

VALUES, SECULARISM, AND ATTITUDES TOWARD GAY AND LESBIAN CIVIL RIGHTS

GRAZIELLA DI MARCO ZIRA HICHY FEDERICA SCIACCA UNIVERSITY OF CATANIA

This study aims to evaluate the effects of four higher-order values (openness to change, self-transcendence, conservation, and self-enhancement; Schwartz's model) on attitudes toward both same-sex marriage and adoption by same-sex couples. Furthermore, the mediation effect of state secularism in the relationship between values and attitudes toward gay and lesbian civil rights was assessed. Participants were Spanish university students who completed a questionnaire. The results showed that state secularism, self-transcendence, and openness to change positively correlated with both attitudes investigated, whereas conservation and self-enhancement negatively correlated with both types of attitude. Moreover, state secularism mediated the relationship between conservation and self-transcendence and attitudes toward both same-sex marriage and adoption by same-sex couples.

Keywords: Values; Secularism; Gays and lesbians; Same-sex marriage; Same-sex parenting.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Zira Hichy, Department of Educational Sciences,
University of Catania, Via Biblioteca 4 (Palazzo Ingrassia), 94124 Catania (CT), Italy. Email: z.hichy@unict.it

Same-sex marriage is legally performed and recognized in various countries (e.g., Canada, Germany, France, and Spain), whereas other countries (e.g., Greece, Italy, and Switzerland) have alternative forms of legal recognition (e.g., civil union). In the same way, various countries allow adoption by same-sex couples (e.g., France, and Spain) or step-child adoption (e.g., Switzerland). Studies investigating attitudes toward these gay and lesbian civil rights have shown inconsistent results; indeed, some studies have found negative attitudes toward same-sex families, while other studies found positive attitudes toward them (Camilleri & Ryan, 2006; Morse, McLaren, & McLachlan, 2007). To explain attitudes toward gay and lesbian marriage and adoption, different variables (e.g., sex, age, religion, political orientation) were taken into account (Baiocco, Nardelli, Pezzuti, & Lingiardi, 2013; Ioverno et al., 2019; Todd & Ong, 2012). In this study, we tested the effect of values on attitudes toward same-sex marriage and adoption by same-sex couples. Moreover, the mediational effect of state secularism between these variables was tested.

Values are defined as concepts or beliefs that guide the selection or evaluation of behaviors transcending specific situations (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1990). Schwartz (1992) identified 10 basic values (universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, security, power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, and self-direction) that, based on compatibility or conflict between their motivational goals, form a circular continuum. Values whose goals are compatible are nearby on the circular continuum (e.g., achievement and power), whereas values whose goals conflict are positioned on opposite sides of the circular continuum (e.g., achievement and benevolence).

In this circular continuum, values are represented on a bidimensional space, whose orthogonal dimensions, namely higher-order value, are openness to change versus conservation and self-enhancement



Di Marco, G., Hichy, Z., & Sciacca, F. Values, secularism, and gay and lesbian civil rights

versus self-transcendence. The first dimension reflects the opposition between values emphasizing the seeking of self-expression, challenge, and autonomy (self-direction and stimulation values), and values emphasizing the avoidance of anxiety, threat, and change (security, conformity, and tradition values). The second dimension reflects the opposition between concern for the interests of others and self. Individuals endorsing self-enhancement (achievement and power) promote their own welfare and needs; whereas individuals endorsing self-transcendence (universalism and benevolence) promote the search for welfare, prosperity, and serenity for everyone. Hedonism is located between openness to change and self-enhancement values, and it could be associated with both (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz et al., 2001). However, hedonism is often associated with openness to change (Bilsky, Janik, & Schwartz, 2011).

Various studies carried out in different countries have shown that this structure is common to all human societies (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995). Moreover, various studies have suggested that values are related with the attitude toward homosexuality; in particular, it seems that openness to change and universalism values lead to positive attitudes toward homosexuals, whereas conservation and power values lead to negative attitudes toward homosexuals (Heaven & Oxman, 1999; Kuntz, Davidov, Schwartz, & Schmidt, 2015).

Secularism promotes the principle of the separation of government institutions from religious institutions (Feldman, 2005), which means that state governments should be neutral toward religion, neither promoting nor prohibiting it and, at the same time, religion should not influence state government. Across the world, there are both religious (such as The Islamic Republic of Iran) and secular states. Secular states differ for the force wherewith they embrace secularism, going from states considering religion as a private issue (soft secularism; e.g., the United Kingdom, where the relationship between church and state is purely formal) to states near to atheism (hard secularism; e.g. the People's Republic of China, that is officially atheist, see Kosmin, 2007). Other states, such as the United States, Spain, and Italy (whose constitutions affirm the separation between church and state and allow religious freedom) fall somewhere in the middle of this continuum. From a psychological point of view, secularism seems tied to various personal and social variables; for example, some studies showed that secularism negatively correlates with right-wing political orientation, extrinsic and intrinsic religious orientations, and with Catholic identification (see, e.g., Hichy, Falvo, Santisi, & Dazzi, 2014), and positively with quest religious orientation (see, e.g., Hichy et al., 2014), prejudice toward immigrants (see, e.g., Roebroeck & Guimond, 2016), and attitudes toward some social issues pertinent to religion (e.g., pre-implantation genetic diagnosis; see, e.g., Hichy & Di Marco, 2014).

