $p < .001$), DE ($F_{4,159} = 8.796$; $p < .001$), LAP ($F_{4,212} = 14.477$; $p < .001$), AP ($F_{4,159} = 7.825$; $p < .001$). The values of the Omega Squared varied from a minimum of .094 to a maximum of .199 indicating medium or large effects.

Table 8: ANOVA Analyses: Current Relation with Religion and Attitudes Toward Homosexuals and Same-Sex Parenting

		M	DS	F	p	ω^2
	<i>Current relation with religion</i>					
ATGL				16.854	.000	.190
	Believer/practicing	21.750	7.331			

	Believer/lapsed	18.355	6.026			
	Non-believer/practicing	28.000	0.000			
	Non-believer/lapsed	14.708	4.279			
ATL				16.010	.000	.180
	Believer/practicing	10.179	3.518			
	Believer/lapsed	8.805	3.031			
	Non-believer/practicing	13.500	0.707			
	Non-believer/lapsed	6.878	2.249			
ATG				14.777	.000	.161
	Believer/practicing	12.151	4.797			
	Believer/lapsed	9.719	3.814			
	Non-believer/practicing	14.500	0.707			
	Non-believer/lapsed	7.867	2.579			
DE				10.795	.000	.151
	Believer/practicing	19.621	7.143			
	Believer/lapsed	20.867	5.697			
	Non-believer/practicing	22.000	11.314			
	Non-believer/lapsed	25.485	4.602			
LAP				19.031	.000	.199
	Believer/practicing	9.771	4.420			
	Believer/lapsed	12.096	4.501			
	Non-believer/practicing	12.000	5.657			
	Non-believer/lapsed	15.490	3.930			
AP				10.644	.000	.149
	Believer/practicing	19.143	3.147			
	Believer/lapsed	20.424	3.277			
	Non-believer/practicing	21.000	0.000			
	Non-believer/lapsed	22.652	2.879			

Table 9: ANOVA Analyses: The Attribution of Importance of Religion in Participants' Life and Attitudes Toward Homosexuals and Same-Sex Parenting

		M	DS	F	p	ω^2
	<i>The attribution of importance of religion in participants' life</i>					
ATGL				8.140	.000	.124
	Very important	23.800	8.562			
	Important enough	18.649	6.578			
	Unimportant	16.333	4.421			
	Nothing important	15.350	5.336			
	I don't know	15.812	3.525			
ATL				6.347	.000	.094
	Very important	10.867	4.068			

	Important enough	8.862	3.046			
	Unimportant	7.907	2.672			
	Nothing important	7.177	2.725			
	I don't know	7.375	2.217			
ATG				9.040	.000	.130
	Very important	13.222	5.094			
	Important enough	10.185	4.210			
	Unimportant	8.436	2.699			
	Nothing important	8.197	3.021			
	I don't know	8.437	2.898			
DE				8.796	.000	.160
	Very important	15,857	4.204			
	Important enough	21,096	6.521			
	Unimportant	23,537	5.201			
	Nothing important	24,422	5.311			
	I don't know	26,333	5.033			
LAP				14.477	.000	.199
	Very important	8.000	3.725			
	Important enough	11.382	4.529			
	Unimportant	14.593	4.196			
	Nothing important	15.129	4.202			
	I don't know	14.500	3.882			
AP				7.825	.000	.143
	Very important	17.571	3.368			
	Important enough	20.392	2.926			
	Unimportant	21.902	3.056			
	Nothing important	21.935	3.263			
	I don't know	23.000	3.045			

The results concerning the correlation between different involvement in religious activities and the attitudes against lesbian, gay and same-sex parenting showed a significant correlation ($ps < .05$) in all the analyses performed between the level of involvement in religious activities and the subscales of ATLG-R and the subscales of the attitudes toward the same-sex parenting scale (see Table 10). In the first analysis, the involvement in religious activities showed a positive correlation with attitudes toward lesbians ($r = .176$; $p < .05$), toward gay men ($r = .258$; $p < .001$) and toward homosexuality in general ($r = .236$; $p < .05$). In the second analysis, the involvement in religious activities showed a negative correlation with DE ($r = -.234$; $p < .05$), LAP ($r = -.260$; $p < .001$) and AP subscales ($r = -.269$; $p < .05$).

Table 10: Pearson Correlations for the Involvement in Religious Activities and Attitudes Toward Homosexuals and Same-Sex Parenting

	ATL	ATG	ATGL	DE	LAP	AP
<i>Involvement in religious activities</i>	.176*	.258***	.236***	-.234**	-.260***	-.269***

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

Knowledge about Homosexuality and Attitudes Toward Homosexuality and Same-Sex Parenting

Significant correlations were found ($ps < .001$) between knowledge about homosexuality and the subscales of ATLG-R and the subscales of the attitudes toward same-sex parenting scale (see Table 11). In the first analysis, the level of knowledge showed a negative correlation with attitudes toward lesbians ($r = -.395$; $p < .001$), toward gay men ($r = -.414$; $p < .001$), and toward homosexuality in general ($r = -.434$; $p < .001$). In the second analysis, the level of knowledge presented a positive correlation with the DE ($r = .391$; $p < .001$), LAP ($r = .324$; $p < .001$), and AP subscales ($r = .357$; $p < .001$).

