International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies

ISSN(print): 2770-2782, ISSN(online): 2770-2790

Volume 04 Issue 03 March 2024

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55677/ijssers/V04I3Y2024-12, Impact Factor: 6.759

Page No: 259-275



Attitude of Bosnian and Herzegovinian Citizens towards LGBT Population

Ivan Šijaković¹, Mirjana Damjenić², Aida Spahić³

¹Professor of General Sociology and Contemporary sociological theories University of Banja Luka

ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6616-4022

²Master of sociology at the Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Banja Luka

³PhD in Sociology, Consultant in The Federal Ministry of Health

ABSTRACT Published Online: March 28, 2024

The paper analyses the attitude of Bosnian and Herzegovinian citizens towards LGBT population. The aim of this paper is to determine how the citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina perceive members of LGBT population, in order to explain the degree of understanding, acceptance, integration, as well as stigmatisation, discrimination and neglect of the members of this population. The core of the paper is the research, carried out on the sample of 314 respondents in the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The research has shown that there are two groups of citizens, both in the range of 35-40% - one that does not support (somewhat or strongly) LGBT people and their struggle for free and dignified status in the society and the other group that supports (somewhat or strongly) the activities of LGBT population. Between these two groups, there is a part of citizens (15-20%) who do not have an attitude towards this issue, are not interested or ignore the presence and activity of LGBT people in their environment.

KEYWORDS:

LGBT population, same-sex marriage, discrimination, stigmatisation, family.

INTRODUCTION

Despite the significant shift in emancipation, achieved at the turn of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century, LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender) population is still exposed to discrimination, marginalisation and stigmatisation in most contemporary countries. In 1990 the World Health Organisation omitted homosexuality from the international classification of diseases and suggested that all the countries should implement a strategy of promoting and supporting the eradication of stigmatisation and discrimination against LGBT population in order to create conditions for the promotion of sexual health everywhere in the world.

In the past three decades, great interest of scientists and researchers (sociologists, psychologists, pedagogues, anthropologists) has been noticed for the issues and problems faced by the LGBT population in modern society. Research shows that in the United States (which is considered to have a more liberal and tolerant attitude towards members of the minority sexual orientation, than most other countries in the 2005; Sharpe, S., 2002). According to a study, at the beginning of the 21st century, 77% of LGBT students at US universities experienced verbal attacks because of their

Corresponding Author: Ivan Šijaković

*Cite this Article: Ivan Šijaković (2024). Attitude of Bosnian and Herzegovinian Citizens towards LGBT Population. International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies, 4(3), 259-275

world), there is still discrimination against members of the LGBT population (Strong, B., De Vault, C., & Cohen, T., sexual orientation, while 22% said they were persecuted and physically abused (Burn, 2000). On the other hand, researchers have observed that heterosexual (heteronormative) men in many countries show a higher degree of intolerance towards LGBT people, than it is the case with heterosexual women (Marlene Arndt & Gideon de Bruin, 2006). Another study found that there is a significant correlation between prejudice and negative attitudes of health care professionals toward LGBT population and the low quality of health care delivery to that group (Rowe et al., 2017).

Citizens of heterosexual orientation react differently when they meet or communicate with members of LGBT population. Some react negatively, from verbal insults to attempted physical violence, others are confused and feel uncomfortable in the presence of LGBT people (Shaine T. Duhaylungsod, 2018), the third group of citizens tends to ignore the presence of such people in their vicinity and surroundings, while the fourth group of heteronormative

people try to understand the position of LGBT people in society, to establish a normal and tolerant relationship with them, and to sometimes protect them from stigmatisation, discrimination or violence. Citizens' attitudes towards LGBT population are influenced by various factors, such as tradition, gender, age, race, education, culture, political relations, religious relations and the social status of citizens. As a consequence of prejudice, two types of attitudes towards LGBT population appear (De Carlo, 2014), namely homophobia (strong prejudice against homosexuals) and heterosexism (belief that all people should be heterosexual).

A study shows that the majority of citizens of Novi Sad (Serbia) believe that homosexuality is a disease, and less than a third of citizens believe that members of LGBT population are exposed to physical, psychological and verbal violence because of their sexual and gender identity. In addition, as many as 43% of parents are not at all familiar with the sexual orientation and gender identity of their LGBT children (CEPROM, 2019).

These few examples show that there is still a high degree of prejudice, stigmatisation and discrimination around the world towards LGBT population. In this paper, we want to investigate the attitude of the citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina towards LGBT population.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Research and discussions on the attitude of the citizens towards LGBT population include three key forms of attitude: first, the attitude towards LGBT members as a moral issue, the issue of tradition and public morality; second, the attitude towards LGBT as a complete rejection of their presence in public life and condemnation of their behaviour and actions; third, the attitude towards members of the LGBT population through the prism of human rights.

Attitude towards LGBT as a moral issue

When meeting members of LGBT population, a part of the citizens react with restraint, in a little confused way or clumsily, looking at, above all, homosexuals as someone who violates traditional moral principles in their environment and society. This is especially characteristic of people who live in smaller communities and traditional communities or come to large cities from those communities. One study found that in the United States, students who come from smaller communities to university campuses have a high degree of homophobia and anti-LGBT attitudes when they first meet members of a different sexual orientation (Schott-Ceccacci, et al., 2015). The research focuses on four socio-demographic variables (religion, race, gender and education) following their impact on students' initial attitudes, as well as the transition of these attitudes during the following years of study, campus stays and meetings with LGBT students. According to the authors, students initially imitate parental patterns and show aversion to members of different sexual orientation, but later there is an evolution of these attitudes

towards acceptance and tolerance towards the members of LGBT population.

The attitude towards LGBT population is conditioned by a strong traditional gender identity in which one starts from the attitude that a man is brave, strong and courageous, possessor and protector of women, while women are gentle, devoted, loyal and subordinate only to men. The stronger, stiffer and more unshakable the patriarchal gender identity of a man and a woman is, the more morally unacceptable for them is the behaviour of members of a different sexual orientation (Gormey & Lopez, 2010). On the other hand, Swank & Raiz (2010) found that students whose parents had friends or communicated with LGBT people had a more tolerant relationship and established easier contact with groups of students belonging to LGBT population, while students whose parents had a stronger gender identity and who practice an authoritarian gender role and have no friends among members of LGBT population, had significant prejudices and a negative attitude towards students belonging to LGBT population. These examples show the influence of family socialisation on the attitudes of young people towards LGBT population. According to DeCarlo (2014), children socialise from an early age (spontaneously or in an organised manner) to accept traditional gender roles, so that when young people come to study or go to larger cities, they adhere to these gender patterns. This is more pronounced in male students, than in female students. Men adhere to traditional moral patterns, because violating these patterns could cause negative consequences for them in terms of avoidance, isolation and even punishment, such as denial of finances, attention and support from parents.

One longitudinal study (Anderssen, 2002) showed that Norwegian students at the beginning of their studies (19 year olds) had had prejudices against homosexuals and lesbians in the range of 39-63% and that this percentage decreased very little after two years (32-59 %). The majority of respondents stated at the beginning of the study (66-79%) that they had no contact with gay and lesbians, while two years later the same students stated that they had no contact with the mentioned population in the range of 51-62%. Anderssen notes that in both cases, girls had a more positive attitude towards homosexuals and lesbians, than men. Data from a study on the attitudes of Canadian university students and their parents towards LGBT people indicate that attitudes have become increasingly tolerant and acceptable over a period of 14 years during which this phenomenon has been monitored. The results of the research show that the main cause of this change is increased contact with people who are known to be homosexual or lesbian (Altemeyer, 2002).

Here we see that prolonged contact of heterosexuals with gay and lesbians affects the change of their attitude, but partly very slowly. The behaviour of LGBT people becomes more morally acceptable for heterosexual people, when contact and communication between them is more frequent. Exploring the change in attitudes of Americans toward gay

and lesbians between 1977 and 2012, Ellen Decoo (2014) observed that Americans view homosexuality in two ways; on the one hand, as a moral issue, that is, a personal choice of an individual in sexual behaviour (not as a question of innate biological characteristics), therefore it is socially unacceptable for many Americans (morally harmful); while on the other hand, they see it as a political issue (a question of political correctness) that refers to the human rights, freedom and political equality (suffrage) of citizens, regardless of their social, racial, gender and sexual affiliation and identity. According to Zhang and Brym (2019), the progress of liberalism, the development of political freedoms and the expansion of education during the 1970s and 1980s led to an increase in tolerance towards various social groups (feminists, countercultural movements, various social, antiwar and anti-nuclear movements) and among them movements for a different sexual orientation, that is, the struggle of members of LGBT population to get out of the zone in which they are socially invisible and unacceptable. All this has led to the relativisation and alleviation of the moral unacceptability of LGBT people by heterosexual citizens in some countries during the first two decades of the 21st century.

