

Generational attitudes towards homosexuality across Europe: Why individual and country-related factors matter?

Karina Kravčenko^a, Vytautas Magnus University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Psychology, LT-44248 Kaunas, Lithuania.

Gabija Jarasiunaite-Fedosejeva^{b*}, Vytautas Magnus University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Psychology, LT-44248 Kaunas, Lithuania

Suggested Citation:

Kravčenko, K. & Jarasiunaite-Fedosejeva, G. (2022). Generational attitudes towards homosexuality across Europe: Why individual and country-related factors matter? *Global Journal of Sociology: Current Issues*. 12(1), 12-30. <https://doi.org/10.18844/gjs.v12i1.7354>

Received from December 12, 2021; revised from February 12, 2022; accepted from April 10, 2022.

Selection and peer review under responsibility of Prof. Dr. Kobus Maree, University of Pretoria South Africa.

©2022 Birlesik Dunya Yenilik Arastırma ve Yayıncılık Merkezi. All rights reserved

Abstract

Only a few studies have examined generational differences in attitudes towards homosexuality across Europe. Also, little is known about the explanatory factors for these attitudes. This study aimed at exploring the differences between generations in attitudes towards homosexuality across Europe and examining the importance of the individual (gender, education, religiosity, political views and parenthood) and country-related (communist history, laws and policies guaranteeing LGBT rights) factors in explaining such attitudes of different generations. European Social Survey Round 9 data with 47,086 respondents from 27 European countries were analysed. The results showed that each younger generation was more accepting of homosexuality than the previous one. While gender, religiosity and communist history of the country were important predictors of attitudes towards homosexuality in all generations, the importance of education, political views, parenthood as well as laws and policies guaranteeing LGBT rights differed. This study extends the understanding of attitudinal changes and generational differences in attitudes towards homosexuality.

Keywords: Homosexuality, generations, LGBT, rights;

* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Gabija Jarasiunaite-Fedosejeva, Vytautas Magnus University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Psychology, LT-44248 Kaunas, Lithuania

E-mail address: gabija.jarasiunaite-fedosejeva@vdu.lt /Tel +370 37 327 824

1. Introduction

Various empirical findings show that societal attitudes towards homosexuality are closely related to the well-being of sexual minorities. For example, negative attitudes or reactions to the disclosure of homosexual orientations have negative consequences for a homosexual individual, such as higher depression (Berghe, Dewaele, Cox, & Vincke, 2010; Ryan, Huebner, Diaz, & Sanchez, 2009; Ryan, Legate, & Weinstein, 2015), a greater risk to attempt suicide, use of illegal drugs, have unprotected sexual intercourse and lower self-esteem (Ryan et al., 2009). On the other hand, being surrounded by family members, friends and work or school associates who accept homosexuality may lead to greater self-esteem, life satisfaction and protection of homosexual individuals against depression and drug use (Espelage, Aragon, Birkett, & Koenig, 2008; Luhtanen, 2003).

Moreover, societal attitudes towards homosexuality can help explain anti-gay and discriminatory behaviours that affect homosexual individuals as well. For example, a study with self-identified heterosexual men revealed that homophobic individuals experience more negative affect, anxiety, anger-hostility and aggression towards homosexuals than non-homophobic individuals (Bernat, Calhoun, Adams, & Zeichner, 2001). Thus, empirical findings confirm and highlight the importance of studying societal attitudes towards homosexuality in order to explain the physical, psychological and social health of homosexual individuals.

Recent research studies have shown that societal attitudes towards sexual minorities have become more positive over the past decades in Europe (Halman & Van Ingen, 2015; Jakobsson, Kotsadam, & Jakobsson, 2013; Takacs, Szalma, & Bartus, 2016). These changes could be explained by generational differences. The generation here is defined as a social group of people of the same age who are unified by some historical events rather than only their biological age (Mannheim, 1952). The authors of the two most known theories on generational differences – Theory of Generations (Mannheim, 1952) and Generational Theory (Strauss & Howe, 1991) – state that individuals of different generations are significantly influenced by external factors, such as the socio-historical environment in their youth. In other words, the economic and political contexts in which individuals live and are being raised shape their personalities, and affect and change particular characteristics of generations that, in turn, determine generational differences.

1.1. Literature review

1.1.1. Characteristics of generations

Generational boundaries and generation names vary depending on the source and the country. The most common names of generations are Silent Generation, Baby boomers, Generation X, Generation Y and Generation Z. However, the Silent Generation is also called the generation of builders, the lucky generation, the generation of veterans, pre-boomers, the seniors, the depression generation and the Schwarzkopf generation. Baby boomers are also called the boomers, the love generation, the sandwich generation, the war babies and the hippies. Generation X is equally called the generation of post-boomers, the X-ers, the 13th generation (in the USA only), the Pepsi generation, the baby busters and the MTV generation. Members of Generation Y are sometimes referred to as the millennials, net generation, Google generation, the nexters and dot.com generation. Generation Z is also called the generation of digital integrators, the screenagers, iGen, the new millennials and the tweens (McCrinkle, 2018).

Howe and Straus (2000) cited the Silent Generation as being born between 1925 and 1942; the Baby-boom generation between 1943 and 1960; the 13th generation between 1961 and 1981; and the Millennial Generation between 1982 and 2003. Martin and Tulgan (2006) listed the Schwarzkopf generation as being born before 1946; Baby boomers between 1946 and 1964; Generation X between 1965 and 1977; and Generation Y between 1978 and 1989. Another study cited the Veterans as born between 1922 and 1943; Baby boomers between 1943 and 1960; Gen-Xers between 1960 and 1980; and nexters between 1980 and 1999 (Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2000). Scholz and Renning (2019)

listed Baby boomers as being born between 1950 and 1964; Generation X between 1965 and 1979; Generation Y between 1980 and 1994; and Generation Z born after 1995. Levickaite (2010) used the following division: Generation X born between 1960 and 1974; Generation Y between 1975 and 1989; and Generation Z from the mid-1990s to the late 2000s.

To date, several global studies analysing the differences between generations have been made and most of them use the classification defined by Pew Research Centre (Dimock, 2019). In this study, the classification of Pew Research Centre (Dimock, 2019) and the following generation names were used: Silent Generation (1928–1945), Baby boomers (1946–1964), Generation X (1965–1980), Generation Y (1981–1996) and Generation Z (1997–2012).

To better understand generational differences in attitudes towards homosexuality, it is important to be familiar with political, economic and cultural contexts in which members of different generations have grown, as well as the individual characteristics that were shaped by these contexts. Furthermore, we briefly present the main contextual and personal features of the Silent Generation, Baby boomers and Generations X, Y and Z.

The Silent Generation grew up in the context of World War II and later the Cold War experienced hardship in its early years and prosperity later in life. They worked hard all their lives and lived through economic problems, and instability and most members of this generation have already retired (Moore, Jones, & Frazier, 2017). They were the last generation who spent their adulthood in 'gender-specific roles dictated by a society where duty rather than options, and where responsibility rather than personal wants guided one's work and life choices' (McCrindle, 2018, p.78). They tend to see the world in white and black, right and wrong, do not question authority figures and elders, have distrust in changes, prefer to get clear and simple information and are the most religious of all living generations (McCrindle, 2018). Members of the Silent Generation share the values of saving, loyalty and moral responsibility; they are conservative, pragmatic and reserved and their moral concerns in their youth were related to cohabitation, premarital sex and mixed-race relationships (McCrindle, 2018; Scholz & Renning, 2019).