Table 11: Pearson Correlations for Knowledges and Attitudes Toward Homosexuals and Same-Sex Parenting

		ATL	ATG	ATGL	DE	LAP	AP
Knowledges	Pearson Index	-.395*	-.414*	-.434*	.391*	.324*	.357*

*. $p < .001$

Post-Hoc Analyses

Level of Education and ATLG-R, ATL, ATG, LAP, and AP Scores

ATLG-R. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of "bachelor degree" and the means of "high school" ($p < .001$) and "master degree" ($p < .05$); and between the means of "other" and the means of "high school" ($p < .05$), "bachelor degree" ($p < .001$), "master degree" ($p < .05$), and "post-graduate" ($p < .05$).

ATL. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of "bachelor degree" and the means of "high school" ($p < .001$) and "master degree" ($p < .05$); and between the means of "other" and the means of "high school" ($p < .05$), "bachelor degree" ($p < .001$), "master degree" ($p < .05$), and "post-graduate" ($p < .05$).

ATG. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “bachelor degree” and the means of “high school” ($p < .001$) and “master degree” ($p < .05$); and between the means of “other” and the means of “high school” ($p < .001$), “bachelor degree” ($p < .001$), “master degree” ($p < .05$), and “post-graduate” ($p < .05$).

LAP. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences among the means of “bachelor degree”, the means of “high school” ($p < .001$) and “master degree” ($p < .05$); between the means of “other” and the means of “high school” ($p < .05$) and “bachelor degree” ($p < .001$).

AP. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences among the means of “other” and the means of “high school” ($p < .05$), “bachelor degree” ($p < .001$), “master degree” ($p < .05$) and “post-graduate” ($p < .05$).

Political Orientation and ATLG-R, ATL, ATG, DE, LAP, and AP Scores

ATLG-R. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “right” and the means of “center-left” ($p < .05$), “left” ($p < .001$), and “apolitical” ($p < .05$); between the means of “left” and the means of “center” ($p < .05$) and “center-left” ($p < .05$); and between the means of “apolitical” and the means of “center” ($p < .05$).

ATL. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “right” and the means of “apolitical” ($p < .05$); and between the means of “left” and the means of “right” ($p < .001$), “center-right” ($p < .05$), “center” ($p < .05$), “center-left” ($p < .05$), and “apolitical” ($p < .05$).

ATG. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “right” and the means of “center-right” ($p < .05$), “center-left” ($p < .05$), “left” ($p < .05$), and “apolitical” ($p < .05$); between the means of “left” and the means of “center” ($p < .05$) and “center-left” ($p < .05$); and between the means of “apolitical” and the means of “center” ($p < .05$).

DE. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “right” and the means of “center-left” ($p < .05$); between the means of “left” and the means of “right” ($p < .001$), “center-right” ($p < .001$), “center” ($p < .05$), “center-left” ($p < .001$), and “apolitical” ($p < .05$); and between the means of “apolitical” and the means of “right” ($p < .05$) and “center-right” ($p < .05$).

LAP. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “right” and the means of “center-left” ($p < .05$), “left” ($p < .001$) and “apolitical” ($p < .001$); between the means of “left” and the means of “center-right” ($p < .001$), “center” ($p < .001$), and “center-left” ($p < .001$); and between the means of “apolitical” and the means of “center-right” ($p < .05$), “center” ($p < .05$), “center-left” ($p < .05$), and “left” ($p < .05$).

AP. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “left” and the means of “right” ($p < .05$), “center” ($p < .05$), and “center-left” ($p < .05$); and between the means of “apolitical” and the means of “left” ($p < .05$).

Current Relation of Participants with Religion and ATLG-R, ATL, ATG, DE, LAP, and AP Scores

ATLG-R. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “believer/lapsed” and the means of “believer/practicing” ($p < .05$), “non-believer/lapsed” ($p < .001$), and “practicing/non-believer” ($p < .05$); and between the means of “non-believer/lapsed” and the means of “believer/practicing” ($p < .001$) and “practicing/non-believer” ($p < .05$).

ATL. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “believer/lapsed” and the means of “believer/practicing” ($p < .05$), “non-believer/lapsed” ($p < .001$), and “practicing/non-believer” ($p < .05$); and between the means of “non-believer/lapsed” and the means of “believer/practicing” ($p < .001$) and “practicing/non-believer” ($p < .05$).

ATG. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “believer/lapsed” and the means of “believer/practicing” ($p < .05$) and “non-believer/lapsed” ($p < .05$); and between the means of “non-believer/lapsed” and the means of “believer/practicing” ($p < .001$) and “practicing/non-believer” ($p < .05$).

DE. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “non-believer/lapsed” and the mean of “believer/practicing” ($p < .001$) and “believer/lapsed” ($p < .001$).

