Prejudice in Turkey and Belgium: The cross-cultural comparison of correlations of right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation with sexism, homophobia, and racism

Şeyda Dilşat Çetiner¹ | Jasper Van Assche^{2,3}

¹ Department of Psychology, Nuh Naci Yazgan University, Kayseri, Turkey

² Department of Developmental, Personality and Social Psychology, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

³ Center for Social and Cultural Psychology, Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium

Correspondence

Jasper Van Assche, Department of Developmental, Personality and Social Psychology Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Ghent University Henri Dunantlaan 2, B-9000 Ghent, Belgium.
Email: Jasper.VanAssche@UGent.be

Abstract

Using data from Turkey and Belgium, this study investigated the relationships of right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation with ambivalent sexism, homophobia, and subtle racism. First, we predicted that men are more prejudiced than women. This hypothesis was confirmed in the Turkish but not in the Belgian sample. Second, Muslims were higher in authoritarianism and homophobia than people belonging to other (or no) religious groups. Third, Muslims also showed more hostile sexism toward both men and women. Fourth, negative associations of education with authoritarianism, sexism, and homophobia were expected and found. Fifth, in both countries, authoritarianism was positively related to homophobia and sexism, and social dominance orientation was positively associated with racism. Finally, groups comparing both samples, we found that Turks' authoritarianism and prejudice was higher than Belgians'. Implications for theory and practice are discussed.

KEYWORDS

right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, ambivalent sexism, homophobia, racism

INTRODUCTION

Researchers have offered several definitions of prejudice that seemed to converge around a common ground. Allport (1954), who created the first comprehensive theory of prejudice in psychology, defined prejudice as “antipathy based on a faulty or inflexible generalization” (Paker, 2012, p.42). Simpson and Yinger (1965) defined prejudice as “stereotyped and emotional attitudes directed at individuals who are members of an outgroup” (Jones, 2002). According to Jackson (1992), prejudice is a “differential evaluation solely based on group membership”. Yet another group of scholars maintained that prejudice involves “negative evaluations towards members of a particular group rather than positive evaluations” (Dovidio et al., 2005; as cited in Oyman, 2010).

According to Quillian (2006), there is a consensus that prejudice consists of two main components: (1) a stereotypical judgment that can be defined as an unfounded idea or belief against a group of people, and (2) a strong affect observed with stereotyping (Paker, 2012). Indeed, most definitions seem to agree on the fact that negative evaluations of outgroup members are the core of prejudice. There are many different theories about the origin of prejudice. Some theories explain prejudice by individual differences such as personality factors or ideological worldviews, and others by environmental factors (Oyman, 2010). In the present study, we focus on two strong individual difference predictors of prejudice, that is, right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation. In two divergent cultural contexts (Turkey and Belgium), we examine their role in the prediction of three types of prejudice: sexism, homophobia, and racism.

Right-wing authoritarianism

For the first time, Adorno et al. (1950) explained prejudice by personality factors and proposed the authoritarian personality theory. They argued that the authoritarian personality structure is very effective on prejudice (Paker, 2012). Individuals with an authoritarian personality tend to obey authority figures and tend to be biased (Oyman, 2010). Throughout time, the conception of authoritarianism as a fixed personality trait was adapted toward an understanding of authoritarianism as a stable yet malleable social-ideological attitude (Van Assche, 2019). The concept of right-wing authoritarianism was developed by Altemeyer in 1981. Altemeyer (2004) based the right-wing authoritarianism theory on social learnings and suggested that the construct has three main components. According to Altemeyer, right-wing authoritarianism includes the components of “authoritarian aggression,” “traditionalism,” and “authoritarian submission” (see also Karayegen, 2015). Individuals with a high level of authoritarian aggression have a tendency to show offensive behaviors toward individuals whom they consider to be deviant in society, or to minority groups that they think are different from them (Güldü, 2011). Individuals high in traditionalism accept the rules and traditions approved by the authority to which they obey without question (Karayegen, 2015). Finally, “authoritarian submission” is the tendency of individuals to obey the existing legitimate authority without question (Karayegen, 2015).

Authoritarian individuals think that they must obey authorities as well as social norms approved by the authority. They have a high tendency to act aggressively toward individuals and groups that are opposed to authority or individuals and groups that the authority does not approve of (Karayegen, 2015). Moreover, authoritarian individuals believe that the authority

always does and knows the right thing so that whatever the authority does, it must be obeyed and respected. Individuals with high levels of right-wing authoritarianism tend to adopt conservative ideologies and they consider themselves more honest and moral than other people (Altemeyer, 2004). Importantly, right-wing authoritarianism has also been associated with variables such as support for economic and social inequalities, resistance toward social change, and several facets of prejudice such as racism, homophobia, and opposition to women's rights (Altemeyer, 2004; Jost et al., 2003; Laythe et al., 2001; Van Assche et al., 2019). Individuals high in right-wing authoritarianism tend to support economic and political conservative ideas and tend to exert pressure on external groups (Altemeyer, 2004; Stones, 2006; see also Karayeğen, 2015). Right-wing authoritarianism, according to Wang (1999), is good predictor of attitudes toward women. Centers (1963) has suggested that as the level of right-wing authoritarianism in people increases, the levels of approval of equality between men and women decrease, that is, they develop anti-feminist attitudes (see also Erkurt, 2015; Van Assche et al., 2017).

Social dominance orientation

Individuals with a high social dominance tendency support intergroup hierarchy and want internal groups to dominate external groups; they tend to reject policies based on equality (Kessler & Mummendey, 2008). Individuals with low levels of social dominance orientation tend to see equality as unjust and oppose equality among social groups (Kessler & Mummendey, 2008; see also Oyman, 2010). Oyman (2010) also suggested that people high in social dominance orientation tend to have a prejudiced attitudes toward groups with a lower status than their own. Individuals with a higher level of social dominance orientation believe that the group they belong to is superior and dominant, and adopt the tendency to discriminate low-status outgroups (Erkurt, 2015; Van Assche et al., 2019). The presence of threatening situations increases the level of social dominance that people have, leading to greater observation of outgroup discrimination in humans (Pratto & Shih, 2000; see also Erkurt, 2015). Individuals who encounter events and situations involving threats may show some discriminatory reactions to outgroup members because they may think that they will harm their socio-economic position (Erkurt, 2015).