Baby boomers were born post-World War II, during the population growth as birth rates increased. Their minds have been shaped by the civil rights and Women's movements, seeing people landing on the moon, the invention of television, the rebellion of the students for a better education system, free love movements and rock concerts (McCrindle, 2018; Moore et al., 2017; Scholz & Renning, 2019). The members of this generation are rebellious, hardworking and materialistic, and because of that have a bit distant relationship with their children. Also, they are idealistic, visionary and consistent with their decisions; they value work ethic, freedom of expression, questioning, enthusiasm for causes, have low trust in authority and become conservative in later years (Celik & Arslan Gurcuoglu, 2016; McCrindle, 2018; Moore et al., 2017). In their youth, they were mostly concerned about gender equality, working mums and sexual freedom (McCrindle, 2018).

Generation X has also grown and lived through the Cold War, experienced the AIDS epidemic, and economic uncertainty, saw the invention of the computer, the fall of the Berlin Wall and the Soviet Union (Moore et al., 2017; Scholz & Renning, 2019). The members of this generation have faced parents' divorces the most, had more distant relationships with parents and were more alienated as children than the Baby boomers (McCrindle, 2018; Moore et al., 2017; Scholz & Renning, 2019; Basari & Uzunboylu, 2018). This generation is also described as having the best education of all generations and being the one that began to use technology out of necessity (Celik & Arslan Gurcuoglu, 2016; Scholz & Renning, 2019). The members of Generation X have low trust in the government and employers, have apathetic political orientation, embrace diversity, value freedom and flexibility and they try to balance between family and work, and are very adaptable and well-grounded, but they are

pessimistic and sceptical (McCrindle, 2018; Moore et al., 2017). The moral concerns of the members of this generation include gay rights, cultural diversity and equality (McCrindle, 2018).

Generation Y saw the fall of the Soviet Union in the early years and has lived through the rise of technologies beginning with computers and then the Internet and digital media; some also lived through the Balkan war (Scholz & Renning, 2019). This generation is described as totally different from previous ones, because two-thirds of the members of this generation grew up accessing new technologies and therefore were able to access family, friends, information and entertainment immediately, at every moment of the day (Celik & Arslan Gurcuoglu, 2016). The members of this generation tend to delay such life events that are typically related to adulthood (marriage, having children, getting a steady carrier etc.) and they are more environmentally as well as politically conscious than previous generations (McCrindle, 2018). They are characterised as self-confident, optimistic, narcissistic, entrepreneurs, sociable, lonely and fast consumers; the ones who do not like to work, have high trust in authority, crave community, value tolerance and diversity, social awareness and were protected as children (McCrindle, 2018; Moore, Jone & Frazier, 2017). Their moral concerns include same-sex marriage and refugee detention centres, as well as climate change (McCrindle, 2018).

Generation Z was already born in the age of globalisation and digitalisation. They lived through the global financial crisis, have seen global terrorism, global health epidemics such as Ebola and Zika viruses, same-sex marriages, free traveling and open-border policy, some countries joining the European Union and the UK leaving it and influencers shaping the minds of young people (McCrindle, 2018; Parker, Graf, & Igielnik, 2019; Scholz & Renning, 2019). The members of this generation are the most technologically saturated, but globally connected and have the fewest siblings of all generations (McCrindle, 2018). Living in a fast-changing world, they feel a lack of security in everyday life, are described as realistic and risk-takers, have a liberal set of attitudes and openness to emerging new social trends, have high trust in authority, are connected to their parents, have a progressive and equality-driven political orientation, but having no trust in politicians (Moore et al., 2017; Parker et al., 2019; Scholz & Renning, 2019). Generation Z shares the same moral concerns as Generation X that are related to same-sex marriage, climate change and refugee detention centres (McCrindle, 2018).

As can be seen, scientists agree that individuals from different generations have different values, beliefs and behavioural patterns. Younger generations tend to be more liberal, secular and individualistic, as well as they attribute higher importance to openness to change values than individuals of older generations (Egri & Ralston, 2004; Jones, Cox, & Cook, 2011; Sun & Wang, 2010). Therefore, it is not surprising that members of different generations have different views on various socially sensitive issues including acceptance of sexual minorities.

Recent research shows that younger generations have more favourable attitudes to different aspects of homosexuality, such as same-sex marriage, adoption, lifestyle etc. (Andersen & Fetner, 2008; Janmaat & Keating, 2019; Jones et al., 2011; Parker et al., 2019; Pew Research Centre, 2015; Van den Akker, Van der Ploeg, & Scheepers, 2013). For example, members of Generation Z and Generation Y tend to report favourable attitudes towards same-sex marriage by stating that allowing gay and lesbian couples to marry is a good thing for the country, whereas this support decreases with each older generation (Parker et al., 2019). Van den Akker et al. (2013) found that older birth cohorts predict disapproval of homosexuality as a lifestyle. Furthermore, in the USA, a majority of members of Generation Y (69%) have favourable attitudes towards adoption by same-sex couples, while only 36% of seniors support this (Jones et al., 2011). Thus, empirical findings confirm that older, less tolerant and conservative generations are being replaced by younger and more open-minded ones.

1.2. Related studies

1.2.1. Explanatory factors of societal attitudes towards homosexuality

Some empirical studies are focused on explanatory factors of societal attitudes towards homosexuality. Their findings revealed that individual characteristics, such as gender, education,

religiosity, parenthood and political view, as well as country-related factors, such as the country's communist history and the presence of laws and policies that ensure LGBT rights, were found to be strongly related to attitudes towards different homosexuality-related aspects (e.g., same-sex marriage, adoption etc.). Specifically, it was found that men, less educated, more religious people and those who have children and hold conservative political views are more homonegative (Jackle & Wenzelburger, 2015; Jakobsson et al., 2013; Lazar & Hammer, 2018; Lee & Hicks, 2011; Mahaffey, Bryan, & Hutchison, 2005; Olson & DeSauza, 2017; Reingarde, Tereskinas, & Zdanevicius, 2007; Sani & Quaranta, 2020; Van den Akker et al., 2013). Moreover, people who live in the (post)communist countries, as well as in the countries where LGBT rights are not ensured by laws and policies, have more negative attitudes towards homosexuality (Jackle & Wenzelburger, 2015; Sani & Quaranta, 2020; Takacs et al., 2016; Van den Akker et al., 2013).

Some theoretical explanations for the above-mentioned assumptions may be found in the literature. The effect of gender on homonegativity could be explained by the stereotypical perception of masculinity that is recognised in men from an early age. Heterosexual men are convinced that gays do not meet typical gender role requirements (Gough, 2002). Thus, males who do not fit those masculinity standards (e.g., are small, timid, obedient, do not meet gender expectations in dress, speech etc.) trigger various homophobic outbursts among other males in their youth, even before sexual maturation (Plummer, 2014).