AIM OF THE STUDY

This study aims to replicate and refine results obtained in other studies concerning variables affecting attitudes toward gay-related issues, such as secularism and personal values. In particular, this study has two aims: 1) testing the effects of four higher-order personal values (openness to change, self-transcendence, conservation, and self-enhancement) and attitudes toward secular state on attitudes toward same-sex marriage and adoption by same-sex couple; 2) testing the mediation role of state secularism in the relationship between the four higher-order personal values and gay and lesbian civil rights investigated.

Regarding the relationship between values and attitudes toward gay and lesbian civil rights, we hypothesized that self-transcendence and openness to change should be positively related to these attitudes, whereas conservation and self-enhancement should be negatively related. In particular, conservation should



Di Marco, G., Hichy, Z., & Sciacca, F. Values, secularism, and gay and lesbian civil rights

be negatively correlated with favor toward gay and lesbian civil rights, because same-sex marriage and parenting may be perceived as a threat to the traditional family (Haddock & Zanna, 1998; Haddock, Zanna, & Esses, 1993), and therefore a threat for people striving to obey prevailing social norms, preserve traditional customs, and avoid disruption of the status quo. In the same way, even self-enhancement should negatively correlate with the issues investigated because this value encompasses the pursuit of superiority for the self that can be achieved by discriminating against weak groups, such as gays and lesbians (Kuntz et al., 2015). On the other hand, self-transcendence should positively correlate with favor toward gay and lesbian civil rights, because of the importance given to tolerance and appreciation of all individuals, and for the welfare of others (Schwartz, 1992). Finally, with regards to openness to change this value should be positively related to same-sex marriage and adoption by same-sex couples because this value is related to the acceptance of counternormative and alternative lifestyles (Schwartz, 1992). Regarding the relationship between secularism and attitudes toward gay and lesbian civil rights, previous studies have found that favorable attitudes toward a secular state were related with favorable attitudes toward both same-sex marriage and parenting (Hichy, Coen, & Di Marco, 2015; Hichy, Gerges, Platania, & Santisi, 2015). Following these results, we hypothesized that people striving for a secular state should be favorable to same-sex marriage and adoption by same-sex couples.

With regard to the second aim, we hypothesized that attitudes toward secular state should mediate the relationship between conservation and self-transcendence, and attitude toward gay and lesbian civil rights; indeed, previous studies showed that socially relevant values are related with attitude towards secular state: in particular, conservation negatively influences secularism, while self-transcendence positively influences it (Di Marco, Hichy, Coen, & Rodriguez-Espartal, 2018).

CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

This study was carried out in Spain, which is a secular state, as ratified in its constitution, which states the absence of a state religion ("No religion shall have a State character. The public authorities shall take into account the religious beliefs of Spanish society and shall consequently maintain appropriate cooperation relations with the Catholic Church and other confessions," Section 16, Spanish Constitution). The Spanish Constitution also states religious freedom ("Freedom of ideology, religion, and worship of individuals and communities is guaranteed, with no other restriction on their expression that may be necessary to maintain public order as protected by law," Section 16, Spanish Constitution).

Concerning religion, 69% of Spaniards define themselves as Catholic (Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas, 2019). Same-sex marriage and, with this, adoption by same-sex couples, have been recognized by the Spanish law since July 3, 2005 (Law 13/2005).

Regarding attitudes towards lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and intersex (LGBTI) people, the majority of Spaniards are in favor of same-sex marriage and believe that same-sex couples have the right to adopt children (Eurobarometer, 2006). In general, Spain is the most gay-friendly country in the world, where 88% of its population thinks that homosexuality should be accepted by society (Pew Research Center, 2013). In Spain, political representatives actively engage in LGBTI events to express solidarity and support (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2009) and since 2013 a network of prosecutors has been created specifically dedicated to the protection of the principles of equality and non-discrimination (Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2014).



Di Marco, G., Hichy, Z., & Sciacca, F.
Values, secularism, and gay and lesbian civil rights

METHODS

Participants and Procedure

Participants were 226 Spanish university students (103 males and 123 females), enrolled in various courses (Educational Sciences = 60, Engineering = 18, Environmental Sciences = 17, Foreign Languages = 5, Juridical Sciences = 60, Physiotherapy = 15, and Psychology = 51). All participants were born and lived in Spain, and were aged between 18 and 46 years (M = 22.00, SD = 4.47). Participants were an opportunity sample of university students who were approached and volunteered to take part in the study. They were contacted in various university sites (e.g., study room) and asked to complete a questionnaire. All participants were informed that their responses would remain confidential. Ethical approval for the study was granted by the principal investigator's institution.

Measures

Secularism of State Scale. Attitudes toward secularism were measured using the Secularism of State Scale (Hichy, Rogriguez-Espartal, Trifiletti, & Di Bernardo, 2012), consisting of eight items such as: "The Church should remain in its place and avoid getting involved in political affairs" and "I think it is appropriate that the Church gives its opinion on State laws" (reverse coded). For each item, participants expressed their opinion on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), with 4 meaning neither agree nor disagree (alpha = .88).

