

GAY MARKETING: Opportunity or Nightmare for Firms**FERIDE BAHAR ISIN***Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Baskent University, 06530, Ankara, Turkey,
bahar@baskent.edu.tr***ABSTRACT**

This study investigated young adults' attitudes towards homosexuality and perceptions of gay marketing based on data acquired through a survey questionnaire that included a total of 64 items on demographics and life experiences, attitude towards homosexuality and perceptions of gay marketing administered to 402 students at a private university in Turkey of both sexes aged 18 to 28. Findings suggest that young adults hold negative attitudes towards homosexuality, ranging from moderately negative to strongly negative, and generally with no significant differences by the respondents' parents' education, respondents' political view or acquaintance with any homosexual person or level of exposure to gay themed advertisements. Female respondents hold slightly more negative attitudes towards homosexuality than male respondents do. A factor analytic method revealed three major components of young adults' perceptions of gay marketing which could be named subjective perceptions (SP), perceptions of marketing strategies (MS) and opinion on moral consequences (MC). Results are discussed with the limitations of the study, and implications for marketers.

Key words: homosexuality, gay marketing, morality, gay, lesbian.

Gays with potentially double salaries, no children and hedonistic lifestyles form a very promising market for marketers (Schofield and Schmidt, 2005; Anonymous, 2006). In other words, they have higher disposable income and more leisure time compared to the heterosexual market. In fact, they do not have extensive income but they have different modes of spending compared with the general population. For instance, Rudd (1996) pointed out that there exist some aesthetic differences as regards preferences of dressing styles and perfumes between heterosexual and homosexual men.

Studies in this field mainly focused on gay subculture, their socioeconomic profiles, similarities in their lifestyles and target markets (Peñaloza, 1996; Cole, 2000). For instance, Haslop et al. (1998) investigated consumption patterns of gay socialization. There are many studies which describe them as the trend setting avant-garde consumers (Rudd, 1996; Dewaele et al., 2006) and emphasize the innovativeness of gays (Kolko et al, 2003; Johnson, 2006). Gay consumers are very attractive for producers who want to establish brand loyalty (Kates, 2002). Studies revealed that the gay community accepts lower quality goods but have quite high loyalty to the brand (Tuten, 2006) and to the advertisers who directly address them (Cherkassy, 2004). Also, gay customers who are regarded as the "dream market" as regards their buying power have higher brand and fashion consciousness compared to their heterosexual counterparts (Peñaloza, 1996). One interesting finding is that ads heterosexuals liked most were the ads the homosexual population liked least (Dotson et al., 2009).

On the other hand, the gay market is not homogenous in itself (Stuber, 2002). It contains all races, ages and ethnic groups (Adams, 1999). That is, there are niche markets in gay markets (Branchik, 2002). Bowes (1996) claimed that since the needs of gays and lesbians are different, they should be investigated separately. Supporting this claim, studies revealed that there were marked differences between gays and lesbians as regards consumer behavior, sexual orientation and sex (Yin, 2003). In fact, these findings are expected because gay and lesbian societies share some specific symbols. Freitas et al. (1996) and Tharp (2001) discussed dressing styles, symbols, language and outlooks specific to this subculture which do not mean anything for those who have very little knowledge about it.

The number of companies that run advertisements in gay media has been increasing. According to recent data, 175 out of Fortune 500 firms ran advertisements in gay media (Anonymous, 2006). Advertisers sometimes prefer promoting their products as "young and hip" by using gay themes. In some instances, gay themes are also used for creating humor effects. Today, homosexuality is one of the most powerful tools to draw the attention of

people. The presence of gay images in some commercials has a surprising, sometimes even shocking, effect on customers. Some commercials, however, are perhaps not overtly but vaguely gay (Wilke, 1999). Tuten (2005) found that heterosexual consumers were aware of gay friendly positioning in branding and responded neutrally or sometimes positively to gay brand positioning. Oakenfull and Greenlee (2004) found that mainstream straight audience is alienated by explicit gay and lesbian imagery but not by implicit ones.

The gay market also draws the interest of travel, automotive, financial service sectors (Anonymous, 2005). Studies showed that gays buy discretionary goods and services such as fitness center membership or they travel more often than heterosexuals (Pritchard et al., 1998). Gay weddings also form an important niche market. Since gay weddings are not legally recognized, gays need to formalize their relations by some overt actions such as buying houses. This creates important opportunities for banks (Daw, 1998).

Some homosexuals are trying to conceal themselves by hiding behind the dominating heterosexual culture. It is not possible to conceptualize the market with traditional separation approach in order to shape the sexual, personal identity and consumer behavior of the market. Current market targeting strategies may not be enough to reach the homosexual market. They may create an awkward, false and disturbing situation which may alienate this potential market (Schofield and Schmidt, 2005). The most frequent recommendations to reach this market and to form the gay-friendliness of a brand are to use gay themes in commercials and to support gay causes (Kates, 2000; Tuten, 2006), using gay themes in the mainstream media offering a domestic partner benefits and making commercials in gay media (Yin, 2003). Regarding these findings, it was suggested that firms may address gay customers by using coded messages (Anonymous, 1999). As is the case for all subcultures, the gay culture has developed its own identity markers (Kates, 2000). This paves the way for the marketing directors to reach gays and lesbians by the use of iconography and symbolisms without creating any negative societal reactions (Peñaloza, 1996; Grier and Brumbaugh, 1999). Examples of such gay iconography may include rainbow, freedom rings, pink triangle and references to "family" and "pride" which enable gay consumers to draw specific messages which are not apparent to heterosexuals (Bhat et al., 1996).

Selling goods and service to the gay market requires skills. Even if the item sold is the same, the establishment of stability and distribution in the market is different (Blom, 2000). Peñaloza (1996) claimed that the emphasis of their themes and the acceptance of their social movement may be very beneficial in gay marketing. A survey of GL (gay-lesbian) Consumer Online Census demonstrated that gays were more likely to buy products from companies they knew were gay friendly (Tuten, 2006). Kates (2000) says that gays have loyalty to gay positive brands and boycott anti-gay brands to establish a gay market power.