Complete rejection of members of LGBT population

There are many countries in the world where members of LGBT population experience stigmatisation, discrimination and violence inflicted by heterosexual people. A number of transgender people in India experience discomfort even in medical facilities when they seek medical help. It is estimated that 4.3% of the Indian male population suffer and die from AIDS because they do not have the courage to seek medical help, fearing the stigma by doctors and medical staff (Kar, Ventriglio and Bhugra, 2018).

Research conducted in South Africa shows that there is undisguised hostility and violence against gay and lesbians (Arndt and Bruin, 2006). The results of the research indicate a large number of attacks on gay population and lesbians regardless of the fact that the South African constitution provides great protection of human rights to persons of different sexual orientation. There is a well-known example of 21-year-old student Matthew Shepard when members of the anti-gay movement brutally beat him, set him on fire, and then tied him to a fence in icy weather, and he eventually died (Arndt and Bruin, 2006: 17). Also, a study from Philippines shows that LGBT members still experience some forms of discrimination and stigmatisation. According to Reyes et al. (2014), the negative perception of most Filipinos towards LGBT people is significantly influenced by religious beliefs. The issue of the same-sex marriage is not acceptable to most residents, nor to the governmental and state institutions of Indonesia (Yuningsih, et. Al., 2018). Any request for recognition of the special rights of LGBT people is considered a violation of the basic principles, norms and beliefs of the people of Indonesia.

Other research have shown that negative attitudes toward lesbians and gay men are more common in men than in women, and attitudes toward gay and lesbians change more slowly in men, than in women (Schope & Eliason, 2004; DeCarlo, 2014; Cardenas et al. 2012).), such as the intolerance of heterosexual men is less towards lesbians, than towards

According to a survey in Serbia, citizens still consider it a shame to have a child who is a member of LGBT population, as evidenced by the fact that 7% of parents would ask their child to leave the family home if they admitted to being gay or lesbian, and as many would stop communicating with him / her for the same reason. Besides, 48% of the respondents look at a different sexual orientation as a disease, which is why they would try to find medical help for the child (CEPROM, 2019). In the same research, we find out that members of the LGBT population face pressure and rejection from their families, which is confirmed by the attitude of 26% of LGBT respondents who constantly suffer psychological and physical violence in the family, while two thirds of the population confirmed that they experienced violence in public space (street, educational space and workplace).

LGBT people and the issue of human rights

The attitude of citizens towards the LGBT population, through the prism of human rights, can be viewed from two aspects: first, the existence of legal and normative rules that warn citizens that any public violence against the LGBT population is subject to legal sanctions; secondly, where there are no laws and regulations, citizens who consider LGBT behaviour to be "unnatural", immoral or a matter of personal orientation and identity, still reject discrimination and violence against them as a form of endangering their basic human rights (right to life, free movement, social and political rights).

As Ellen Decoo (2014) points out, Americans today are more willing to support the human rights of gay and lesbians, than it was the case in previous decades, but they still consider it a morally unacceptable behaviour. This change came about through the activities of numerous gay and lesbian movements that emphasised the fight against discrimination in the workplace and in everyday life, thus succeeding in convincing citizens to accept them, at least from a human rights standpoint (Miceli, 2005). Besides, the increased support for respect for human rights by members of LGBT groups is conditioned by the understanding that it is the result of biological and genetic predisposition. However, support is significantly reduced or completely lost if citizens perceive gay and lesbian affiliation as an attributed activity, a matter of personal choice on the basis of which, a special group identity is built and the movements that exert pressure are formed (Pride Parade) to recognise their special place, role, significance and influence in society (Haider-Markel and Joslyn, 2008: 294-295). Citizens accept the human rights of LGBT people only as their individual and personal rights

of "invisible people", but it is difficult and slow to accept their activity within various LGBT movements, which demand a way out of "invisibility" and a clear declaration of LGBT identity and equal participation in everyday life. Thus, formal human rights are accepted, but the privileges and roles of LGBT people in everyday life are difficult to accept, and it is even more difficult to publicly show affection for those people.

The previous views can best be traced through the evolution of same-sex marriage acceptance, both by state institutions and by heterosexual citizens. As Fetner (2016) points out, Massachusetts was the first US state to legalise same-sex marriage in 2004. At the time, there were still 35 U.S. states banning same-sex marriage by law. Gradual legal evolution and change came under pressure from the "protest marriage" movement, led by Del Martin and Phyllis Lyon, who were married in 2006 in San Francisco, but their marriage was accepted by the city in 2008. There were more and more "protest weddings" every day, but the official institutions declared them invalid. The movement of "protest marriage" began to gain the favour of the citizens, because they believed that the state unjustly took away the marriage from same-sex partners, even if they chose it themselves. The attitude of state institutions has gradually changed, as some states have adopted a law on the right to same-sex marriage, which has further influenced the attitude of citizens about same-sex marriage from the initial 27% support (1996) to 50% support in 2015 (Fetner, 2016: 23-24).

It should be noted that at the end of 2019, there were 42 countries in the world (the most in Europe) in which the right to enter into same-sex marriages were recognised (Masci and Desilver, 2019). Out of these, 21 states fully recognise and equate same-sex with heterosexual marriages, including parental rights, such as adoption and parenting; in 16 countries there are "registered partnerships" ("civil unions") as a transitional form of same-sex marriage, without parental rights; while in 5 countries (USA, Mexico, Australia, Japan and Taiwan) same-sex marriage or "registered partnership" is recognised in some parts of the country. On the other hand, there are still more than 70 countries (primarily in Africa, the Middle East and Asia) that prohibit same-sex marriage by law, justifying it with great resistance from citizens bound by tradition and religious worldview (Chamie and Mirkin, 2014). Several countries are considering the possibility of initiating the procedure for the adoption of the law on the right to same-sex marriage, while other countries are not considering the issue (neither governments, nor citizens) and consider it unnecessary, although there are

¹ A characteristic example of this attitude is Serbia, where the Prime Minister is a declared member of LGBT population and has a female partner who gave birth to a child. Pride parades are held in Serbia, but with the help of the police, which secures the gatherings. However, governmental

countries where there is unregistered cohabitation of samesex couples¹.

Social environment and circumstances in which LGBT people find themselves in Bosnia and Herzegovina

LGBT activism appeared in the form of a movement in B&H² only in 2004 with the founding of the *Q Association*. The movement gained its greatest visibility in 2008 by organising the Queer Sarajevo Festival, which was attacked by religious and nationalist extremists and prevented from happening. Shortly afterwards, this Association was closed. With the disappearance of this Association, the second generation of LGBT activists, led by the Sarajevo Open Centre, enters the scene, which still operates today (UNDP, 2017: 12). The past 15 years have been marked by violence and visible attacks on LGBT-related events, but also little progress when it comes to the visibility of LGBT people. LGBT activism in the past 5 years has also brought significant improvements to the institutional, legal and public policy framework for the protection of the human rights of LGBT people. An indicator of progress in the visibility of the LGBT people in B&H was the Pride Parade held on September 8, 2019 in Sarajevo, which was attended by slightly more than 1,000 people, but with great security and protection of the procession by the police. At the same time, a protest was organised by Islamic organisations and activists against the Pride in the park next to the street where the LGBT activists, who participated in the Pride, passed. "Nevertheless, the LGBT people and their lives in B&H remain on the margins of political, institutional and social focus" (UNDP, 2017: 5).