Portrait Values Questionnaire. To measure personal values, the Spanish adaptation of the Portrait Values Questionnaire devised by Schwartz and coworkers (Schwartz et al., 2001) was used. The scale consists of 40 descriptions of a hypothetic person and his/her goals, which represent the 10 Schwartz values. Examples of items (and pertinent values) are: "He/She likes to be in charge and to tell others what to do," "He/She wants people to do what he/she says" (power); "Being very successful is important to him/her," "He/She likes to stand out and to impress other people" (achievement); "He/She really wants to enjoy life," "Having a good time is very important to him/her" (hedonism); "He/She looks for adventures and likes to take risk," He/She wants to have an exciting life" (stimulation); "He/She thinks it is important to be interested in things," "He/She is curious and tries to understand everything" (self-direction); "He/She thinks it is important that every person in the world should be treated equally," "He/She wants justice for everybody, even for people he/she does not know" (universalism); "He/She always wants to help the people who are close to him/her," "It is very important to him/her to care for the people he/she knows and likes" (benevolence); "He/She thinks it is important to do things the way he/she learned from his/her family," "He/She wants to follow their customs and traditions" (tradition); "He/She believes that people should do what they are told," "He/She thinks people should follow rules at all time, even when no one is watching" (conformity); "The safety of his/her country is very important to him/her," "He/She wants his/her country to be safe from its enemies" (security). For each item, the participant indicated how much like him/her that person was on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (not like me at all) to 6 (very much like me). Reliabilities of four high-order values were satisfactory (conservation = .75; self-transcendence = .80; openness to change = .78; self-enhancement = .86).

Attitudes toward same-sex marriage. Attitudes toward same-sex marriage were measured using four items (e.g., "I think that gays and lesbians should have the right to marry legally"; see Hichy, Coen, &



Di Marco, G., Hichy, Z., & Sciacca, F.
Values, secularism, and gay and lesbian civil rights

Di Marco, 2015). For each item, participants expressed their opinion on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*), with 4 meaning *neither agree nor disagree* (alpha = .87).

Attitudes toward adoption by gays and lesbians. To measure attitudes toward adoption by gays and lesbians, four items were used (e.g., "It is right that gay and lesbian couples can adopt children"; see Hichy, Coen, & Di Marco, 2015). For each item, participants answered on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), with 4 meaning neither agree, nor disagree (alpha = .78).

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

In order to test the factor structure of the measures used, confirmatory factor analyses were performed using LISREL 8 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2004). To evaluate the adequacy of the models, we used the chi-square: a solution fits the data well when chi-square is nonsignificant (p > .05). Because this statistic is sensitive to the sample size, the two-index strategy (Hu & Bentler 1999), proposing the combined use of comparative fit index (CFI; Bentler, 1990) and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR; Bentler, 1995), was used. The model fits the data well if CFI is greater than or equal to .95, and SRMR is smaller than or equal to .08. A multidimensional scaling analysis was performed in order to test the structural model of values devised by Schwartz et al. (2001). The model was supported by our data. The solution with two dimensions fit the data well: stress = .05, RSQ = .99. As in the previous studies in other cultural contexts (Schwartz et al., 2012), the 10 values tend to assume a circular shape in the graph, and each quadrant represents well the four high-order values hypothesized; hedonism is associated to openness to change. Furthermore, a confirmatory factor analysis with four latent factors (the four high-order values: openness to change, self-enhancement, conservation, and self-transcendence) was performed (LISREL 8). For each higher-order value, two aggregated indicators were obtained by randomly splitting the respective items (partial disaggregation model; Bagozzi & Heatherton, 1994). As in previous studies (Sapienza, Hichy, Guarnera, & Di Nuovo, 2010), the results showed that the four-factors model fit the data very well: $\chi^2(14)$ = 35.88, p < .05, CFI = .98, SRMR = .031; moreover, all factor loadings were significant and ranged between .77 and .92. With regard to secularism of state, results showed that the one-factor structure fit the data well: $\chi^2(14) = 104.76$, p < .001, CFI = .97, SRMR = .069. In addition, factor loadings were significant and ranged from .60 to .84. Finally, with regards to attitudes toward same-sex marriage and attitudes toward adoption by gays and lesbians, a model with two factors (the two kinds of attitude) was tested. The results showed that this model fit the data well: $\chi^2(19) = 70.62$, p < .001, CFI = .98, SRMR = .047. Even in this case, all loadings were significant and included between .40 and .86.

Descriptive Statistics

The means, standard deviations, and inter-correlations of investigated constructs are reported in Table 1. The results showed that the most endorsed value was self-transcendence followed by openness to change and conservation; whereas the least endorsed value was self-enhancement. Concerning secularism, the results showed that the attitude towards a secular state was quite positive as far as attitude toward same-sex marriage and attitude toward adoption by same-sex couples.



Di Marco, G., Hichy, Z., & Sciacca, F. Values, secularism, and gay and lesbian civil rights

TABLE 1
Means, standard deviations, and correlations

| | | М | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|---|
| 1 | Conservation | 3.91 | 0.63 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 2 | Self-transcendence | 4.60 | 0.64 | .19* | 1 | | | | | |
| 3 | Openness to change | 4.46 | 0.64 | .13 | .46* | 1 | | | | |
| 4 | Self-enhancement | 3.30 | 0.97 | .42* | 18* | .23* | 1 | | | |
| 5 | Secularism of state | 5.29 | 1.32 | 24* | .20* | .19* | 09 | 1 | | |
| 6 | Attitude toward same-sex marriage | 5.48 | 1.61 | 27* | .29* | .21* | 31* | .54* | 1 | |
| 7 | Attitude toward adoption by same-sex couple | 4.70 | 1.67 | 35* | .26* | .21* | 26* | .36* | .64* | 1 |

^{*} *p* < .01.