Studies showed that more than half of the gay community does not follow the media regularly (Pritchard et al, 1998). However advertisers have an increasing tendency to make advertisement in gay media (Anonymous, 1999). Under this situation marketers should seriously consider to extend their commercials to the general media in order to reach the gay market since the appearance of gay issues in the general media may have a positive effect on the gay and lesbian community as regards the acceptance of their causes. Dotson et al. (2009) says that gays and lesbians like perceiving themselves in mainstream fashion ads and show strong positive responses to gay themed ads. It is clear that the gay market has a very big potential but its size is not comparable to that of the heterosexual market. Some firms which want to advertise to the gay community have some worries as well. Their dominant worries are centering on the idea that their regular customers will not like to see the products they use appearing in the gay media (Horovitz, 1993). This creates anxiety in the firms about their promoting strategies (Lacayo, 1998).

Heterosexuals mostly think that homosexuality is not an acceptable lifestyle (Dotson et al, 2009). There are numerous studies related to the attitude of the society at large against homosexuality. These studies indicated that the attitude of heterosexuals towards homosexuals might vary to a great extent but was mostly negative (Haddock et al., 1993). Lamar and Kite (1998) say that heterosexual consumers have negative attitudes when they were exposed to examples of gay targeted advertising. The biggest barrier in front of the producers to reach this "dream market" is such kind of potentially adverse behaviors of heterosexual customers.

Herek (1988) emphasized that the difference in the attitude of heterosexuals towards homosexuality according to sex stems from the cultural structure of the gender. The research conducted on this subject point out that the male picture in America represents masculinity and heterosexuality (Herek, 1987). A similar situation exists in Turkey (Sakalli, 2002b). Also Hoover and Fishbein (1999) stated that men have a higher tendency to maintain their social status than women. Lamar and Kite (1998) found that the society reacts more markedly when the sexual roles are violated by men. Heterosexual women are more tolerant towards gays and lesbians since they face lesser social pressure for the hostility against homosexuality which creates a bigger opportunity to interact

with them (Sakalli, 2002a; 2002b; 2002c). It was proven that heterosexual men have a more negative attitude towards gays than heterosexual women do (e.g. Herek, 2000; Cirakoglu, 2006; Morrison and Morrison, 2002; Ito, 2007; Herek and Rivera, 2006). Also, the overall attitude of people is more positive to lesbians than to gays (Sakalli and Ugurlu, 2001; Gelbal and Duyan, 2006). Same men also exhibit negative attitude when a commercial targets gay men than lesbian women (Herek, 1988; Whitley, 1988). Whitley (1988) claimed that lesbianism has an erotic value for heterosexual men which were proven by exhibition of lesbianism in men's magazines. On the other hand, Dotson et al. (2009) found no significant difference between heterosexual males and heterosexual females responses to lesbian ads. Lesbians have not been differentiated from gay men as a distinct target of prejudice (Herek, 2000).

Heterosexual women's attitudes towards homosexuals were inconsistent (Ito, 2007). Whitley (1988) says that people hold more negative attitudes toward homosexuals of their own sex. Some studies claim that heterosexual women have a similar attitude against homosexual men or women (Herek, 1988; 2000). Other studies report that heterosexual women think more negatively about the image of lesbian women than the image of gay men (Kite, 1994; Whitley, 1988). Kite and Whitley (1996) noticed that when measures of attitudes towards homosexuality included many items assessing homosexual stereotypes, women appeared to be more negative towards lesbians than towards gay men. On the contact component, heterosexual women were more negative towards lesbians than towards gay men (Lamar and Kite, 1998).

Previous studies showed that heterosexual men showed a negative reaction to the use of gays than the use of lesbians in the commercials. Similarly heterosexual women are much more tolerant to the use of lesbians in the commercials than the use of gays (Oakenfull and Greenlee, 1999). This creates the opportunity of using lesbians in the commercial to target both gays and lesbians without creating an extensive social reaction (Alsop, 1999).

Taking all these points into consideration, the determination of perceptions of heterosexuals against gay marketing and the strategies of firms directed to homosexuals and the discussion of the effect of demographic factors and heterosexuals' attitudes towards homosexuality on these perceptions are essential for the derivation of a correct strategy for this market. It also very important that the reaction of the heterosexual market should be correctly evaluated to minimize the associated risks. In the present study, university students' perceptions of gay marketing and strategies of firms directed to homosexuals and the discussion of the effect of demographic factors and young adults' attitudes towards homosexuality on these perceptions were investigated with a factor analytic method.

METHODOLOGY

Participants and Procedures:

The study involved the development and administration of a 64-item questionnaire to 402 university students who participated voluntarily. The majority of students were from a private university in Ankara, Turkey. An approximate English version of the questionnaire is attached as Appendix. All items in the questionnaire were printed on a two sided sheet of paper and the questions on the perception scales were shuffled and items were designed using gay and lesbians probes. Before the perception scale a short description of "gay" and "lesbian" provided since they were not originally Turkish words. Therefore all participants had an equal chance of getting any of the two probes. The questionnaires were administrated mainly during class hours and the process took approximately 15 minutes.

Measures:

Demographics and life experience. This scale included a total of 8 questions, where respondents were asked 6 demographic items to indicate year of birth, sex, both parents' education levels, respondent's longest place of residence, respondent's political view, and 2 items on life experiences, one being whether the respondent had an acquaintance/contact with someone who the respondent knew was gay or lesbian, and the respondent's level of frequency of exposure to gay themed advertisement.

Attitude toward homosexuality. The scale consisted of 11 items as derived from Cirakoglu (2006). The scale begins with the instruction "x is a gay man" or "x is a lesbian woman". These statements were used as probes. Participants were asked to state how disturbing some routine life situations might be for them. They indicated their feeling of disturbance on a five-point Likert-type scale (1= very disturbing, 5=not disturbing at all). Attitudes toward vignettes were found by taking mean score for the scale. Higher scores in the scale indicated more positive attitudes.