LAP. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “believer/lapsed” and the means of “believer/practicing” ($p < .05$) and “non-believer/lapsed” ($p < .001$); and between the mean of “non-believer/lapsed” and the mean of “believer/practicing” ($p < .001$).

AP. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “non-believer/lapsed” and the means of “believer/practicing” ($p < .001$) and “believer/lapsed” ($p < .05$).

The Attribution of Importance of Religion in Participant’s life and ATLG-R, ATL, ATG, DE, LAP, and AP Scores

ATLG-R. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “very important” and the means of “important enough” ($p < .05$), “unimportant” ($p < .001$), “not at all important” ($p < .001$), and “I don’t know” ($p < .001$); and between the means of “important enough” and the means of “unimportant” ($p < .05$) and “not at all important” ($p < .05$).

ATL. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “very important” and the means of “important enough” ($p < .05$), “unimportant” ($p < .05$), “not at all important” ($p < .001$), and “I don’t know” ($p < .05$); and between the mean of “important enough” and the mean of “not at all important” ($p < .05$).

ATG. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “very important” and the means of “important enough” ($p < .05$), “unimportant” ($p < .001$), “not at all important” ($p < .001$), and “I don’t know” ($p < .001$); and between the means of “important enough” and the means of “unimportant” ($p < .05$) and “not at all important” ($p < .05$).

DE. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “very important” and the means of “important enough” ($p < .05$), “unimportant” ($p < .001$), “not at all important” ($p < .001$), and “I don’t know” ($p < .001$); and between the mean of “important enough” and the mean of “not at all important” ($p < .05$).

LAP. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “very important” and the means of “important enough” ($p < .05$), “unimportant” ($p < .001$), “not at all important” ($p < .001$), and “I don’t know” ($p < .001$); and between the means of “important enough” and the means of “unimportant” ($p < .001$), “not at all important” ($p < .001$), and “I don’t know” ($p < .05$).

AP. Post-hoc analysis showed significant differences between the means of “very important” and the means of “important enough” ($p < .05$),

“unimportant” ($p < .001$), “not at all important” ($p < .001$), and “I don’t know” ($p < .001$); and between the means of “important enough” and the means of “unimportant” ($p < .05$), “not at all important” ($p < .05$), and “I don’t know” ($p < .05$).

DISCUSSION

In recent decades, many studies have focused on attitudes toward homosexuality and same-sex parenting, but few have studied these constructs in the Italian population (Aversa, Tripodi, Nimbi, Baiocco, & Simonelli, 2016; La Barbera & Cariota, 2009; Petrillo, La Barbera, & Falasconi, 2003; Petruccelli, Baiocco, Ioverno, Pistella, & D’urso, 2015). In line with previous research, the findings of this study confirm, even in the group of Italian participants, that (a) there is a connection between attitudes toward homosexuality and attitudes toward same-sex parenting; (b) socio-demographic and socio-cultural variables associated with positive or negative attitudes toward homosexuality also have an association with attitudes toward same-sex parenting (men, older people, people with a lower level of education, conservative people and those who define themselves as religious have more negative attitudes toward homosexuality and same-sex parenting than women, younger people, people with a higher level of education, liberal people, and those who are not religious); and (c) a low level of knowledge about homosexuality and lesbian–gay issues correlates with negative attitudes toward homosexuality and same-sex parenting. This research has also demonstrated how the connection between the two types of attitudes to lesbian, gay and same-sex parenting could be explained through the allocation of the negative connotation of homosexuals to the homosexual couples and then to same-sex parenting (Massey, 2007; Massey et al., 2013; Morse, McLaren, & McLachlan, 2008).

Regarding the second hypothesis, the findings have highlighted, as previously identified in the literature, how men have more negative attitudes than women. This data could be explained if you consider that men are stricter due to their gender belief and therefore they will be more sensitive to the violation of gender stereotypes (Kite & Deaux, 1987; Lloyd et al., 2017; Mohipp & Morry, 2004; Moreno, Herazo, Oviedo, & Campo-Airas, 2015; Moskowitz, Rieger, & Roloff, 2010; Sherkat, Vries, & Crekk, 2010; Steffens, 2005). Despite previous research having shown a gender difference in attitudes toward homosexuality (Herek & Gonzales-Rivera, 2006; Lingardi, Falanga, & D’Augelli, 2005;

Loftus, 2001; Ratcliff, Lassiter, Markman, & Snyder, 2006), in the present research this result was found not to be significant. Furthermore, Louderback and Whitley (1997) described how the huge erotic component that men experienced toward lesbians could explain the absence of negative attitudes toward female homosexuals. Regarding to same-sex parenting, the only significant subscale was the one measuring attitudes toward legislative issues.

Regarding age, and in line with previous studies (Baiocco, Nardelli, Pezzuti, & Ligiardi, 2013; Brumbaugh, Sanchez, Nock, & Wright, 2008; Herek, 2002; Steffens & Wagner, 2004), this study's findings confirmed that as age increases, so do the negative attitudes toward homosexuality and same-sex parenting. Other research (Baiocco, Nardelli, Pezzuti, & Ligiardi, 2013; Brumbaugh, Sanchez, Nock, & Wright, 2008; Hollekim, Slaatten, & Anderssen, 2012) has explained this result as the influence of sexual stigma in people's lives: the longer they live, the more they are influenced in their thought and consequently the more their negative attitudes increase.

