

RELIGIOSITY, FAMILY GENDER ROLES SOCIALIZATION, AND COLLEGE STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER (LGBT)

Izdihari Nisa'ul Hasna, Diah Krisnatuti, Musthofa^{*)}

Department of Family and Consumer Science, Faculty of Human Ecology,
IPB University, Dramaga, Bogor 16680

^{*)}*E-mail: thofaipb@gmail.com*

Abstract

Society's attitudes towards LGBT can be understood through college students' viewpoints as the university's environment can act as a microcosm of a larger community. Their voices can act as a representation of the youth generation and fellow citizens' tolerance. This study aims to analyze the influences of religiosity and family gender roles socialization on students' attitudes toward LGBT. Primary data used in this study were collected through an online questionnaire filled by 60 respondents, divided into male and female, who were selected by multistage random sampling technique involving all IPB's undergraduate programs. This study found a significant difference between male and female students' rejection of lesbians, with female students having higher rejection than male students. Students' religiosity and family gender roles socialization are in the medium category. Sex positively correlated to attitudes toward lesbians, while the mother's Occupation positively correlated to family gender roles, socialization, and religiosity was found to positively correlate with attitudes toward lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transgender. Sex, explicitly being female, positively influences attitudes toward lesbians. In contrast, religiosity positively influences attitudes toward lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender, which means female students have a higher rejection of lesbians. The greater religiosity will result in increased rejection of LGBT.

Keywords: attitudes towards LGBT, college students, gender roles socialization, religiosity

RELIGIUSITAS, SOSIALISASI PERAN GENDER DALAM KELUARGA DAN SIKAP MAHASISWA ATAS LESBIAN, GAY, BISEKSUAL, DAN TRANSGENDER (LGBT)

Abstrak

Sikap masyarakat atas LGBT dapat dipahami dengan melihat sudut pandang yang dimiliki oleh mahasiswa sebagaimana lingkungan universitas dapat berperan sebagai mikrokosmos dari komunitas yang lebih besar dan suara mereka dapat mencerminkan toleransi generasi muda serta warga negara lainnya. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis pengaruh religiusitas dan sosialisasi peran gender di dalam keluarga terhadap sikap mahasiswa atas LGBT. Penelitian ini menggunakan data primer yang dikumpulkan melalui pengisian kuesioner secara online oleh 60 responden, dibedakan antara laki-laki dan perempuan, yang dipilih menggunakan teknik multistage random sampling dengan melibatkan seluruh program sarjana IPB. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan perbedaan signifikan sikap penolakan atas lesbian antara mahasiswa laki-laki dan perempuan, dengan mahasiswa perempuan memiliki sikap penolakan yang lebih tinggi. Religiusitas dan sosialisasi peran gender di dalam keluarga terkategori sedang. Jenis kelamin perempuan berhubungan positif dengan sikap atas lesbian, sementara pekerjaan ibu berhubungan positif dengan sosialisasi peran gender di dalam keluarga, serta religiusitas berhubungan positif dengan sikap atas lesbian, gay, biseksual, dan transgender. Jenis kelamin perempuan berpengaruh positif terhadap sikap atas lesbian, serta religiusitas berpengaruh positif signifikan terhadap sikap atas lesbian, gay, biseksual, dan transgender, artinya mahasiswa perempuan memiliki sikap penolakan atas lesbian yang lebih tinggi dan semakin tinggi religiusitas, akan meningkatkan sikap penolakan mahasiswa terhadap LGBT.

Kata kunci: mahasiswa, religiusitas, sikap terhadap LGBT, sosialisasi peran gender

INTRODUCTION

The number of LGBT in Indonesia is estimated to increase at this time along with the development of LGBT organizations in Indonesia. The organization aims to support survivors of minority sexual orientations scattered in big cities such as Jakarta, Lampung, Surabaya, and Bandung, including: Yayasan Pelangi Kasih Nusantara (YPKN), Arus Pelangi, LPA Karya Bakti, Gaya Lentera Muda Lampung (Gay-Lam), Gay Sumatera (Gaytra), Gaya Warna Lentera (GWL-INA), Gaya Nusantara Surabaya, and Gaya Priangan Bandung. Similar organizations are also developing in other areas such as Abiara Bogor, Yayasan Gessang Solo, Viesta Jogjakarta, and Gaya Dewata Bali.

Many organizations of LGBT survivors in Indonesia today can at least describe the development of the LGBT community in Indonesia, both those that have shown their existence openly and those that still cover it up. This aligns with Yanuarti's (2019) that the number of LGBT groups in Indonesia is increasing, although the number is unknown. Refers to groups with different orientations and gender orientations from the gender that is common today. For example, Rosentreich (2013) stated that LGBT is commonly used as an acronym that includes all people whose sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender is different from the heterosexual gender. Alternatively, male and female and gender norms, regardless of people's identity labels.

Religious denominations have been widely cited as an essential factor in constructing attitudes toward LGBT rejection (Ellison & Musick, 1993; Schulte & Battle, 2004; Schwartz & Lindley, 2005; Worthington, Dillon, & Becker-Schutte, 2005; Olson, Cadge, & Harrison, 2006; Rowatt *et al.*, 2006; Jaspers, Lubbers, & De Graaf, 2007; Brown & Henriquez, 2008; Hooghe, Claes, Harell, Quintelier, & Dejaeghere, 2010; Stewart, Heck, & Cochran, 2015; Duhaylungsod *et al.*, 2018; Zhang, 2019; Zmyj & Huber-Bach, 2020). However, the influence of these religious denominations is not absolute, and No religion has always been proven to have negative attitudes toward minority sexual orientation groups (Brown & Henriquez, 2008; Jäckle & Wenzelburger, 2015). The explanation for the limitations of religion in building a homonegative attitude is caused by variations in the intensity of religious interaction in each individual (Brown & Henriquez, 2008; Hooghe, Claes, Harell, Quintelier, & Dejaeghere, 2010). This level of dedication to religion, beliefs, and religious activities is known as religiosity (Gibbs & Goldbach, 2015). Religiosity describes the level of religious belief and the strength of each faith (Huber & Huber, 2012). A person can be affiliated with a particular religion but live lifelessly or even not guided by the teachings of his religion. A person who does not or does not behave according to the teachings of his religion can show support and acceptance of the orientation group, even though religion has explained LGBT behaviour.