Perceptions of gay and lesbian marketing. A 45-item scale for perceptions of gay marketing was developed by the author. Some items in the scale were adapted from existing literature on gay marketing (Tuten, 2005; 2006;

Dotson et al, 2009; Oakenfull and Greenlee, 2004; Wilke, 1999) and some of them were generated based on the focus group study conducted with a university student sample before data collection (35 students): The scale begins with the question “What are the possible causes and consequences of gay marketing?” Participants stated their agreements on a five-point Likert type scale (1=strongly disagree. 5=strongly agree). After performing Principal Component Analysis (PCA), items in each component were averaged and served as dependent variables in further analyses. Since items included negative propositions, higher scores in components indicated more negative opinions.

RESULTS

The sample consisted of 201 women and 201 men and the mean age for the entire sample was 22 years. About one in ten (9.70 %) of participants reported previous acquaintance/contact with a homosexual person. No information about the nature of the contact was collected because of the privacy considerations. More than half (58.70%) of the participants reported themselves as holding rightist political views and 41.30% of the participants as leftist political view. The majority of students (58.0%) were from a big city or metropolis and 33.3% of the students were from towns. A majority (60.70%) of the respondents' fathers had bachelor's degrees or higher, 31.1% of the students' fathers were high school graduates. On mother's side, 49.80% of the respondents' mothers had bachelor's degrees or higher, whereas 39.80% of the students' mothers were high school graduates (see Table 1).

Insert Table 1 about here

Table 1 gives the profile of the respondent group on one hand, while the last two columns to the right provides respondent subgroups Attitude Towards Homosexuality (ATH) scores, and significance levels for differences between subgroups based on one-way analysis of variance of ATH scores. Since ATH scale elicited responses on a 5-point Likert scale from respondents where 1 meant the most negative response, “very disturbing”, and 5 meant the most positive response, “not disturbing at all”.

As could be seen from the table, male respondents and female respondents differ significantly in their ATH scores in that males have less negative attitude towards homosexuality than females do. However, it must be noted that the mean ATH score for the entire respondent group ($N = 402$) is 2.34 which indicates a negative attitude. Indeed only 18 respondents out of 402 (3%) have ATH scores at 3.00 or above where the remaining 384 respondents have ATH scores below 3.00 ranging from 0.91 (strongly negative) to 2.91 (moderately negative).

Respondents differ in such attitude also by their longest place of residence, however such difference seems to be driven by the two subgroups labeled “village” and “abroad” as revealed by Scheffe post-hoc analyses. Respondents do not differ in their ATH scores in other respects such as mother's education, father's education, political view, previous contact with a homosexual person or the level of exposure to gay themed advertisement.

Attitudes toward homosexuality (ATH) scores were calculated by taking arithmetic mean of the 11 items in the scale. The internal consistency of this scale (ATH) is .76. Higher scores in the scale indicated more positive attitudes. The mean scores for the attitudes towards homosexuality of students can be seen in Table 2. While the statement “Shopping in the same store while this person is present” had the highest mean ($X=3.75$) which means such a situation is one which least disturbs the respondents, the statement, “Being on vacation at the same hotel while this person is present” had the lowest mean for all the statements ($X=2.07$), which means this situation is the most disturbing to the respondents.

Insert Table 2 about here

Prior to analyses, a reliability analysis was performed for the 45-item scale. Because corrected item total correlations for all items was high enough ($>.20$) all items were used in further analyses. An initial PCA with a 45-item scale revealed 11 components. Since the scree plot proposed a three-component solution, another PCA with oblimin rotation was performed by forcing the number of components to three. The cutoff level of .25 was used as used in some previous research (e.g. Cardenas and Barrientos 2008; Rosik, 2007). Consequently, three items appeared to be not loading to any of these three forced components, thus they were dropped from analysis. Table 3 presents PCA results, eigenvalues, internal consistencies and variance explained by each component.

Insert Table 3 about here

The first component included 19 items, regarding perceptions about overall gay marketing and named as *subjective perception (SP)*. This component explained 20.61% of the total variance with an internal consistency of .89. The second component which consisted of 14 items explained 8.12 of the variance and internal consistency of the component was .74. This component was labeled as *marketing strategies (MS)*. The items loaded under this component were related to perception on the marketing strategies related to gay marketing. The third component included 9 items which explained 6.20 of the variance. Internal consistency of the component was .56. This component named as *moral consequences (MC)* and consisted of items that were related to perception on possible societal moral consequences of gay marketing. The three components explained 35% of total variance and internal consistency for the total scale was .87. Then, correlations among these three components and ATH were investigated, as presented in Table 4.

Insert Table 4 about here

A 2(sex)x 2(label) Multivariate Analysis of Variance was performed on the four dependent variables: subjective perception (SP), marketing strategies (MS), moral consequences (MC) and attitudes (ATH). With the use of Wilks' criterion lambda, a main effect for label is found $F(4, 395)=26.80, p<.05, \eta^2=.21$. Analysis of the univariate F tests revealed that label had significant effects on subjective perception component, $F(1, 398)=55.04, p<.05, \eta^2=.12$ and attitudes $F(1, 398)=27.56, p<.05, \eta^2=.06$. The label "lesbian" yielded significantly higher mean scores ($M=3.96, SD=.04$) than did the label "gay" ($M=3.49, SD=.045$) on subjective perception component. On the attitudes "lesbian" ($M=2.95, SD=.033$) yielded significantly higher mean scores compared to gay label ($M=2.71, SD=.032$). That is, participants of the research have more positive attitudes toward lesbians than gays. But the same group has more negative subjective perceptions for lesbians than gays.