The results concerning education level revealed, in line with previous research, that a higher level of education was associated with more positive attitudes. Several studies have presented data that describe the association of higher levels of education with freer moral values (Jackson, 2006; Lubbers, Jaspers, Ultee, 2009), and such data have been interpreted as being due to those with higher levels of education being more receptive to new ideas (Strand, 1998), having more opportunities to develop cognitive abilities (Ohlander, Batalova, & Treas, 2005), and consequently having more opportunities to share principles (and meanings) of equality (Van de Meerendonk & Scheepers, 2004).

With respect to political orientation, negative attitudes were more associated with conservative people compared to liberal ones (Baiocco, Nardelli, Pezzutti, & Ligiardi, 2013; Jackson, 2006; McVeigh & Diaz, 2009). Adams (2005) explained that conservative people were more oriented to traditional family values and, on account of this, they had more negative attitudes toward homosexuality since they believed it could destroy the tradition of family.

The results concerning religion demonstrated that believers, who were more involved in religious activities, who considered religion very important in their life, and had a strong relation with religion, shared more negative attitudes toward homosexuality and same-sex parenting than those who were not religious.

This is in line with findings of previous research (Finlay & Walther, 2003; Schulte & Battle, 2004; Olson, Cadge, & Harrison, 2006; Cardenas & Barrientos, 2008; Brown & Henriquez, 2008; Adolfsen, Iedema, & Keuzenkamp, 2010; Vincent, Parrott, & Peterson, 2011; Ellison, Acevedo, & Ramos Wada, 2011; Brinson, Denby, Crowther, & Brunton, 2011).

Finally, the results relating to the third hypothesis (that those who had incorrect ideas about homosexuality and same-sex parenting would have more negative attitudes toward these issues) showed how knowledge about homosexuality could influence people's opinions on the subject, as has been demonstrated in other research (Alderson, Orzeck, & McEwen, 2009; Eliason & Huges, 2004; Waterman Reid, Garfield, & Hoy, 2001). This occurs because an argument that is based on poor knowledge will anchor itself to the cultural stereotypes to which it refers and, in this context, the cultural stereotypes concern sexual minorities (Devine, 1989; Gordijn, Koomen, & Stapel, 2001).

In summary and as a conclusion of the present study, we wish to underline the importance of studying which aspects are connected to discriminatory attitudes with respect to LG people and their characteristics as parents. This focus would be useful not only for lesbian and gay people *per se* but also for those who grow up in same-sex family contexts. The attention that professionals and researchers dedicate to information, training, support and prevention contributes extensively to the improvement of life conditions not only of LG people but increases also the wellbeing of entire community.

LIMITATION AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVE

The results of the present study should be considered in the context of its limitations. First, the use of only a self-report method, and second, the limited numbers of participants. Future studies should deepen the impact of the variables studied by considering the causal links between them. It would be interesting to examine the changes in the attitudes against same-sex parenting after the approval of the Same-Sex Union law in Italy in May 2016.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adam BD. The rise of a gay and lesbian movement. Revised edition. Social movements past and present series. New York: Twayne Publishers; 1995.
- [2] Adolfsen A, Iedema J, Keuzenkamp S. Multiple dimensions of attitudes about homosexuality: Development of a multifaceted scale measuring attitudes toward