Here we will list several social entities that influence the creation of a negative perception of the LGBT people in Bosnian-Herzegovinian society. In the first place are the religious communities in B&H. This can be best seen in the example of attacks by extremists and religious fanatics on the "Queer Sarajevo Festival" in 2008, when representatives of all three major religious communities (Catholic, Orthodox and Islamic) jointly condemned the holding of this festival. They confirmed their views with a series of official statements and decisions issued by the institutions of religious communities. Another example is the conclusion of the Council of Mufti of the Islamic Community of B&H in 2015, in response to the attack of religious fanatics on members of the LGBT people who organised the "Merlinka Festival" at the Criterion Art Cinema in Sarajevo on February 1, 2014. The Conclusion formally condemns violence against persons of the same sex, but also clearly condemns same-sex marriage and calls "homosexuality" a "great sin." "Such

institutions have still not raised the issue of adopting a law that allows same-sex marriages.

262

² Hereinafter, we will often use the usual abbreviation (acronym) B&H instead of the full name Bosnia and Herzegovina.

actions of religious communities take place without any comments from the institutions of executive and legislative power in B&H" (UNDP, 2017: 6-7).

Another important subject of every society, including Bosnian-Herzegovinian, are political parties and their activities. Most political parties and their representatives in B&H avoid questions about the position and rights of LGBT people, both in their programs and in their daily political activities and debates in institutions. The main cause is the fear that they will lose the support of voters if they publicly show understanding for the issues and problems of the LGBT population (Pandurević, Bošnjak, Kučukalić, 2015).

Research shows that the police and the judiciary, as important social entities, do not keep records of crimes committed out of hatred towards LGBT people (Vasić, Gavrić, Bošnjak, 2016).

The media space, as an important social entity, is not equally accessible to LGBT people and LGBT topics arue not the focus of media reporting. During the interview, it was noticed that journalists do not have enough knowledge and sensitivity for the problems of the LGBT population (Institution of the Human Rights Ombudsman of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2016)

The health system does not recognise the specific needs of the LGBT people. Many doctors have an ignorant, or even discriminatory attitude towards this community. Persons of the same sex are still excluded from the blood donation system in Republika Srpska (B&H entity). Persons who are in the process of gender reassignment cannot receive specialist treatments in B&H, nor are the costs of medical treatments abroad covered by health funds (UNDP, 2017: 24).

Although in B&H there is a Law on Prohibition of Discrimination adopted at the session of the House of Peoples of the Parliamentary Assembly in 2016, the law does not mention the protection of the LGBT population anywhere.

In October 2018, the Government of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (entity in B&H) passed a Conclusion on the formation of a working group that would work on drafting a law on regulating the status of same-sex communities. The Conclusion was made on the initiative of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Federation of B&H, due to the increasing number of requests of same-sex couples regarding problems in solving administrative-bureaucratic issues. However, the drafting of the law has not started yet. There is still no similar initiative in Republika Srpska (the second entity in B&H).

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The aim of the paper and research questions

The aim of this paper is to determine the attitude of citizens in Bosnia and Herzegovina towards the LGBT people. We were interested to find out whether heterosexual citizens notice the presence and activities of the LGBT people

in their environment, whether they approve of the legalisation of same-sex marriages and their parental function, as well as their attitude towards several LGBT topics.

To make it easier to meet the set goal, we started with research questions, which gave us the opportunity to fully explore the attitude of citizens towards LGBT people.

- 1. How familiar are the citizens with the essence and meaning of the term LGBT and do they personally know someone who belongs to the LGBT population?
- 2. How do the citizens perceive the presence, behaviour and activities of LGBT people, their groups and movements?
- 3. What is the attitude of heterosexual citizens towards LGBT people (acceptance, non-acceptance, tolerance, stigmatisation, discrimination)?
- 4. How aware are the citizens of the problems the LGBT population faces in B&H?
- 5. What is the perception of the citizens about who provides assistance and protection to the LGBT population in B&H?

Data collection techniques

In this paper, we used a questionnaire designed for the purpose of this research, which consisted of 23 questions related to the knowledge and opinion of respondents about the current situation of the LGBT population in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The research was conducted online through the Google questionnaire platform during January and February 2020.

Statistical data processing

The collected data were processed with the help of freely available open source software JASP (JASP Team, 2020), and after data entry and coding, frequency analysis was used to display the values on the sample, and descriptive data are then shown in absolute frequencies. For the descriptive bivariate analysis of the relationship between the variables, contingency tables were used, and then the Hisquare test was used in the inferential part of the analysis. Due to the ordinal nature of the variables, the correlation was examined using the Kendal-tau correlation coefficient and the Spearman correlation coefficient. The significance threshold of the p-value for all tested statistical hypotheses was set to $\alpha = 0.05$."

Statistical sample

The study involved 314 respondents (49.4% men and 50.6% women), average age 41.4 years (SD = 17.3, range: 19 - 87 years), out of which 50.3% resided in the Federation of B&H, and 49.7% in Republika Srpska. There were 57.3% employed, 28.7% unemployed and 14% pensioners. 50% of them live in the city, 22.3% in the suburbs, and 27.7% live in the countryside. 14.7% of respondents completed primary school, 31.2% completed

secondary school, 12.7% of them were students at the time of the survey, 20.4% of them had a university degree and 12.1% had a master's degree, while 8.9% of respondents had completed doctoral studies.

RESEARCH RESULTS

In the continuation of this paper, we will analyse the obtained results based on the conducted research where we try to determine the attitude of the citizens of heterosexual orientation towards persons, groups and movements belonging to the LGBT population in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Familiarity of the citizens with the concept and characteristics of LGBT groups and movements

At the beginning of the research, we wanted to find out how familiar our respondents are with the concept and meaning of the abbreviation LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender). Do they know who it refers to, what the difference between certain categories within the LGBT group is, as well as whether they know in their immediate environment a person who belongs to this group? The results show that more than half of the respondents (52.5%) are fully familiar with the meaning of the term LGBT, and that 44.3%

partially know what the term referred to, while only 3.2% of respondents are not sure what the term exactly means. Of particular interest is the fact that 67.5% of respondents said they were aware that according to the official interpretation of the World Health Organisation (WHO), homosexuality and lesbianism was no longer a disease, while 32.5% said they learned it for the first time from our Questionnaire. Besides, 49% of respondents said they knew someone who declared himself a member of the LGBT population.

We noticed the existence of differences between male and female persons in knowledge and awareness of the meaning of the term which represents the acronym LGBT. Females (62.3%) more accurately understand the meaning of this term comparing to males (42.6%). Besides, a higher percentage of women (73.6%) had knowledge that, according to the WHO interpretation, homosexuality and lesbianism is no longer a disease. In addition, a significantly higher percentage of female respondents (56%), than men (41.9%) know someone who is a member of the LGBT population. Older respondents are generally unfamiliar with the term LGBT with the WHO's official interpretation. Besides, older respondents, much less often comparing to younger ones, know someone in their immediate environment who is a member of the LGBT population.

Table 1: The presence of gender differences and administrative criteria in matters related to the term LGBT

		Sex		• • • •	-
		Male	Female	χ²	p
Are you familiar with the term (abbre	eviation	acronym) LGBT ar	nd its meaning?		
Yes, fully	n	66	99		
res, runy	%	42.6	62.3		
Yes, partially	n	85	54		
	%	54.8	34	13.865	< .001
No Total	n	4	6	15.605	< .001
	%	2.6	3.8		
	n	155	159		
Totai	%	100	100		
wareness that homosexuality and le	sbianisn	n, according to the of	fficial interpretation of the V	World Health Organisa	ation (WHC
s no longer a disease					
Yes	n	95	117		
Yes	%	61.3	73.6		
No, it's the first time I hear it	n	60	42	5.409	0.02
	%	38.7	26.4	3.407	0.02
Total	n	155	159		
Total	%	100	100		
acquaintance with a person who is a	member	of the LGBT popula	ation		
Yes	n	65	89		
105	%	41.9	56		
No	n	90	70	6.19	0.013
INU	0/	58.1	44		
	%	30.1	77		

Ivan Šijaković, Attitude of Bosnian and Herzegovinian Citizens Towards LGBT Population