DISCUSSION

The present study examined young adults' attitudes towards homosexuality and perceptions of gay marketing, and of the strategies of firms directed to homosexuals and the effect of the demographic factors and young adults' attitudes towards homosexuality on these perceptions using a factor analytic method. The study revealed three components for young adults' perceptions of gay marketing. The first component was named "subjective perception (SP) referring to the respondent's overall perception of gay marketing. The second component named "Perception of Marketing Strategies (MS) referred to the respondent's perception of marketing strategies directed to homosexual consumers. The third component named as *perception of moral consequences (MC)* related to the respondent's perception of society's moral consequences of gay marketing efforts as a whole. Herek (1984) found two component factors, condemnation/tolerance and beliefs, Lamar and Kite (1994) suggest four factors related to homosexuals namely condemnation/tolerance, morality, contacts, stereotypes. Cardenas and Barrientos (2008) on the other hand determine a five factor model; beliefs, natural/anti-natural sexual option, traditional values, social sanction, lesbian rights. Cirakoglu (2006) found four component solution namely disorder, problems, preference, sensation seeking. The factor "subjective perception" could be equivalent to the condemnation/tolerance factor or "beliefs factor". "Perception of moral consequences" could be similar to the factor named "social sanction". The third factor is a new factor that is not found in previous studies.

Respondents have more positive attitudes towards lesbians than towards gays. This result is consistent with the related literature. People's attitudes as a whole are more positive to lesbians than gays (e.g. Herek, 2000; Sakalli, 2002; Sakalli and Ugurlu, 2001; Gelbal and Duyan, 2006). The possible causes were discussed in the literature section.

When we look at the mean of components, the highest mean was for subjective perception component, meaning that the most negative evaluation of the participants was for subjective perception component. The most positive evaluation was for the perception of moral consequences component. The highest mean score was obtained for the statement that some of the products are still bought by gays even if there are no marketing efforts directed towards gays. That is, this result demonstrates participants have perceptions that marketing efforts towards homosexuals are useless. The lowest mean score was for the statement that "some firms use homosexual images in their ads to create an effect of surprise ". These findings are important regarding the fact that managers who are trying to establish a marketing strategy for gays and lesbians should be careful for the conceptions and attitudes of young adults towards these efforts. Experience of interpersonal contact with a gay man or lesbian causes heterosexuals to adopt more favorable attitudes toward homosexuals. But in our research only a few participants have had contact with homosexuals. So, contact component is not included in the analysis. Also, the probability of encountering ads using homosexual image is quite low. There are no, or a few if any, discussions about issues of homosexuality in Turkey. Therefore, Turkish people may have neutral attitudes toward homosexuals rather than extreme ones and participants found unnecessary these kinds of marketing efforts.

The respondent group indicated more negative subjective perceptions of lesbians than of gays; while the same respondents held more positive attitudes toward lesbians than towards gays. The earlier attitudes seem to have become more liberal, possibly due to an increasingly favorable media exposure and the public relations efforts of gay and human rights organizations. Many heterosexuals equate homosexuality with men, and they think primarily or exclusively of men when they are exposed to a stimulus word such as homosexual. So it is possible that they interpret questions about gay men as if they were general questions about homosexuality, but interpret questions about lesbians to apply specifically to homosexual women (Herek and Capitanio, 1999). Attitudes were associated with negative experiences with gay people with an unexpected cross-sex effect. Negative interactions with gay men tended to affect attitudes toward lesbians, while negative interactions with lesbians influenced attitudes toward gay men. Study of Herek (2000) found that heterosexual women who emphasized feminine attributes and did not endorse gender equality had the most negative attitudes toward lesbians. Because they are required to discipline their children and make money related decisions, they learn masculine characteristics. In other words, women are acquiring more masculine traits. Also, as mentioned although the people often associate homosexuality with being gay they might find the efforts directed against lesbians equally unnecessary.

Turkish society is recognized as highly patriarchal with clear-cut gender role differences. Marriage and family notions are highly patriarchal as well (Sakalli and Beydogan, 2002). Sakalli (2002c) suggests that negative cultural value is an important predictor of prejudice against gay men and lesbians in Turkey. According to Islam, human is not homosexual by nature, and homosexuality is seen as a deviation from the norm. In Turkey, people have expressed negative attitudes toward homosexuality. It is described as perversion, illness, sexual fantasy, disgusting, different of only accepted that they keep it private but never as a sexual identity definition (Gelbal and Duyan, 2006). It is quite difficult to study sexuality in countries like Turkey where traditional codes and norms are still prevalent. In Turkey, as in the West, homosexuality has been increasingly visible. Despite these promising changes, homosexuality is still not completely accepted (Miresghhi and Matsumoto, 2008).

The literature on heterosexuals' attitudes towards homosexuality indicates that heterosexual men and women react differently to homosexuality (Herek and Capitanio, 1999). As cultural gender norms are different for women and men, attitudes toward them are likely to be different also (Green, 2005). Our results are in good accordance with these. There is no sex effect for the four components of the research. Heterosexual men's attitudes especially towards lesbians appear to be highly susceptible to contextual cues. It may be useful in future research to explore the possibility that heterosexual men tend to give somewhat greater emphasis to issues of gender and sexual identity, especially in their evaluations of gay men, whereas heterosexual women tend to frame their attitudes mainly in terms of a minority group schema (Herek, 2000). This implication can differentiate the perceptions of participants. Also, as Kite and Whitley (1996) says that sex differences in attitudes toward homosexuality varied depending on the type of sample and attitude being assessed. There may be different data obtained in a study carried out with a different sample taking the psychological situations and the type and quality of contact of the people. Apart from that, the emphasis of the gay market in the study may have created a situation which hindered the gender differentiation.

Limitations

Replication with probability samples representative of the general public will be especially valuable in determining the extent to which the present findings can be generalized beyond the student population. Perhaps sex differences in attitudes are less prominent among college students than among the general population. Generalization of the present results may be somewhat limited. Consequently, the data reported here should be viewed as preliminary and suggestive rather than definitive.

Consideration of moderators of the predicted relationships was beyond the scope of this article. Consequently, the present author did not assess whether our respondents actually had contacts with homosexuals.

In addition, we must examine not only the answers that respondents give to our questions but also the psychological processes that produce those answers.

Because sexual orientation of the respondents was not inquired, the sample might have included lesbian, gay or bisexual individuals, which could have weakened the relationship between some of the variables. Also there is no information regarding the nature of prior contact with homosexual people.