- homosexuality. *Journal of Homosexuality*. 2010; 57(10): 1237-57.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2010.517069>
- [3] Alderson KG, Orzeck TL, McEwen SC. Alberta High School Counsellors' Knowledge of Homosexuality and Their Attitudes Toward Gay Males. *Canadian Journal of Education*. 2009; 32(1): 87-117
- [4] Allen M, Burrell N. Comparing the impact of homosexual and heterosexual parents on children: Meta-analysis of existing research. *Journal of Homosexuality*. 1997; 32(2): 19-35.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v32n02_02
- [5] Amodeo A, Esposito C, Bochicchio V, Valerio P, Vitelli R, Bacchini D, Scandurra C. Parenting Desire and Minority Stress in Lesbians and Gay Men: A Mediation Framework. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 2018; 15(10), 2318.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15102318>
- [6] Anderssen N, Amlie C, Ytterøy EA. Outcomes for children with lesbian or gay parents. A review of studies from 1978 to 2000. *Scandinavian journal of psychology*. 2002; 43(4): 335-51.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9450.00302>
- [7] Aversa F, Tripodi F, Nimbi FM, Baiocco R, Simonelli C. Atteggiamenti verso il matrimonio e il parenting di persone lesbiche e gay: correlazione con sessismo, omofobia e stigma sessuale interiorizzato. *Rivista di sessuologia clinica*. 2017.
- [8] Bailey JM, Pillard RC. A genetic study of male sexual orientation. *Archives of general psychiatry*. 1991; 48(12): 1089-96.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.1991.01810360053008>
- [9] Bailey JM, Pillard RC, Dawood K, Miller MB, Farrer LA, Trivedi S, *et al.* A family history study of male sexual orientation using three independent samples. *Behavior genetics*. 1999; 29(2): 79-86.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021652204405>
- [10] Bailey JM, Zucker KJ. Childhood sex-typed behavior and sexual orientation: A conceptual analysis and quantitative review. *Developmental Psychology*. 1995; 31(1): 43.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.31.1.43>
- [11] Baiocco R, Nardelli N, Pezzuti L, Lingiardi V. Attitudes of Italian heterosexual older adults towards lesbian and gay parenting. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*. 2013; 10(4): 285-92.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-013-0129-2>
- [12] Baiocco R, Santamaria F, Ioverno S, Fontanesi L, Baumgartner E, Laghi F, *et al.* Lesbian mother families and gay father families in Italy: Family functioning, dyadic satisfaction, and child well-being. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*. 2015; 12(3): 202-12.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-015-0185-x>
- [13] Biblarz TJ, Stacey J. How does the gender of parents matter? *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 2010; 72(1): 3-22.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2009.00678.x>
- [14] Bigner J, Jacobsen RB. Parenting behaviors of homosexual and heterosexual fathers. *Journal of Homosexuality*. 1989; 18(1-2): 173-86.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v18n01_09
- [15] Blanchard R. Birth order and sibling sex ratio in homosexual versus heterosexual males and females. *Annual Review of Sex Research*. 1997; 8(1): 27-67.
- [16] Blanchard R, Bogaert AF. The relation of closed birth intervals to the sex of the preceding child and the sexual orientation of the succeeding child. *Journal of Biosocial Science*. 1997; 29(1): 111-8.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021932097001119>
- [17] Blanchard R, Klassen P. HY antigen and homosexuality in men. *Journal of theoretical biology*. 1997; 185(3): 373-8.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/jtbi.1996.0315>
- [18] Brannock JC, Chapman BE. Negative sexual experiences with men among heterosexual women and lesbians. *Journal of homosexuality*. 1990; 19(1): 105-10.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v19n01_06
- [19] Brinson J, Denby R, Crowther A, Brunton H. College students' views of gays and lesbians: A case for a moral exclusion framework. *Journal of Human Services*. 2011; 31(1): 51-70.
- [20] Brown MJ, Henriquez E. Socio-Demographic Predictors of Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians. *Individual Differences Research*. 2008; 6(3).
- [21] Brumbaugh SM, Sanchez LA, Nock SL, Wright JD. Attitudes toward gay marriage in states undergoing marriage law transformation. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 2008; 70(2): 345-59.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00486.x>
- [22] Byne W, Tobet S, Mattiace LA, Lasco MS, Kemether E, Edgar MA, *et al.* The interstitial nuclei of the human anterior hypothalamus: an investigation of variation with sex, sexual orientation, and HIV status. *Hormones and Behavior*. 2001; 40(2): 86-92.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/hbeh.2001.1680>
- [23] Cameron P, Cameron K. Does incest cause homosexuality? *Psychological Reports*. 1995; 76(2): 611-21.
<https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1995.76.2.611>
- [24] Camilleri P, Ryan M. Social work students' attitudes toward homosexuality and their knowledge and attitudes toward homosexual parenting as an alternative family unit: An Australian study. *Social Work Education*. 2006; 25(3): 288-304.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02615470600565244>
- [25] Cardenas M, Barrientos JE. The attitudes toward lesbians and gay men scale (ATLG): Adaptation and testing the reliability and validity in Chile. *Journal of sex research*. 2008; 45(2): 140-9.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490801987424>
- [26] Casta-eda M. La experiencia homosexual: Para comprender la homosexualidad desde dentro y desde fuera 1999.
- [27] Churchill W. Homosexual behavior among males: A cross-cultural and cross species investigation: Hawthorn Books; 1967.
- [28] Clarke V, editor What about the children? Arguments against lesbian and gay parenting. *Women's Studies International Forum*; 2001: Elsevier.
- [29] Colapinto J. *As nature made him: The boy who was raised as a girl*: HarperCollins Publishers; 2000.
- [30] Devine PG. Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 1989; 56(1): 5.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.1.5>
- [31] Diamond M, Sigmundson HK. Sex reassignment at birth: Long-term review and clinical implications. *Archives of pediatrics & adolescent medicine*. 1997; 151(3): 298-304.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/archpedi.1997.02170400084015>
- [32] D'Amore S, Green R-J, Scali T, Liberati G. Belgian heterosexual attitudes toward homosexual couples and families. *Coming-out for LGBT*. 2014: 18.
- [33] Eliason MJ, Hughes T. Treatment counselor's attitudes about lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered clients: Urban vs. rural settings. *Substance Use & Misuse*. 2004; 39(4): 625-44.
<https://doi.org/10.1081/JA-120030063>
- [34] Ellison CG, Acevedo GA, Ramos-Wada AI. Religion and attitudes toward same-sex marriage among US Latinos. *Social Science Quarterly*. 2011; 92(1): 35-56.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2011.00756.x>
- [35] Farr RH, Forssell SL, Patterson CJ. Gay, lesbian, and heterosexual adoptive parents: Couple and relationship issues. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*. 2010; 6(2): 199-213.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15504281003705436>