Better educated people may express more tolerance towards homosexuality because education teaches tolerance and increases individuals' willingness to support civil liberties, as well as stimulates cognitive sophistication and the ability to evaluate new ideas (Ohlander, Batalova, & Treas, 2005). Many traditional religious doctrines posit homosexuality as a sin and clergy members may actively postulate this position (Herek & McLemore, 2013). Thus, religious people, especially those who are extrinsically motivated (i.e., their attitudes are based on the statements of religious leaders) may internalise religious values and perceive homosexuality as immoral behaviour and, in turn, develop negative attitudes towards sexual minorities (Fulton, Gorsuch, & Maynard, 1999; Jackle & Wenzelburger, 2015).

People who have children may hold negative attitudes towards homosexuals because they tend to believe that homosexuality is associated with paedophilia, e.g., gay men are stereotypically perceived as predators as well as child molesters (Herek, 2002). Homosexuals are also stereotyped 'as recruiters and role models – people who encourage children to become homosexual' (Rosky, 2009, p. 257). These negative stereotypes might affect negative attitudes towards homosexuals. The effect of political view may be explained by the assumption that in some cases people perceive political ideology as a source of authority and therefore follow the beliefs that it postulates (Whitehead & Baker, 2012).

Furthermore, in countries with high gay rights recognition (e.g., legalisation of a same-sex relationship, marriage, adoption etc.), anti-homosexual prejudice is socially unacceptable and, therefore, may lead to more favourable attitudes towards homosexuality (Kite, 2011). Finally, the effect of a country's communist history is explained by the heritage of socialism ideology where homosexuality is defined as 'a phenomenon of a bourgeois and degenerate society' (Jackle & Wenzelburger, 2015)

Nevertheless, it remains unclear what factors are important in explaining the attitudes of each generation towards homosexuality. Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine the importance of the individual (gender, education, religiosity, parenthood and political view) and country-related (country's communist history, the presence of laws and policies that ensure LGBT rights) factors in explaining different generations' attitudes towards homosexuality (as a lifestyle, homosexual family member and adoption by same-sex couples). We included the above-mentioned variables in the

further explanatory analysis because they received much attention in previous studies and were extensively used to predict societal attitudes towards sexual minorities.

1.3. Purpose of the study

Nevertheless, several studies have focused on generational differences in attitudes towards homosexuality. Most of them were conducted with Americans (Andersen & Fetner, 2008; Jones et al., 2011; Pew Research Center, 2015), Canadians (Andersen & Fetner, 2008) and British (Janmaat & Keating, 2019). Although one research was found exploring attitudes towards homosexuality in Europe, only one aspect of attitudes towards homosexuality, i.e., attitudes towards homosexuality as a lifestyle is analysed there (Van den Aker et al., 2013). Thus, to get more knowledge of generational differences in attitudes towards sexual minorities, it is important to analyse different attitudinal aspects and explore this question in broader contexts. According to this, the first purpose of this study was to examine potential differences between generations in attitudes towards homosexuality (as a lifestyle, homosexual family members and adoption by same-sex couples) across Europe.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Data collection instrument

The European Social Survey (ESS) Round 9 data (2.0 edition) (ESS, 2018) was used for the analysis of differences between generations in attitudes towards homosexuality and the importance of individual and country-related factors to explain such attitudes. ESS is a cross-national survey that has been conducted across Europe every 2 years since 2001. It provides high-quality comparative data on Europeans' attitudes, beliefs and behavioural patterns. ESS Round 9 data was collected from 27 European countries from late 2018 to 2019 by using probability sampling through computer-assisted personal (face-to-face) interviewing.

2.2. Participants

The sample consisted of 47,086 respondents aged 15 years and above: 46.2% were male and 53.8% were female (mean age: 51.13 years; std. deviation = 18.629). Respondents were clustered into five cohorts representing different generations based on respondents' year of birth. The distribution of respondents by generation is presented in Table 1. The mean of respondents' full-time education in years was 12.89 (std. deviation = 4.078). 70.2% of the respondents ever gave birth to or fathered a child. The majority of respondents in a sample were less religious (mean on a 0–10 Likert scale = 4.56; std. deviation = 3.145; mode = 0). Furthermore, the majority placed themselves on the moderate or centrist position on the right/left scale evaluating political orientation (mean on a 0–10 Likert scale = 5.03; std. deviation = 2.261; mode = 5). Almost half of the respondents (42.2%) were from a post-communist country. The ILGA index varied from 17 to 79 (mean = 47.74; std. deviation = 18.928).

Table 1. Distribution of respondents by generations, *n* (%)

Silent Generation (1928–1945)	Baby boomers (1946–1964)	Generation X (1965–1980)	Generation Y (1981–1996)	Generation Z ^a (1997–2004)
13.2	33.2	26.2	20.2	7.2

^aGeneration Z usually represents people born between 1997 and 2012; however, ESS data consist of a sample of 15 years or older respondents.

2.3. Procedure

ESS's core questionnaire includes three statements measuring respondents' attitudes towards homosexuality: *'Gay men and lesbians should be free to live their own life as they wish'*; *'If a close family member was a gay man or a lesbian, I would feel ashamed'*; and *'Gay male and lesbian couples should have the same rights to adopt children as straight couples'*. The first statement evaluates respondents' attitudes towards homosexuality as a lifestyle. The second statement is more personal as the respondent has to evaluate his/her attitudes towards a homosexual family member. The last statement measures the legal possibility of same-sex couples adopting children. Respondents were asked to express their (dis)agreement with each statement using the 5-point Likert scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Gender, education, parenthood, religiosity and political views were assigned to individual factors, while communist history, laws and policies guaranteeing LGBT rights were considered country-related characteristics. The level of education was measured by years of full-time education completed, including compulsory years of schooling. Parenthood was evaluated by asking respondents whether they have ever given birth to or fathered a child. Religiosity was measured by asking respondents to evaluate it on an 11-point Likert scale, where '0' meant 'not at all religious' and '10' meant 'very religious'. Political views were assessed by asking respondents to place themselves on the 'left/right' on an 11-Likert point scale, where '0' meant 'left' and '10' meant 'right' (a higher value represented more conservative political views).

The respondents were distributed to the ones who are from post-communist countries and the others who live in countries where the communist regime never existed. The respondents were also given an index based on the laws and policies guaranteeing LGBT rights in their country. We relied on the ILGA index (also called the rainbow index) which is assessed annually by the International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association (ILGA, 2018, 2019). The index is created using a set of 69 criteria measuring legal and policy practices for LGBT people. It includes the evaluation of equality and non-discrimination, family rights, hates crime and hates speech, legal gender recognition and bodily integrity, civil society space and asylum. The country is given a percentage 'weight' from 0 to 100%. A higher index means more laws and policies guaranteeing LGBT rights in a country, while a lower index means fewer rights guaranteed for the LGBT community in a country. We assigned the index (ILGA index of 2018, 2019) to respondents, depending on the country they live in and the year of being interviewed.