Most of the statements had negative connotations and left no chance for participants who had positive or neutral view of homosexuality. Mean scores of factors were between 2.82 and 3.71. None of the mean scores exceeds 4.00 which is the score that would indicate higher agreement on a particular component.

CONCLUSION

The study results reveal that the findings are consistent with the literature related to attitudes of heterosexual's attitudes towards homosexuals. It is clear that there is a strong link between the label and people's attitudes and perceptions regarding gay marketing efforts.

As literature suggests, some firms are afraid that their regular customers will not like the products they use appear in the gay media, the anxiety how the heterosexuals react to the approach of the firms towards the gay market is a big problem for marketing manager. The most practical implication of the findings of positive attitudes of heterosexual to lesbian than gays is the opportunity of using lesbians in the commercial to target both the gays and lesbians without creating an extensive social reaction. But, the negative high scores for subjective perception of heterosexual to lesbians must be considered in this situation also.

Future research should focus on the effects of others variables and conditions that may contribute to heterosexuals' and homosexuals' perceptions and attitudes toward gay marketing efforts.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, M. (1999). Promphobia. *Incentive*, 173 (9): 83- 86.
2. Anonymous (1999). More Advertisers Target Gay Consumers With Coded Messages, Avoiding Backlash, Marketers Use Public Places to Plant Symbols Lost on Many Heterosexuals. *Wall Street Journal*, Jul (1): 4.
3. Anonymous (2006). Wal-Mart right to market to gays. *Advertising Age*, 77 (36): 12
4. Anonymous (2005). Queer eye for the marketing guy. *Multi Channel News*, 29 (June), 27
5. Alsop, Ronald (1999). In Marketing to Gays, Lesbians are Often Left Out. *Wall Street Journal*, 234, (71): B1
6. Bhat, S., Leigh, T. and Wardlow, D. (1996). The effect of homosexual imagery in advertising on attitude toward the ad. In D. Wardlow (ed.), *Gays, lesbians, and consumer behavior: theory, practice, and research issues in marketing* (pp. 161–176). Binghamton: The Haworth Pres.
7. Blom, E. (2000). *Gay marketing A Portland man's store is an eye-catching example of a broader trend* *Staff Writer*. Portland: Portland Press Herald.
8. Bowes, J.E. (1996). Out of the closet and into the marketplace: meeting basic needs in the gay community. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 31 (1/2): 219–244.
9. Branchik, B. (2002). Out in the market: a history of the gay market segment in the United States, *Journal of Macromarketing*, 22 (1): 86–97
10. Cardenas, M., Barrientos, J. (2008). The attitudes toward lesbians and gay men scale (ATLG): adaptation and testing the reliability and validity in Chile. *The Journal of Sex Research*, April: 1
11. Cherkassy, I. (2004). A valuable consumer niche target marketing. *Gay Lesbian Rev World*, Dec (27): 12- 55
12. Cole, S. (2000). *Don we now our gay apparel: Gay Men's Dress in the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Berg
13. Cirakoglu, O. C. (2006). Perception of homosexuality among Turkish university students: the roles of labels, gender and prior contact. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 146 (3): 293-305
14. Daw, L. (1998). Corporate gay marketing takes off. *Marketing Magazine*, 103 (28): 2
15. Dewaele, A, Cox N., Van den Berghe, W. (2006). *The social status of gays, lesbians and bisexuals and their social networks: about friendship and other blood relationships*. Research Paper, Antwerp University
16. Dotson, M., Hyatt, E., Thompson, L. (2009). Sexual orientation and gender effects of exposure to gay and lesbian themed fashion advertisements. *Journal of Fashion Marketing And Management*, 13 (4): 431-447
17. Freitas, A., Kaiser, S., Hammidi, T. (1996). Communities, commodities, cultural space, and style. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 31 (1/2): 83-107.
18. Green, R. (2005). The use of bidimensional scales to assess social workers' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Social Work Research*, 29 (1): 57-60
19. Grier, S. and Brumbaugh, A. (1999). Noticing cultural differences: ad meanings created by target and non-target markets. *Journal of Advertising*,. 28 (1): 79–93
20. Haddock, G., Zanna, M., Esses, V. (1993). Assessing the structure of prejudicial attitudes: the case of attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65: 1105-1118
21. Haslop, C., Hill, H., Schmidt, R. (1998). The gay lifestyle – spaces for a subculture of consumption. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 16 (5): 318-26.