- [36] Fedewa AL, Black WW, Ahn S. Children and adolescents with same-gender parents: A meta-analytic approach in assessing outcomes. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*. 2015; 11(1): 1-34.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2013.869486>
- [37] Finlay B, Walther CS. The relation of religious affiliation, service attendance, and other factors to homophobic attitudes among university students. *Review of Religious Research*. 2003: 370-93.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3512216>
- [38] Flaks DK, Ficher I, Masterpasqua F, Joseph G. Lesbians choosing motherhood: A comparative study of lesbian and heterosexual parents and their children. *Developmental psychology*. 1995; 31(1): 105.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.31.1.10>
- [39] Frias-Navarro D, Monterde-i-Bort H. A scale on beliefs about children's adjustment in same-sex families: Reliability and validity. *Journal of Homosexuality*. 2012; 59(9): 1273-88.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2012.720505>
- [40] Gartrell NK, Bos HM, Goldberg NG. Adolescents of the US National Longitudinal Lesbian Family Study: Sexual orientation, sexual behavior, and sexual risk exposure. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 2011; 40(6): 1199-209.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-010-9692-2>
- [41] Gartrell N, Bos H. US National Longitudinal Lesbian Family Study: psychological adjustment of 17-year-old adolescents. *Pediatrics*. 2010; peds. 2009-3153.
- [42] Gartrell N, Rodas C, Deck A, Peyser H, Banks A. The national lesbian family study: 4. Interviews with the 10-year-old children. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*. 2005; 75(4): 518-24.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0002-9432.75.4.518>
- [43] Gato J, Freitas D, Fontaine AM. Attitudes toward same-sex parenting: Exploratory, confirmatory, and invariance analyses of two psychometric scales. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*. 2013; 9(3): 205-29.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2013.781906>
- [44] Gavrillets S, Rice WR. Genetic models of homosexuality: generating testable predictions. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2006; 273(1605): 3031-8.
<https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2006.3684>
- [45] Gerino E, Calderara AM, Curti L, Brustia P, Rollè L. Intimate partner violence in the golden age: systematic review of risk and protective factors. *Frontiers in psychology*. 2018; 9: 1595.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01595>
- [46] Golombok S, Perry B, Burston A, Murray C, Mooney-Somers J, Stevens M, *et al.* Children with lesbian parents: a community study. *Developmental psychology*. 2003; 39(1): 20.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.39.1.20>
- [47] Golombok S, Tasker F. Do parents influence the sexual orientation of their children? Findings from a longitudinal study of lesbian families. *Developmental psychology*. 1996; 32(1): 3.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.32.1.3>
- [48] Gordijn EH, Koomen W, Stapel DA. Level of prejudice in relation to knowledge of cultural stereotypes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 2001; 37(2): 150-7.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.2000.1443>
- [49] Green R. Sexual identity of thirty-seven children raised by homosexual or transvestite parents. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 1978; 135(6).
- [50] Green R. The best interests of the child with a lesbian mother. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law Online*. 1982; 10(1): 7-15.
- [51] Green R, Mandel JB, Hotvedt ME, Gray J, Smith L. Lesbian mothers and their children: A comparison with solo parent heterosexual mothers and their children. *Archives of sexual behavior*. 1986; 15(2): 167-84.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01542224>
- [52] Gross M. L'homoparentalité. 2009.
- [53] Harris MB, Turner PH. Gay and lesbian parents. *Journal of Homosexuality*. 1986; 12(2): 101-13.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v12n02_0
- [54] Herek GM. Beyond" homophobia": A social psychological perspective on attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Journal of homosexuality*. 1984; 10(1-2): 1-21.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v10n01_01
- [55] Herek GM. Attitudes toward lesbians and gay men scale. *Handbook of sexuality-related measures*. 1998: 392-4.
- [56] Herek GM. Gender gaps in public opinion about lesbians and gay men. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 2002; 66(1): 40-66.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/338409>
- [57] Herek GM, Gonzalez-Rivera M. Attitudes toward homosexuality among US residents of Mexican descent. *Journal of sex research*. 2006; 43(2): 122-35.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490609552307>
- [58] Hoeffler B. Children's acquisition of sex-role behavior in lesbian-mother families. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*. 1981; 51(3): 536.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.1981.tb01402.x>
- [59] Hollekim R, Slaatten H, Anderssen N. A nationwide study of Norwegian beliefs about same-sex marriage and lesbian and gay parenthood. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*. 2012; 9(1): 15-30.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-011-0049-y>
- [60] Hudson WW, Ricketts WA. A strategy for the measurement of homophobia. *Journal of homosexuality*. 1980; 5(4): 357-72.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v05n04_02
- [61] Kirk, RE. Practical Significance: A Concept Whose Time Has Come. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 1993; 56(5), 746-759.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164496056005002>
- [62] Kirkpatrick M, Smith C, Roy R. Lesbian mothers and their children: A comparative survey. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*. 1981; 51(3): 545.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.1981.tb01403.x>
- [63] Kite ME, Deaux K. Gender belief systems: Homosexuality and the implicit inversion theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 1987; 11(1): 83-996.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1987.tb00776.x>
- [64] Kite ME, Whitley Jr BE. Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexual persons, behaviors, and civil rights a meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 1996; 22(4): 336-53.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167296224002>
- [65] Kweskin SL, Cook AS. Heterosexual and homosexual mothers' self-described sex-role behavior and ideal sex-role behavior in children. *Sex Roles*. 1982; 8(9): 967-75.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00290021>
- [66] Lannutti PJ, Lachlan KA. Assessing attitude toward same-sex marriage: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Homosexuality*. 2007; 53(4): 113-33.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00918360802103373>
- [67] LeVay S. A difference in hypothalamic structure between heterosexual and homosexual men. *Science*. 1991; 253(5023): 1034-7.
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1887219>
- [68] Lingiardi V. La famiglia "inconcepibile". *Infanzia e adolescenza*. 2013; 12(2): 74-85.
- [69] Lingiardi V, Falanga S, D'augelli AR. The evaluation of homophobia in an Italian sample. *Archives of sexual behavior*. 2005; 34(1): 81-93.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-005-1002->
- [70] Lloyd M, Ramon S, Vakalopoulou A, Videmšek P, Meffan C, Roszczynska-Michta J, *et al.* Women's experiences of