Attitude is a tendency or tendency to respond positively or negatively to a particular idea, object, person, or situation (Bentea, 2015). In addition, attitude is a feeling or emotion towards a fact or situation, with the perception and view that someone plays a role in constructing the attitude to be formed (Duhaylungsod *et al.*, 2018). This review can be understood concerning attitudes towards LGBT that attitudes towards LGBT are a person's tendency or tendency to respond to sexually-oriented minority groups both negatively and positively. Meanwhile, many studies have explained the strong influence of religiosity on attitudes of rejection of LGBT, and this cannot be used as a single factor to determine a person's attitude towards LGBT. According to Herek (1984) in Zhang (2019), certain attitudes toward homosexuality can be influenced by various variables. Among these variables, gender, family, and religious ideology influence value expressive attitudes. This finding emphasizes the importance of looking at the influence of one's religious affiliation and examining two other factors that influence attitudes towards LGBT, namely gender and family.

Gender is known as one factor determining the variety of attitudes towards homosexuality. According to Zhang (2019), Schnabel (2018), Manalastas *et al.* (2017), and Worthen (2012), apart from factors such as personal background and personal experience, gender is the strongest indicator of changing attitudes towards male homosexuality. Women generally have lower levels of homonegativity and have higher homosexual acceptance than men (LaMar & Kite, 1998; Herek, 2002; Lim, 2002; Steffens & Wagner, 2004; Liang & Alimo, 2005; Schwartz & Lindley, 2005; Worthington, Dillon, & Becker-Schutte, 2005; Brown & Henriquez, 2008; Hooghe, Claes, Harell, Quintelier, & Dejaeghere, 2010; Meaney & Rye, 2010). According to Zmyj and Huber-Bach (2020), a possible explanation for the difference in attitudes between women and men towards individuals with minority sexual orientations is gender role orientation (Brown & Henriquez, 2008). A person's gender role orientation is primarily shaped by the socialization of gender roles in the family. Gender socialization refers to the transmission of norms, behaviours, values, and skills essential to being a 'successful' woman or man (Lawson, Ceouter, & McHale, 2015). Parents carry out gender socialization in several ways, such as setting an example, strengthening or punishing children's behaviour, determining the child's environment and forming opportunities in that environment, and developing children's skills (Bornstein, 2012).

Gender socialization is a process that allows individuals to learn culturally appropriate behaviour regarding femininity and masculinity associated with the biological sex of women or men. The social learning process in the family explains the development of attitudes towards gender roles in children (Marks, Lam, & McHale, 2009). Meanwhile, in addition to the factors previously described, it turns out that a person's age also influences attitudes towards LGBT. Younger people are generally more tolerant of minority sexual orientation groups (Andersen & Fetner, 2008; Slootmaeckers & Lievens, 2014). The report *The Global Divide on Homosexuality* by the Pew Research Center on Global Attitudes and Trends (2013) stated that age is one of the most important factors influencing people's attitudes towards homosexuality, and in most countries, young people (aged 18-29) are more accepting than younger generations. With the older generation (aged 30-49 years and over 50 years). The current young generation will be the leaders and movers of the nation in the future, so how they respond to a social phenomenon will determine the direction of the country's development. To understand the shift in attitudes towards LGBT among young Indonesians, it is essential to know the viewpoints held by students, as the university environment can be understood as a microcosm of the larger community (Gumprecht, 2003; Worthen, 2012), and their voices can be heard. To a certain degree reflects the tolerance of the younger generation and other citizens (Zhang, 2019).

Many related studies showed that student characteristics influenced attitudes towards LGBT, including those related to gender (LaMar & Kite, 1998; Herek, 2002; Lim, 2002; Steffens & Wagner, 2004; Liang & Alimo, 2005; Schwartz & Lindley, 2005; Worthington, Worthington, Dillon, & Becker-Schutte, 2005; Brown & Henriquez, 2008; Hooghe, Claes, Harell, Quintelier, & Dejaeghere, 2010; Meaney & Rye, 2010; Worthen, 2012; Manalastas *et al.*, 2017; Schnabel, 2018; Zhang, 2019), and length of study at university, with being two years in university is an appropriate measure to measure attitudes towards homosexuals (Liang & Alimo, 2005). However, previous research still rarely examines family characteristics concerning the socialization of gender roles in the family, such as the characteristics of fathers and mothers, parents' education and occupation, parents' income, and family size. At the same time, family characteristics are essential to study (Bolzendahl & Myers, 2004; Marks *et al.*, 2009; Lawson *et al.*, 2015). Therefore, this study generally aims to analyze the effect of religiosity and socialization of gender roles in the family on student attitudes towards LGBT, while the specific objectives are (1) to identify student and family characteristics, religiosity, socialization of gender roles in the family, and attitudes towards against LGBT in students; (2) to analyze the differences in religiosity, socialization of gender roles in the family, and attitudes towards LGBT in male and female students; (3) to analyze the relationship between student and family characteristics, religiosity, and socialization of gender roles in the family with students' attitudes towards LGBT; (4) to analyze the influence of student and family characteristics, religiosity, and socialization of gender roles in the family on attitudes about LGBT among students.

METHODS

This study used a cross-sectional research design conducted in the IPB Dramaga campus area, Bogor Regency, West Java and the IPB Business School, Bogor City, West. The determination of the research location was carried out considering that there were no studies that assessed IPB's attitude towards LGBT, and research related to this topic could be investigated by the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences.

The population in this study were IPB University students who came from all undergraduate, joined Islamic study programs and completed the lecture period in the sixth semester of the 2019/2020 academic year. Sampling was carried out using a multistage random sampling technique involving nine architectures and one school in the undergraduate program of IPB. Of all faculties, one study program was chosen randomly, except for the Faculty of Animal Husbandry (FKH) and the College of Business (SB) because each had only one study program. Then from each selected study program, three male students and three female students will be selected randomly so that a total sample of 60 students was obtained. Selected students were then asked to fill out an online questionnaire. The type of data used is primary data collected through surveys.

There are five variables in this study, namely student characteristics (X1), the identity attached to students, including gender and age; socioeconomic characteristics of the family (X2), the social and economic identity attached to a family, including the age of husband and wife, husband and wife's last education level, husband and wife's Occupation, family income, and number of family members; religiosity (Y1), the level of one's devotion to religion, belief, and religious activities that describe the level of religious belief and the strength of one's faith (Saputra, Anggiriawan, & Sutupa, 2018); socialization of gender roles (Y2), transmission of norms, behaviors, values, and skills that are important to become successful women or men according to the standards that apply in the social environment carried out in the family by parents to their children through several ways, such as imitating, strengthen or punish children's behavior, determine the child's environment

and form opportunities in that environment, and develop children's skills (Nurhayani, 2021); and attitudes towards LGBT (Y3), the response given by students to LGBT (Prakoso, Arifianto, & Suseno, 2020).