22. Herek, G. (1984). Attitudes toward lesbians and gay men a factor analytic study. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 10 (1-2): 39-51
23. Herek, G. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes towards lesbians and gay men correlates and gender differences, *Journal of Sex Research*, 25 (4): 451-477
24. Herek, G., Rivera, M. G. (2006). Attitudes toward homosexuality among U.S. residents of Mexican descent, *Journal of Sex Research*, 43 (2): 122-135
25. Herek, G., Capitanio, J. (1999). Sex differences in how heterosexuals think about lesbians and gay men: evidence from survey context effects. *Journal of Sex Research*, 36 (4): 348-360.
26. Herek, G. M. (2000). Sexual prejudice and gender do heterosexuals' attitudes towards lesbians and gay men differ?. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56: 251-266
27. Herek, G.M., (1987). Religion and prejudice: a comparison of racial and sexual attitudes. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.*, 13 (1): 56-65.
28. Hoover, R., Fishbein, H. D. (1999). The development of the prejudice and sex role stereotyping in white adolescents and white young adults. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 20: 431-448
29. Horowitz, B. (1993). *Alternative Approach Finding New Ways to Appeal to Gays, Lesbians*. Los Angeles, Calif.
30. Ito, D. (2007). *College students prejudiced attitudes towards homosexuals: a comparative analysis in Japan and United states*. Georgia State, Georgia State University
31. Johnson, B. (2006). Pink pound flexes technological muscle. *Guardian Unlimited* from <http://technology.guardian.co.uk/news/story/0,,1704083,00.html?gusrc=rss>.
32. Kates, S. (2002). the protean quality of sub cultural consumption an ethnographic account of gay consumers. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29 (December): 383-399
33. Kates, S. (2000). Out Of The Closet And Out On The Street: Gay Men And Their Brand Relationships. *Psychology & Marketing*, 17 (6): 493-513
34. Kite, M. E., Whitley, B.E. (1996). Sex differences in attitudes towards homosexual persons, behavior and civil rights a meta analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22: 336-353
35. Kite, M. (1994). When perspectives meet reality. In: Greene, B. and Herek, G., Editors, 1994. *Lesbian and gay psychology: theory, research, and clinical applications* Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications: 25-53
36. Kolko, J., Gazala, ME, Strohm, CQ. (2003). Gays are the technology early adopters you want. *San Francisco Research Center Forrester Research, Inc.* From <http://www.forrester.com/ER/Research/Brief/0,1317,17004,00.html>, 24/06/2003.
37. Lacayo, R. (1998). The new gay struggle. *Time*, 2: 23-25
38. Lamar, L., Kite, M. (1998). Sex differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians a multidimensional perspective. *Journal of Sex Research*, 3: 25-31
39. Morrison, M. A. & Morrison, T. G. (2002). Development and validation of a scale measuring modern prejudice toward gay men and lesbian women. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43: 15-37.
40. Oakenfull, G, Greenlee, T. (1999). *All the colors of the rainbow: the relationship between gay identity and response to advertising content*. Paper presented at the Conference of the Society for Consumer Psychology, San Antonio, TX, February
41. Oakenfull, G., Greenlee, T. (2004). The three rules of crossing over from gay media to mainstream media advertising: lesbians, lesbians, lesbians, *Journal of Business Research*, 57: 1276-1285
42. Peñaloza, L. (1996). We're here, we're queer, and we're going shopping! A critical perspective on the accommodation of gays and lesbians into the U.S. marketplace, *Journal of Homosexuality*, 31 (1&2): 9-41
43. Pritchard, A., Morgan, N., Sedgely, D., Jenkins, A. (1998). Reaching out to the gay tourist: opportunities and threats in an emerging market segment. *Tourism Management*, 19 (3): 273-282
44. Rosik, C. (2007). Ideological concerns in the operationalization of homophobia, an analysis of Herek's ATLG-R scale. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 35 (2): 132-144
45. Rudd, N.A. (1996). Appearance and self-presentation research in gay consumer cultures: issues and impact. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 31 (1): 109-134.
46. Sakalli, U. (2002a). Turkish college student's attitudes toward women managers the effects of patriarchy, sexism and gender differences. *Journal of psychology*, 136 (6): 647-656
47. Sakalli, U. (2002b). Relationship between sexism and attitudes toward homosexuality in a sample of Turkish university college students. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43: 53-64
48. Sakalli, U. (2002c). A application of the attribution value model of prejudice to homosexuality. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 142: 264-271
49. Sakalli, N., Ugurlu, O. (2001). The effects of social contact with homosexuals on heterosexual Turkish university students' attitudes towards homosexuality. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 42: 53-62.

50. Schofield, K., Schmidt, R. (2005). Fashion and clothing: the construction and communication of gay identities. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 33 (4): 310-324
51. Stuber, M. (2002). Tourism marketing aimed at gay men and lesbians: a business perspective. In. S. Clift, M. Luongo and C. Callister, (ed.), *Gay tourism: Culture, identity and sex*, Continuum, London: 88–124
52. Tharp, M. (2001). *Marketing and consumer identity in multicultural America*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications
53. Tuten, T. (2005). The effect of gay-friendly and non-gay-friendly cues on brand attitudes: a comparison of heterosexual and gay lesbian reactions. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 21: 441-461
54. Tuten, T. L. (2006). Exploring the Importance of Gay-friendliness and its Socialization Influences. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 12 (2): 79–94
55. Whitley, B.E. (1988). Sex difference in heterosexuals' attitudes towards homosexuals: it depends upon what you ask. *Journal of Sex Research*, 24: 287–291
56. Wilke, M. (1999). A kiss before buying: More and more ads are using gay themes to capture audience attention and clinch sales. *The Advocate*, April (27): 34
57. Yin, S. (2003). Coming out in print: the hidden power of the gay press has advertisers lining up to reach a largely untapped consumer segment, *American Demographics*, 25 (1): 18–22

58. APPENDIX

AN APPROXIMATE ENGLISH VERSION OF THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

A version of the questionnaire referred to “gays”, while another version referred to “lesbians” in the items to elicit the respondent’s view on gays or lesbians respectively. Each respondent was administered only one version of the questionnaire. The following questionnaire is the “gays version”.

Your year of birth: _____ **Your sex:** ☐ Female ☐ Male

Your mother’s educational attainment: <input type="checkbox"/> Illiterate <input type="checkbox"/> Literate <input type="checkbox"/> Primary education <input type="checkbox"/> High school graduate <input type="checkbox"/> University graduate <input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	Your father’s educational attainment: <input type="checkbox"/> Illiterate <input type="checkbox"/> Literate <input type="checkbox"/> Primary education <input type="checkbox"/> High school graduate <input type="checkbox"/> University graduate <input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	Type of human settlement where you have lived longest: <input type="checkbox"/> Village <input type="checkbox"/> Small town <input type="checkbox"/> City (small to medium) <input type="checkbox"/> Large city / metropolis <input type="checkbox"/> Foreign country
--	--	---

How would you define yourself politically?

☐ Radical left ☐ Left ☐ Center left ☐ Center right ☐ Right ☐ Radical right

DEFINITION: BEING GAY MEANS A MALE HAVING EMOTIONAL/SEXUAL RELATIONSHIP WITH ANOTHER MALE.