While all the aforementioned concepts are related to the theories about what can cause bias or prejudice, the concepts to be mentioned hereinafter will be the concepts and expressions that are subject to bias, where bias is reflected and the effects of such bias can be observed.

Ambivalent sexism toward men and women

The concept of sexism includes "all kinds of discriminatory attitudes and behaviors based on gender and is generally used to express negative attitudes towards women" (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2003; as cited in Okuta & Büyüksahin-Sunal, 2011). According to Glick and Fiske (1996, 1997), sexism is a concept that includes anger toward women and a conservative worldview of traditional gender roles lies at the basis of anger directed at women (Erkurt, 2015). It causes women to be exposed to discriminatory attitudes and behaviors that occur in almost every aspect of our social life, including economic, political, and cultural domains (Erkurt, 2015). Although sexism is thought to reflect only *negative* attitudes toward *women*, Glick and Fiske (1997) have developed the theory of ambivalent sexism, emphasizing that sexism can include *positive* attitudes and

stereotypes toward *both* men and women. According to this theory, there are two aspects sexism: Benevolent sexism and hostile sexism (Okutan & Büyüksahin-Sunal, 2011). The concept of hostile sexism contains that women are perceived to be weaker and lower in status than men, which includes more negative attitudes toward women (Erkurt, 2015). On the other hand, benevolent sexism includes attitudes and beliefs that women who are seen as weak and powerless should be glorified and loved (Erkurt, 2015).

Although benevolent sexism appears to have a more positive tone toward women compared to hostile sexism, it also harms women's individuality. From this perspective, both hostile and benevolent sexism advocate that the male sex is a strong and the female is a weak and powerless breed (Glick & Fiske, 1996, 1997; Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2002, 2003). Repressive patriarchy, which is accepted as a reflection of the patriarchal social structure based on male domination, does not consider a woman as an adult who can take care of herself. This belief tends to portray men as competent individuals who govern women in women's lives. While protectionist patriarchy follows a benevolent and protective attitude toward women; oppressive patriarchy tries to establish dominance over women. According to conservative patriarchy, women are indispensable in men's lives as a spouse, lover or mother, and they need protection because they are weak (Glick & Fiske, 1996; 1997; Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2002; 2003; as cited in Erkurt, 2015).

Importantly, hostile and benevolent forms of sexism can also be directed toward men. In this study, we incorporate all four forms of sexist attitudes. In general, we hypothesize that social dominance orientation and particularly authoritarianism are positively related to sexism. One study (Van Assche et al., 2019) already confirmed these relationships in two Western (Belgian and Dutch) and one non-Western (Turkish) sample. Our aim is to replicate their findings regarding the links of authoritarianism and social dominance orientation with several facets of sexism in a Western (Belgium) and non-Western (Turkey) context. Moreover, we aim to extend these patterns to other forms of prejudice, too, such as homophobia and racism.

Attitudes toward gays and lesbians (homophobia)

Another minority group subject to discrimination and prejudice are homosexual individuals (Oyman, 2010). Gay individuals face many psychological and social problems, such as stigmatization and exclusion, inability to explain their sexual orientation, and physical and verbal assault (Okutan & Büyüksahin-Sunal, 2011). Homophobia, including prejudice against homosexuality and homosexuals, can be seen in almost every segment of society. Homophobia, which leads to discriminatory behaviors and attitudes toward homosexuals, can have many negative consequences both in social and individual terms (Oyman, 2010). The term homophobia was first used by George Weinberg in 1972 in his book "*Society and the Healthy Homosexual*." Weinberg (1972) defined homophobia as the fear of being close to homosexuals. He also emphasized that the term homophobia is accepted as the prejudice of one group toward another group (Oyman, 2010). Madureira (2007) defined homophobia as hate and fear of homosexuality. Herek (2000a) preferred to use the term sexual prejudice instead of homophobia and further (Herek, 2000b) defined sexual prejudice as having negative attitudes toward individuals due to their sexual orientation. Sexual prejudice, like other types of prejudice, has three basic characteristics. First, it involves attitudes. Second, it is directed directly at a social group and its members. Finally, it includes negativity and hostility (Oyman, 2010). Studies have shown that negative attitudes toward homosexual individuals are based on stereotypes and traditional gender role beliefs (Herek, 2000a; Kite & Deaux, 1987; Whitley, 1987) and sexist attitudes (Aosved & Long,

2006; Davies, 2004; Ficarrotto, 1990; Sakallı, 2002). Some of the studies related to negative attitudes toward homosexual individuals emphasize that sexual bias is closely related to sexism (Davies, 2004; Sakallı, 2002; Whitley, 1987). Hence, a shared set of individual differences may be related to both sexism and homophobia.

The fact that homosexual groups or homosexual individuals do not conform to the value systems of heterosexual people may be a source of sexual prejudice (Oyman, 2010). Pharr (1988) has shown that homosexuality is seen as a threat to the established social order, which is a reason for the hostility of heterosexual men to gay men (Kilianski, 2003). According to this idea, homosexual men are regarded as individuals who deviate from the accepted norms and cause the disruption of the existing social order (Kilianski, 2003). As such, we can predict that social dominance orientation, and authoritarianism in particular, will be positively associated with anti-gay attitudes toward both gay men and lesbians.

As a side note, studies also found that the negative attitudes of heterosexual men toward homosexuals were more powerful than those of women (Brandt, 2003). That said, while men tend to have more negative attitudes toward gay men than lesbians; women tend to have more negative attitudes toward lesbians than gay men (Brandt, 2003). In other studies, on attitudes toward homosexuals, it was found that the higher the education level of individuals, the more positive their attitudes toward homosexuals were. It has also been observed that as individuals' religiosity levels increase, their sexual prejudice increases. Finally, it has been found that people have negative attitudes toward homosexuals because they see them as the people who violate God's rules and do not behave according to God's gender ideology (Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2006). To replicate these results, we will take into account some demographic background characteristics that have been found to relate to this type of prejudice.

Racism

Although racism has undergone various changes throughout history, it has always been a social problem in human life from past to present (Kırık et al., 2018). The concept of racism is linked to acts of discrimination, othering and exclusion, and the concept of race is "used as a tool to carry out these acts" (Kırık, et al., 2018, p. 15). Therefore, it is thought to be useful to refer to the concept of race before touching upon on racism. The concept of race is a powerful concept that continues from the past to the present, supports discrimination and inequality among people, and may cause loss of objectivity in human relations (Sayın & Candan, 2016). Racism, on the other hand harms human dignity and world peace where social, cultural, and ethnic classifications are made among people (Kırık, et al., 2018). Here, we expect that authoritarianism and especially social dominance orientation will be related to greater negative racial attitudes.