The measurement of religiosity applied a modified questionnaire from the Measurement of Islamic Religiosity (Tiliouine & Belgoumidi, 2009). The results of the modified questionnaire have 45 question items and use a Likert scale of 1-5 with details 1 = not at all, 2 = rarely, three = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = always. The value of Cronbach's Alpha questionnaire that measures religiosity is 0,784. The measurement of gender role socialization variables in the family uses a modified questionnaire from Gender Equality and Quality of Life (Krzaklewska, 2014). The results of the modified questionnaire have 23 question items. Likert scale 1-5 is used in the questionnaire, i.e., 0 = other; 1= father only; 2= dominant father; 3= mother only; 4= dominant mother; 5 = father and mother are equal. The value of Cronbach's Alpha questionnaire, which measures the socialization of gender roles in the family, is 0,817. Categorization of index scores on the measurement of religiosity and socialization of gender roles was carried out using Bloom's Cut-Off Point, which was adapted from Abdullah *et al.* (2016), namely (1) low: <60, (2) moderate: 60-79, (3) high: 80.

The measurement of student attitudes towards LGBT uses four different measuring instruments, each representing a spectrum in LGBT. However, the four questionnaires use Bloom's Cut-Off Point, which was adapted from Abdullah *et al.* (2016), namely (1) low: <60, (2) moderate: 60-79, (3) high: 80 for index score categorization. Attitudes towards lesbians and gays were measured using a questionnaire from the Modern Homophobia Scale (MHS) derived questionnaire (Raja & Stoke, 1998), namely MHS-L, to measure attitudes toward lesbians and MHS-G to attitudes towards gays. The modified results of the two questionnaires each have 12 question items. A Likert scale of 1-5 was used in the questionnaire, namely 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree. The value of Cronbach's Alpha questionnaire that measures attitudes towards lesbians is 0,833, while the value of Chronbach's Alpha questionnaires on attitudes towards gays is 0,821. Attitudes toward bisexuality were measured using a questionnaire asking about the Attitudes About Bisexuality Scale – Female/Male Form (ARBS-FM) (Mohr & Rochlen, 1999) involving ten questions. A Likert scale of 1-5 was used in the questionnaire, namely 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree. The value of Cronbach's Alpha questionnaire, which measures attitudes towards bisexuality, is 0,817. Attitudes toward transgender were measured using a questionnaire based on the Genderism and Transphobia Scale (Hill & Willoughby, 2005). The modified results have 12 question items. A Likert scale of 1-7 was used in the questionnaire, namely 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neutral, 5 = somewhat agree, 6 = agree, 7 = strongly agree. The value of Cronbach's Alpha questionnaire that measures attitudes toward transgender is 0,713.

The data that has been collected is then processed in stages, starting with the process of data entry, cleaning, editing, coding, assessment, and data analysis. Data processing and analysis were carried out using the Microsoft Excel application and the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) 25,0. The data analysis carried out included (1) descriptive analysis to get an overview of the minimum and maximum values, standard deviations, and percentages of each variable, (2) inferential analysis in the form of a different independent sample t-test to see the difference in scores between male and female students. Women in each of the variables tested (religiosity, socialization of gender roles in the family, and attitudes towards LGBT), (3) correlation test to see the relationship between student characteristics, family socioeconomic, religiosity, socialization of gender roles in the family, and attitudes towards LGBT students, and (4) multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to test hypotheses and determine the effect between variables, namely student characteristics, family socioeconomic characteristics, religiosity, and socialization of gender roles in the family on student attitudes towards LGBT.

RESULTS

Student Characteristics

The number of students in this study was equally divided for each gender, with the proportion of students for each study program balanced (5% for each study program per gender). Three-fifths (60%) of male students who are respondents are 21 years old, while more than two-fifths (43,3%) of female students are 20 years old.

Family Socio-Economic Characteristics

The age of parents was grouped into early adulthood (18-40 years), middle adulthood (41-60 years), and late adulthood (>60 years). The largest proportion of mother's age (85%) and father's age (83,3%) is in middle adult characteristics. Most mothers are high school graduates (26,7%), while the father's most recent education level is undergraduate (30%). The father's occupation distribution was dominated by other categories not mentioned in the research questionnaire (26,7%), followed by civil servants (23,3%), while most of the mothers did not work (34%). The largest percentage of total family income per month is the

characteristic of IDR1,000,000,00 up to IDR2,500,000,00 (26,7%). The largest proportion of large families is found in medium family characteristics (51,7%).

Religiosity

The average religiosity index of male students is 70, while the average religiosity index of female students is 75,1. The different tests found no significant difference ($p > 0,05$) between male and female students for each dimension and overall religiosity. Furthermore, two-thirds (66,7%) of male students and three-fifths (60%) of female students were moderate religiosity. Based on the distribution of answers, almost half (46,7%) of male students and more than half of female students (56,7%) felt that they often asked God for forgiveness for wrong words or lies.

Socialization of Gender Roles in the Family

Gender socialization refers to the transmission of norms, behaviours, values, and skills essential to being a 'successful' woman or man (Lawson, Crouter, & McHale, 2015). Parents carry out gender socialization either through modelling, strengthening or punishing children's behaviour, determining the child's environment and forming opportunities in that environment, and developing children's skills. The results showed that the average gender role socialization index for male students was 64,4, while the average for female students was 67,4. The results of the different tests showed a significant difference ($p < 0,05$) in the social dimension, which was higher for female students. This shows that the application of gender role socialization in the social dimension of female student families is higher than that of male student families. In addition, half (50%) of male students and more than three-fifths (63,3%) of female students are socializing gender roles in moderate families. Based on the answers, half of the female students (53,4%) felt that their fathers and mothers had an equal role in participating in community activities such as community service and mutual assistance, compared to male students (23,3%).

Student's Attitude toward LGBT

Table 1 explains that the average rejection index of lesbianism for male students is 61,8, while the average index for female students is 73,8. The results of the different tests showed a very significant difference ($p < 0,01$) in attitudes towards lesbians as a whole and the dimensions of personal discomfort with lesbians, which were higher for female students. This shows that the attitude of rejection of lesbians owned by female students is higher than that of male students. The average index of gay rejection of male and female students showed the same results, which was 75,3 for each gender. The results of the different tests showed no significant difference ($p > 0,05$) in attitudes toward gayness as a whole and for each dimension. The average index of rejection of bisexuality among male students is 71,5, while the average index of female students is 72,4. The results of the different tests showed no significant difference ($p > 0,05$) in attitudes toward bisexuality as a whole and for each dimension. The average index of rejection of transgender for male students is 65,5, while the average index for female students is 62,8. The results of the different tests showed no significant difference ($p > 0,05$) in attitudes toward transgender as a whole and for each dimension.