	%	100	100		
		Place of residence acco	ording to administrative criteri	a	
		Republika Srpska	Federation of B&H		
Are you familiar with the term (abbre	viation	acronym) LGBT and its	meaning?		
Yes, fully	n	86	79		
res, runy	%	55.1	50.0		
Vac montially:	n	67	72		
Yes, partially	%	42.9	45.6	2.064	0.356
No	n	3	7	2.004	0.356
	%	1.9	4.4		
	n	156	158		
Total	%	100.0	100.0		
Yes	11 %	69.2	65.8		
is no longer a disease	n	108	104		
Yes No, it's the first time I hear it	n	48	54		0.519
	%	30.8	34.2	0.416	
	70	30.0			0.519
	n	156	158		0.519
Total	n %	156 100.0	158 100.0		0.519
Total Acquaintance with a person who is a	%	100.0	100.0		0.519
Acquaintance with a person who is a	%	100.0	100.0		0.519
	% member	100.0 of the LGBT population	100.0		0.519
Acquaintance with a person who is a Yes	% member n	100.0 of the LGBT population 85	100.0	2 675	
Acquaintance with a person who is a	% member n %	100.0 of the LGBT population 85 54.5	100.0 69 43.7	3.675	0.519
Acquaintance with a person who is a Yes	member n % n	100.0 of the LGBT population 85 54.5 71	100.0 69 43.7 89	3.675	

We noticed that there is a connection between the place of residence and how familiar the respondents are with the meaning of the term LGBT. The link indicates that the respondents from cities are more versed in the meaning of the term, than those living in a suburban settlement or village. It is interesting to note that a higher percentage of the respondents from Republika Srpska know someone who belongs to the LGBT population, comparing to the respondents in the Federation of B&H. The respondents with a higher level of education also have greater knowledge about the meaning of the term LGBT and more often in their immediate environment have acquaintances of the LGBT population, compared to the respondents with a lower level of education. Depending on the working status of the respondents, the level of their knowledge about the meaning of the term LGBT also differs (r τ = 0.261, p <0.001). The connection between these two variables indicates that those who are employed have more knowledge about the meaning of the term LGBT, while those who are retired, more often answered that they heard it for the first time that homosexuality was no longer medically classified as a disease.

Citizens' attitudes towards LGBT people, their groups and movements

The general view on the frequencies and percentages of the respondents' responses (Appendix 1) shows that B&H citizens still have a lot of prejudices against LGBT people. If we look at a few characteristic responses that confirm this view, we will see that 35.9% of the respondents support the view that "homosexuality and lesbianism is a kind of disease," despite being aware that the WHO no longer qualifies it as such. On the other hand, 20.7% of the respondents believe that the "LGBT population is trying to impose their way of life" on other citizens, while 52.9% disagree with this statement. It is interesting to note that 26.4% of the respondents abstained on this issue. One of the most reliable indicators by which we can measure the attitude of the citizens towards LGBT people is the attitude towards same-sex marriages. The respondents in our survey with 44.9% (somewhat or strongly) support the position on the legalisation of same-sex marriage, while 36.3% of them do not support this position and 18.8% are indifferent. When we wanted to further check the position on same-sex marriages, we asked whether "legalisation of same-sex marriages could jeopardise the values and significance of heterosexual marriages", we learned that 50.6% of the respondents believe

that same-sex marriages will not jeopardise the values of "traditional" marriage, while 37.6% of the respondents believe that the legalisation of same-sex marriages would violate the values of heterosexual marriages. The most important test of the position on same-sex marriages is the question of the possibility of adopting children by same-sex married couples. In our survey, 48.7% of respondents reject such an attitude (31.2% completely), while 30.9% support the view that same-sex married couples can adopt children.

Previous views tell us that there is a significant mood among the heterosexual citizens in B&H that the earlier atmosphere of rejection is changing into an atmosphere of the acceptance of LGBT people.

In order to find out more about the attitude of the citizens towards LGBT people, we compared the basic statistical data by gender, age, education, employment and place of residence.

Table 2: The gender difference in the attitude that homosexuality and lesbianism are a kind of disease

Homosexuality and lesbianism are a kind of disease		Sex		2,2	
Holliosexuality and lesofallistif are a kille of disease					
Strongly disagrae	n	n 23 43 % 14.8 27 n 46 40 % 29.7 25.2 n 21 28 % 13.5 17.6 n 45 33			
Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree	%	14.8	27		
Community of discourse	n	46	40		
Somewnat disagree	%	29.7	25.2		
Naidan ann dia an	n	21	28		
Neither agree, nor disagree	%	13.5	17.6	9.99	0.041
Companies agree	n	45	33	9.99	0.041
Somewhat agree	%	29	20.8		
Strongly cores	n	20	15		
Strongly agree	%	12.9	9.4		
Total	n	155	159		
Total	%	100	100		

We noticed that there were differences according to gender in the statement "homosexuality and lesbianism is a kind of disease", especially in the choice of answers "Strongly disagree", where 27% of females and 14.8% of males. On the other hand, 29% of men and 20.8% of women "somewhere agree" with this attitude (Table 2). There is a significant

difference between the respondents according to age, and it indicates that as they grow older, respondents less and less agree with the statement that the legalisation of same-sex marriages could reduce the value and importance of heteronormative marriages (Table 3).

Table 3: Relationship between age and claims about members of the LGBT community (choice of characteristic attitudes).

			$\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{s}}$	p
		Homosexuality and lesbianism are a kind of disease.	0.094	0.096
		The LGBT population imposes its way of life on the rest of the population.	-0.052	0.363
		Same-sex marriages should be legalised.	0.023	0.69
		Same-sex partners should be allowed to adopt children.	-0.003	0.956
Age respondent	of	Legalisation of same-sex marriages could diminish the value and significance of heteronormative marriages.	-0.124	0.028
		The Pride Parade should be held in B&H cities.	-0.032	0.577
		Organising a Pride Parade in B&H cities would improve the position of the LGBT people in B&H.	-0.02	0.719

The correlation between place of residence and the attitude towards the statement that "LGBT population imposes its way of life on the rest of the population" (r τ = 0.134, p = 0.007) indicates that the respondents living in less urbanised areas agree more with this statement. The respondents living in cities and suburbs have a higher percentage of "disagree" or "somewhat disagree" with the

statements in Table 3, while the percentage of agreement with these statements is slightly higher among the respondents living in rural areas, than those living in more urban environments. In addition, a higher percentage of the respondents living in cities and suburbs agree that they should "allow the adoption of children by same-sex partners", than the respondents living in rural areas (Appendix 2).

When it comes to the most sensitive issue that testifies to the existence of the LGBT movement, and that is the holding of the Pride Parade in the cities of B&H, we see that there is a significant difference in the opinion of the respondents in relation to the entities in which the respondents live³. Thus, 37.2% of the respondents from Republika Srpska do not agree at all with this statement, compared to 27.2% of the respondents from the Federation of B&H. Besides, 9.6% of the respondents from Republika Srpska fully support the position that the Pride Parade should be held freely in the cities of B&H, while this position is

supported by 12% of the respondents from the Federation of B&H. From these data, we can see that the inhabitants of Republika Srpska are somewhat more conservative comparing to the inhabitants of the Federation of B&H.

Our study showed a significant correlation between educational attainment and claims about the LGBT population, especially in a few cases (Table 4). The link between educational attainment and the claim that "LGBT population imposes its way of life on others", indicates that the higher the level of education of the respondents, the more they disagree with the stated statement.

Table 4: The relationship between the educational attainment of the respondents and the claims about the LGBT population

	Statements	r_{τ}	p
	The LGBT population imposes its way of life on the rest of the population.	-0.228	< .001
	Members of the LGBT population should have the same rights in all areas as heteronormative people.	0.324	< .001
Respondents'	Same-sex marriages should be legalised.	0.305	< .001
educational	Same-sex partners should be allowed to adopt children.	0.239	< .001
attainment	Legalisation of same-sex marriages could diminish the value and significance of heteronormative marriages.	-0.284	< .001
	Topics on the LGBT population should be more represented in the B&H education system.	0.271	< .001

There is a positive correlation between the educational attainment and the agreement with the statement that members of LGBT population should have equal rights in all areas as heterosexuals, as well as with the statement that same-sex marriages should be legalised. Thus, a higher level of education gives a higher degree of agreement of the respondents with these statements. Besides, higher education is positively related to the degree of agreement with the statement that "same-sex partners should be allowed to adopt children", while negatively related to the statement that legalisation of same-sex marriages will diminish the value and significance of heteronormative marriages. There is also a positive link between higher educational attainment and the claim that "topics about LBGT population should be more represented in the B&H educational system."