2.4. Data analysis

The data were analysed using IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 23). The chi-squared test was used to compare the attitudes of different generations towards homosexuality. Z-test was used to compare the differences between each generation and *p*-values were adjusted using the Bonferroni method. The generalised ordinal logistic regression model was used for the evaluation of the importance of individual and country-related factors in explaining different generations' attitudes towards homosexuality. The answers to the statements measuring respondents' attitudes towards homosexuality were recoded from a 5-point Likert scale to a three-answer scale measuring agreement (*'strongly agree'* and *'agree'*), neutral position (*'neither agree nor disagree'*) and disagreement (*'disagree'* and *'strongly disagree'*), and were reversed for easier interpretation. All the data were weighted by using post-stratification weight in combination with population sign weight. This procedure 'corrects for differential selection probabilities within each country as specified by sample design, for nonresponse, non-coverage, and sampling error related to the four post-stratification variables (gender, age, education, geographical region) and takes into account

differences in population size across countries' (Kaminska, 2020, p. 4). The chosen statistical significance level was 0.05.

3. Results

The results of this study showed that all three aspects of attitudes towards homosexuality differed between all generations ($p < 0.001$): each younger generation was more accepting than the previous one. Generation Z was the most accepting of homosexuality as a lifestyle and the legal possibility of same-sex couples adopting children, while both Generation Z and Generation Y showed the most tolerance towards acceptance of a homosexual family member ($p < 0.05$) (see Table 2). In general, respondents reported more favourable attitudes towards homosexuality as a lifestyle, were less tolerant towards the idea of accepting a homosexual family member and expressed the least support for the legal possibility of same-sex couples adopting children.

Table 2. Comparison of attitudes of different generations towards homosexuality

Attitudes towards homosexuals		Generation (%)					χ^2 (df)
		Silent Generation	Baby boomers	Generation X	Generation Y	Generation Z	
Homosexuality as a lifestyle	Agree	65.5	78.3	80.9	82.1	85.1	721.987*** (8)
	Neither agree nor disagree	15.9	11.2	9.7	10.0	8.4	
	Disagree	18.6	10.6	9.4	7.8	6.4	
Homosexual family member	Agree	23.1	14.0	12.4	10.9	10.3	762.906*** (8)
	Neither agree nor disagree	17.0	12.9	10.7	9.8	9.4	
	Disagree	59.8	73.1	76.9	79.3	80.3	
Legal possibility of same-sex couples adopting children	Agree	32.5	48.0	53.8	61.0	69.9	1,669.845*** (8)
	Neither agree nor disagree	18.3	16.0	15.0	14.4	11.2	
	Disagree	49.2	36.0	31.2	24.6	18.9	

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

All generalised ordinal logistic regression models were significant ($p < 0.001$). All analysed individual and country-related factors were significant in explaining respondents' attitudes towards homosexuality as a lifestyle and the right for homosexual couples to adopt children in the Silent Generation. In addition, all analysed factors, except parenthood, were significant in explaining attitudes towards a homosexual family member. Females, more educated and less religious respondents who have biological children, place themselves on the left according to political views, as well as respondents from countries with no communist past and that have more laws and policies guaranteeing LGBT rights are more tolerant towards homosexuality as a lifestyle, homosexual family member and the legal possibility for same-sex couples to adopt children in the Silent Generation ($p < 0.05$) (see Table 3).

Table 3. Factors explaining attitudes towards homosexuality in the Silent Generation

Attitudes towards homosexuality	Estimates	Std. error	Odds ratio	95% CI
Gender (male)	-0.298***	0.0804	0.742	0.634; 0.869
Parenthood (yes)	0.313**	0.1220	1.367	1.076; 1.736

Attitudes towards homosexuality		Estimates	Std. error	Odds ratio	95% CI
Gays and lesbians free to live as they wish	Years of education	0.094***	0.0100	1.099	1.078; 1.121
	Religiosity	-0.090***	0.0150	0.914	0.887; 0.941
	Political views	-0.100***	0.0174	0.905	0.875; 0.936
	Communist history (post-communist country)	-0.732***	0.1388	0.481	0.366; 0.631
	ILGA index	0.023***	0.0024	1.023	1.018; 1.028
	Gender (male)	0.416***	0.0752	1.516	1.309; 1.757
Ashamed if a close family member is gay or lesbian	Parenthood (yes)	-0.099	0.1153	0.905	0.722; 1.135
	Years of education	-0.073***	0.0090	0.930	0.914; 0.947
	Religiosity	0.075***	0.0136	1.077	1.049; 1.107
	Political views	0.059***	0.0164	1.060	1.027; 1.095
	Communist history (post-communist country)	0.614***	0.1375	1.848	1.412; 2.420
	ILGA index	-0.015***	0.0023	0.986	0.981; 0.990
Gay and lesbian couples' right to adopt children	Gender (male)	-0.528***	0.0711	0.590	0.513; 0.678
	Parenthood (yes)	0.276*	0.1093	1.318	1.064; 1.632
	Years of education	0.026***	0.0076	1.026	1.011; 1.042
	Religiosity	-0.108***	0.0123	0.898	0.876; 0.920
	Political views	-0.164***	0.0162	0.849	0.822; 0.876
	Communist history (post-communist country)	-0.782***	0.1649	0.458	0.331; 0.632
	ILGA index	0.024***	0.0023	1.025	1.020; 1.029

CI = Confidence interval.

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

Furthermore, all analysed individual and country-related factors, except parenthood, were significant in explaining respondents' attitudes towards homosexuality as a lifestyle, towards a homosexual family member and the right for homosexual couples to adopt children in the Baby boomer generation. Females, more educated and less religious respondents, the ones who agree more with left-wing political values, respondents from countries with no communist past and that have more laws and policies guaranteeing LGBT rights reported greater acceptance of homosexuality as a lifestyle, homosexual family members and adoption by same-sex couples ($p < 0.001$) (see Table 4).

Table 4. Factors explaining attitudes towards homosexuality in Baby boomers

Attitudes towards homosexuality		Estimates	Std. error	Odds ratio	95% CI
Gays and lesbians free to live as they wish	Gender (male)	-0.446***	0.0596	0.640	0.570; 0.720
	Parenthood (yes)	0.138	0.0835	1.148	0.975; 1.352
	Years of education	0.094***	0.0078	1.099	1.082; 1.116
	Religiosity	-0.088***	0.0107	0.916	0.897; 0.935
	Political views	-0.113***	0.0133	0.893	0.870; 0.917
	Communist history (post-communist country)	-1.237***	0.0946	0.290	0.241; 0.349
	ILGA index	0.014***	0.0019	1.014	1.010; 1.018

Attitudes towards homosexuality		Estimates	Std. error	Odds ratio	95% CI
Ashamed if a close family member is gay or lesbian	Gender (male)	0.546***	0.0546	1.726	1.551; 1.921
	Parenthood (yes)	0.084	0.0788	1.088	0.932; 1.270
	Years of education	-0.111***	0.0071	0.895	0.883; 0.908
	Religiosity	0.086***	0.0097	1.090	1.070; 1.111
	Political views	0.081***	0.0120	1.084	1.059; 1.110
	Communist history (post-communist country)	1.363***	0.0902	3.907	3.274; 4.663
	ILGA index	-0.012***	0.0017	0.988	0.985; 0.992
	Gender (male)	-0.526***	0.0445	0.591	0.542; 0.645
Gay and lesbian couples' right to adopt children	Parenthood (yes)	0.003	0.0618	1.003	0.889; 1.132
	Years of education	0.044***	0.0053	1.045	1.034; 1.056
	Religiosity	-0.104***	0.0076	0.901	0.888; 0.915
	Political views	-0.174***	0.0105	0.841	0.823; 0.858
	Communist history (post-communist country)	-0.863***	0.0892	0.422	0.354; 0.502
	ILGA index	0.025***	0.0014	1.025	1.023; 1.028

CI = Confidence interval.