We will examine these associations in a "typical" Western European country and culture (i.e., Belgium), and in Turkey, a Middle Eastern country "in transition," being a nation on the periphery of Europe, but with an authoritarian government more characteristic of the Middle East (Hofstede, 1980).

Purpose and hypothesis of the research

The purpose of this research is to investigate the relationship between people's level of right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation on the one hand, and their level of ambivalent

sexism, homophobia, and attitudes toward immigrants on the other. Moreover, we want to make an intercultural comparison between a Western, relatively tolerant country and a non-Western, relatively collectivistic and more masculine context (Hofstede, 1980). Finally, we want to explore the relationships between several demographic characteristics and prejudice. The hypotheses of the research are as follows:

1. A positive correlation between right-wing authoritarianism and sexism and homophobia is expected for both samples.
2. A positive relationship between social dominance orientation and racism is expected in both samples.
3. The level of homophobia and sexism of the Turks is expected to be higher than that of the Belgians.
4. In both samples, it is expected that men have a higher level of right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, sexism, homophobia, and racism than women.
5. It is expected that Muslims will be more authoritarian, sexist, and more homophobic.
6. It is expected that there is a negative correlation between education level on the one hand, and right-wing authoritarianism, homophobia, and sexism on the other.

STUDY 1: ANALYSIS OF THE TURKISH DATA

Method

Participants

Data were collected digitally with Google Docs, via a snowballing method.¹ Respondents were given a brief description of the study and were asked to complete an informed consent form. Our first sample consisted of Turkish people. A total of 394 people participated in the study ($M_{\text{age}} = 24.48$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 5.40$; min = 15, max = 61 years old), with 60.8% women, 38.9% men, and 0.3% others. The ethnic background of the participants was as follows: 78.1% of the participants were Turkish, 15.5% were Kurdish, and 6.4% were others. The majority of the participants were Muslims (86.1%), the rest atheists (4.8%), or others (9.1%). Ninety-two percent of the sample was heterosexual, 7.8% was nonheterosexual. The educational level of the participants was as follows: 0.6% had only completed elementary school, 0.3% finished secondary school, 10.2% high school, 4.7% academy (for 2 years), 76.9% university, and 7.3% postgraduate. All participants completed all questions, yielding no missing data.

Measures

Seven-point Likert-type scales were used for all measures, ranging from 1 ("Totally disagree") to 7 ("Totally agree").

¹ This study was not preregistered, but all data and materials are available on the Open Science Framework: <https://osf.io/ap7f2/>.

Right-Wing authoritarianism (RWA)

RWA was assessed with nine statements (Duckitt et al., 2010). An example item is: “What our country needs most is discipline, with everyone following our leaders in unity” ($\alpha = .86$).

Social dominance orientation (SDO)

The social dominance scale consists of six statements (Ho et al., 2015). After the reliability analysis, it was decided to include just three statements, because the Cronbach's α score was found to be low (.67) for six items. Therefore, for items 1, 2, and 3, and for items 4, 5, and 6, Cronbach's α scores were checked separately. Because the Cronbach's α score of the first three statements was low again with .51, we did not include this scale. Items 4, 5, and 6 will be used to evaluate the results. Cronbach's α was .80 for the last three items. An example item is: “In an ideal world, all nations would be equal” (*reverse coded*).

Ambivalent sexism toward men and women

Ambivalent sexism was assessed with 16 statements (Bendixen & Kennair, 2017). There are two types of sexism toward women and men: benevolent sexism and hostile sexism. Thus, four subscales were obtained: ASI-Hostile: items 1–4; ASI-Benevolent: items 5–8; AMI-Hostile: items 9–12; and AMI-Benevolent: items 13–16. All descriptive analyses are as follows: for ASIH: $\alpha = .84$; for AMIH: $\alpha = .73$ for ASIB: $\alpha = .80$; and for AMIB: $\alpha = .80$. An example item for ASIH is: “Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.” “No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman” is an example item for ASIB. An example item for AMIH is: “When men act to ‘help’ women, they are often trying to prove they are better than women.” “Every woman needs a male partner who will cherish her” is an example item for AMIB.

Attitudes toward lesbians and gay men (Homophobia)

This scale consists of ten statements ($\alpha = .87$; Herek, 2000a). This scale has 2 factors: attitudes toward lesbians (HSL, items 1–5), and attitudes toward gay men (HSG: items 6–10). Items 2, 4, 8, and 10 should be reverse coded. The descriptive of each subscale are: For HSL; $\alpha = .78$, for HSG; and $\alpha = .84$. An example item for HSG is: “Male homosexuality is a perversion.” “Female homosexuality is a sin” is an example item for homophobia toward lesbians.

Subtle racism

The subtle racism scale was assessed with eight statements (Van Assche, Asbrock, Dhont, & Roets, 2018; items 2, 4, 6, and 8 should be reverse coded). Because the Cronbach's α was .56, reliability analyses were conducted again and we found a Cronbach's α of .77 when we just include items 2, 4, 6, and 8. “I feel empathy for the immigrant community” is a (reverse-coded) example item.

RESULTS

An ANOVA test was used to assess whether there were significant differences in the scales between the demographic groups. Correlation analyses were used for the continuous demographics (i.e., education and age). Furthermore, we also ran correlation analyses to examine the strength of the associations between all scales (see Table 1, below diagonal).

TABLE 1 Correlations among study variables (Turkish sample, Study 1: Below diagonal; Belgian sample, Study 2: Above diagonal)

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. RWA	–	.23***	.60***	.51***	.02	.52***	.39***	.35***	.42***
2. SDO	.04	–	.31***	.20***	.03	.13	.37***	.31***	.45***
3. ASIH	.38***	.17***	–	.47***	–.11	.47***	.34***	.36***	.40***
4. ASIB	.53***	.04	.42***	–	.11	.74***	.23**	.25***	.40***
5. AMIH	.21***	–.09	.23***	.35***	–	.20**	.03	.14	–.01
6. AMIB	.60***	.09	.49***	.76***	.27***	–	.24***	.35***	.30***
7. ATG	.52***	.07	.27***	.39***	.01	.49***	–	.63***	.28***
8. ATL	.58***	.03	.24***	.37***	.10	.48***	.78***	–	.21**
9. SR	–.08	.15**	.00	.03	–.03	–.06	.01	–.05	–

Note: *: $p < .05$; **: $p < .01$; ***: $p < .001$.
 Abbreviations: AMIB, Benevolent Sexism toward Men; AMIH, Hostile Sexism toward Men; ASIB, Benevolent Sexism toward Women; ASIH, Hostile Sexism toward Women; ATG, Negative Attitudes toward Gay Men; ATL, Negative Attitudes toward Lesbian Women; RWA, Right-Wing Authoritarianism; SDO, Social Dominance Orientation; SR, Subtle Racism.