Understanding the problems and difficulties faced by the LGBT population in B&H

In order to have a more complete view of the attitude of B&H citizens towards LGBT people, we asked several questions to check whether the respondents are aware of the position, problems and difficulties that LGBT people face in everyday life. We were first interested in whether the respondents were aware of the existence of discrimination against persons on the basis of sexual orientation. The respondents' responses indicate that there is an approximate percentage of those who reject such a claim (41.1%), as well as those who agree (46.8%) (Appendix 1). In addition, we were interested to find out whether the respondents were aware of the problems and difficulties that LGBT people face at work and career advancement. We can see that the respondents in a high percentage perceive the difficulties that LGBT people face at work, especially in career advancement (49.4%) (Table 5).

Table 5: An overview of the frequencies and estimates for claims related to the problems that LGBT people may encounter at work

creates difficulties for B&H Strongly Somewhat citizens regarding: disagree disagree Somewhat strongly agree, nor disagree disagree Total

³ Bosnia and Herzegovina is divided into two entities and one district. In Republika Srpska entity, 82.95% of population are Serbs, 12.69% Bosniaks and 2.27% Croats. In the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 70.4% are Bosniaks, 22.44% are

Croats and 2.41% are Serbs. (Data taken from http://www.statistika.ba/).

	n	23	123	24	105	39	314
Employment	%	7.3	39.2	7.6	33.4	12.4	100
	K %	7.3	46.5	54.1	87.6	100	
	n	32	79	60	95	48	314
Relations at work	%	10.2	25.2	19.1	30.3	15.3	100
	K %	10.2	35.4	54.5	84.7	100	
	n	39	88	40	101	46	314
Retaining job	%	12.4	28	12.7	32.2	14.7	100
	K %	12.4	40.4	53.2	85.4	100	
C	n	45	76	38	85	70	314
Career advancement opportunities	%	14.3	24.2	12.1	27.1	22.3	100
opportunities	K %	14.3	38.5	50.6	77.7	100	

When we look at gender differences in the perception of difficulties faced by the LGBT people at work, we see that a higher percentage of men support the view that the LGBT population encounters difficulties in employment, while women more often believe that the LGBT people encounter difficulties and problems in relationships at work and career advancement. The most important attitude about the mentioned problems can be given to us by the respondents who are already employed. Employees perceive the difficulties of the LGBT people in "relations at work" with 52.8% (somewhat agree 30%, strongly agree 22.8%), then in "job retention" (55.5%), as well as "career advancement opportunities" (53.3%). Besides, significant data for us, in the perception of difficulties of the LGBT people related to work and career advancement, are the diference in attitudes according to the level of education. The respondents with a higher level of education (including students) in a higher percentage than those with primary and secondary education, believe that members of the LGBT population face problems related to potential employment.

$Attitudes \ of \ the \ citizens \ about \ the \ support \ that \\ the \ LGBT \ population \ receives \ in \ B\&H$

In every society there are groups, institutions and individuals who support the activities of LGBT people and

their fight for emancipation, against discrimination and stigmatisation. Most often, these are some NGOs, then institutions that protect the law, sometimes governments and especially famous public figures (athletes, artists, scientists or some politicians). In our research, we want to find out how respondents perceive support for LGBT people and which entities in B&H provide support to these people. If we look at the general overview of frequencies and percentages of of our respondents' responses (Appendix 3), we can see that the respondents believe (95.6%) that NGOs give the most support to the LGBT people, followed by the media (46.5%) and celebrities (37.6 %). On the other hand, the respondents are aware that religious organisations least support the activities of the LGBT people (12.1%), followed by public institutions such as universities, schools and health care institutions (16.6%).

By comparing the data, using the basic variables, we have found that there is a correlation between opinions about how much the LGBT population is represented in the media and the level of education of the respondents ($r\tau = -0.136$; p = 0.004), which indicates that the respondents with higher education believe that the LGBT population is not sufficiently represented in the media.

Table 6: The ratio of age and place of residence to the support of the LGBT population by different entities

The follow	ving entities support the activities of the LGBT population in B&H:	r_s	p
	Public institutions	0.114	0.043
	Governmental institutions	0.131	0.020
	Religious organisations	0.01	0.856
A	Business entities	0.131	0.021
Age	media	-0.091	0.108
	NGOs	-0.119	0.035
	celebrities	0.187	< .001
	None of the above	0.009	0.875

The following institutions support the activities of the LGBT community in B&H: r_{τ} p

Respondents' Public institutions -0.112 **0.024**

place	Governmental institutions	0.073	0.141
of	Religious organisations	-0.142	0.006
residence	Business entities	-0.115	0.021
	media	-0.113	0.028
	NGOs	-0.169	< .001
	celebrities	-0.110	0.027
	None of the above	0.072	0.140

DISCUSION

Our research shows that in the second decade of the 21st century, there is a significant percentage of the citizens in Bosnia and Herzegovina who are not ready to sincerely, openly and fully accept the LGBT people in their environment. We can see that 35.9% of our respondents (somewhat or strongly) consider homosexuality to be a kind of disease; 36.3% reject the possibility of legalising same-sex marriage; 48.7% disagree that same-sex marriages should be allowed the legal possibility of adopting children; 50.6% believe that the legalisation of same-sex marriages would jeopardise the values and significance of heteronormative marriages; 53.2% oppose organising the Pride Parade in B&H cities; while 31.8% believe that the LGBT people are "often" or "very often" represented in the media. On the other hand, it is encouraging that 79.0% of the respondents believe that LGBT people should have "equal rights as heteronormative people". This tells us that homosexuality in B&H is understood as a moral issue, i.e. the violation of traditional order in sexual orientation, as well as sexual, partner and marital relations.

Our research shows that the citizens of heterosexual orientation in B&H are sufficiently familiar with the concept, term, characteristics and meaning of the LGBT (52.5% extremely familiar; 44.3 very familiar). The situation is somewhat worse with the knowledge that homosexuality is no longer medically classified as a disease, because 67.5% of the respondents had known it before they read in our questionnaire, while 32.5% of them stated they heard it for the first time. Besides, 49.0% of the respondents stated that they personally knew a person who belonged to the LGBT population, while 51.0% of them stated that they did not know such a person. Based on these data, the answer to our first research question ("How familiar are citizens with the essence and meaning of the term LGBT and do they personally know a person belonging to the LGBT population?") is that most B&H citizens are familiar with the meaning of LGBT, but that most citizens do not personally know a person who belongs to the LGBT population.

The answer to our second research question ("How do citizens perceive the presence, behaviour and activities of the LGBT people, their groups and movements?") we will start with our respondents' perception of whether the LGBT population "imposes its way of life on the rest of the population". From a general overview of the answers, we can see that a total of 52.9% think that the LGBT population does

not dimpose its lifestyle, while 20.7% think that it imposes its lifestyle on the rest of the population. If we add to this the percentage of the respondents (26.4%) who are indifferent (indeterminate) to this statement, then we can conclude that the majority of citizens in B&H do not have an a priori negative attitude towards the LGBT population. Another important indicator of the citizens' preference for the LGBT population can be found in the attitude of our respondents who with 79.0% support the view that members of the LGBT population should have equal rights in all areas of social life. However, when we look at the perception of our respondents towards LGBT people as a group (same-sex marriage, lesbianism, homosexuality as a collective behaviour), we can see that the support for same-sex marriage is somewhat lower (44.9%), out of which 19.4% give full support, while support for the adoption of children is even lower (31.2% complete rejection versus 15.3% full support). An indicator of weak support for LGBT people as a movement is the issue of organising the Pride Parade in B&H cities. Our respondents with 32.2% strongly disapprove of such activity, while 10.8% of them strongly approve of the Pride Parade. Thus, the answer to our previous research question is that B&H citizens perceive members of the LGBT population moderately positively as individuals, but most negatively perceive the activities and behaviour of LGBT people as a group, and especially negatively as a movement.

For a more complete understanding of the attitude of heterosexual citizens towards LGBT people, we offered our respondents the statement that "organising the Pride Parade in B&H cities would improve the position of the LGBT people in B&H." We can see that 49.4% of the respondents disagreed with this statement, while 35.7% supported such a statement. Based on all the previously presented views of our respondents, the answer to the third research question ("What is the attitude of heteronormative citizens towards LGBT people" is that B&H citizens are almost equally divided when it comes to acceptance (non-acceptance) of LGBT people, because when all the data are compared, we get the result that slightly more than 1/3 of citizens accept LGBT people, but there are as many people who do not accept them, while about 1/5 of citizens are indifferent to the position and status of the LGBT population in B&H. It is similar when we talk about tolerance towards the presence and activity of LGBT people - more respondents support same-sex marriage, but there are more of them who do not support the adoption of children by same-sex couples. In addition, 9% of the respondents support

the claim that homosexuality is a kind of disease regardless of the position of the WHO. As far as the discrimination of the LGBT people in B&H is concerned, we can also see that 46.8% of the respondents are aware of the existence of discrimination, while 41.1% do not accept that there is such discrimination.