With regard to correlations between measures, the results showed a positive correlation between conservation and self-transcendence, conservation and self-enhancement, self-transcendence and openness to change, openness to change and self-enhancement; a negative correlation was found between self-transcendence and self-enhancement; no correlation was found between conservation and openness to change, the secularism of state was negatively correlated with conservation and positively with self-transcendence, openness to change, attitude toward same-sex marriage, and attitude toward adoption by same-sex couples; no correlation was found between secularism of state and self-enhancement. Finally, attitudes toward same-sex marriage and attitudes toward adoption by same-sex couples positively correlated with each other and with self-transcendence and openness to change, and negatively correlated with conservation and self-enhancement (see Appendix A for correlations considering the 10 basic personal values).

Mediation Model: Effects of Values and Secularism of State

In order to test the mediation effects of secularism of state, the bootstrapping procedure (Hayes, 2009, 2013) was used. Following this method, three regression analyses for each dependent variable were carried out: (1) the mediator variable (secularism of state) was regressed on the independent variable (the four values); (2) the dependent variable (attitude toward same-sex marriage or attitudes toward adoption by same-sex couples) was regressed on the independent variables; (3) the dependent variable was regressed simultaneously on both the mediator and the independent variables. The indirect (mediation) effect was obtained from the first and third regression; the direct effect (the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable controlling for the mediator) was estimated with the third regression. Finally, the total effect (the sum of direct and indirect effect) was obtained from the second regression. All regressions were estimated by using 5,000 bootstrap samples (Hayes, 2009; Preacher & Hayes, 2008); the MEDIATE macro (Hayes 2009) was applied. Estimates and 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals are reported in Table 2 and Table 3 (if zero is not included between the lower and upper bound of the confidence interval, then the indirect effect is significant; Hayes, 2009; Preacher & Hayes, 2008).

With regard to secularism of state, the results showed that it was negatively affected by conservation and positively by self-transcendence: when people adopt values emphasizing order, self-restriction, preservation of the past, and resistance to change, they reject a secular state; instead, when people endorse

Di Marco, G., Hichy, Z., & Sciacca, F.
Values, secularism, and gay and lesbian civil rights

values emphasizing welfare and interests of others, then they support a secular state. Regarding attitude toward same-sex marriage, the results (Table 2) showed that it was negatively affected by conservation and self-enhancement, and positively by self-transcendence and openness to change. People emphasizing preservation of the past and self-interests reject same-sex marriage, whereas people emphasizing independence of thought and interests of others accept same-sex marriage. Furthermore, the results indicated that attitudes toward a secular state positively correlated with attitudes toward same-sex marriage: the more people were favorable to a secular state the more they accepted same-sex marriage. As for the indirect effect, the results showed that secularism of state mediated the effects of conservation and self-transcendence (the confidence interval did not include zero); whereas the indirect effect of openness to change and self-enhancement was not significant (the confidence interval included zero). People adopting values emphasizing the preservation of the past reject same-sex marriage because they want state laws to represent religious values; in contrast, people endorsing values stressing the welfare of others accept same-sex marriage because they want state laws to be free from religious values.

TABLE 2
Mediation effects of secularism of state. Dependent variable: Attitudes toward same-sex marriage

| | Secularism of state | | s toward marriage | Indirect effect | Bootstrapping bias corrected 95% CI | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-------|--|
| • | B (SE) | B (SE) | B (SE) | B (SE) | Lower | Upper | |
| Conservation | 66*** (.15) | 63*** (.17) | 27 (.16) | 35 (.09) | 56 | 20 | |
| Self-transcendence | .45** (.16) | .53** (.19) | .29 (.17) | .24 (.10) | .07 | .46 | |
| Openness to change | .25 (.16) | .49** (.18) | .36* (.16) | .14 (.09) | 03 | .31 | |
| Self-enhancement | .07 (.11) | 36** (.12) | 40*** (.11) | .04 (.05) | 07 | .14 | |
| Secularism of state | | | .54*** (.07) | | | | |
| R^2 | .14 | .24 | .40 | | | | |
| F | 8.85*** | 17.24*** | 29.99*** | | | | |
| Df | 4,221 | 4,221 | 5,220 | | | | |

Note. B = unstandardized coefficient; 5,000 bootstrap samples; SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval.

Similar results were found regarding attitudes toward adoption by same-sex couples (Table 3): it was negatively affected by conservation and self-enhancement and positively by openness to change. Even in this case, people endorsing protection of the past reject adoption by same-sex couples, whereas people endorsing freedom of thought and others' welfare accept adoption by same-sex couples. Moreover, the results indicated that attitudes toward a secular state positively correlate with attitudes toward adoption by same-sex couples: the more people were favorable to the secular state the more they accepted adoption by same-sex couples. As for the indirect effect, the results showed that secularism of state mediated the effects of conservation and self-transcendence (the confidence interval did not include zero); in contrast, the indi-

^{*} *p* < .05. ** *p* < .01. *** *p* < .01.

Di Marco, G., Hichy, Z., & Sciacca, F.
Values, secularism, and gay and lesbian civil rights

rect effect of openness to change and self-enhancement on attitude toward adoption by same-sex couples was not significant (the confidence interval did not include zero). People adopting values accentuating the preservation of tradition reject adoption by same-sex couples because they want state laws to represent traditional religious values; in contrast, people supporting values emphasizing the welfare of all people accept adoption by same-sex couples because they want state laws to be free from religious dictates.