Differences between demographic groups

There was a significant effect of gender on SDO ($F(2, 372) = 5.06, p = .007$), all four forms of sexism (all F s ($2, 372$) > 4.44 , all p s $< .01$) and attitudes toward gay men ($F(2, 372) = 6.16, p = .002$). Specifically, men were higher than women on all outcomes ($M_{\text{men}} = 2.58, SD_{\text{men}} = 1.56$ vs. $M_{\text{women}} = 2.18, SD_{\text{women}} = 1.35$ for SDO; $M_{\text{men}} = 4.17, SD_{\text{men}} = 1.47$ vs. $M_{\text{women}} = 3.28, SD_{\text{women}} = 1.66$ for ASIH; $M_{\text{men}} = 4.16, SD_{\text{men}} = 1.64$ vs. $M_{\text{women}} = 3.66, SD_{\text{women}} = 1.71$ for ASIB; $M_{\text{men}} = 3.67, SD_{\text{men}} = 1.79$ vs. $M_{\text{women}} = 2.81, SD_{\text{women}} = 1.69$ for AMIB; $M_{\text{men}} = 4.14, SD_{\text{men}} = 1.83$ vs. $M_{\text{women}} = 3.79, SD_{\text{women}} = 1.81$ for ATG), except for hostile sexism toward men, with $M_{\text{men}} = 3.97, SD_{\text{men}} = 1.49$ vs. $M_{\text{women}} = 4.64, SD_{\text{women}} = 1.31$ for AMIH.

The only significant difference in terms of ethnic groups was found in terms of subtle racism ($F(3, 371) = 3.06, p = .03$). The racism level of Turkish respondents was higher than the racism of Kurdish and others ($M_{\text{Turkish}} = 4.26, SD_{\text{Turkish}} = 1.41$ vs. $M_{\text{Kurdish}} = 3.93, SD_{\text{Kurdish}} = 1.23$ vs. $M_{\text{others}} = 3.38, SD_{\text{others}} = 1.49$). There was no significant difference between Kurdish and others in their level of racism.

There were differences between religious groups in terms of right-wing authoritarianism ($F(2, 372) = 20.87, p < .001$), benevolent sexism toward both gender groups ($F(2, 372) = 12.69, p < .001$ for ASIB and $F(2, 372) = 9.09, p < .001$ for AMIB) and both forms of homophobia ($F(2, 372) = 18.89, p < .001$ for ATG and $F(2, 372) = 40.99, p < .001$ for ATL). More specifically, Muslims were higher in RWA than others and atheists ($M_{\text{Muslims}} = 3.68, SD_{\text{Muslims}} = 1.30$ vs. $M_{\text{others}} = 2.46, SD_{\text{others}} = 1.12$ vs. $M_{\text{Atheists}} = 2.44, SD_{\text{Atheists}} = 0.87$). There was no significant difference between others and atheists. Very similar patterns were observed for the other outcomes, with $M_{\text{Muslims}} = 4.02, SD_{\text{Muslims}} = 1.66$ vs. $M_{\text{others}} = 2.92, SD_{\text{others}} = 1.60$ vs. $M_{\text{Atheists}} = 2.56, SD_{\text{Atheists}} = 1.55$ in ASIB; $M_{\text{Muslims}} = 3.28, SD_{\text{Muslims}} = 1.81$ vs. $M_{\text{others}} = 2.51, SD_{\text{others}} = 1.33$ vs. $M_{\text{Atheists}} = 1.74, SD_{\text{Atheists}} = 1.15$ in AMIB; $M_{\text{Muslims}} = 3.95, SD_{\text{Muslims}} = 1.80$ vs. $M_{\text{others}} = 2.66, SD_{\text{others}} = 1.72$ vs. $M_{\text{Atheists}} = 1.88, SD_{\text{Atheists}} = 0.99$ in ATG; and $M_{\text{Muslims}} = 3.89, SD_{\text{Muslims}} = 1.68$ vs. $M_{\text{others}} = 1.82, SD_{\text{others}} = 0.96$ vs. $M_{\text{Atheists}} = 1.58, SD_{\text{Atheists}} = 0.71$ in ATL.

Finally, we found significant, negative relations between education and RWA ($r = -.15, p = .006$), ASIH ($r = -.13, p = .02$), ASIB ($r = -.14, p = .01$), AMIB ($r = -.16, p = .003$), ATG ($r = -.12,$

$p = .03$), and ATL ($r = -.16$, $p = .004$). As such, we replicated the established pattern in Western contexts that the more educated seem to be less authoritarian and less bigoted.

Correlational analyses

As can be seen in Table 1, RWA seems to correlate positively and significantly with each of the prejudice outcomes, except with subtle racism. SDO shows the opposite pattern, being positively related to subtle racism and only one other type of prejudice, that is, hostile sexism toward women. Apparently, SDO most strongly relates to strong forms of prejudice that are targeted toward low-status groups (i.e., women and immigrants) that might threaten the current socio-economic hierarchical structure in society. Alternatively, the rather poor reliability of this scale might have reduced the strength of some correlations. Furthermore, corroborating the notion of generalized prejudice, all types of prejudice are positively interrelated, with a few notable exceptions. First, hostile sexism toward men is unrelated to homophobia (toward gay men as well as toward lesbian women). Second, the subtle racism scale appears to be unrelated to all sexism and homophobia scales. This could be due to the poor reliability of the racism scale, or it could be a well-known association that does not replicate in a non-Western context. Study 2, which is a replication of Study 1 in a Western context, that is, Belgium, aims to answer this open-ended question.