Table 1 Distribution of students based on statistical data and the results of the different test results of the attitude dimension index on LGBT and gender

Indicators	Male			Female			Different Test (p)
	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max	Average	
Attitude towards Lesbians							
Personal discomfort with lesbians	15	82,5	62,3	15	90	75,3	0,001**
Support for institutionalized discrimination against lesbians	0	100	59,6	0	100	66,7	0,549
Attitude towards Lesbians	20,8	85,4	61,8	12,5	91,7	73,8	0,006**
Gay attitude							
Personal discomfort with gay	32,5	100	74,6	17,5	92,5	74,5	0,355
Support for institutionalized discrimination against gays	37,5	100	79,2	25	100	79,6	0,928
Gay attitude	33,3	100	75,3	18,8	93,8	75,3	0,748
Attitude to Bisexual							
Tolerance	12,5	100	75,5	4,2	100	79,4	0,225

Table 1 Distribution of students based on statistical data and the results of the different test results of the attitude dimension index on LGBT and gender (continue)

Indicators	Male			Female			Different Test (p)
	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max	Average	
Stability	37,6	100	65,4	6,3	100	61,9	0,866
Attitude to Bisexual	22,5	100	71,5	5	97,5	72,4	0,553
Attitude towards Transgender							
Transphobia	22,2	100	78	0	100	75	0,732
Genderism	44,4	88,9	65,6	30,6	83,3	66,9	0,084
Gender bashing	16,7	88,9	52,8	11,1	100	42,4	0,501
Attitude towards Transgender	31,9	88,9	65,5	18,1	87,5	62,8	0,375

Notes: *Significant at $p < 0,05$; **Significant at $p < 0,01$

Table 2 shows that more than two-fifths of male students and three-fifths of female students have an attitude of rejection of lesbians in the moderate category. Based on the distribution of the answers, most of the female students strongly agree with the statement that seeing two women kissing will make them feel uncomfortable when compared to male students. Half of the male students and more than half of the female students have a moderate attitude toward gay rejection. The distribution of the answers shows that two-thirds of male and female students who strongly agree with the statement that male homosexuality is a psychological disease are the same. Almost half of the male students and half of the female students have a moderate attitude toward bisexuality.

Table 2 Distribution of students by category of attitudes towards LGBT and gender

Spectrum	Male (n= 30)		Female (n= 30)		Total (n= 60)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Attitude towards						
Lesbians						
Low	12	40	2	6,7	14	23,3
Moderate	14	46,7	18	60	32	53,4
High	4	13,3	10	33,3	14	23,3
Gay attitude						
Low	5	16,7	3	10	8	13,3
Moderate	15	50	16	53,3	31	51,7
High	10	33,3	11	36,7	21	35
Attitude to Bisexual						
Low	6	20	3	10	9	15
Moderate	13	43,3	15	50	28	46,7
High	11	36,7	12	40	23	38,8
Attitude towards						
Transgender						
Low	8	26,7	9	30	17	28,3
Moderate	18	60	20	66,7	38	63,4
High	4	13,3	1	3,3	5	8,3

Description: n= number; %=percentage

Based on the distribution of the answers, one-sixth of male and female students felt neutral about the statement that bisexuality was a contradiction. Three-fifths of male students and two-thirds of female students have an attitude of rejection of transgender in the moderate category. The distribution of answers shows that one in ten male students and similarly female students somewhat agree with the statement that men who dress in women's clothes for their sexual gratification are considered disgusting.

Relationship between Student Characteristics, Family Socio-Economic, Religiosity, and Socialization of Gender Roles in Families with Students' Attitudes towards LGBT

Table 3 of the Pearson correlation test results show that gender has a very significant positive relationship with attitudes towards lesbians. This means that the attitude of rejection of lesbians by female students is higher than that of male students. A significant positive relationship was also found between the mother's employment status and gender role socialization. This means that mothers who do not work have lower socialization of gender roles in the family than mothers who work. Religiosity has a significant positive relationship with attitudes toward lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender. The higher the student's religiosity,

the higher the attitude toward rejection of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people.

Table 3. Correlation coefficient values between student characteristics and family socioeconomic characteristics with religiosity, socialization of gender roles in the family, attitudes towards lesbians, attitudes towards gays, attitudes toward bisexuality, and attitudes toward transgender

Variable	Religion	Gender Role Socialization	Attitudes to Lesbian	Attitudes to Gay	Attitudes to Bisexual	Attitudes to Transgender
Student Characteristics						
Gender (1=male; 2=female)	0,239	0,116	0,353**	0,000	0,027	-0,106
Student Age	-0,181	0,003	0,105	0,057	0,025	0,117
Family Socio-Economic Characteristics						
Mother's Age	0,050	0,011	-0,059	-0,025	-0,030	-0,007
Mother's Occupation (0= not working, 1= working)	-0,036	0,311*	0,124	-0,106	-0,080	-0,060
Father's Age	-0,210	-0,172	-0,038	0,034	0,002	0,022
Father's Type of Work (0= not working, 1= working)	0,028	0,060	0,052	0,046	0,200	-0,023
Total Family Income (Rp/month)	0,046	-0,122	-0,005	-0,157	0,016	-0,145
Religiosity	1	-0,085	0,450**	0,315*	0,311*	0,425**
Gender Role Socialization	0,085	1	0,086	0,001	-0,115	-0,056
Attitude towards Lesbians	0,450**	0,086	1	0,708**	0,631**	0,681**
Gay attitude	0,315*	0,001	0,708**	1	0,838**	0,789**
Attitude to Bisexual	0,311*	-0,115	0,631**	0,838**	1	0,675**
Attitude towards Transgender	0,425*	-0,056	0,681**	0,789**	0,675**	1

Notes: *Significant at $p < 0,05$; **Significant at $p < 0,01$

The Influence of Student Characteristics, Family Socio-Economic, Religiosity, and Socialization of Gender Roles in the Family on Student Attitudes towards LGBT