 $\begin{tabular}{l} TABLE\ 3 \\ Mediation\ effects\ of\ secularism\ of\ state.\ Dependent\ variable:\ Attitudes\ toward\ adoption\ by\ same-sex\ couples \\ \end{tabular}$

| | Secularism of state | Attitudes adoption by san | | Indirect effect | Bootstrapping bias corrected 95% CI | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-------|--|
| | B (SE) | B (SE) | B (SE) | B (SE) | Lower | Upper | |
| Conservation | 66*** (.15) | 99*** (.18) | 82*** (.18) | 17.07 | 33 | 07 | |
| Self-transcendence | .45** (.16) | .59** (.19) | .47* (.19) | .12.06 | .03 | .27 | |
| Openness to change | .25 (.16) | .48** (.18) | .41* (.18) | .07.05 | 01 | .20 | |
| Self-enhancement | .07 (.11) | 18 (.12) | 20 (.12) | .02.03 | 03 | .08 | |
| Secularism of state | | | .26*** (.08) | | | | |
| R^2 | .14 | .26 | .29 | | | | |
| F | 8.85*** | 19.01*** | 18.19*** | | | | |
| Df | 4,221 | 4,221 | 5,220 | | | | |

Note. B = unstandardized coefficient; 5,000 bootstrap samples; SE = standard error; CI = confidence interval. * p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.

DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between attitudes toward secularism of state, personal values, and attitudes toward same-sex marriage and adoption by same-sex couples. As expected, values affect both issues, positively in the case of self-transcendence and openness to change, and negatively in the case of conservation and self-enhancement. People that support the welfare of others accept that civil rights are guaranteed to gays and lesbians, because all people should have the same rights. In the same way, people striving for independence of thinking, freedom, novelty, and challenge in life (self-enhancement) are more likely to accept alternative lifestyles that challenge conventional customs. Indeed, even if values related to openness to change apply to the self, they do not deny the pursuit of these same goals to other people (Kuntz et al., 2015). In contrast, people supporting the maintenance of traditional social norms and religion tend to be opposed to same-sex marriage and adoption by same-sex couples, because both could contravene norms generally allowed by traditional society. In the same way, for people that pursue self-superiority, discrimination toward minority groups, the denial of their civil rights, could serve to emphasize one's own superiority.

With regard to the effects of attitude toward a secular state, as in other studies (Hichy, Coen, & Di Marco, 2015; Hichy, Gerges et al., 2015), the results showed that this variable is positively associated with



Di Marco, G., Hichy, Z., & Sciacca, F.
Values, secularism, and gay and lesbian civil rights

favor toward same-sex marriage and the adoption by same-sex couples, confirming the importance of having a state independent from religious dogma for these issues. Moreover, the results confirm the mediation effect of attitudes toward a secular state in the relationship between personal values and delicate issues that in some way may involve religious principles (see Di Marco et al., 2018). Indeed, also in the case of attitudes toward same-sex marriage and adoption by same-sex couples, secularism mediated the effects of self-transcendence and conservation. People striving for universal welfare are in favor of granting gay and lesbian civil rights because they believe that the welfare of all people can be guaranteed only by a state not influenced by religious principles. In contrast, people striving for conservation refuse to guarantee gay and lesbian civil rights because they believe that state laws should reflect traditional religious norms.

The correlational nature of this study does not allow the causal relationship to be established between the variables considered. Further studies may adopt a longitudinal design to better understand the causal relationships between values, secularism, and attitude toward gay and lesbian civil rights. Moreover, using university students as participants may reduce the generalizability of the results. Future studies should replicate these findings in a more general sample; moreover, it could be interesting investigating the effects of religion (as mediator or moderator) on relationships between values, secularism, and attitude towards gays and lesbians civil rights.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to Noelia Rodriguez Espertal and Alberto Nantista for their contribution to data collection.

REFERENCES

- Bagozzi, R. P., & Heatherton, T. F. (1994). A General approach to representing multifaceted personality constructs: Application to state self-esteem. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 1, 35-67. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519409539961
- Baiocco, R., Nardelli, N., Pezzuti, L., & Lingiardi, V. (2013). Attitudes of Italian heterosexual older adults towards lesbian and gay parenting. Sexuality Research and Social Policy, 10, 285-292. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-013-0129-2
- Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238-246. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238
- Bentler, P. M. (1995). EQS: Structural Equations Program Manual. Encino, CA: Multivariate Software.
- Bilsky, W., Janik, M., & Schwartz, S. H. (2011). The structural organization of human values-evidence from three rounds of the European Social Survey (ESS). *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 42, 759-776. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022110362757
- Camilleri, P., & Ryan, M. (2006). Social work students' attitudes toward homosexuality and their knowledge and attitudes toward homosexual parenting as an alternative family unit: An Australian study. *Social Work Education*, 25, 288-304. https://doi.org/10.1080/02615470600565244
- Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas. (2019). *Barómetro de Junio 2019* (Estudio nº 3252). http://www.cis.es/cis/opencm/ES/11_barometros/depositados.jsp
- Di Marco, G., Hichy, Z., Coen, S., & Rodriguez-Espartal, N. (2018). The effect of values and secularism on attitude towards pre-implantation genetic diagnosis of embryos. *Social Sciences*, 7, 216. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci7110216
- Eurobarometer. (2006). Standard Eurobarometer 66.
 - $https://ec.europa.eu/commfront of fice/public opinion/archives/eb/eb66/eb66_en.htm$
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2009). Homophobia, transphobia and discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity.
 - https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2011/annual-report-2009
- Feldman, N. (2005). Divided by God: America's Church-State Problem and What We Should Do About It. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.