STUDY 2: ANALYSIS OF THE BELGIAN SAMPLE

Method

Participants

Data were collected in a university lab¹. Our second sample consisted of Belgian students who completed an online survey on a university computer. They participated in the study in return for partial course credit for a social psychology course. A total of 172 people ($M_{\text{age}} = 18.62$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 0.89$; min = 16, max = 22 years old; 64.5% women, 27.9% men, and 7.6% other) participated in this study. The majority of the participants were Flemish (88.4%), the rest of the participants were others (11.6%). Ninety-one percent of the participants were heterosexual, 9.1% were nonheterosexuals (asexual, homosexual, or bisexual). Twenty-seven percent of the participants were Christian, 35.1% were atheists, and 38.0% of the participants were others.

Measures

The same seven-point Likert-type scales as in Study 1 were used for all measures, with all scales showing good to excellent reliabilities ($\alpha = .88$ for RWA; $\alpha = .80$ for SDO; $\alpha = .88$ for ASIH; $\alpha = .83$ for ASIB; $\alpha = .84$ for AMIH; $\alpha = .74$ for AMIB; $\alpha = .84$ for SR), except for the two homophobia scales ($\alpha = .56$ for ATG; $\alpha = .41$ for ATL). This might be due to floor effects in this (rather extreme) measure of prejudice (see Study 3). In any case, we should be cautious when interpreting the results for these two scales.

Results

An ANOVA test was used to assess whether there were significant differences in the scales between the demographic groups. Correlation analyses were used for the continuous demographics (i.e., education and age). Furthermore, we also ran correlation analyses to examine the strength of the associations between all scales (see Table 1, above diagonal).

Differences between demographic groups

The only significant difference in terms of ethnic groups was found in terms of homophobia ($F(1, 170) = 7.03, p = .009$ for ATG; $F(1, 170) = 21.22, p < .001$ for ATL). The level of homophobia of non-Belgian respondents was higher than that of Belgians ($M_{\text{Belgian}} = 1.66, SD_{\text{Belgian}} = 0.78$ vs. $M_{\text{non-Belgian}} = 2.19, SD_{\text{non-Belgian}} = 1.17$ for ATG and $M_{\text{Belgian}} = 1.60, SD_{\text{Belgian}} = 0.75$ vs. $M_{\text{non-Belgian}} = 2.38, SD_{\text{non-Belgian}} = 1.16$ for ATL).

Correlational analyses

As can be seen in Table 1, RWA seems to correlate positively and significantly with each of the prejudice outcomes, except with hostile sexism toward men. SDO shows the same pattern of results, but it is also unrelated to benevolent sexism toward men. As was already revealed in Study 1, SDO especially relates to strong forms of prejudice targeted toward low-status groups. Furthermore, corroborating Study 1's results and in line with the notion of generalized prejudice, all types of prejudice are positively interrelated, with one notable exception. The hostile sexism toward men subscale appears to be unrelated to all other scales, except the benevolent sexism toward men subscale. In this predominantly female sample, it appears that negative attitudes toward men are a somewhat different type of prejudice compared to other types. Nevertheless, higher levels of benevolent negative attitudes toward men were related to higher levels of authoritarianism, which is in line with the tendency of authoritarians to view women in a traditionally gendered way (i.e., as pure and warm but also as weak, fragile and in need for protection).

STUDY 3: COMPARISON OF THE TURKISH AND BELGIAN SAMPLE

In a final set of analyses, we compared the levels of right-wing ideological attitudes (i.e., RWA and SDO) and prejudice (i.e., sexism, homophobia, and racism) between the two samples in the previous studies (i.e., the Turkish sample in Study 1 and the Belgian sample in Study 2). The results of this ANOVA are portrayed in Table 2. There were cross-country differences in almost all key variables. In particular, higher levels of authoritarianism, (all forms of) sexism, (both forms of) homophobia, and subtle racism were found in the Turkish as opposed to the Belgian sample. There was no significant differences between two countries in social dominance orientation. Indeed, the level of social dominance orientation in Turkey was almost the same value as the level of social dominance orientation in Belgium.

TABLE 2 Country differences among study variables in study 3

Measure	Turkish sample		Belgian sample		<i>F</i> (1,564)
	M	SD	M	SD	
1. RWA	3.52	1.34	2.54	1.05	71.30***
2. SDO	2.34	1.46	2.20	1.08	1.44
3. ASIH	3.61	1.64	2.38	1.34	74.27***
4. ASIB	3.85	1.69	2.60	1.44	70.77***
5. AMIH	4.37	1.42	3.36	1.54	56.46***
6. AMIB	3.13	1.77	2.74	1.37	6.67**
7. ATG	3.75	1.84	1.73	0.85	189.05***
8. ATL	3.60	1.75	1.69	0.75	188.51***
9. SR	4.16	1.39	2.78	1.20	126.12***

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

Abbreviations: AMIB, Benevolent Sexism toward Men; AMIH, Hostile Sexism toward Men; ASIB, Benevolent Sexism toward Women; ASIH, Hostile Sexism toward Women; ATG, Negative Attitudes toward Gay Men; ATL, Negative Attitudes toward Lesbian Women; RWA, Right-Wing Authoritarianism; SDO, Social Dominance Orientation; SR, Subtle Racism.

Discussion

Turkish Sample

The association of gender with homophobia and sexism

We can conclude that Turkish men are more sexist and have more homophobic attitudes toward male homosexuals compared to Turkish women. This is in line with previous studies in Turkey (e.g., Pharr, 1988; Oyman, 2010) that found that negative attitudes of heterosexual men toward homosexuals were stronger than those of women. Furthermore, previous work indicated that individuals have more negative attitudes toward homosexual individuals of their own gender. Put differently, men would have more homophobic attitudes toward gay men, while women would have more homophobic attitudes toward lesbians (Oyman, 2010). The results of our research are consistent with previous research in that men were more homophobic toward gay individuals, but contrary to Oyman's (2010) findings, our results showed that there was no significant difference between women and men in their attitudes toward lesbians.