The research has shown that the respondents are aware of the issues that members of the LGBT population face at work, as well as in the educational and health systems. Regarding job-related problems, the respondents perceived employment opportunities (45.8%) and career advancement (49.4%) as the biggest issues for the LGBT people. On the other hand, 59.6% of our respondents believe that topics about the LGBT population should be more represented in the school and educational system of B&H. Besides, 47.8% of the respondents support the view that homosexuals should be allowed to change their gender in medical institutions at the expense of the state budget. Based on these views, the answer to our fourth research question ("How aware are the citizens of the issues faced by the LGBT population in B&H?") is that nearly 50 percent of the citizens are aware of the fact that members of the LGBT community may have significant issues and difficulties related to work, education and medical services.

The answer to our fifth research question ("What is the perception of the citizens about who provides assistance and protection to the LGBT population in B&H?"), is that the respondents believe that there is little support from major social actors (public and governmental institutions, as well as celebrities), while they have the greatest support from NGOs (80.6%) and solid support from the media (50.3%). The respondents are also aware that the LGBT community has the least support from religious organisations and businesses.

CONCLUSION

By insight into literature, we have learnt that the LGBT population and community was increasingly present as a research topic and task for theoretical analysis, especially during the first two decades of the 21st century. However, there is a significant disbalance: this topic has been dealt with much more in the developed countries of the West (USA, Canada, Australia and Europe), than in other countries of the world. Besides, we noticed that most of the research on the position of LGBT people in society is related to the problem and perception in the field of education and health, and that there is little research related to employment, social relations, everyday life, politics and culture. Our research is aimed at providing a broader insight into the problem and issues faced by the LGBT people in Bosnia and Herzegovina, viewed through the prism of the experiences and attitudes that heterosexual (heteronormative) people have towards them.

The review of empirical data, reports and attitudes indicates that today there are more than 100 countries in the world where LGBT population suffers discrimination, stigmatisation, and even violence by heteronormative people,

their groups, movements and even governmental institutions. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, a debate has been launched in the Federation of B&H on the need to adopt the laws on same-sex marriage and the protection of the rights of LGBT people, but this initiative has not gone far. In Republika Srpska entity, this issue is not raised and official institutions avoid any discussion that includes the issue of the position and problems of LGBT people.

Our research has shown that there is a significant polarisation between two groups of B&H citizens when it comes to the attitudes towards LGBT people. One group has a negative attitude and does not support the activities of the LGBT, which shows the average of all frequencies of attitudes of the respondents (37.4%). The second group has a positive attitude towards the LGBT and supports their activities, which shows the average of all frequencies of attitudes of the respondents (39.6%). The rest of the citizens do not have their own position, do not decide, avoid or ignore all issues related to the LGBT population in B&H. The research further shows that slightly more than half of the citizens do not know a person who belongs to the LGBT community, which indicates that citizens are careful in communicating with LGBT people, and that they try to avoid direct contact with them. The percentage of the respondents (36.2%) who support the view that "homosexuality is a type of disease", indicates that more than one third of B&H citizens are not ready for tolerance and contact with LGBT. If we add the percentage of the respondents (15.6%) - those who avoid or ignore issues and topics related to LGBT population, we can conclude that there is not good enough atmosphere to improve the situation and develop tolerance towards the LGBT people in B&H.

Our research has shown that men are more likely to express a negative attitude towards the LGBT population than women. We have also found that citizens with a higher level of education are more likely to accept LGBT people and their activities, than people with a low level of education, just as citizens living in urban areas have more tolerance towards LGBT people, than citizens living in villages and suburbs. A particularly interesting finding from our research is that citizens in Republika Srpska are less receptive and less supportive of LGBT activities, than citizens of the Federation of B&H.

Our research has shown that in B&H there are three basic types of citizens' attitudes towards LGBT people, which are present in modern theory: first, the citizens' attitudes towards the LGBT community as a moral issue (violation of traditional public morals in sexual and marital relations); second, the complete rejection of LGBT people and their struggle for emancipation and freedom; third, citizens show the highest tolerance and understanding for the activities of the LGBT population when they view them through the prism of human rights and possible discrimination in society.

We can conclude that the citizens of B&H have a moderately positive attitude and tolerance towards LGBT

people, their behaviour and activities. We also note that citizens show a greater degree of sensitivity to the issues and problems of LGBT community than representatives of the government, public institutions, companies and religious organisations.

REFERENCES

- 1. Altemeyer, Bob. (2002). "Changes in Attitudes Toward Homosexuals". *Journal of Homosexuality*. Vol. 42, Issue 2. Pp. 63-75.
- 2. Anderssen, Norman. (2002). "Does contact with lesbians and gays lead to friendlier attitudes?" *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, Vol.12 No,2: 124-136.
- 3. Arndt Marlene and Gideon de Bruin. (2006). "Attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: relations with gender, race and religion among university students". *PINS*, *No.* 33, pp.16-30.
- 4. Burn, S. (2000). "Heterosexuals' use of "fag" and "queer" to deride one another: A contributor to heterosexism and stigma". *Journal of Homosexuality*, No. 40(2), pp. 1-11.
- "Nevidljivi građani predrasude i diskriminacija kao odraz stanja jednog društva". Centar za profesionalizaciju medija i medijsku pismenost (CEPROM). 2019.
- Cárdenas, M., Barrientos, J., Gómez, F. & Frias-Navarro, D. (2012). "Attitudes towards gay men and lesbians and their relationship with gender role beliefs in a sample of Chilean university students". *International Journal of Sexual Health*, No. 24. Pp.226-236.
- 7. Chamie Joseph and Barry Mirkin. (2014). "Same-Sex Marriage: A New Social Phenomenon". *Population and Development Review*, Vol. 37, No. 3. pp. 529-551.
- 8. DeCarlo, Aubrey Lynne. (2014). "The Relationship between Traditional Gender Roles and Negative Attitudes towards Lesbians and Gay Men in Greek-Affiliated and Independent Male College Student". (ReserchGate).
- 9. Decoo, Ellen. (2014). "Changing Attitudes Toward Homosexuality in the United States from 1977 to2012". Department of Sociology Brigham Young University.
- 10. https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi ?article=5090&context=etd
- 11. Fetner Tina (2016). "Attitudes Toward Lesbian & Gay People are Better than ever". *Contexts*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 20-26. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1536 504216648147
- 12. Gormley, Barbara & Lopez, Frederick. G. (2010). Authoritarian and homophobic attitudes: Gender