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

The results showed that in Generation X, gender, parenthood, education, religiosity, political views and countries' communist history were important factors in explaining respondents' attitudes towards homosexuality as a lifestyle and the attitudes towards a homosexual family member. However, laws and legal policies guaranteeing LGBT rights in the country were not related to respondents' attitudes towards homosexuality as a lifestyle and acceptance of a homosexual family member. Moreover, all analysed factors, except parenthood, were significant in explaining attitudes towards a legal possibility for same-sex couples to adopt children.

In Generation X, females, more educated, less religious respondents and those who expressed stronger left-wing political views and live in countries with no communist past are more tolerant towards all three aspects of homosexuality – as a lifestyle, homosexual family members and the legal possibility of same-sex couples to adopt children. Additionally, those members of Generation X who have biological children are more tolerant of homosexuality as a lifestyle and would be more accepting of a homosexual family member. Whereas those who live in countries that have more laws and policies guaranteeing LGBT rights have more favourable attitudes towards adoption by same-sex couples ($p < 0.05$) (see Table 5).

Table 5. Factors explaining attitudes towards homosexuality in Generation X

Attitudes towards homosexuality		Estimates	Std. error	Odds ratio	95% CI
Gays and lesbians free to live as they wish	Gender (male)	-0.375***	0.0652	0.687	0.605; 0.781
	Parenthood (yes)	0.172*	0.0786	1.188	1.018; 1.386
	Years of education	0.070***	0.0084	1.072	1.055; 1.090
	Religiosity	-0.130***	0.0109	0.878	0.859; 0.897
	Political views	-0.178***	0.0151	0.837	0.813; 0.862
	Communist history (post-communist country)	-1.698***	0.0981	0.183	0.151; 0.222
	ILGA index	0.003	0.0021	1.003	0.999; 1.007
	Gender (male)	0.537***	0.0604	1.712	1.520; 1.927
Parenthood (yes)	-0.152*	0.0726	0.859	0.745; 0.990	

Attitudes towards homosexuality		Estimates	Std. error	Odds ratio	95% CI
Ashamed if a close family member is gay or lesbian	Years of education	-0.108***	0.0078	0.897	0.884; 0.911
	Religiosity	0.155***	0.0100	1.168	1.145; 1.191
	Political views	0.099***	0.0137	1.105	1.075; 1.135
	Communist history (post-communist country)	1.718***	0.0927	5.575	4.649; 6.685
	ILGA index	-0.002	0.0020	0.998	0.994; 1.002
Gay and lesbian couples' right to adopt children	Gender (male)	-0.505***	0.0483	0.604	0.549; 0.664
	Parenthood (yes)	-0.109	0.0595	0.897	0.798; 1.008
	Years of education	0.040***	0.0058	1.041	1.029; 1.053
	Religiosity	-0.163***	0.0080	0.850	0.837; 0.863
	Political views	-0.197***	0.0115	0.821	0.803; 0.840
	Communist history (post-communist country)	-1.189***	0.0843	0.304	0.258; 0.359
	ILGA index	0.030***	0.0015	1.031	1.028; 1.034

CI = Confidence interval.

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

All analysed individual and country-related factors were significant in explaining respondents' attitudes towards the legal possibility for homosexual couples to adopt children in Generation Y. Moreover, all analysed factors, except parenthood and policy practices for LGBT people in a country, were related to respondents' attitudes towards homosexuality as a lifestyle. Also, all factors, except parenthood, were important in explaining Europeans' tolerance towards a homosexual family member.

In Generation Y, females, respondents who are more educated, less religious, with stronger left-wing political orientation and those from countries with no communist past are more tolerant towards homosexuality as a lifestyle, would be more accepting of a homosexual family member as well as are more tolerant towards adoption by same-sex couples ($p < 0.001$). Whereas those members of generation Y who live in countries where LGBT rights are protected by laws and policies are less tolerant towards homosexual family members but more accepting of the legal possibility for same-sex couples to adopt children. However, respondents who have biological children are less supportive of adoption by homosexual couples ($p < 0.05$) (see Table 6).

Table 6. Factors explaining attitudes towards homosexuality in Generation Y

Attitudes towards homosexuality		Estimates	Std. error	Odds ratio	95% CI
Gays and lesbians free to live as they wish	Gender (male)	-0.415***	0.0719	0.661	0.574; 0.761
	Parenthood (yes)	0.087	0.0724	1.091	0.946; 1.257
	Years of education	0.085***	0.0102	1.088	1.067; 1.110
	Religiosity	-0.212***	0.0118	0.809	0.791; 0.828
	Political views	-0.120***	0.0165	0.887	0.859; 0.916

Attitudes towards homosexuality		Estimates	Std. error	Odds ratio	95% CI
	Communist history (post-communist country)	-2.034***	0.1187	0.131	0.104; 0.165
	ILGA index	-0.003	0.0025	0.997	0.992; 1.002
Ashamed if a close family member is gay or lesbian	Gender (male)	0.628***	0.0678	1.875	1.641; 2.141
	Parenthood (yes)	0.090	0.0672	1.094	0.959; 1.248
	Years of education	-0.124***	0.0095	0.884	0.867; 0.900
	Religiosity	0.192***	0.0107	1.212	1.186; 1.237
	Political views	0.081***	0.0155	1.085	1.053; 1.118
	Communist history (post-communist country)	1.950***	0.1133	7.032	5.631; 8.780
	ILGA index	0.006**	0.0024	1.006	1.002; 1.011
Gay and lesbian couples' right to adopt children	Gender (male)	-0.523***	0.0553	0.592	0.532; 0.660
	Parenthood (yes)	-0.258***	0.0564	0.772	0.692; 0.863
	Years of education	0.090***	0.0077	1.094	1.078; 1.111
	Religiosity	-0.196***	0.0088	0.822	0.808; 0.836
	Political views	-0.159***	0.0133	0.853	0.831; 0.876
	Communist history (post-communist country)	-1.409***	0.0938	0.244	0.203; 0.294
	ILGA index	0.026***	0.0018	1.026	1.022; 1.030

CI = Confidence interval.

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

In Generation Z, only gender, religiosity and countries' communist history are important in explaining respondents' attitudes towards different aspects of homosexuality. The importance of parenthood, respondent's education, political views as well as the presence of laws and policy practices protecting LGBT rights in a country differs when analysing different aspects of attitudes towards homosexuality.