Di Marco, G., Hichy, Z., & Sciacca, F.
Values, secularism, and gay and lesbian civil rights

- Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1998). Authoritarianism, values, and the favorability and structure of antigay attitudes. In G. M. Herek (Ed.), *Stigma and Sexual Orientation: Understanding Prejudice against Lesbians, Gay Men, and Bisexuals.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Haddock, G., Zanna, M. P., & Esses, V. M. (1993). Assessing the structure of prejudicial attitudes: The case of attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 1105-118. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.65.6.1105
- Hayes, A. F. (2009). Beyond Baron and Kenny: Statistical mediation analysis in the new millennium. *Communication Monographs*, 76, 408-420. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637750903310360
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Heaven, P. C. L, & Oxman L. N. (1999). Human values, conservatism and stereotypes of homosexuals. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 27, 109-118. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(98)00216-5
- Hichy, Z., Coen, S., & Di Marco, G. (2015). The interplay between religious orientations, state secularism, and gay rights issues. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 11, 82-101. https://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2014.914005
- Hichy, Z., & Di Marco, G. (2014). Effects of state secularism, Catholic identity, and political orientation on issues related to technologies involving embryos. *Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 21, 37-50. https://doi.org/10.4473/TPM21.1.3
- Hichy, Z., Falvo, R., Santisi, G., & Dazzi, C. (2014). Effects of political orientation, religious identification and religious orientations on attitude toward a secular state. *Archive for the Psychology of Religion*, *36*, 70-85. https://doi.org/10.1163/15736121-12341278
- Hichy, Z., Gerges, M. H. H., Platania, S., & Santisi, G. (2015). The role of secularism of state on the relationship between Catholic identity, political orientation, and gay rights issues. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 62, 1359-1373. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2015.1060068
- ty, 62, 1359-1373. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2015.1060068

 Hichy, Z., Rogriguez-Espartal, N., Trifiletti, E., & Di Bernardo, G. A. (2012). The Secularism of State Scale. *Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 19, 151-163. https://doi.org/10.4473/TPM19.3.1
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118
- Ioverno, S., Baiocco, R., Lingiardi, V., Verrastro, V., D'Amore, S., & Green R. J. (2019). Attitudes towards same-sex parenting in Italy: The Influence of traditional gender ideology. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 21, 188-204. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2018.1459846
- Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. (2004). *LISREL 8.7 for Windows* [Computer Software]. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International, Inc.
- Kosmin, B. A. (2007). Contemporary secularity and secularism. In B. A. Kosmin and A. Keysar (Eds.), *Secularism and Secularity* (pp. 1-13). Hartford, CT: Institute for the Study of Secularism in Society and Culture.
- Kuntz, A., Davidov, E., Schwartz, S. H., & Schmidt P. (2015). Human values, legal regulation, and approval of homosexuality in Europe: A cross-country comparison. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, 120-134. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2068
- Morse, C. N., McLaren, S., & McLachlan, A. J. (2007). The attitudes of australian heterosexuals toward same-sex parents. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, *3*, 425-455. https://doi.org/10.1300/J461v03n04_04 Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2014). *Spain Light Good Practices*.
 - https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Discrimination/LGBT/Res_27_32/Spain.pdf
- Pew Research Center. (2013). The global divide on homosexuality. Greater acceptance in more secular and affluent countries.
 - https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2013/06/04/the-global-divide-on-homosexuality/
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40, 879-891. https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.40.3.879
- Roebroeck, É. & Guimond, S. (2016). Pour une psychologie sociale de la laïcité: Identification et mesure de deux conceptions distinctes de la laïcité. *L'Année psychologique*, 116(4), 489-518. https://doi.org/10.4074/S0003503316000415
- Sapienza, I., Hichy, Z., Guarnera, M., & Di Nuovo, S. (2010). Effects of basic human values on host community acculturation orientations. *International Journal of Psychology*, 45, 311-339. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207591003587978
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1-65. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: extensions and cross-cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 878-891. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.5.878



Di Marco, G., Hichy, Z., & Sciacca, F.
Values, secularism, and gay and lesbian civil rights

- Schwartz, S. H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., Ramos, A., Verkasalo, M., Lönnqvist, J.-E., Demirutku, K., Dirilen-Gumus, O., & Konty, M. (2012). Refining the theory of basic individual values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103, 663-688. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029393
- Schwartz, S. H., Melech, G., Lehmann, A., Burgess, S., Harris, M., & Owens, V. (2001). Extending the cross-cultural validity of the theory of basic human values with a different method of measurement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 519-542. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022101032005001
- Schwartz, S. H., & Sagiv, L. (1995). Identifying culture-specifics in the content and structure of values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26, 92-116. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022195261007
- Todd, N. R., & Ong, K. S. (2012). Political and theological orientation as moderators for the association between religious attendance and attitudes toward gay marriage for White Christians. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 4, 56-70. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025142