Table 4 shows the influence analysis results with a coefficient of determination (*Adjusted R²*) of 0,191 for attitudes towards lesbians, meaning that 19,1 percent of the variables in the research model affect attitudes toward lesbians in students with the remaining 80,9 percent being influenced by variables. Other outside the variables studied. The value of the coefficient of determination (*Adjusted R²*) for gay attitudes is 0,063, which means that only 6,3 percent of the variables in the research model can affect students' attitudes toward gay rejection. At the same time, the remaining 93,7 percent can be influenced by other variables outside of the variable researched. Attitudes toward bisexuality have a coefficient of determination (*Adjusted R²*) of 0,055, which means that 5,5 percent of the variables in the research model can affect attitudes toward bisexuality in students, with the remaining 94,5 percent being influenced by other variables outside the variables studied. Attitudes toward transgender have a coefficient of determination (*Adjusted R²*) of 0,223, which means that 22,3 percent of the variables in the research model can affect attitudes toward transgender students, with the remaining 77,7 percent can be influenced by other variables outside the variables studied. The results of the regression test showed that religiosity had a significant positive effect on attitudes toward rejection of lesbian ($B=0,724$; $p=0,001$), gay ($B=0,511$; $p=0,011$), bisexual ($B=0,559$; $p=0,016$), and transgender ($B=0,581$; $p=0,000$). This means that the higher the religiosity, the higher the attitude of rejection towards lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people.

Table 4 Regression test coefficients for student characteristics, family socioeconomic characteristics, religiosity, socialization of gender roles in the family towards student attitudes towards LGBT

Variable	Attitudes to Lesbian			Attitudes to Gay			Attitudes to Bisexual			Attitudes to Transgender		
	UC	SC	Sig.	UC	SC	Sig.	UC	SC	Sig.	UC	SC	Sig.
	B	B		B	β		B	β		B	β	
Constant	-100,749		0,229	15,398		0,842	-28,327		0,752	-20,750		0,727
Gender	-9,423	-0,277	0,040	2,335	0,079	0,576	-0,177	-0,005	0,971	5,941	0,240	0,068
Mothers Education Level	-0,065	-0,006	0,977	2,061	0,233	0,327	2,169	0,213	0,372	0,739	0,099	0,645
Fathers Education Level	0,451	0,045	0,832	-0,862	-0,098	0,664	1,395	0,138	0,544	-1,385	-0,187	0,364
Big Family	3,382	0,119	0,362	0,402	0,016	0,907	2,565	0,091	0,520	2,250	0,109	0,396
Religiosity (index)	0,724	0,449	0,001**	0,511	0,366	0,011*	0,559	0,348	0,016*	0,581	0,495	0,000**
Gender Role Socialization (indeks)	0,159	0,123	0,411	0,117	0,104	0,516	-0,132	-0,102	0,528	0,122	0,129	0,379
R ²		0,369			0,270			0,263			0,394	

Table 4 Regression test coefficients for student characteristics, family socioeconomic characteristics, religiosity, socialization of gender roles in the family towards student attitudes towards LGBT (continue)

Variable	Attitudes to Lesbian			Attitudes to Gay			Attitudes to Bisexual			Attitudes to Transgender		
	UC	SC	Sig.	UC	SC	Sig.	UC	SC	Sig.	UC	SC	Sig.
	B	B		B	β		B	β		B	β	
Adjusted R ²		0,191			0,063			0,055			0,223	
F		2,069			1,305			1,265			2,305	
Sig.		0,035 ^b			0,245 ^b			0,268 ^b			0,019 ^b	

Note: UC= Unstandardized Coefficients, SC= Standardized Coefficients, *Significant at p<0,05; **Significant at p<0,01

DISCUSSION

Individuals who do not identify themselves as heterosexual and those who feel that their gender identity is different from their gender at birth are called minority sexual orientation groups (Blashill & Calzo, 2019), which later became known as LGBT, namely Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (Rosentreich, 2013). The number of LGBT groups in Indonesia is increasing, although the exact number is unknown (Yanuarti, 2019). The development of LGBT will impact the conduct of family life, change gender norms and social practices for the entire community, and affect the laws governing all family structures in unpredictable ways (Hunter, 2012). In addition, the development of LGBT in Indonesia itself will impact the practice of marriage and change the structure of the family. The roles and functions carried out in it. These changes can create conflicts in various dimensions of family life. Finally, the impact of LGBT behaviour will affect changes in family and community structures and the society and the state formed from them (Winurini, 2016). One of the essential aspects to be studied in understanding the phenomenon of LGBT development in Indonesia is to look at the form of the response given by the community in response to the presence of these minority sexual orientation groups, and this will determine the sustainability of people's lives and the way policies will be made.

One of the dimensions that can be studied is an attitude to find out the response of acceptance or rejection given by the community to a social issue. Attitude is a tendency to respond positively or negatively to a particular idea, object, person, or situation (Bentea, 2015) and understand the shift in attitudes about LGBT in Indonesia. It is essential to know the point of view held by students in the university environment. High-ranking people are a microcosm of the larger community (Gumprecht, 2003; Worthen, 2012), and their voices can reflect the tolerance of the younger generation and other citizens (Zhang, 2019). Students' attitudes towards LGBT groups are known to be the result of the influence of several factors. In general, these factors can be grouped as individual characteristics and socioeconomic characteristics of families (Kingston *et al.*, 2003). The individual characteristics of students that are known to act as the strongest indicator in forming attitudes towards minority sexual orientation groups are gender (LaMar & Kite, 1998; Herek, 2002; Lim, 2002; Steffens & Wagner, 2004; Liang & Alimo, 2005; Schwartz & Lindley, 2005; Worthington *et al.*, 2005; Brown & Henriquez, 2008; Hooghe *et al.*, 2010; Meaney & Rye, 2010; Worthen, 2012; Manalastas *et al.*, 2017; Schnabel, 2018; Zhang, 2019). Another individual characteristic that influences student attitudes towards LGBT is age (Andersen & Fetner, 2008; Slootmaeckers & Lievens, 2014). Socioeconomic characteristics of families that affect student attitudes towards LGBT are the age of parents (Andersen & Fetner, 2008; Slootmaeckers & Lievens, 2014), the parental education level (Marsiglio, 1993; PEW Research Center on Global Attitude & Trends, 2012; Zhang, 2019), parental occupation (Roberson & Suzuki, 2003), family income (Barrett & Pollack, 2005; Pew Research Center on Global Attitudes & Trends, 2009; Zhang, 2019), and family size (Marks *et al.*, 2009).