- and adult attachment style differences. *Journal of Homosexuality*, Vol. 57. Issue 4. Pp. 525-538.
- Haider-Markel, Donald and Mark R. Joslyn. (2008).
 "Beliefs about the Origins of Homosexuality and Support for Gay Rights: An Empirical Test of Attribution Theory." Public Opinion Quarterly 72(2): 291-310. (ResearchGate).
- 14. Institucija Ombudsmana za ljudska prava Bosne i Hercegovine. *Specijalni Izvještaj o pravima LGBT osoba u Bosni i Hercegovini*. Banja Luka, septembar 2016. Godine
- 15. JASP Team. (2020). JASP (Version 0.13.1)[Computer software].
- 16. Johnston, Tim R. (2017). "Two Steps Forward, One Step Back: The Story of LGBT Gen Xers". *Generations*. Vol.41. No.3.
- 17. Kar, A., Mukherjee, Ventriglio, A., Bhugra, D., (2018) "Attitude of Indian Medical Students towards Homosexuality", *East Asian Archives of Psychiatry*, Vol. 28. No. 2. (Questia).
- 18. Marlene Arndt Gideon de Bruin. (2006). "Attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: relations with gender, race and religion among university students". *PINS*, *No. 33*, *pp. 16-30*
- 19. Masci, David and Drew Desilver. "A global snapshot of same-sex marriage". *Pew Research Center*. October 29, 2019.
- Miceli, Melinda S. (2005). "Morality Politics vs. Identity Politics: Framing Processes and Competition among Christian Right and Gay Social Movement Organizations." Sociological Forum 20(4): 589-612. (ResearchGate).
- 21. Pandurević, Darko, Bošnjak, Emina, Kučukalić, Naida (2015). *Političke stranke I ljudska prava LGBT osoba: Monitoring opštih izbora 2014. godine*. Sarajevo: Sarajevski otvoreni centar.
- 22. Rowe Denise, Yeow Chyeng, Louise O'Keefe and Desiree Crawford. "Providers' Attitudes and Knowledge of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Health". Federal Practitioner, 2017.
- 23. Reyes, Marc Eric S.; Ballesteros, Kristine Cate A.; Bandol, Patricia Anne A.; Jimenez, Kaye Angeline H.; Malangen, Sean Derick R. (2019). "Religiosity, Gender Role Beliefs, and Attitudes toward Lesbians and Gays in the Philippines". *North American Journal of Psychology*. Vol. 21, No. 3.
- 24. Schott-Ceccacci Melinda; Laurel Holland and Todd Matthews, "Attitudes Toward the LGBT Community in Higher Education", Spaces for Difference: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 2015. Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 37-47
- 25. Schope, Robert.D. & Eliason, Michele. J., (2004). "Sissies and tomboys: Gender role behaviors and homophobia". *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social*

- Services: Issues in Practice, Policy, and Research, No.16. Iss.2, pp.73-97.
- 26. Sharpe, S. (2002). 'It's just hard to come to terms with': Young people's views on homosexuality. *Sex Education*, 2(3), 263-277.
- 27. Shaynie T Duhaylungsod, Cheska Grace Y Madrid, Mae Leamor M Lapiz, Cristine S Pongasi, Lea May P Tan. "Attitudes Toward the LGBT". Arts and Social Sciences Journal. 2018. Vol. 9. Issue 6.
- 28. Strong, B., DeVault, C., & Cohen, T. (2005). *The marriage & family experience*. (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Swank, Eric & Raiz, Lisa. (2010). "Attitudes toward gays and lesbians among undergraduate social work students". *Journal of Women and Social Work*, No. 25, 19-29. http://ericswank.weebly.com/uploads/2/3/0/8/2308
- 30. Torales, J.; Barrios, I.; Torres, A.; Dunjo, N.; Benitez, M. G.; Villalba, J.; Ventriglio, A.; Bhugra, D. "Attitude of Medical Students in Paraguay towards Homosexuality", *East Asian Archives of*

0984/swank_affilia_raiz.pdf

Psychiatry, Vol. 28. No. 3. 2018.

31. Wilson K.Christina, Lindsey West, Lara Stepleman, Margo Villarosa, Brittany Ange, Matthew Decker,

- and Jennifer L. Waller. "Attitudes Toward LGBT Patients Among Students in the Health Professions: Influence of Demographics and Discipline". *LGBT Health*, Vol.00. No.00.
- $\frac{https://www.researchgate.net/publication/28652617}{6}$
- 32. Yuningsih, Deity, Haris, Oheo K., Rezky, Ali, Tegnan, Hilaire (2018). "Same Sex Marriage in Legal and Human Rights Perspectives". *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues*. Vol. 21. No. 3.
- 33. UNDP (2017). Biti LGBT u Istočnoj Evropi: Smanjenje nejednakosti, isključenosti i borba protiv homofobije i tansfobije kojoj su izložene LGBT osobe u Bosni i Hercegovini Izveštaj. file:///C:/Users/Profa/Desktop/LGBTQ/Biti%20LGBTI%20u%20BiH.0346%202017%20BSC.pdf
- 34. Vasić, Vladana, Gavrić, Saša, Bošnjak, Emina (2016). *Rozi izveštaj 2016. Godišnji izveštaj o stanju ljudskih prava LGBT osoba u Bosni I Hercegovini.* Sarajevo: Sarajevski otvoreni forum.
- Zhang Tony Huiquan and Robert Brym. "Tolerance of Homosexuality in 88 Countries: Education, Political Freedom, and Liberalism". Sociological Forum, 2019.

Annexes

Annex 1

An overview of frequencies and percentages for claims related to the LGBT population

		Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree, nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	Total
Homosexuality and lesbianism	n	66	86	49	78	35	314
are a kind of disease	%	21.0	27.4	15.6	24.8	11.1	100.0
	K %	21.0	48.4	64.0	88.9	100.0	
In B&H, there is discrimination based on sexual orientation	n	30	99	38	112	35	314
	%	9.6	31.5	12.1	35.7	11.1	100.0
	K %	9.6	41.1	53.2	88.9	100.0	
LGBT population is trying to	n	33	133	83	54	11	314
impose its lifestyle on the rest of the population	%	10.5	42.4	26.4	17.2	3.5	100.0
	K %	10.5	52.9	79.3	96.5	100.0	
Members of LGBT population	n	37	13	16	68	180	314
should have the same rights in	%	11.8	4.1	5.1	21.7	57.3	100.0
all areas as heteronormative persons	K %	11.8	15.9	21.0	42.7	100.0	
	n	65	49	59	80	61	314
Same-sex marriages should be	%	20.7	15.6	18.8	25.5	19.4	100.0
legalised	K %	20.7	36.3	55.1	80.6	100.0	
Same-sex partners should be	n	98	55	64	49	48	314
allowed to adopt children	%	31.2	17.5	20.4	15.6	15.3	100.0
	K %	31.2	48.7	69.1	84.7	100.0	
Legalisation of same-sex	n	45	114	37	91	27	314
marriages could diminish the	%	14.3	36.3	11.8	29.0	8.6	100.0

value and significance of heteronormative marriages	K %	14.3	50.6	62.4	91.4	100.0	
The Daile Development of the Line	n	101	66	49	64	34	314
The Pride Parade should be	%	32.2	21.0	15.6	20.4	10.8	100.0
organised in B&H cities	K %	32.2	53.2	68.8	89.2	100.0	
Organising a Pride Parade in	n	75	80	46	62	51	314
B&H cities would improve the	%	23.9	25.5	14.7	19.7	16.2	100.0
position of the LGBT people in B&H	K %	23.9	49.4	64.0	83.8	100.0	
Topics on the LGBT population	n	31	41	55	95	92	314
should be more represented in	%	9.9	13.1	17.5	30.3	29.3	100.0
the B&H educational system	K %	9.9	22.9	40.4	70.7	100.0	
Gender reassignment should be	n	66	51	47	48	102	314
provided in medical institutions at the expense of the state budget	%	21.0	16.2	15.0	15.3	32.5	100.0
of the entities and the state of	K %	21.0	37.3	52.2	67.5	100.0	

Annex 2

Differences in attitudes towards claims about the LGBT population in relation to the place of residence of the respondents

		Place of	residence		χ²	р
		city	suburb	village	7	
Iomosexuality and lesbianism are a kind of disease					27.217	< .001
Strongly disagree	n	38	21	7		
	%	24.2	30.0	8.0		
Somewhat disagree	n	43	21	22		
	%	27.4	30.0	25.3		
Neither agree, nor disagree	n	30	6	13	7	
	%	19.1	8.6	14.9		
Somewhat agree	n	33	11	34		
-	%	21.0	15.7	39.1	7	
Strongly agree	n	13	11	11	7	
	%	8.3	15.7	12.6		
Total	n	157	70	87		
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0		
me-sex marriages should be legalise	d			'		
Strongly disagree	n	25	9	31	37.129	< .001
	%	15.9	12.9	35.6	7	
Somewhat disagree	n	24	9	16	7	
	%	15.3	12.9	18.4	7	
Neither agree, nor disagree	n	33	8	18		
	%	21.0	11.4	20.7	7	
Somewhat agree	n	43	19	18	7	
	%	27.4	27.1	20.7		
Strongly agree	n	32	25	4		
	%	20.4	35.7	4.6	7	
Total	n	157	70	87		
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0	7	