| | Mean | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| Conformity | 4.06 | 0.78 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tradition | 3.53 | 0.81 | .40* | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Security | 4.11 | 0.82 | .50* | .35* | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Benevolence | 4.54 | 0.66 | .32* | .20* | .20* | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Universalism | 4.64 | 0.76 | .08 | 01 | .13* | .54* | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Self-direction | 4.63 | 0.71 | .07 | 02 | .13* | .50* | .44* | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Stimulation | 4.18 | 0.83 | .01 | 05 | 04 | .23* | .23* | .44* | 1 | | | | | | |
| Hedonism | 4.53 | 0.93 | .16* | .18* | .21* | .32* | .22* | .35* | .49* | 1 | | | | | |
| Achievement | 3.59 | 1.02 | .33* | .17* | .47* | .03 | 16* | .14* | .18* | .29* | 1 | | | | |
| Power | 2.93 | 1.07 | .23* | .15* | .40* | 17* | 24* | .01 | .11 | .23* | .72* | 1 | | | |
| Secularism of state | 5.29 | 1.32 | 12 | 31* | 14* | .07 | .24* | .24* | .15* | .07 | 03 | 15* | 1 | | |
| Attitude toward same–sex marriage | 5.48 | 1.61 | 20* | 27* | 18* | .13 | .33* | .21* | .18* | .11 | 26* | 32* | .54* | 1 | |
| Attitude toward adoption by same–sex couple | 4.70 | 1.67 | 28* | 32* | 24* | .14* | .28* | .19* | .24* | .08 | 22* | 27* | .36* | .63* | 1 |
| | Tradition Security Benevolence Universalism Self-direction Stimulation Hedonism Achievement Power Secularism of state Attitude toward same—sex marriage Attitude toward adoption | Conformity 4.06 Tradition 3.53 Security 4.11 Benevolence 4.54 Universalism 4.64 Self-direction 4.63 Stimulation 4.18 Hedonism 4.53 Achievement 3.59 Power 2.93 Secularism of state 5.29 Attitude toward same—sex marriage 5.48 Attitude toward adoption 4.70 | Conformity 4.06 0.78 Tradition 3.53 0.81 Security 4.11 0.82 Benevolence 4.54 0.66 Universalism 4.64 0.76 Self-direction 4.63 0.71 Stimulation 4.18 0.83 Hedonism 4.53 0.93 Achievement 3.59 1.02 Power 2.93 1.07 Secularism of state 5.29 1.32 Attitude toward same–sex marriage 5.48 1.61 Attitude toward adoption 4.70 1.67 | Conformity 4.06 0.78 1 Tradition 3.53 0.81 .40* Security 4.11 0.82 .50* Benevolence 4.54 0.66 .32* Universalism 4.64 0.76 .08 Self-direction 4.63 0.71 .07 Stimulation 4.18 0.83 .01 Hedonism 4.53 0.93 .16* Achievement 3.59 1.02 .33* Power 2.93 1.07 .23* Secularism of state 5.29 1.32 12 Attitude toward same–sex marriage 5.48 1.61 20* Attitude toward adoption 4.70 1.67 28* | Conformity 4.06 0.78 1 Tradition 3.53 0.81 .40* 1 Security 4.11 0.82 .50* .35* Benevolence 4.54 0.66 .32* .20* Universalism 4.64 0.76 .08 01 Self-direction 4.63 0.71 .07 02 Stimulation 4.18 0.83 .01 05 Hedonism 4.53 0.93 .16* .18* Achievement 3.59 1.02 .33* .17* Power 2.93 1.07 .23* .15* Secularism of state 5.29 1.32 12 31* Attitude toward same—sex marriage 5.48 1.61 20* 27* Attitude toward adoption 4.70 1.67 28* 32* | Conformity 4.06 0.78 1 Tradition 3.53 0.81 .40* 1 Security 4.11 0.82 .50* .35* 1 Benevolence 4.54 0.66 .32* .20* .20* Universalism 4.64 0.76 .08 01 .13* Self-direction 4.63 0.71 .07 02 .13* Stimulation 4.18 0.83 .01 05 04 Hedonism 4.53 0.93 .16* .18* .21* Achievement 3.59 1.02 .33* .17* .47* Power 2.93 1.07 .23* .15* .40* Secularism of state 5.29 1.32 12 31* 14* Attitude toward adoption 4.70 1.67 -28* -32* -24* | Conformity 4.06 0.78 1 Tradition 3.53 0.81 .40* 1 Security 4.11 0.82 .50* .35* 1 Benevolence 4.54 0.66 .32* .20* .20* 1 Universalism 4.64 0.76 .08 01 .13* .54* Self-direction 4.63 0.71 .07 02 .13* .50* Stimulation 4.18 0.83 .01 05 04 .23* Hedonism 4.53 0.93 .16* .18* .21* .32* Achievement 3.59 1.02 .33* .17* .47* .03 Power 2.93 1.07 .23* .15* .40* 17* Secularism of state 5.29 1.32 12 31* 14* .07 Attitude toward adoption 4.70 1.67 -28* -32* -24* 1.4* | Conformity 4.06 0.78 1 Tradition 3.53 0.81 .40* 1 Security 4.11 0.82 .50* .35* 1 Benevolence 4.54 0.66 .32* .20* .20* 1 Universalism 4.64 0.76 .08 01 .13* .54* 1 Self-direction 4.63 0.71 .07 02 .13* .50* .44* Stimulation 4.18 