In this generation, females, less religious respondents who are from countries with no communist past have more favourable attitudes towards homosexuality as a lifestyle, adoption by same-sex couples and would be more accepting of a homosexual family member ($p < 0.05$). However, years of education are positively related only to the acceptance of homosexual family members. Laws and policies guaranteeing LGBT rights in the country are positively related to the acceptance of homosexual family members and of the legal possibility for same-sex couples to adopt children. In addition, stronger expressed left-wing political orientation is positively related to tolerance towards homosexuality as a lifestyle and adoption by homosexual couples. Meanwhile, there is a negative association between these two aspects and having biological children ($p < 0.05$) (see Table 7).

Table 7. Factors explaining attitudes towards homosexuality in generation Z

Attitudes towards homosexuality	Estimates	Std. error	Odds ratio	95% CI
Gender (male)	-0.665***	0.1201	0.514	0.406; 0.651

Attitudes towards homosexuality		Estimates	Std. error	Odds ratio	95% CI
Gays and lesbians free to live as they wish	Parenthood (yes)	-1.363***	0.2928	0.256	0.144; 0.454
	Years of education	0.054	0.0276	1.055	0.999; 1.114
	Religiosity	-0.208***	0.0194	0.813	0.782; 0.844
	Political views	-0.076**	0.0272	0.927	0.879; 0.978
	Communist history (post-communist country)	-1.414***	0.1904	0.243	0.167; 0.353
	ILGA index	0.007	0.0042	1.007	0.998; 1.015
	Gender (male)	1.132***	0.1110	3.101	2.495; 3.855
Ashamed if a close family member is gay or lesbian	Parenthood (yes)	0.166	0.3507	1.180	0.594; 2.347
	Years of education	-0.071**	0.239	0.932	0.889; 0.977
	Religiosity	0.191***	0.0167	1.210	1.171; 1.251
	Political views	0.006	0.239	1.006	0.960; 1.054
	Communist history (post-communist country)	1.399***	0.1709	4.051	2.898; 5.663
	ILGA index	-0.008*	0.0037	0.992	0.985; 0.999
	Gender (male)	-0.850***	0.0973	0.427	0.353; 0.517
Gay and lesbian couples' right to adopt children	Parenthood (yes)	-0.763**	0.2921	0.466	0.263; 0.827
	Years of education	-0.030	0.0212	0.970	0.931; 1.012
	Religiosity	-0.176***	0.0155	0.838	0.813; 0.864
	Political views	-0.123***	0.0222	0.884	0.847; 0.924
	Communist history (post-communist country)	-1.350***	0.1496	0.259	0.193; 0.347
	ILGA index	0.034***	0.0031	1.034	1.028; 1.041

CI = Confidence interval.

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

4. Discussion

First, this study aimed at exploring the differences between generations in attitudes towards homosexuality as a lifestyle, homosexual family members and adoption by same-sex couples. The results revealed that Europeans' tolerance towards all three above-mentioned aspects of homosexuality has been growing with each new generation. This is congruent with the findings of previous studies (Andersen & Fetner, 2008; Janmaat & Keating, 2019; Jones et al., 2011; Van den Akker et al., 2013) and confirms the assumption that more tolerant young generations have been replacing older ones. This may be explained by generational differences in features that were shaped by contextual circumstances in which they have grown. For example, members of the Silent Generation tend to be conservative and meet the requirements of gender-specific roles (Moore et al., 2017; Scholz & Renning, 2019), while younger generations express higher individualism, openness to change etc. (Egri & Ralston, 2004; Jones et al., 2011; Sun & Wang, 2010); their moral concerns include issues of same-sex marriage (McCrinkle, 2018). Tolerance towards homosexuality may also grow with each

younger generation due to increasing access to education and other sources of information, such as the Internet (Celik & Arslan Gurcuoglu, 2016).

Despite this, our results showed that the acceptance of homosexuality differs depending on the aspect that is measured – members of all generations have the most favourable attitudes towards homosexuality as a lifestyle, are less tolerant towards a homosexual family member and have the most negative attitudes towards adoption possibilities for same-sex couples. It suggests that adoption by homosexual couples remains a sensitive issue not even in countries where society expresses greater general support for homosexuals, as was noted by Sani and Quaranta (2020), but also in younger generations that display higher tolerance towards homosexuality. It might be that attitudes towards the legal possibility for same-sex couples to adopt children are the most negative because adoption is not a private matter anymore as it involves a third subject (child) and, therefore, people base their attitudes on the moral beliefs of what might be the best for children (Sani & Quaranta, 2020). For example, people may worry that children might be discriminated against because of having same-sex parents (Stacey & Biblarz, 2001).

The second purpose was to explore what individual and country-related factors explain attitudes of each generation towards homosexuality as a lifestyle, homosexual family members and adoption by same-sex couples in Europe. Our findings are consistent with previous studies showing the predictive power of gender, religiosity and the country's communist history (Jackle & Wenzelburger, 2015; Lazar & Hammer, 2018; Lee & Hicks, 2011; Mahaffey et al., 2005). The results revealed that these factors are important predictors of attitudes towards all three aspects of homosexuality in all generations. Furthermore, results have showed the same directions of associations between attitudes towards homosexuality and education, political views and the presence of laws and policies guaranteeing LGBT rights as has been discussed in the previous literature (Jackle & Wenzelburger, 2015; Jakobsson et al., 2013; Lee & Hicks, 2011; Olson & DeSauza, 2017; Sani & Quaranta, 2020).

Nevertheless, this study revealed that the significance of these factors differs between generations. In particular, it might be assumed that education and political views are becoming less important factors in shaping attitudes towards homosexuality of members of Generation Z, while the protection of LGBT rights by laws already slightly loses its importance in Generation X following Generations Y and Z. An explanation for these findings could be that because of the rapid development of various technologies and the Internet, younger generations (Y and Z) may access any information much easier than older generations. Formal education, therefore, does not serve as the only available source of tolerance teaching anymore. Moreover, because of the open-border policy, traveling nowadays has become much easier and might be assumed as an important part of modern life. Thus, exposure to different cultures, views and ways of living may also contribute to the growing tolerance towards homosexuality in younger generations. Also, distrust of politicians and moral concerns about same-sex marriage, which are characteristics of Generation Z (Scholz & Renning, 2019), may lead to a low level of political interest, but higher adherence to moral beliefs and thus may explain the decreasing significance of political views in explaining attitudes towards homosexuality of generation Z.

Finally, the importance of laws that protect LGBT rights in explaining younger generations' attitudes may decrease because Generations X, Y and Z are in general concerned about homosexual rights (McCrinkle, 2018) and thus changes in legal basis may not affect shaping their attitudes. Also, younger generations have been raised and already live in the context of homosexuality decriminalisation and other legal protections of LGBT rights being established in many European countries. Due to this, members of younger generations may generally be more tolerant towards homosexuality, despite the existing laws in the country.

The most controversial results were found in the relationship between attitudes towards homosexuality and parenthood as the significance and direction of this relationship vary between generations. This study showed some inconsistencies with previous research studies which found that having children is only negatively related to attitudes towards homosexuality (Jackle & Wenzelburger,

2015). On the one hand, we found the opposite direction, i.e., having children may lead to more favourable attitudes towards homosexuality, but only in older generations – the Silent Generation and Generation X. Whereas no significant relationship between these factors was found in Baby boomers. One possible explanation for a positive association between attitudes towards homosexuality and parenthood in the Silent Generation and Generation X could be as follows: most members of these generations have children and some of them already have grandchildren, thus it is more likely that they might have faced a disclosure of homosexual child or grandchild that, in turn, has made them more acceptable of homosexuality. In the Silent Generation, more positive attitudes towards adoption by same-sex couples of individuals who have children may also be shaped by the context of World War II that they lived through (Moore et al., 2017) and its determined population loss.