According to Olson and DeSouza (2017), in addition to the demographic variable in gender, other demographic factors are known to influence significantly attitudes towards minority sexual orientation groups, namely religiosity. Religiosity is known to be one of the most influential factors in a person's attitude towards LGBT (Ellison & Musick, 1993; Schulte & Battle, 2004; Schwartz & Lindley, 2005; Worthington *et al.*, 2005; Rowatt *et al.*, 2006; Jaspers *et al.*, 2007; Brown & Henriquez, 2008; Hooghe *et al.*, 2010; Stewart *et al.*, 2015; Duhaylungsod *et al.*, 2018; Zhang, 2019; Zmyj & Huber-Bach, 2020), while other factors were considered to be involved. Contributing and inseparable to forming one's attitude towards LGBT is the socialization of gender roles in the family (Brown & Henriquez, 2008; Bornstein, 2012; Zmyj & Huber-Bach, 2020).

The final result of the study showed that, in general, the attitude of rejection of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students was in the moderate category. The average attitude index for gay, bisexual, and transgender male and female students is relatively similar. Meanwhile, the average attitude index for lesbian male and female students has a significant difference, with the difference being in the dimensions of personal discomfort with lesbians. These results are in line with the findings in previous studies that there are differences in attitudes between women and men towards groups with minority sexual orientations, including homosexuals (LaMar & Kite, 1998; Herek, 2002; Lim, 2002; Steffens & Wagner, 2004; Liang & Alimo, 2005; Schwartz & Lindley, 2005; Worthington *et al.*, 2005; Herek, 2007; Brown & Henriquez, 2008; Hooghe *et al.*, 2010; Meaney & Rye, 2010; Worthen, 2012; Schnabel, 2018; Zhang, 2019). However, the findings of these studies state that women tend to be more accepting and positive towards minority sexual orientation groups than men, while the results in this study found that women have higher attitudes toward lesbian rejection than men. A possible explanation of these results can be seen in the statement of Mijas *et al.* (2016) that although women tend to be more positive towards same-sex relationships, the less supportive attitude towards lesbians in both men and women can be broadly caused by their religious involvement, political views, and education. The influence of religious involvement in this study can be seen from the regression test results for student religiosity, which shows that female students have a higher percentage in the high category than that found in male students in the same category. These results follow what was stated by Jensen (2019) that women tend to be more religious than men and have implications for what was stated by Bryant (2007) that there are differences between male and female students in terms of spiritual development throughout the lecture period. This affects the differences in spiritual and religious construction so that women tend to be more spiritual and religious than men.

The results of the relationship analysis showed that gender had a very significant positive relationship with attitudes towards lesbians. This finding is in line with that stated by previous studies that gender is one of the most vital indicators that determine a person's attitude towards homosexual groups (LaMar & Kite, 1998; Herek, 2002; Lim, 2002; Liang & Alimo, 2005; Schwartz & Lindley, 2005; Worthington *et al.*, 2005; Herek, 2007; Brown & Henriquez, 2008; Hooghe *et al.*, 2010; Meaney & Rye, 2010; Worthen, 2012; Schnabel, 2018; Zhang, 2019). This difference in attitude is caused by differences in the gender orientation of men and women, with men having a more traditional gender role orientation than women (Brown & Henriquez, 2008; Zmyj & Huber-Bach, 2020). The correlation test results also found that the mother's employment status was significantly positively related to the socialization of gender roles in the family. As stated by Lawson *et al.* (2015), parents' work will have an impact on the attitudes of parents' gender roles, which will affect the socialization practices they carry out with their children. Religiosity was found to have a significant positive relationship with attitudes towards lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people. These findings are in line with those Zmyj and Huber-Bach (2020) stated that religiosity is known as one of the variables associated with homonegativity. In addition, religiosity and religious denomination are known as potential predictors of homonegativity, and there is an equally positive relationship between religiosity and homonegativity.

Student religiosity belongs to the moderate category. The results of the regression test obtained in this study show that religiosity has a significant positive effect on attitudes towards lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender. These findings are consistent with those stated by previous studies that religiosity affects a person's attitude towards minority sexual orientation groups (Ellison & Musick, 1993; Schulte & Battle, 2004; Schwartz & Lindley, 2005; Worthington *et al.*, 2005; Rowatt *et al.*, 2006; Jaspers *et al.*, 2007; Brown & Henriquez, 2008; Hooghe *et al.*, 2010; Stewart *et al.*, 2015; Duhaylungsod *et al.*, 2018; Zhang, 2019; Zmyj & Huber-Bach, 2020). Religiosity is one of the variables related to homonegativity, as religiosity and religious denomination are known as potential predictors of homonegativity. There is an exact positive correlation between religiosity and homonegativity (Zmyj & Huber-Bach, 2020). Religious ideology can influence certain attitudes toward homosexuality, and previous research has identified religiosity as a factor in forming negative associations with affirmation, knowledge, and internal support for LGB rights (Zhang, 2019).

This study still has several limitations, including data collection that was not carried out through direct meetings with respondents and without going through more in-depth interviews with each respondent to find out other factors in terms of individual characteristics and family background that might enrich the explanation of the results obtained—obtained in this study. The ongoing pandemic conditions require that research data be collected through online questionnaires. This research was also only conducted on undergraduate students at IPB, with the age range of respondents not much different from one another.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The results showed that the average age of male students was 20,6 years, while the average age of female students was 20,5 years. The highest proportion of family socioeconomic characteristics is the middle adult age group for both fathers and mothers. Most mothers have a high school education level and do not work, while the highest proportion of fathers' education levels is undergraduate and employed. Overall, most student religiosity and socialization of gender roles in the family are in the moderate category. In general, the attitude of rejection of LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender) students is in the moderate category. There were no significant differences in religiosity, socialization of gender roles in the family, or attitudes toward rejection of gay, bisexual, and transgender students between male and female students. For lesbian attitudes, female students had higher rejection attitudes than male students.

The relationship analysis conducted shows that the higher the religiosity, the higher the student's attitude toward rejection of LGBT. Gender has a significant positive relationship with attitudes towards lesbians, which indicates that female students are associated with high attitudes toward lesbian rejection. The results of the regression test showed that individual characteristics in the form of gender and age of students as well as socioeconomic characteristics of the family in the form of parents' age, parents' education level, parent's type of work, family income, and family size, along with socialization of gender roles in the family did not affect student attitudes towards LGBT. Religiosity was found to significantly affect attitudes towards lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people.