Do you have any acquaintance who you know is gay? ☐ Yes ☐ No

	Never				Very often
How frequently are you exposed to advertisements using gay themes?	1	2	3	4	5

Person X is someone who defines his sexual identity as gay. Based on this information: How disturbing is each of the following to you?		Very disturbing				Not disturbing at all
1	Shopping in the same store while this person is present	1	2	3	4	5

2	Being residents in the same apartment building with this person	1	2	3	4	5
3	Visiting the same doctor as this person visits	1	2	3	4	5
4	Being friends with this person	1	2	3	4	5
5	Dining at the same restaurant while this person is present	1	2	3	4	5
6	Visiting the same barber/hair dresser frequented by this person	1	2	3	4	5
7	Frequenting the same sports/fitness club visited by this person	1	2	3	4	5
8	Being next-door neighbor to this person	1	2	3	4	5
9	Using the same brands of goods as this person uses	1	2	3	4	5
10	Visiting the same night club/bar visited by this person	1	2	3	4	5
11	Being on vacation at the same hotel while this person is present.	1	2	3	4	5

	Please state how you agree/disagree with the following statements	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	I don't approve of giving financial support to gay associations	1	2	3	4	5
2	The use of gay themes in commercials is harassing to the customers	1	2	3	4	5
3	I find marketing efforts directed towards gays unthoughtful	1	2	3	4	5
4	Giving support to any gay activity is impudent	1	2	3	4	5
5	Marketing efforts directed towards gays lack seriousness	1	2	3	4	5
6	It is bad faith to advertise using gay images in the general media.	1	2	3	4	5
7	Marketing efforts directed towards gays serve political purposes	1	2	3	4	5
8	The gay image in commercials is used to show the brand as youthful and untraditional	1	2	3	4	5
9	I don't think the marketing directed towards gays is an acceptable alternative marketing strategy	1	2	3	4	5
10	It is not honest to give advertisements to the journals read by gays	1	2	3	4	5
11	Marketing efforts directed towards gays are against moral norms of the society	1	2	3	4	5
12	Describing oneself as "gay friendly" by the use of marketing	1	2	3	4	5

	tools is being disrespectful to the other customers					
13	Advertisements using gay images are exaggerated.	1	2	3	4	5
14	If I wear a brand known as gay, people will think that I am gay.	1	2	3	4	5
15	Marketing efforts directed towards gays are insolent to other consumers	1	2	3	4	5
16	Today homosexuality is regarded as a perfect tool to draw the attention of others	1	2	3	4	5
17	Marketing efforts directed towards gays are encouraging them	1	2	3	4	5
18	Firms which want to have gay customers fool straight customers.	1	2	3	4	5
19	Some of products are still bought by gays even if there are no marketing efforts directed towards gays	1	2	3	4	5
20	Gay themes are used to create a comic effect in commercials	1	2	3	4	5
21	Marketing efforts directed towards gays is a passing fad	1	2	3	4	5
22	The application of different marketing strategies towards gays is not related to the protection of their rights	1	2	3	4	5
23	Marketing efforts directed towards gays are disturbing to the others	1	2	3	4	5
24	It is not appropriate that the brand I use donates to gays rights associations	1	2	3	4	5
25	Marketing efforts directed towards gays are the imitation of the strategies abroad	1	2	3	4	5
26	I take it as an insult if a store I shop publishes a commercial directed towards gays	1	2	3	4	5
27	Marketing efforts directed towards gays are planned	1	2	3	4	5
28	Marketing efforts directed towards gays are degrading	1	2	3	4	5
29	Economic motives are at play when developing marketing strategies specific to gays.	1	2	3	4	5
30	I stop buying a brand which I know to be implementing a marketing strategy towards gays	1	2	3	4	5

31	An enterprise should sell either to gay or non-gays but not to both	1	2	3	4	5
32	The consequences of marketing efforts directed towards gays are scary	1	2	3	4	5
33	Marketing efforts directed towards gays are immoral	1	2	3	4	5
34	Marketing efforts directed towards gays are disgusting	1	2	3	4	5
35	Marketing efforts directed towards gays are shameful to me	1	2	3	4	5
36	The use of gay themes in commercials is not sincere	1	2	3	4	5
37	Marketing efforts directed towards gays are not under control	1	2	3	4	5
38	Some firms use the gay images in their commercials to create a surprise effect	1	2	3	4	5
39	Marketing strategies towards gays and straights should not be implemented together	1	2	3	4	5
40	It is humiliating that an advertisement of a product I use appears in a gay media	1	2	3	4	5
41	Marketing efforts directed towards gays are harmful to social values	1	2	3	4	5
42	It is not ethical that the brand I use markets its products to the gays using the symbols which I don't understand.	1	2	3	4	5
43	Gays have a right to shop from special shops serving their needs	1	2	3	4	5
44	Marketing efforts directed towards gays are unnecessary	1	2	3	4	5
45	Gay society has different shopping modes compared to the rest of the society	1	2	3	4	5

TABLE 1. Respondents' Profile and Attitude towards Homosexuality (ATH)

Respondent Categorization			One-way ANOVA for ATH	
Sex	n	Percent	ATH mean	Sig.
Male	201	50.0	2.3835	0.048
Female	201	50.0	2.2990	
Total	402	100.0	2.3412	
Age				
18-19	65	17,2	n.a.	
20-21	80	20.0		
22-23	118	29.4		
24-25	129	30,9		
26-28	10	2.5		
Total	402	100.0		
Mother’s Education				
Illiterate	4	1.0	1.8636	0.175
Literate (some schooling)	10	2.5	2.4909	
Primary school graduate	28	7.0	2.3312	
High school graduate	160	39.8	2.3369	
Bachelor’s degrees	190	47.3	2.3565	
Graduate degrees	10	2.5	2.1909	
Total	402	100.0	2.3412	
Father’s Education				
Illiterate	4	1.0	2.4545	0.212
Literate (some schooling)	5	1.2	2.3445	
Primary school graduate	24	6.0	2.2879	
High school graduate	125	31.1	2.3142	
Bachelor’s degrees	228	56.7	2.3756	
Graduate degrees	16	4.0	2.1136	
Total	402	100.0	2.3412	
Previous contact with a homosexual person				
Yes	39	9.7	2.3566	0.814
No	363	90.3	2.3396	
Total	402	100.0	2.3412	
Frequency of exposure to gay themed advertisement				
Never	205	51.0	2.3162	0.467
Seldom	165	41.0	2.3631	
Occasionally	27	6.7	2.3892	
Often	4	1.0		
Very often	1	0.2		
Total	402	100.0	2.3412	
Political view				
Radical left	9	2.2	2.2727	0.952