According to this, members of the Silent Generation may believe that children should have homosexual parents than become orphans. Compared to other generations, Baby boomers are characterised as having a more distant relationship with their children and this may explain why our study showed that parenthood was not an important predictor of Baby boomers' attitudes towards homosexuality. On the other hand, in younger generations (Y and Z), the relationship between parenthood and attitudes towards homosexuality was negative, showing that having children leads to less support for a legal possibility for homosexual couples to adopt children and, additionally, of homosexuality as a lifestyle in Generation Z. This may be explained by possible (not causal) associations between homosexual preference and paedophilia that have been discussed since the mid-1980s (e.g., Freund, Heasman, Racansky & Glancy, 1984; Freund & Watson, 1992).

5. Conclusion

In sum, this study contributes to the existing literature that analyses attitudes towards homosexuality of different generations in Europe. It broadens the understanding of generational differences because different attitudinal aspects of homosexuality were analysed. Furthermore, the study revealed important factors that influence societal attitudes towards homosexuality and this contributes to a deeper understanding of attitudinal changes.

This study has several limitations. We analysed and compared attitudes towards homosexuality of younger people to the attitudes of their elders. Thus, the results of this study cannot completely explain whether differences between generations emerged because of different generations or respondents' biological age. Another limitation is related to different cut-off points of generations used in the scientific literature. As mentioned before, those differences might be related to country-specific factors, such as important events and experiences related to some particular country, groups of countries or nationalities. Especially, differences might occur when defining older generations when there was less globalisation in the world. The absence of universal boundaries makes it difficult to compare results between different studies and thus may bring some inconsistencies within results.

To fully understand the impact of generations on changes in attitudes towards homosexuality, future studies should explore whether young people are more tolerant than not only older age groups but also previous generations of young people. Furthermore, this study does not provide enough support for the above-discussed possible explanations of the findings. Thus, it would be valuable to analyse the nature and the meaning of the factors related to attitudes towards homosexuality, especially the ones that showed inconsistent and different results across generations (e.g., parenthood). Moreover, despite the faster globalisation in the digital world and declining religiosity among members of younger generations, the country's communist history and religiosity were important predictors of Europeans' attitudes towards homosexuality across all generations. Gender was also found to be an important and stable predictor of respondents' attitudes towards homosexuality. Thus, future research could analyse what determines the stability of these factors.

Finally, the importance of media literacy in the explanation of attitudes towards homosexuality should be considered, since information becomes far more accessible for all generations.

Acknowledgement

This paper was prepared under the project that has been funded by the Research Council of Lithuania (Grant No. VS-3).

References

- Andersen, R., & Fetner, T. (2008). Cohort differences in tolerance of homosexuality: Attitudinal change in Canada and the United States, 1981–2000. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 72(2), 311–330. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfn017>
- Basari, S. & Uzunboylu, H. (2018). A content analysis on bibliotherapy studies. *IIOAB JOURNAL*, 9(3), 50-55
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330662409_A_CONTENT_ANALYSIS_ON_BIBLIOTHEAPY_STUDIES
- Berghe, W. V., Dewaele, A., Cox, N., & Vincke, J. (2010). Minority-specific determinants of mental well-being among lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 40(1), 153–166. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00567.x>.
- Bernat, J. A., Calhoun, K. S., Adams, H. E., & Zeichner, A. (2001). Homophobia and physical aggression toward homosexual and heterosexual individuals. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 110(1), 179–187. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.110.1.179>
- Celik, S., & Arslan Gurcuoglu, E. (2016). Generations and their relations in social processes. *Security Strategy and Political Studies*, 1(1), 117–127. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333918242_Generations_and_Their_Relations_in_Social_Processes
- Dimock, M. (2019, January 17). *Defining generations: where millennials end and generation Z begins*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/>
- Egri, C. P., & Ralston, D. A. (2004). Generation cohorts and personal values: A comparison of China and the United States. *Organization Science*, 15(2), 210–220. <https://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/abs/10.1287/orsc.1030.0048>
- Espelage, D. L., Aragon, S. R., Birkett, M., & Koenig, B. W. (2008). Homophobic teasing, psychological outcomes, and sexual orientation among high school students: What influence do parents and schools have? *School Psychology Review*, 37(2), 202–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2008.12087894>
- ESS Round 9: European Social Survey Round 9 Data (2018). Data file edition 2.0. NSD Norwegian Centre for Research Data, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC. Retrieved from <https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/data/download.html?r=9>
- Freund, K., & Watson, R. J. (1992). The proportions of heterosexual and homosexual pedophiles among sex offenders against children: an exploratory study. *Journal of sex & marital therapy*, 18(1), 34–43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00926239208404356>
- Freund, K., Heasman, G., Racansky, I. G., & Glancy, G. (1984). Pedophilia and heterosexuality vs. homosexuality. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 10(3), 193–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00926238408405945>

- Kravčenko, K. & Jarasiunaite-Fedosejeva, G. (2022). Generational attitudes towards homosexuality across Europe: Why individual and country-related factors matter? *Global Journal of Sociology: Current Issues*, 12(1), 12-30. <https://doi.org/10.18844/gjs.v12i1.7354>
- Fulton, A. S., Gorsuch, R. L., & Maynard, E. A. (1999). Religious orientation, antihomosexual sentiment, and fundamentalism among Christians. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 38(1), 14–22. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1387580>
- Gough, B. (2002). 'I've always tolerated it but...': Heterosexual masculinity and the discursive reproduction of homophobia. In A. Coyle, & C. Kitzinge (Eds.), *Lesbian and Gay psychology: New perspectives* (pp. 219–238). Hoboken, NJ: Blackwell Publishing.
- Halman, L., & Van Ingen, E. (2015). Secularization and changing moral views: European trends in church attendance and views on homosexuality, divorce, abortion, and euthanasia. *European Sociological Review*, 31(5), 616–627. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcv064>
- Herek, G. M., & McLemore, K. A. (2013). Sexual prejudice. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, 309–333. Retrieved from <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143826>
- Herek, G. M. (2002). Gender gaps in public opinion about lesbians and gay men. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 60(1), 40–66. <https://doi.org/10.1086/338409>
- Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- ILGA-Europe. (2018). *Rainbow Europe index 2018*. Retrieved from https://www.ilga-europe.org/sites/default/files/Attachments/index_2018_small.pdf
- ILGA-Europe. (2019). *Rainbow Europe index 2019*. Retrieved from https://www.ilga-europe.org/sites/default/files/Attachments/rainbowindex2019online_0_0.pdf
- Jackle, 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>
- Jakobsson, N., Kotsadam, A., & Jakobsson, S. S. (2013). Attitudes toward same-sex marriage: The case of Scandinavia. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 60(9), 1349–1360. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00918369.2013.806191>
- Janmaat, J. G., & Keating, A. (2019). Are today's youth more tolerant? Trends in tolerance among young people in Britain. *Ethnicities*, 19(1), 44–65. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1468796817723682>
- Jones, R. P., Cox, D., & Cook, E. (2011). *Generations at odds: The millennial generation and the future of gay and lesbian rights*. Washington, DC: Public Religion Research Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.ppri.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/PRRI-Report-on-Millennials-Religion-Gay-and-Lesbian-Issues-Survey.pdf>
- Kaminska, O. (2020). *Guide to using weights and sample design indicators with ESS Data*. European Social Survey. Retrieved from https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/docs/methodology/ESS_weighting_data_1_1.pdf
- Kite, M. E. (2011). (Some) things are different now: an optimistic look at sexual prejudice. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 35(3), 517–522. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684311414831>
- Lazar, A., & Hammer, J. H. (2018). Religiousness and anti-gay/lesbian attitudes: The mediating function of intratextual religious fundamentalism. *Psychology of Violence*, 8(6), 763–771. <https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000197>
- Lee, T. T. & Hicks, G. (2011). An analysis of factors predicting attitudes toward same-sex marriage: Do the media matter? *Journal of Homosexuality*, 58(10), 1391–1408. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2011.614906>