For male and female students, it is important always to involve the role of religion and return every problem of life to religious teachings in facing every phenomenon and challenge in life. Parents need to continue maintaining communication and emphasize religious values to their children who have entered college and provide supervision as far as possible. The university can facilitate religious programs as a forum for students to develop their own spiritual experiences in a positive way, such as including religious subjects in the educational curriculum, holding additional programs or student activity units based on religion, and holding seminars or religious studies with international organizations. and intra-campus. Communities need to maintain religious harmony in daily life, develop a social environment that always upholds religious values, and synergize with each other in realizing the implementation of positive religious activities. As the executor of the state, the government needs to consistently implement the role of the First Precepts of Pancasila in every policy and strategic step that is made, as well as maintain the sustainability of people's lives in harmony with religious values.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank all the respondents and the Family and Consumer Sciences, Faculty of Human Ecology, IPB University.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, A., Hassan, A. Kadarman, N., Saleh, A., Baraya, Y. S., & Lua, P. L. (2016). Food Safety Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice toward Compliance with Abattoir Laws among the Abattoir Worker in Malaysia. *International Journal of General Medicine*, 9, 79-87. <https://doi.org/10,2147/IJGM.S98436>
- Andersen, R., & Fetner, T. (2008). Cohort Differences in Tolerance of Homosexuality: Attitudinal Change in Canada and the United States, 1981-2000. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 311-330. <https://doi.org/10,1093/poq/nfn017>
- Barrett, D. C., & Pollack, L. M. (2005). Whose Gay Community? Social Class, Sexual Self-Expression, and Gay Community Involvement. *Sociological Quarterly*, 46(3), 437-456. <https://doi.org/10,1111/j,1533-8525,2005,00021.x>
- Bente, C.-C. (2015). Relationships between Personality Characteristics and Attitude Towards Work in School Teachers. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 180, 1562-1568. <https://doi.org/10,1016/j.sbspro,2015,02,307>
- Blashill, A. J., & Calzo, J. P. (2019). Sexual Minority Children: Mood Disorders and Suicidality Disparities. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 246, 96-98. <https://doi.org/10,1016/j.jad,2018,12,040>

- Bolzendahl, C. I., & Myers, D. J. (2004). Feminist Attitudes and Support for Gender Equality: Opinion Change in Women and Men. *Social Forces*, 759–789. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2005.0005>
- Bornstein, S. (2012). The Law of Gender Stereotyping and the Work-Family Conflicts of Men. *Hastings Law Journal*, 63(5), 1297–1345.
- Brown, M. J., & Henriquez, E. (2008). Socio-Demographic Predictors of Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians. *Individual Differences Research*, 6(3), 193–202.
- Bryant, A. N. (2007). Gender Differences in Spiritual Development during the College Years. *Sex Roles*, 56(11–12), 835–846. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9240-2>
- Duhaylungsod, S. T., Grace Y Madrid, C., Leamor M Lapiz, M., Pongasi, C. S., & Tan, L. M. P. (2018). Attitudes Toward the LGBT: A Research Paper Presented to the Faculty of the Senior High School Department Iligan City National High School. *Arts and Social Sciences Journal*, 09(03), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.4172/2151-6200.1000356>
- Ellison, C. G., & Musick, M. A. (1993). Southern Intolerance: A Fundamentalist Effect?. *Social Forces*, 72(2), 379–398. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/72.2.379>
- Gibbs, J. J., & Goldbach, J. (2015). Religious Conflict, Sexual Identity, and Suicidal Behaviors among LGBT Young Adults. *Archives of Suicide Research*, 19(4), 472–488. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13811118.2015.1004476>
- Gumprecht, B. (2003). The American College Town. In *Geographical Review*, 93(1), 51–80. American Geographical Society. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1931-0846.2003.tb00020.x>
- Herek, G. M. (1984). Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 10(1–2), 39–51. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v10n01_03
- Herek, G. M. (2002). Gender Gaps in Public Opinion about Lesbians and Gay Men. In *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 66(1), 40–66. Oxford University Press (OUP). <https://doi.org/10.1086/338409>
- Herek, G. M. (2007). Confronting Sexual Stigma and Prejudice: Theory and Practice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63(4), 905–925. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2007.00544.x>
- Hill, D. B., & Willoughby, B. L. B. (2005). The Development and Validation of the Genderism and Transphobia Scale. *Sex Roles*, 53(7–8), 531–544. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-7140-x>
- Hooghe, M., Claes, E., Harell, A., Quintelier, E., & Dejaeghere, Y. (2010). Anti-Gay Sentiment among Adolescents in Belgium and Canada: A Comparative Investigation into the Role of Gender and Religion. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 57(3), 384–400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918360903543071>
- Huber, S., & Huber, O. W. (2012). The Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS). *Religions*, 3(3), 710–724. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel3030710>
- Hunter, N. D. (2012). The Future Impact of Same-Sex Marriage: More Questions than Answers. *Georgetown Law Journal*, 100, 1855–1879.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014.969071>
- Jaspers, E., Lubbers, M., & De Graaf, N. D. (2007). “Horrors of Holland”: Explaining attitude change towards euthanasia and homosexuals in the Netherlands, 1970–1998. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 19(4), 451–473. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/edm029>
- Jensen, M. A. (2019). Why Are Women More Religious than Men?. *Inquiries Journal*, 11(10).
- Kingston, P. W., Hubbard, R., Lapp, B., Schroeder, P., & Wilson, J. (2003). Why education matters. *Sociology of Education*, 76(1), 53–70. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3090261>
- Krzaklewska, E. (2014). Measurement of Gender Equality—Analysing Dimensions, Embracing Areas, Considering Contexts.
- LaMar, L., & Kite, M. (1998). Sex Differences in Attitudes Toward Gay Men and Lesbians: A Multidimensional Perspective. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 35(2), 189–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499809551932>
- Lawson, K. M. ., Crouter, A. C. ., & McHale, S. M. (2015). Links between Family Gender Socialization Experiences in Childhood and Gendered Occupational Attainment in Young Adulthood. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 90, 26–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.07.003>
- Liang, C. T. H., & Alimo, C. (2005). The Impact of White Heterosexual Students’ Interactions on Attitudes Toward Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual People: A Longitudinal Study. In *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(3), 237–250. Johns Hopkins University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2005.0028>