Strongly disagree	n	43	17	38		
	%	27.4	24.3	43.7		
Somewhat disagree	n	34	8	13		
	%	21.7	11.4	14.9		
Neither agree, nor disagree	n	33	11	20	26.284	< .00
	%	21.0	15.7	23.0		
Somewhat agree	n	23	14	12		
	%	14.7	20.0	13.8		
Strongly agree	n	24	20	4		
	%	15.3	28.6	4.6		
Total	n	157	70	87		
	%	100.0	100.0	100.0		
galisation of same-sex marriages co	uld diminish	the value	and significance of	heteronormative	marriages	
Strongly disagree	n	24	16	5		
	%	15.3	22.9	5.7		
Somewhat disagree	n	66	21	27		
	%	42.0	30.0	31.0		
Neither agree, nor disagree	n	13	13	11		
	%	8.3	18.6	12.6	24.998	0.002
Somewhat agree	n	44	17	30	2,0	0.002
	%	28.0	24.3	34.5		
Strongly agree	n	10	3	14		
Strongry agree	**	10				
and the second s	0/2	6.4	13	16.1		
	% n	6.4	4.3	16.1		
Total	n	157	70	87		
Total	n %	157 100.0	70 100.0	87 100.0	T	
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit	n % ties would im	157 100.0 prove the	70 100.0 position of the LGB	87 100.0 BT people in B&F		0.007
Total	n % ties would im n	157 100.0 prove the	70 100.0 position of the LGB	87 100.0 8 T people in B&F	H 21.24	0.007
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree	n %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17 24.3	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5		0.007
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit	n % ties would im % n % n	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17 24.3 19	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20		0.007
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree	n %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17 24.3 19 27.1	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0		0.007
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree	n %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1 19	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17 24.3 19 27.1 6	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0 21		0.007
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree	n % ties would im n % n % n % n %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1 19	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17 24.3 19 27.1 6 8.6	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0 21 24.1		0.007
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree	n %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1 19 12.1 34	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17 24.3 19 27.1 6 8.6 8	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0 21 24.1 20		0.007
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree Somewhat agree	n % ties would im n % n % n % n % n % n % n % %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1 19 12.1 34 21.7	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17 24.3 19 27.1 6 8.6 8 11.4	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0 21 24.1 20 23.0		0.007
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree	n % ties would im % n % n % n % n % n % n % n n % n n % n n % n n %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1 19 12.1 34 21.7 22	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17 24.3 19 27.1 6 8.6 8 11.4 20	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0 21 24.1 20 23.0 9		0.007
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree	n % ties would im % n % n % n % n % n % n % n	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1 19 12.1 34 21.7 22 14.0	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17 24.3 19 27.1 6 8.6 8 11.4 20 28.6	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0 21 24.1 20 23.0 9 10.3		0.007
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree Somewhat agree	n % ties would im % n % n % n % n % n % n % n % n % n %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1 19 12.1 34 21.7 22 14.0 157	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17 24.3 19 27.1 6 8.6 8 11.4 20 28.6 70	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0 21 24.1 20 23.0 9 10.3 87		0.007
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree Total	n % ties would im % n % n % n % n % n % n % n % n % n %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1 19 12.1 34 21.7 22 14.0 157 100.0	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17 24.3 19 27.1 6 8.6 8 11.4 20 28.6 70 100.0	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0 21 24.1 20 23.0 9 10.3 87 100.0		0.007
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree Total pics on the LGBT population shoul	n %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1 19 12.1 34 21.7 22 14.0 157 100.0 presented	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17 24.3 19 27.1 6 8.6 8 11.4 20 28.6 70 100.0 in the B&H educati	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0 21 24.1 20 23.0 9 10.3 87 100.0 sonal system	21.24	
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree Total	n %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1 19 12.1 34 21.7 22 14.0 157 100.0 presented	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17 24.3 19 27.1 6 8.6 8 11.4 20 28.6 70 100.0 in the B&H educati	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0 21 24.1 20 23.0 9 10.3 87 100.0 sonal system		
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree Total pics on the LGBT population shoul Strongly disagree	n %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1 19 12.1 34 21.7 22 14.0 157 100.0 presented 14	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17 24.3 19 27.1 6 8.6 8 11.4 20 28.6 70 100.0 in the B&H educati 8 11.4	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0 21 24.1 20 23.0 9 10.3 87 100.0 fonal system 9 10.3	21.24	
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree Total pics on the LGBT population shoul	n %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1 19 12.1 34 21.7 22 14.0 157 100.0 presented 14 8.9 22	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17 24.3 19 27.1 6 8.6 8 11.4 20 28.6 70 100.0 in the B&H educati 8 11.4 5	87 100.0 ET people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0 21 24.1 20 23.0 9 10.3 87 100.0 conal system 9 10.3 14	21.24	
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree Total pics on the LGBT population shoul Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree	n %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1 19 12.1 34 21.7 22 14.0 157 100.0 presented 14 8.9 22 14.0	70	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0 21 24.1 20 23.0 9 10.3 87 100.0 fonal system 9 10.3 14 16.1	21.24	
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree Total pics on the LGBT population shoul Strongly disagree	n %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1 19 12.1 34 21.7 22 14.0 157 100.0 presented 14 8.9 22 14.0 18	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0 21 24.1 20 23.0 9 10.3 87 100.0 sonal system 9 10.3 14 16.1 26	21.24	
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree Total pics on the LGBT population shoul Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree	n %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1 19 12.1 34 21.7 22 14.0 157 100.0 presented 14 8.9 22 14.0 18 11.5	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17 24.3 19 27.1 6 8.6 8 11.4 20 28.6 70 100.0 in the B&H educati 8 11.4 5 7.1 11 15.7	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0 21 24.1 20 23.0 9 10.3 87 100.0 sonal system 9 10.3 14 16.1 26 29.9	21.24	
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree Total pics on the LGBT population shoul Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree	n %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1 19 12.1 34 21.7 22 14.0 157 100.0 presented 14 8.9 22 14.0 18 11.5 56	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0 21 24.1 20 23.0 9 10.3 87 100.0 fonal system 9 10.3 14 16.1 26 29.9 27	21.24	
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree Total pics on the LGBT population shoul Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree djelimično se slažem	n %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1 19 12.1 34 21.7 22 14.0 157 100.0 presented 14 8.9 22 14.0 18 11.5 56 35.7	70	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0 21 24.1 20 23.0 9 10.3 87 100.0 6onal system 9 10.3 14 16.1 26 29.9 27 31.0	21.24	
Total ganising a Pride Parade in B&H cit Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree Total pics on the LGBT population shoul Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree, nor disagree	n %	157 100.0 prove the 41 26.1 41 26.1 19 12.1 34 21.7 22 14.0 157 100.0 presented 14 8.9 22 14.0 18 11.5 56	70 100.0 position of the LGB 17	87 100.0 8T people in B&F 17 19.5 20 23.0 21 24.1 20 23.0 9 10.3 87 100.0 fonal system 9 10.3 14 16.1 26 29.9 27	21.24	<.001

Annex 3

An overview of the frequencies and percentages of respondents' opinions regarding the support that the LGBT population receives from various entities

For the following entities, indicate the extent to which you consider them to support the activities of the LGBT population in B&H:		Strongly condemn	Somewhat condemn	Neither condemn, nor support	Somewhat support	Strongly support	Total
Public institutions	n	23	114	125	47	5	314
	%	7.3	36.3	39.8	15.0	1.6	100.0
	K %	7.3	43.6	83.4	98.4	100.0	
Governmental	n	24	94	129	59	8	314
institutions	%	7.6	29.9	41.1	18.8	2.5	100.0
	K %	7.6	37.6	78.7	97.5	100.0	
Religious organisations	n	152	124	27	10	1	100
	%	48.4	39.5	8.6	3.2	0.3	314.0
	K %	48.4	87.9	96.5	99.7	100.0	
Business entities	n	64	113	108	28	1	314
	%	20.4	36.0	34.4	8.9	0.3	100.0
	K %	20.4	56.4	90.8	99.7	100.0	
media	n	3	19	134	146	12	314
	%	1.0	6.1	42.7	46.5	3.8	100.0
	K %	1.0	7.0	49.7	96.2	100.0	
Non-governmental	n	3	11	47	158	95	314
organisations	%	1.0	3.5	15.0	50.3	30.3	100.0
	K %	1.0	4.5	19.4	69.7	100.0	
celebrities	n	2	108	118	58	28	314
	%	0.6	34.4	37.6	18.5	8.9	100.0
	K %	0.6	35.0	72.6	91.1	100.0	