Pharr (1988) cited the view of homosexuality as a threat to the established social order as the cause of heterosexual men's hostility toward gay men (Kilianski, 2003; see Oyman, 2010). According to this idea, homosexual men are considered individuals who deviate from accepted norms and cause the breakdown of the existing social order (Kilianski, 2003). The negative attitudes of Turkish men toward homosexual men may thus be related to the fact that (authoritarian) Turkish men make the concept of masculinity a subject of honor or that they care about the continuity of their generation. Hegemonic masculinity is a type of masculinity within the patriarchal system (Yürek & Karaboğa, 2018). Individuals high in hegemonic masculinity are known for their closeness to heterosexuality and tend to have homophobic attitudes (Onur & Koyuncu, 2004; see also Yürek & Karaboğa, 2018). Hegemonic masculinity defends the idea that men are always superior to women (Özbay, 2013; as cited in Yürek & Karaboğa, 2018) and these individuals see themselves at the top of the social hierarchy, establish dominance over women and groups of men who are not like them (Yürek & Karaboğa, 2018). The likelihood that the men involved in the study were of a hegemonic type may offer an explanation for their stronger homophobic attitudes toward

gay men and for their sexist attitudes, although this should be explored in further detail in future studies.

The relation of religion with right-wing authoritarianism, sexism, and homophobia

Muslims were found to be more homophobic and sexist, and they had a higher level of right-wing authoritarianism than their religious and non-religious counterparts. In Islam, there is no difference between men and women in terms of worship and humanity. Moreover, women are no different from men in terms of fundamental rights and responsibilities (Gürhan, 2010). After the religion of Islam has been accepted by multiple nations, it is common to believe that women have lost their place, former effectiveness, and freedom in Islam, as a result of misapplication of Islam (Gürhan, 2010). Indeed, “according to Islamist groups, this is not because of the essence of Islam, but because of its misapplication” (Gürhan, 2010, p. 368). Another reason is that different sects fabricate many Hadith (i.e., statements of Muhammad) that are not original. This has cast a shadow over the equality of women and men mentioned in the Qur’an and put women in a second position (Gürhan, 2010). Based on all this, the place of women in Islam may have been reflected differently to the present day. That may have led to misunderstandings. For this reason, Muslims may have exhibited stronger sexist attitudes toward women.

Islamic law defines different sexual orientations (i.e., nonheterosexuality) as a crime and sin because homosexuals exceed the limits set by Allah. According to the Qur’an, people have only one gender, and people need to behave in accordance with the gender identity they have (Şahin, 2015). This may also be why Muslims endorse more homophobic attitudes than atheists and than those adhering to another religion. Future work could further explore this interesting avenue of research.

The relation of ethnicity and racism

The ethnic origins of the participants in Turkey were Turkish, Kurdish, and other. The racist attitudes of Turks were found to be higher than Kurdish’ and other ethnicities’. There are various political problems with Kurds living in eastern Turkey from time to time. There are many refugees who have come to Turkey as a result of the civil war in Syria. Based on all this, the Turks may think that people of different ethnic backgrounds will cause many problems on Turkish soil. This idea may be increasing the racist attitudes of Turks, although it remains subject to further investigation.

Belgian sample

The relation of ethnicity with homophobia

The level of homophobia that individuals belonging to other ethnic groups have was found to be higher than that of Belgian people. The majority of individuals with another ethnic background in Belgium are people from countries of Muslim origin (i.e., Turkey and Morocco). The fact that Muslims generally have more homophobic attitudes may give clarity to this conclusion; yet, this should be examined in future research with bigger samples of ethnic-cultural minorities. That said, it is vital to note that the strongest predictors of prejudice are—as in the Turkish sample in Study 1—social-ideological attitudes, rather than demographic characteristics.

Differences between the Turkish and Belgian data

Significant differences were found between Turkish and Belgians in the levels of RWA, sexism, homophobia, and racism. Turkish people have a higher level of right-wing authoritarianism, are more homophobic, sexist, and racist than Belgians. The fact that Turks have a higher level of right-wing authoritarianism than Belgians may explain why Turks are more homophobic and sexist than Belgians, because Karayeğen (2015) mentioned that individuals with a high level of right-wing authoritarianism are also likely to have sexist and homophobic attitudes.

Belgium is a country where same-sex marriages are legal. The level of homophobia in Belgian society toward gay individuals is virtually nonexistent. On the contrary, Turkey is considered to be a country in transition, still under an authoritarian regime (Hofstede, 1980). If we take into account the trans murders that have been happening in Turkey recently, it can be said that Turkish society has a prejudiced attitude, not only toward homosexuals but toward all LGBTQIA+ individuals. Thus, the fact that Turks have a higher level of homophobia is not a surprising result, although this might evolve in the near future, given the societal changes on the edge of happening.

The perception of collectivism and individualism is a cultural variable in a society that shows whether individuals care more about social values or individual values (Çarıkçı & Koyuncu, 2010). Hofstede's (1980) studies have shown that Turks' collectivist tendencies are higher than their individualist tendencies. The consciousness of "we" prevails in collectivist cultures, while the idea of "I" is adopted in individualist cultures (Çarıkçı & Koyuncu, 2010). While collectivist cultures prioritize the group, individualist cultures prioritize the individual (Çarıkçı & Koyuncu, 2010, p. 6). The fact that Turkey is a collectivist (and more masculine) society and Belgium is rather individualistic (and less masculine) may explain why Turks on average have more negative attitudes toward individuals of different ethnicities and toward nonheterosexual persons that exist in society. This tentative conclusion will hopefully inspire future endeavors to take a closer look at both cultures and their differences and similarities with regards to intergroup relations.

Similarities between the Turkish and Belgian data

The relation of social dominance orientation with racism

We found a significant positive correlation between social dominance orientation and subtle racism in both countries. According to Karayeğen (2015), people with a high social dominance orientation adopt conservative ideas and support ideas such as racism, nationalism, discrimination, and reject ideas about equality. According to Oyman (2010), they also advocate the dominance of ingroups over outgroups and advocate intergroup hierarchy. We can say that our results are consistent with these previous studies and theorizing.

The relation of right-wing authoritarianism with homophobia and sexism

A significant positive correlation was found between the level of right-wing authoritarianism on the one hand and sexism and homophobia on the other hand. Karayeğen (2015) mentioned that right-wing authoritarianism is associated with homophobia and opposition to women's rights in his article. According to Wang (1999), the concept of right-wing authoritarianism is a trait that can predict attitudes toward women well. According to Centers (1963), as the level of right-wing authoritarianism increases, the level of people approving gender equality decreases, meaning they

develop anti-feminist attitudes (Erkurt, 2015). Thus, the results we have reached both confirm our research hypothesis and are consistent with other study results.

LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A limitation of the current set of studies is that the Belgian data were only collected from students. Future studies should aim to collect more representative samples that also include older and less educated respondents. Second, the amount of data collected from Turkey and Belgium was quite different. In terms of the generalizability and reliability of the results, it may be good to pay attention in future research so that the amount of data collected from different countries is almost equal in size. In Belgium, data must also be collected from the community because this is an important detail in terms of the similarity of the samples. Information on the education level was only collected from Turkey, since all respondents from Belgium were university students. Information on the level of education of the participants can also be collected for the Belgian data in future studies. Third, future research could explicitly focus on specific subgroups. Where some of our subsamples were relatively low to make reliable comparisons, larger samples could try to confidently replicate the patterns we found. Finally, a scale of gender roles or a scale of gender equality and scales of individualism–collectivism and religious attitudes can be included in future research, giving a new perspective to the literature.

In sum, we replicated some associations repeatedly found in Western contexts, and successfully generalized these patterns in a unique, non-Western country. Moreover, we found some interesting mean differences in these key constructs as well. As such, this study adds to the existing body of literature by revealing some important differences *and* similarities between both contexts under examination. We can conclude that although there are mean differences in prejudice levels in Turkey and Belgium, the predictive role of demographics and particularly of ideology is very similar in these two contexts. Such conclusions can have widespread implications, not only for understanding daily life in these countries, but also for setting up interventions to ameliorate intergroup relations and create social cohesion and harmony in local communities in both cultures.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there are no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available on the Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/ap7f2/>).

ORCID

Jasper Van Assche <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2570-2928>

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J. & Sanford, R.N. (1950) *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper.
- Altemeyer, B. (2004) The other “authoritarian personality. In: Jost J.T. & Sidanius J. (Eds.) *Political psychology: Key readings*. New York, Psychology Press/Taylor & Francis, 85–107.

- Allport, G.W. (1954) *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Aosved, A.C. & Long, P.J. (2006) Co-occurrence of rape myth acceptance, sexism, racism, homophobia, ageism, classism, and religious intolerance. *Sex Roles*, 55, 481–492.
- Bendixen, M. & Kennair, L.E.O. (2017) When less is more: psychometric properties of Norwegian short-forms of the Ambivalent Sexism Scales (ASI and AMI) and the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance (IRMA) Scale. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 58(6), 541–550.
- Brandt, S.L. (2003) Understanding sexual prejudice: Heterosexual attitudes towards lesbians and gay men. (Unpublished PhD thesis). San Jose, San Jose State University.
- Centers, R. (1963) Authoritarianism and misogyny. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 61, 81–85.
- Çarıkcı, İ.H. & Koyuncu, O. (2010) Bireyci-toplumcu kültür ve girişimcilik eğilimi arasındaki ilişkiyi belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma [A study to determine the relationship between individualist-collectivist culture and entrepreneurial tendency.]. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 3, 1–18.
- Davies, M. (2004) Correlates of negative attitudes toward gay men: sexism, male role norms, and male sexuality. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 41(3), 259–266.
- Dovidio, J.F., Glick, P. & Rudman, L.A. (2005) Introduction: Reflecting on the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport. In Dovidio, J. F., Glick ve P., & Rudman L. A. (Ed.) *On the nature prejudice: Fifty years after Allport*. Madlen, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 1–15.
- Duckitt, J., Bizumic, B., Krauss, S.W. & Heled, E. (2010) A tripartite approach to right-wing authoritarianism: the authoritarianism-conservatism-traditionalism model. *Political Psychology*, 31(5), 685–715.
- Erkurt, A. (2015) *Kadına Yönelik Şiddet: Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik, Yetkecilik ve Sosyal Baskınlık Yönelimi Açısından Bir İnceleme* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). [Violence against women: a study in terms of contradictory sexism, authoritarianism and social dominance orientation]. (Unpublished master's thesis). Ankara, Turkey, Ankara University.
- Ficarrotto, T.J. (1990) Racism, sexism, and erotophobia: attitudes of heterosexuals toward homosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 19, 111–116.
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S.T. (1996) The ambivalent sexism inventory: differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 491–512.
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S. T. (1997) Hostile and benevolent sexism: measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 119–135.
- Güldü, Ö. (2011) SağKanatYetkeçiliği Ölçeği: uyarlama Çalışması [Right-wing authoritarianism scale: the adaptation study]. *Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi [Ankara University Journal of Social Sciences]*, 2(2), 22–51.
- Gürhan, A.G.N. (2010) Toplumsal cinsiyet ve din [Gender and religion]. *Şarkiyat*, (4), 58–80.
- Herek, G.M. (2000a) *The psychology of sexual prejudice. Psychological perspectives on lesbian, gay, and bisexual experiences*. New York: Columbia University Press, 157–164.
- Herek, G.M. (2000b) Sexual prejudice and gender: do heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men differ? *Journal of Social Issues*, 56, 251–266.
- Ho, A.K., Sidanius, J., Kteily, N., Sheehy-Skeffington, J., Pratto, F., Henkel, K.E., Foels, R., & Stewart, A. L. (2015) The nature of social dominance orientation: theorizing and measuring preferences for intergroup inequality using the new SDO₇ scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109(6), 1003–1028.
- Hofstede, G. (1980) Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 10(4), 15–41.
- Jackson, L.A. (1992) In what way is the unfinished mind unfinished? *Psychological Inquiry*, 3, 163–165
- Jones, M. (2002) *Social psychology of prejudice*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Jost, J.T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A.W. & Sulloway, F. (2003) Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 339–375.
- Karayegen, G. (2015) *Çevreci Tutum Ve Davranışlar: sosyal Baskınlık Yönelimi, Yetkecilik Ve Ahlak Açısından Bir Değerlendirme* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). [Environmentalist attitudes and behaviors: an evaluation in terms of social dominance orientation, authoritarianism and ethics.] (Unpublished master's thesis)]. Ankara, Turkey, Ankara University.
- Kessler, T. & Mummendey, A. (2008) Prejudice and intergroup relations. In: Hewstone M., Stroebe W. & Jonas K. (Eds.) *Introduction to social psychology: A European perspective*. Madlen, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 290–314.
- Kırık, M.A., Öztürk, F.E., Saltık, R. & Orujova, A. (2018) Bir Tutum ve Davranış Biçimi Olarak Irkçılığın Pekiştirilmesinde Reklamcılığın Rolü [The role of advertising in the continuation of racism as an attitude and behavior.]. *Avrupa'dan Asya'ya Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 4, 15–22.