- domestic violence and mental health: Findings from a European empowerment project. *Psychology of violence*. 2017; 7(3): 478.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000111>
- [71] Loftus J. America's liberalization in attitudes toward homosexuality, 1973 to 1998. *American Sociological Review*. 2001; 762-82.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3088957>
- [72] Louderback LA, Whitley Jr BE. Perceived erotic value of homosexuality and sex-role attitudes as mediators of sex differences in heterosexual college students' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Sex Research*. 1997; 34(2): 175-82.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499709551882>
- [73] Lubbers M, Jaspers E, Ultee W. Primary and secondary socialization impacts on support for same-sex marriage after legalization in the Netherlands. *Journal of Family Issues*. 2009; 30(12): 1714-45.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X09334267>
- [74] MacCallum F, Golombok S. Children raised in fatherless families from infancy: a follow-up of children of lesbian and single heterosexual mothers at early adolescence. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry*. 2004; 45(8): 1407-19.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2004.00324.x>
- [75] Massey SG. Sexism, heterosexism, and attributions about undesirable behavior in children of gay, lesbian, and heterosexual parents. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*. 2008; 3(4): 457-83.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J461v03n04_05
- [76] Massey SG, Merriwether AM, Garcia JR. Modern prejudice and same-sex parenting: Shifting judgments in positive and negative parenting situations. *Journal of GLBT family studies*. 2013; 9(2): 129-51.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2013.765257>
- [77] McVeigh R, Maria-Elena DD. Voting to ban same-sex marriage: Interests, values, and communities. *American Sociological Review*. 2009; 74(6): 891-915.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00031224090740060>
- [78] Miller JA, Jacobsen RB, Bigner JJ. The child's home environment for lesbian vs. heterosexual mothers: A neglected area of research. *Journal of Homosexuality*. 1981; 7(1): 49-56.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v07n01_05
- [79] Mohipp C, Morry MM. The Relationship of Symbolic Beliefs and Prior Contact to Heterosexuals' Attitudes Toward Gay Men and Lesbian Women. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*. 2004; 36(1): 36.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0087214>
- [80] Money J, Ehrhardt AA. Man and woman, boy and girl: Differentiation and dimorphism of gender identity from conception to maturity. 1972
- [81] Money J, Hampson JG, Hampson JL. Imprinting and the establishment of gender role. *AMA Archives of Neurology & Psychiatry*. 1957; 77(3): 333-6.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/archneurpsyc.1957.0233033011901>
- [82] Moreno A, Herazo E, Oviedo H, Campo-Arias A. Measuring homonegativity: psychometric analysis of Herek's attitudes toward lesbians and gay men scale (ATLG) in Colombia, South America. *Journal of homosexuality*. 2015; 62(7): 924-35.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014.1003014>
- [83] Morrison MA, Morrison TG. Development and validation of a scale measuring modern prejudice toward gay men and lesbian women. *Journal of homosexuality*. 2003; 43(2): 15-37.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v43n02_02
- [84] Morse CN, McLaren S, McLachlan AJ. The attitudes of Australian heterosexuals toward same-sex parents. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*. 2008; 3(4): 425-55.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J461v03n04_04
- [85] Moskowitz DA, Rieger G, Roloff ME. Heterosexual attitudes toward same-sex marriage. *Journal of Homosexuality*. 2010; 57(2): 325-36.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0091836903489176>
- [86] Mucklow BM, Phelan GK. Lesbian and traditional mothers' responses to adult response to child behavior and self-concept. *Psychological Reports*. 1979; 44(3): 880-2.
<https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1979.44.3.880>
- [87] Ohlander J, Batalova J, Treas J. Explaining educational influences on attitudes toward homosexual relations. *Social Science Research*. 2005; 34(4): 781-99.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2004.12.004>
- [88] Rollè L, Brustia P, Caldarera AM. Homophobia and Transphobia In Michalos A.C., *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life Research*, Springer, Dordrecht, 2905–2910, 2014.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_4205
- [89] Rollè L, Dell'Oca L, Sechi C, Brustia P, Gerino E. Evaluation of Attitudes Toward Same-Sex Parenting in the Italian Context: Adaptation of a French Questionnaire. *Journal of homosexuality*. 2018: 1-23.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2018.1550328>
- [90] Rollè L, Giardina G, Caldarera AM, Gerino E, Brustia P. When intimate partner violence meets same sex couples: A review of same sex intimate partner violence. *Frontiers in psychology*. 2018; 9.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01506>
- [91] Rollè L, Sechi C, Patteri L, Costa G, Bergaglia M, Menzio L, et al. Intimate partner violence: Attitudes in a sample of Italian students. *Cogent Psychology*. 2018; 5(1): 1-12.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2018.1514960>
- [92] Sherkat DE, De Vries KM, Creek S. Race, religion, and opposition to same-sex marriage. *Social Science Quarterly*. 2010; 91(1): 80-98.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2010.00682.x>
- [93] Siegenthaler AL, Bigner JJ. The value of children to lesbian and non-lesbian mothers. *Journal of homosexuality*. 2000; 39(2): 73-91.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v39n02_04
- [94] Speranza AM. Crescere in una famiglia omogenitoriale. *Medico e bambino*. 2015; 34(2): 95.
- [95] Steffens MC. Implicit and explicit attitudes towards lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality*. 2005; 49(2): 39-66.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v49n02_03
- [96] Steffens MC, Wagner C. Attitudes toward lesbians, gay men, bisexual women, and bisexual men in Germany. *Journal of Sex Research*. 2004; 41(2): 137-49.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490409552222>
- [97] Tasker F. Lesbian mothers, gay fathers, and their children: A review. *Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics*. 2005; 26(3): 224-40.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/00004703-200506000-00012>
- [98] Tasker F, Patterson CJ. Research on gay and lesbian parenting: Retrospect and prospect. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*. 2008; 3(2-3): 9-34.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J461v03n02_02
- [99] Tomeo ME, Templer DI, Anderson S, Kotler D. Comparative data of childhood and adolescence molestation in heterosexual and homosexual persons. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 2001; 30(5): 535-41.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010243318426>
- [100] Van de Meerendonk B, Scheepers P. Denial of equal civil rights for lesbians and gay men in the Netherlands, 1980–1993. *Journal of Homosexuality*. 2004; 47(2): 63-80.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v47n02_04
- [101] Van de Ven P, Bornholt L, Bailey M. Measuring cognitive, affective, and behavioral components of homophobic reaction. *Archives of sexual behavior*. 1996; 25(2): 155-79.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02437934>