- Levickaite, R. (2010). Generations X, Y, Z: How social networks form the concept of the world without Borders (the Case of Lithuania). *LIMES: Cultural Regionalistics*, 3(2), 170–183. <https://doi.org/10.3846/limes.2010.17>
- Luhtanen, R. K. (2003). Identity, stigma management, and well-being: a comparison of lesbians/bisexual women and gay/bisexual men. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 7(1), 85–100. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J155v07n01_06
- Mahaffey, A. L., Bryan, A. & Hutchison, K. E. (2005). Sex differences in affective responses to homoerotic stimuli: Evidence for unconscious bias among heterosexual men, but not heterosexual women. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 34(5), 537–545. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10508-005-6279-4>
- Mannheim, K. (1952). The problem of generations. In P. Kecskemeti (Ed.), *Essays on the sociology of knowledge: Collected works* (pp. 276–322). London, UK: Routledge. Retrieved from <http://marcuse.faculty.history.ucsb.edu/classes/201/articles/27MannheimGenerations.pdf>
- Martin, C. A., & Tulgan, B. (2006). *Managing the generational mix: From urgency to opportunity*. Amherst, MA: HRD Press. Retrieved from <https://downloads.hrdpressonline.com/files/7320080417162646.pdf>
- Mccrindle, M. (2018). *The ABC of XYZ: Understanding the global generations*. New South Wales, Australia: McCrindle Research Pty Ltd. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328347222_The_ABC_of_XYZ_Understanding_the_Global_Generations
- Moore, K., Jones, C., & Frazier R. S. (2017). Engineering education for generation Z. *American Journal of Engineering Education*, 8(2), 111–126. <https://doi.org/10.19030/ajee.v8i2.10067>
- Ohlander, J., Batalova, J., & Treas. J. (2005). Explaining educational influences on attitudes toward homosexual relations. *Social Science Research* 34(4), 781–799. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2004.12.004>
- Olson, M. D., & DeSouza, E. (2017). The influences of socio-cultural factors on college students' attitudes toward sexual minorities. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 44(3), 73–94. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol44/iss4/5>
- Parker, K., Graf, N., & Igielnik, R. (2019, January 17). *Generation Z Looks a lot like millennials on key social and political issues*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2019/01/17/generation-z-looks-a-lot-like-millennials-on-key-social-and-political-issues/>
- Pew Research Center (2015, June 15). *Support for same-sex marriage at record high, but key segments remain opposed*. Retrieved from https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2015/06/08/section-1-changing-views-of-same-sex-marriage/?fbclid=IwAR38FJFbu- qyXtSAhpiZrf4URfwZpifdyX51aZKtDe4TiiOhO_w-b3xp0A
- Plummer, D. (2014). The ebb and flow of homophobia: a gender taboo theory. *Sex Roles*, 71(3), 126–136. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11199-014-0390-8>
- Reingarde, J., Tereskinas, A., & Zdanevicius, A. (2007). Homofobija ir Lietuvos gyventojų požiūris į homoseksualumą [Homophobia and the attitudes of the Lithuanian population towards homosexuality]. In A. Zdanevicius (Ed.), *Nematomi pilieciai: apie homoseksualių žmonių teises ir homofobiją Lietuvoje* (pp. 81–116). Kaunas, Lithuania: Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12259/47990>
- Rosky, C. J. (2009). Like father, like son: Homosexuality, parenthood, and the gender of homophobia. *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism*, 20, 257–355. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/yjlf/vol20/iss2/3>

- Kravčenko, K. & Jarasiunaite-Fedosejeva, G. (2022). Generational attitudes towards homosexuality across Europe: Why individual and country-related factors matter? *Global Journal of Sociology: Current Issues*, 12(1), 12-30. <https://doi.org/10.18844/gjs.v12i1.7354>
- Ryan, C., Huebner, D., Diaz, R. M., & Sanchez, J. (2009). Family rejection as a predictor of negative health outcomes in white and Latino lesbian, gay, and bisexual young adults. *Pediatrics*, 123(1), 346–352. Retrieved from <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19117902/>
- Ryan, W. S., Legate, N., & Weinstein, N. (2015). Coming out as lesbian, gay, or bisexual: The lasting impact of initial disclosure experiences. *Self and Identity*, 14(5), 549–569. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2015.1029516>
- Sani, G. M. D. & Quaranta, M. (2020). Let them be, not adopt: General attitudes towards gays and lesbians and specific attitudes towards adoption by same-sex couples in 22 European countries. *Social Indicators Research*, 150, 351–373. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-020-02291-1>
- Scholz, C. & Renning, A. (2019). *Generations Z in Europe: Inputs, insights, and implications*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Stacey, J. & Biblarz, T. J. (2001). (How) does the sexual orientation of parents matter? *American Sociological Review*, 66(2), 159–183. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2657413>
- Strauss, W. & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations the history of America's future, 1584 To 2069* (1st ed.). New York, NY: William Morrow and Company. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/GenerationsTheHistoryOfAmericasFuture1584To2069ByWilliamStraussNeilHowe/page/n11/mode/2up>
- Sun, J., & Wang, X. (2010). Value differences between generations in China: a study in Shanghai. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 13(1), 65-81. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13676260903173462>
- Takacs, J., Szalma, I. & Bartus, T. (2016). Social attitudes toward adoption by same-sex couples in Europe. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 45(7), 1787–1798. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-016-0691-9>
- Van den Akker, H., Van der Ploeg, R. & Scheepers, P. (2013). Disapproval of homosexuality: Comparative research on individual and national determinants of disapproval of homosexuality in 20 European countries. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 25(1), 64–86. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/edr058>
- Whitehead, A. L. & Baker, J. O. (2012). Homosexuality, religion, and science: Moral authority and the persistence of negative attitudes. *Sociological Inquiry*, 82(4), 487–509. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.2012.00425.x>
- Zemke, R., Raines, C. & Filipczak, B. (2000). *Generations at work: Managing the class of veterans, boomers, xers, and nexters in your workplace*. New York, NY: AMACON.