- Lim, V. K. G. (2002). Gender Differences and Attitudes Towards Homosexuality. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43(1), 85–97. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v43n01_05
- Manalastas, E. J., Ojanen, T. T., Torre, B. A. ., Ratanashevorn, R., Hong, B. C. C., Kumaresan, V., & Veeramuthu, V. (2017). Homonegativity in Southeast Asia: Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men in Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam. *Asia-Pacific Social Science Review*, 17(1), 25–33.
- Marks, J. L., Lam, C. B., & McHale, S. M. (2009). Family Patterns of Gender Role Attitudes. *Sex Roles*, 61(3–4), 221–234. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9619-3>
- Marsiglio, W. (1993). Attitudes Toward Homosexual Activity and Gays as Friends: A National Survey of Heterosexual 15- to 19-Year-Old Males. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 30(1), 12–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499309551673>
- Meaney, G. J., & Rye, B. J. (2010). Gendered Egos: Attitude Functions and Gender as Predictors of Homonegativity. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 57(10), 1274–1302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2010.517074>
- Mijas, M., Koziara, K., Dora, M., Szpitalak, M., D'Amore, S., & Green, R.-J. (2016). Are Men more Homophobic than Women? Insights from Polish Research on Attitudes Toward Marriage Equality and LGBT Parenting.
- Mohr, J. J., & Rochlen, A. B. (1999). Measuring Attitudes Regarding Bisexuality in Lesbian, Gay Male, and Heterosexual Populations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 46(3), 353–369. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.46.3.353>.
- Nurhayani, N. (2021). Ethnic identity in paternal behaviour. *Journal of Gender and Social Inclusion in Muslim Societies*, 2(1), 17-28.
- Olson, L. R., Cadge, W., & Harrison, J. T. (2006). Religion and Public Opinion about Same-Sex Marriage. *Social Science Quarterly*, 87(2), 340–360. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2006.00384.x>
- Olson, M., & DeSouza, E. (2017). The Influence of Sociocultural Factors on College Students' Attitudes toward Sexual Minorities. *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, 44(4), 73–94.
- Pew Research Center on Global Attitude and Trends. (2012, February). The American-Western European Values Gap: American Exceptionalism Subsides. Pew Research Center of Global Attitude and Trends.
- Pew Research Center on Global Attitudes and Trends. (2009, February). The Global Middle Class: Chapter 2. Religion and Social Issues. Pew Research Center on Global Attitudes and Trends.
- Pew Research Center on Global Attitudes and Trends. (2013, June). The Global Divide on Homosexuality. Pew Research Center on Global Attitudes and Trends.
- Pew Research Center on Global Attitudes and Trends. (2020, June). Views of Homosexuality Around the World: The Global Divide on Homosexuality Persists. Pew Research Center on Global Attitudes and Trends.
- Pew Research Center on Religion and Public Life. (2015, November). U.S. Public Becoming Less Religious. Pew Research Center on Religion and Public Life.
- Prakoso, C. B., Arifianto, Y. A., & Suseno, A. (2020). LGBT in a Bible Perspective as the Foundation for Forming a Paradigm of Christian Ethics towards the Association of Believers. *Journal of Theology (JUTEOLOG)*, 1(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.52489/juteolog.v1i1.8>
- Raja, S., & Stokes, J. P. (1998). Assessing Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men: The Modern Homophobia Scale. *International Journal of Sexuality and Gender Studies*, 3(2), 113–134. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023244427281>
- Roberson, J. E. ., & Suzuki, N. (2003). Men and Masculinities in Contemporary Japan: Dislocating the Salaryman (J. A. A. Stockwin (ed.); 1st ed.). Routledge.
- Rosentreich, G. (2013). LGBTI People Mental Health and Suicide. Revised 2nd Edition.
- Rowatt, W. C., Tsang, J. A., Kelly, J., LaMartina, B., McCullers, M., & McKinley, A. (2006). Associations between Religious Personality Dimensions and Implicit Homosexual Prejudice. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 45(3), 397–406. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5906.2006.00314.x>
- Saputra, K. A. K., Anggiriawan, P. B., & Sutapa, I. N. (2018). Akuntabilitas pengelolaan keuangan desa dalam perspektif budaya tri hita karana. *Jurnal Riset Akuntansi Dan Bisnis Airlangga*, 3(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.31093/jraba.v3i1.90>
- Schnabel, L. (2018). Sexual Orientation and Social Attitudes. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World*, 4, 18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023118769550>

- Schulte, L. J., & Battle, J. (2004). The Relative Importance of Ethnicity and Religion in Predicting Attitudes Towards Gays and Lesbians. *In Journal of Homosexuality*, 47(2), 127–142. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v47n02_08
- Schwartz, J. P., & Lindley, L. D. (2005). Religious Fundamentalism and Attachment: Prediction of Homophobia. *International Journal of Phytoremediation*, 21(1), 145–157. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327582ijpr1502_3
- Slootmaeckers, K., & Lievens, J. (2014). Cultural Capital and Attitudes Toward Homosexuals: Exploring the Relation Between Lifestyles and Homonegativity. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 61(7), 962–979. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014.870848>
- Steffens, M. C., & Wagner, C. (2004). Attitudes Toward Lesbians, Gay Men, Bisexual Women, and Bisexual Men in Germany. *In Journal of Sex Research*, 41(2), 137–149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490409552222>
- Stewart, B. T., Heck, N. C., & Cochran, B. N. (2015). A Comparison of Sexual Minority Youth Who Attend Religiously Affiliated Schools and Their Nonreligious-School-Attending Counterparts. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 12(2), 170–188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2014.969864>
- Tiliouine, H., & Belgoumidi, A. (2009). An Exploratory Study of Religiosity, Meaning in Life and Subjective Wellbeing in Muslim Students from Algeria. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 4(1), 109–127. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-009-9076-8>
- Winurini, S. (2016). Interpreting LGBT Behavior in Indonesia (Review of Abnormal Psychology). *Brief Info on Research Center of the Indonesian House of Representatives Expertise Board*, 8(5), 9–12.
- Worthen, M. G. F. (2012). Understanding College Student Attitudes Toward LGBT Individuals. *Sociological Focus*, 45(4), 286–305. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00380237.2012.712857>
- Worthington, R. L., Dillon, F. R., & Becker-Schutte, A. M. (2005). Development, Reliability, and Validity of the Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Knowledge and Attitudes Scale for Heterosexuals (LGB-KASH). *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(1), 104–118. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.1.104>
- Yanuarti, E. (2019). Islamic Parenting Patterns for Parents in Preventing the Emergence of LGBT Behavior From an Early Age. *Scholar: Journal of Education and Society*, 17(1), 57–80. <https://doi.org/10.21154/cendekia.v17i1.1337>
- Zhang, T. (2019). Male homosexuality in Japan from the perspective of the younger generation: a case study of students at a National University. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2019.1684415>
- Zmyj, N., & Huber-Bach, L. (2020). German adolescents' homonegativity and the relationship to their religious denomination and gender role orientation. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 17(3), 241–259. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2019.1641174>