- [102] Van Gelderen L, Bos HM, Gartrell N, Hermanns J, Perrin EC. Quality of life of adolescents raised from birth by lesbian mothers: The US National Longitudinal Family Study. *Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics*. 2012; 33(1): 17-23.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/DBP.0b013e31823b62af>
- [103] Vanfraussen K, Ponjaert-Kristoffersen I, Brewaeys A. Family functioning in lesbian families created by donor insemination. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*. 2003; 73(1): 78-90.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0002-9432.73.1.78>
- [104] Vecho O, Schneider B. Attitudes des psychologues français à l'égard de l'homoparentalité. *La psychiatrie de l'enfant*. 2012; 55(1): 269-92.
<https://doi.org/10.3917/psyse.551.0269>
- [105] Vincent W, Parrott DJ, Peterson JL. 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*. 2011; 12(4): 383.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023807>
- [106] Waterman AD, Reid JD, Garfield LD, Hoy SJ. From curiosity to care: Heterosexual student interest in sexual diversity courses. *Teaching of Psychology*. 2001; 28(1): 21-6.
https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328023TOP2801_05
- [107] Wellings K, Field J, Johnson AM, Wadsworth J, Bradshaw S. *Sexual behaviour in Britain: the national survey of sexual attitudes and lifestyles*: Penguin Books; 1994.
- [108] Yang AS. Trends: Attitudes toward homosexuality. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*. 1997; 61(3): 477-507.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/297810>
- [109] Zietsch BP, Morley KI, Shekar SN, Verweij KJ, Keller MC, Macgregor S, *et al.* Genetic factors predisposing to homosexuality may increase mating success in heterosexuals. *Evolution and Human Behavior*. 2008; 29(6): 424-33.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2008.07.002>

Received on 15-12-2018

Accepted on 24-12-2018

Published on 31-12-2018

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12974/2313-1047.2018.05.2>

© 2018 Rollè *et al.*; Licensee Savvy Science Publisher.

This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>) which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.