- Kilianski, S.E. (2003) Explaining heterosexual men's attitudes toward women and gay men: the theory of exclusively masculine identity. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 4, 37–56.
- Kite, M.E. & Deaux, K. (1986) Attitudes toward homosexuality: assessment and behavioral consequences. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 7(2), 137–162.
- Laythe, B., Finkel, D. & Kirkpatrick, L.A. (2001) Predicting prejudice from religious fundamentalism and right-wing authoritarianism: a multiple regression approach. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 40, 1–10.
- Madureira, A.F.A. (2007) The psychological basis of homophobia: cultural construction of a barrier. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 41, 225–247.
- Okutan, N. & Büyüksahin-Sunal, A. (2011) EscinsellereYönelikTutumlar, Cinsiyetçilik ve Romantik İlişkilerle İlgili Kalıpyargılar: yetiskin Bağlanma BiçimleriAçısından Bir Degerlendirme [Attitudes towards gays, sexism, and stereotypes about romantic relationships: an evaluation of adult attachment styles.]. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 14(27), 69.
- Oyman, S. (2010) *Cinsel Yönelimi Farklı Mağdur Ve Zanlı Kişilere Yapılan Yüklemeler Üzerinde Katılımcı Cinsiyeti, Eğitim Düzeyi ve Homofobik Tutumların Rolü* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). [The role of participant gender, education level and homophobic attitudes on attributions to victims and suspects of different sexual orientation (Unpublished master's thesis).] Ankara, Turkey, Hacettepe University.
- Onur, H. & Koyuncu, B. (2004) Hegenomik” erkeklğin görünmeyen yüzü: sosyalizasyon sürecinde erkeklik oluşumları ve krizleri üzerine düşünceler. *Toplum ve Bilim Dergisi*, 101, 31–49.
- Özbay, C. (2013) Türkiye’de hegemonik erkeklği aramak [Seeking hegemonic masculinity in Turkey]. *Doğu Batı Dergisi*, 63, 185–204.
- Paker, M. (2012) Psikolojik Açıdan Önyargı ve Ayrımcılık [Psychological prejudice and discrimination]. Ayrımcılık Çok Boyutlu Yaklaşımlar, İstanbul, Turkey: Center for Sociology and Education Studies, 41–52.
- Pharr, S. (1988) The common elements of oppression. In *Homophobia: A weapon of sexism*. Inverness, CA: Chardon Press, 53–64.
- Pratto, F. & Shih, M. (2000) Social dominance orientation and group context in implicit group prejudice. *Psychological Science*, 11(6), 515–518.
- Quillian, L., (2006) New approaches to understanding racial prejudice and discrimination. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 32, 299–328.
- Sakallı, N. (2002) The relationship between sexism and attitudes toward homosexuality in a sample of Turkish college students. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 42, 53–63.
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2003) Ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward women who engage in premarital sex in Turkey. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 40, 296–302.
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2006) Eşcinsellere ilişkin tutumlar: türkiye’de yapılan görgül çalışmalar [Attitudes towards homosexuals: empirical studies in Turkey]. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 9, 53–69.
- Sayın, E.. & Candan, H. (2016) Küresel Irkçılığın Yükselişi (The rising global racism.]. *Ardahan Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4, 35–46.
- Simpson, G.E. & Yinger, J.M. (1965) *Racial and cultural minorities*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Stones, C.R. (2006) Antigay prejudice among heterosexual males: right-wing authoritarianism as a stronger predictor than social-dominance orientation and heterosexual identity. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 34(9), 1137–1150.
- Şahin, N.Z. (2015) İslam Hukuku Ve İnsan Hakları Bağlamında Eşcinsellik Sorunu [The problem of homosexuality in the context of Islamic law and human rights.]. *Ekev Akademi Dergisi*, 62(62), 507–530.
- Van Assche, J. (2019) Ethnic diversity, ideological climates, and intergroup relations: a person X context approach. *Psychologica Belgica*, 59(1), 33–49.
- Van Assche, J., Dhont, K. & Pettigrew, T.F. (2019) The social-psychological bases of far-right support in Europe and the United States. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 29(5), 385–401.
- Van Assche, J., Asbrock, F., Dhont, K., & Roets, A. (2018). The diversity challenge for high and low authoritarians: Multilevel and longitudinal effects through intergroup contact and threat. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 44(8), 1163–1179.
- Van Assche, J., Koç, Y. & Roets, A. (2019) Religiosity or ideology? On the individual differences predictors of sexism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 139, 191–197.

- Van Assche, J., Roets, A., De keersmaecker, J. & Van Hiel, A. (2017) The mobilizing effect of right-wing ideological climates: cross-level interaction effects on different types of outgroup attitudes. *Political Psychology*, 38(5), 757–776.
- Van Assche, J., Van Hiel, A., Dhont, K. & Roets, A. (2019) Broadening the individual differences lens on party support and voting behavior: cynicism and prejudice as relevant attitudes referring to modern-day political alignments. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 49, 190–199.
- Wang, A.Y. (1999) Gender and nature: a psychological analysis of ecofeminist theory. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29, 2410–2424.
- Weinberg, G.H. (1972) *Society and the healthy homosexual*. Toronto, Canada: Macmillan.
- Whitley, B.E. Jr. (1987) The relationship of sex-role orientation to heterosexuals' attitudes toward homosexuals. *Sex Roles*, 17(1/2), 103–113.
- Yürek, N. & Karaboğa, F.A.B. (2018) Türkçe Ders Kitaplarında Hegemonik Erkeklik [Hegemonic masculinity in Turkish textbooks]. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 14(3), 956–987.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Şeyda Dilşat Çetiner is a bachelor student at the Department of Psychology at Nuh Naci Yazgan University in Turkey. She has completed a research internship at the Department of Developmental, Personality and Social Psychology at Ghent University, Belgium. She is interested in studying prejudice across cultures.

Jasper Van Assche is a postdoctoral researcher at the Department of Developmental, Personality and Social Psychology at Ghent University, Belgium, and an assistant professor at the Center for Social and Cultural Psychology, Université Libre de Bruxelles (Belgium). His research deals with the role of diversity in society, political attitudes, intergroup relations, and prejudice.

How to cite this article: Çetiner Ş.D. & Assche J.V. (2021) Prejudice in Turkey and Belgium: the cross-cultural comparison of correlations of right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation with sexism, homophobia and racism. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy* 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/asap.12280>