Left	80	19.9	2.3670	
Centre-left	77	19.2	2.3046	
Centre-right	64	15.9	2.3480	
Right	139	34.6	2.3453	
Radical right	33	8.2	2.3526	
Total	402	100.0	2.3412	
Longest Place of Residence				
Village	4	1.0	1.8864	0.003
Small Town	22	5.5	2.3595	
City (small to medium)	134	33.3	2.3881	
Large city / metropolis	233	58.0	2.3375	
Abroad	9	2.2	1.8990	
Total	402	100.0	2.3412	

Note: Scheffe post-hoc analyses revealed significant differences only between “village” and “abroad” respondents as opposed to the remaining three groups for longest place of residence. For groups of other categorical variables, no significant inter-group difference was identified by Scheffe post-hoc procedure.

TABLE 2. Means and Standard Deviations for Attitudes towards Homosexuality (ATH)

Attitudes Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Shopping in the same store while this person is present	3.75	1.19
Being residents in the same apartment building with this person	2.12	.95
Visiting the same doctor as this person visits	3.47	.79
Being friends with this person	2.19	1.01
Dining at the same restaurant while this person is present	3.42	.86
Visiting the same barber/hair dresser frequented by this person	3.74	1.20
Frequenting the same sports/fitness club visited by this person	2.15	.94
Being next-door neighbor to this person	2.21	.96
Using the same brands of goods as this person uses	2.15	.96
Visiting the same night club/bar visited by this person	2.17	.96
Being on vacation at the same hotel while this person is present.	2.07	.93

Scale: 5 = not disturbing at all, ..., 1 = very disturbing.

TABLE 3. Means, Standards Deviations, Reliabilities, and Direct Oblimin Analysis Results For The Gay Marketing Scale

ITEMS	Component				
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3
Marketing efforts directed towards gays are insolent to other consumers	3.80	1.26	.705		
Giving support to any gay activity is impudent	3.98	1.13	.669		
Marketing efforts directed towards gays lack seriousness	3.36	1.29	.546		
Advertisements using gay images are exaggerated.	3.38	1.35	.533		
Marketing efforts directed towards gays is a passing fad	3.89	1.07	.706		
Marketing efforts directed towards gays are disturbing to the others	3.66	1.22	.578		
I stop buying a brand which I know to be implementing a marketing strategy towards gays	3.80	1.13	.368		
An enterprise should sell either to gay or non-gays but not to both	3.79	1.17	.756		
Marketing efforts directed towards gays are disgusting	3.54	1.31	.661		
Marketing efforts directed towards gays are shameful to me.	3.27	1.28	.433		
Marketing strategies towards gays and straights should not be implemented together	3.88	1.09	.699		
It is humiliating that an advertisement of a product I use appears in a gay media	3.97	1.056	.667		
Marketing efforts directed towards gays are unnecessary	3.82	1.15	.324		
Marketing efforts directed towards gays are the imitation of the strategies abroad	3.79	1.14	.691		
It is not appropriate that the brand I use donates to gays rights associations	3.84	1.099	.714		
It is not ethical that the brand I use markets its products to the gays using the symbols which I don't understand.	3.72	1.056	.295		
The use of gay themes in commercials is harassing to the customers	3.81	1.16	.636		
Describing oneself as "gay friendly" by the use of marketing tools is being disrespectful to the other customers	3.45	1.33	.303		
Marketing efforts directed towards gays are degrading	3.72	1.20	.492		
I don't approve of giving financial support to gay associations	3.69	1.24		.638	

I find marketing efforts directed towards gays unthoughtful	3.79	1.21	.669		
Marketing efforts directed towards gays serve political purposes	3.64	1.23	.562		
The gay image in commercials is used to show the brand as youthful and untraditional	2.18	.93	.375		
It is not honest to give advertisements to the journals read by gays	3.64	1.27	.643		
Today homosexuality is regarded as a perfect tool to draw the attention of others	2.20	.98	.287		
Marketing efforts directed towards gays are encouraging them	2.53	1.16	.228		
Firms which want to have gay customers fool straight customers.	2.63	1.10	.258		
Some of products are still bought by gays even if there are no marketing efforts directed towards gays	4.05	.91	.449		
I take it as an insult if a store I shop publishes a commercial directed towards gays	3.78	1.21	.741		
Marketing efforts directed towards gays are planned	2.20	.94	.422		
The use of gay themes in commercials is not sincere	3.80	1.20	.728		
Some firms use the gay images in their commercials to create a surprise effect	2.17	.98	.375		
The application of different marketing strategies towards gays is not related to the protection of their rights	3.53	1.25	.558		
Gay community has different shopping modes compared to the rest of the society	2.21	1	.707		
I don't think the marketing directed towards gays is an acceptable alternative marketing strategy	2.84	1.23	.360		
Gay themes are used to create a comic effect in commercials	2.22	.97	.380		
The consequences of marketing efforts directed towards gays are scary	2.21	1.01	.355		
Marketing efforts directed towards gays are not under control	2.24	1.02	.436		
Marketing efforts directed towards gays are harmful to social values	2.29	1.06	.739		
Marketing efforts directed towards gays are immoral	3.79	1.19	.367		
Gays have a right to shop from special shops serving their needs	3.96	.99	.436		
Marketing efforts directed towards gays are against moral norms of the society	3.80	1.15	.339		
Eigenvalue		13.60	9.2	3,67	2,82

Variance (%)	35	20.61	8,12	6,20
Alpha	.87	.89	,74	,56

Note: N	402	402	402
---------	-----	-----	-----

Scale: 5 = strongly agree, ..., 1 = strongly disagree.

TABLE 4. Correlation Among Components

Component	SP	MS	MC	ATH
MS	.527			
MC	.381	.347		
ATH	.642	.388	.247	
MEAN	3.71	3.05	2.84	2.82
SD	.69	.48	.50	.47
Note. N=402. All correlations were significant at $p < .01$.				