0.83 .01 05 04 .23* .23* Hedonism 4.53 0.93 .16* .18* .21* .32* .22* Achievement 3.59 1.02 .33* .17* .47* .03 16* Power 2.93 1.07 .23* .15* .40* 17* 24* Secularism of state 5.29 1.32 12 31* 14* .07 .24* Attitude toward adoption < | Conformity 4.06 0.78 1 Tradition 3.53 0.81 .40* 1 Security 4.11 0.82 .50* .35* 1 Benevolence 4.54 0.66 .32* .20* .20* 1 Universalism 4.64 0.76 .08 01 .13* .54* 1 Self-direction 4.63 0.71 .07 02 .13* .50* .44* 1 Stimulation 4.18 0.83 .01 05 04 .23* .23* .44* Hedonism 4.53 0.93 .16* .18* .21* .32* .22* .35* Achievement 3.59 1.02 .33* .17* .47* .03 16* .14* Power 2.93 1.07 .23* .15* .40* 17* 24* .01 Secularism of state 5.29 1.32 12 31* 14* | Conformity 4.06 0.78 1 Tradition 3.53 0.81 .40* 1 Security 4.11 0.82 .50* .35* 1 Benevolence 4.54 0.66 .32* .20* .20* 1 Universalism 4.64 0.76 .08 01 .13* .54* 1 Self-direction 4.63 0.71 .07 02 .13* .50* .44* 1 Stimulation 4.18 0.83 .01 05 04 .23* .23* .44* 1 Hedonism 4.53 0.93 .16* .18* .21* .32* .22* .35* .49* Achievement 3.59 1.02 .33* .17* .47* .03 16* .14* .18* Power 2.93 1.07 .23* .15* .40* 17* 24* .01 .11 Secularism of state 5.29 1 | Conformity 4.06 0.78 1 Tradition 3.53 0.81 .40* 1 Security 4.11 0.82 .50* .35* 1 Benevolence 4.54 0.66 .32* .20* .20* 1 Universalism 4.64 0.76 .0801 .13* .54* 1 Self-direction 4.63 0.71 .0702 .13* .50* .44* 1 Stimulation 4.18 0.83 .010504 .23* .23* .44* 1 Hedonism 4.53 0.93 .16* .18* .21* .32* .22* .35* .49* 1 Achievement 3.59 1.02 .33* .17* .47* .0316* .14* .18* .29* Power 2.93 1.07 .23* .15* .40*17*24* .01 .11 .23* Secularism of state 5.29 1.321231*14* .07 .24* .24* .15* .07 Attitude toward same—sex marriage Attitude toward adoption 4.70 1.6728*32*24* 1.14* .28* 1.9* .24* .08 | Conformity 4.06 0.78 1 Tradition 3.53 0.81 .40* 1 Security 4.11 0.82 .50* .35* 1 Benevolence 4.54 0.66 .32* .20* .20* 1 Universalism 4.64 0.76 .0801 .13* .54* 1 Self-direction 4.63 0.71 .0702 .13* .50* .44* 1 Stimulation 4.18 0.83 .010504 .23* .23* .44* 1 Hedonism 4.53 0.93 .16* .18* .21* .32* .22* .35* .49* 1 Achievement 3.59 1.02 .33* .17* .47* .0316* .14* .18* .29* 1 Power 2.93 1.07 .23* .15* .40*17*24* .01 .11 .23* .72* Secularism of state 5.29 1.321231*14* .07 .24* .24* .15* .0703 Attitude toward same—sex marriage Attitude toward adoption 4.70 1.6728*32*24* .14* .28* .19* .24* .0822* | Conformity 4.06 0.78 1 Tradition 3.53 0.81 .40* 1 Security 4.11 0.82 .50* .35* 1 Benevolence 4.54 0.66 .32* .20* .20* 1 Universalism 4.64 0.76 .08 01 .13* .54* 1 Self-direction 4.63 0.71 .07 02 .13* .50* .44* 1 Stimulation 4.18 0.83 .01 05 04 .23* .23* .44* 1 Hedonism 4.53 0.93 .16* .18* .21* .32* .22* .35* .49* 1 Achievement 3.59 1.02 .33* .17* .47* .03 16* .14* .18* .29* 1 Power 2.93 1.07 .23* .15* .40* 17* 24* .01 .11 .23* < | Conformity 4.06 0.78 1 Tradition 3.53 0.81 .40* 1 Security 4.11 0.82 .50* .35* 1 Benevolence 4.54 0.66 .32* .20* .20* 1 Universalism 4.64 0.76 .0801 .13* .54* 1 Self-direction 4.63 0.71 .0702 .13* .50* .44* 1 Stimulation 4.18 0.83 .010504 .23* .23* .44* 1 Hedonism 4.53 0.93 .16* .18* .21* .32* .22* .35* .49* 1 Achievement 3.59 1.02 .33* .17* .47* .0316* .14* .18* .29* 1 Power 2.93 1.07 2.3* .15* .40*17*24* .01 .11 2.3* .72* 1 Secularism of state 5.29 1.321231*14* .07 .24* .24* .15* .070315* 1 Attitude toward same-sex marriage Attitude toward adoption 4.70 1.6728*32*24* 1.4* .28* 1.9* .24* 0.822*27* .36* | Conformity 4.06 0.78 1 Tradition 3.53 0.81 .40* 1 Security 4.11 0.82 .50* .35* 1 Benevolence 4.54 0.66 .32* .20* .20* 1 Universalism 4.64 0.76 0.8 -0.01 .13* .54* 1 Self-direction 4.63 0.71 0.7 -0.2 .13* .50* .44* 1 Stimulation 4.18 0.83 0.01 -0.5 -0.4 .23* .23* .44* 1 Hedonism 4.53 0.93 .16* .18* .21* .32* .22* .35* .49* 1 Achievement 3.59 1.02 .33* .17* .47* .03 -1.6* .14* .18* .29* 1 Power 2.93 1.07 .23* .15* .40* -1.17* -2.24* .01 .11 .23* .72* 1 Secularism of state 5.29 1.32 -1.2 -31* -1.4* .07 .24* .24* .15* .07 -0.3 -1.5* 1 Attitude toward same-sex marriage Attitude toward adoption 4.70 1.67 -28* -32* -24* .14* .28* .19* .24* .08 -22* -27* .36* .63* |

^{*} *p* < .05.