

## Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Cinsiyet Kimliği ve Cinsel Yönelim Değişkenlerine Göre Shweder'in Üç Etik Kuramı Bağlamında İncelenmesi

Şahin Atik<sup>1</sup>  
Melih Varol<sup>2\*</sup>

Geliş Tarihi: 31.08.2019  
Kabul Tarihi: 12.09.2019

Atıf Bilgisi:  
IBAD Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi  
Sayı: Özel Sayı Sayfa: 232-243  
Yıl: 2019

This article was checked by Turnitin.  
Similarity Index 8%

<sup>1</sup>İstanbul Üniversitesi, Türkiye,  
[sahinatik43@gmail.com](mailto:sahinatik43@gmail.com)  
ORCID ID 0000-0002-0696-9467  
<sup>2</sup>İstanbul Üniversitesi, Türkiye,  
[melihvarol999@hotmail.com](mailto:melihvarol999@hotmail.com)  
ORCID ID 0000-0002-0716-7458

\* Sorumlu yazar

### ÖZ

Bu araştırmanın amacı üniversite öğrencilerinin etik kodlarının kullanım sıklığının cinsiyet kimliği ve cinsel yönelim değişkenlerine göre farklılaşıp farklılaşmadığını saptanmasıdır. Betimsel nitelikte olan bu araştırmanın örneklemini çeşitli üniversitelerden ve bölümlerden 200 üniversite öğrencisi oluşturmuştur. Veriler toplanırken Walker ve Jensen (2016) tarafından geliştirilen ve Dost-Gözkân (2016) tarafından Türkçeye uyarlanan Etik Dünya Görüşü Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. İki yönlü çok değişkenli varyans analizi sonuçları; alt boyut puanlarının cinsel yönelime göre anlamlı şekilde farklılaştığını, cinsiyet kimliğine göre anlamlı şekilde farklılaşmadığını ve cinsiyet kimliği ile cinsel yönelim etkileşim etkisinin anlamsız olduğunu göstermiştir.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** Shweder, üç etik kuramı, cinsiyet kimliği, cinsel yönelim, etik, ahlâk

## Investigation of University Students with Respect to Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation within the Context of Shweder's Big Three Ethics

Şahin Atik<sup>1</sup>  
Melih Varol<sup>2\*</sup>

**First received:** 31.08.2019  
**Accepted:** 12.09.2019

**Citation:**  
*IBAD Journal of Social Sciences*  
**Issue:** Special Issue **Page:** 232-243  
**Year:** 2019

This article was checked by *Turnitin*.  
*Similarity Index* 8%

<sup>1</sup> İstanbul University, Turkey,  
[sahinatik43@gmail.com](mailto:sahinatik43@gmail.com)

**ORCID ID** 0000-0002-0696-9467

<sup>2</sup> İstanbul University, Turkey,  
[melihvarol999@hotmail.com](mailto:melihvarol999@hotmail.com)

**ORCID ID** 0000-0002-0716-7458

\* Corresponding author

### ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to determine whether the frequency of using ethical codes of university students differs according to gender identity and sexual orientation variables. The sample of this descriptive study consists of 200 university students from various universities and departments. Ethical Worldview Scale developed by Walker and Jensen (2016) and adapted into Turkish by Dost Gözkân (2016) was used for data collection. The results of two-way multivariate analysis of variance denoted that subcategory points differed significantly with respect to sexual orientation, did not differ significantly with respect to gender identity and the interaction effect of gender identity and sexual orientation was not significant.

**Key Words:** Shweder, Three Ethical Theories, Gender Identity, Sexual Orientation, Ethics, Morality.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Moral codes are known to be related to several variables in moral psychology literature. Studies have hitherto been focused on several variables such as gender identity, political tendency, socioeconomic status, religious tendency and whether the society in which individual lives is individualistic or collectivistic. Although several studies show that these variables correlate with moral codes, this research focuses on evaluating the moral codes in relation to gender identity and sexual orientation.

The word ethic is defined as behavioral patterns and laws people must obey in society, morality by Turkish Language Association (n.d.). On the other hand, according to Kohlberg (1984, as cited in Çoban & Türer, 2014) ethic is a cognitive structure which embodies reasoning, making a decision and acting accordingly in matters involving dilemmas such as right-wrong, good-bad, etc. That is to say, ethic is also determined by the individual, including cognitive and behavioral processes proceeding according to tenets that may meet on common ground with the principles adopted by all. As it can be seen, in one definition of ethic the individuals are handled as passive entities who must obey certain rules, in other definition people have a more active role. Therefore, it does not seem possible to claim that ethic has a certain definition accepted by all.

Cognitive, psychological, and social processes are effective on the acquisition and development of ethic and different aspects of ethic are emphasized in different theories. For instance, Freud put emphasis on psychological aspect of ethic in the acquisition of ethic, mentioning the importance of mental mechanisms (Quinodoz, 2016). According to Freud, moral development is a function of superego, a structure of human mind, resulting in the formation of conscience (Turiel, 2002). Identification, parents' authority, anxiety to lose compassion, and internalization of social processes are essential concepts and processes in psychoanalytical theory (Freud, 1921, 2016, as cited in Cesur, 2018). Kohlberg and Piaget are two of outstanding theorists in moral psychology, investigating moral development within the context of cognitive development (Çam, Çavdar, Seydoogulları, & Çok, 2012). Kohlberg formed his theory based upon Piaget's stages of cognitive development (Santrock, 2012). Different from Piaget, Kohlberg (2008) asserted that moral development comprised six stages and three levels, explaining moral development based upon these stages. Emphasizing the social aspect of ethic, Fiske (1992) put emphasis on people's interactions with others, which results in the formation of individuals' ethic. Bandura (2001) asserted that ethic came into being and developed via learning process that is the result of the interaction of cognitive and social factors.

The notion of culture was developed primarily in 19th century by anthropologists. Culture was identified as "That complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, law, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society." (Tylor, 1871, pp.1). Culture helps us learn normative behaviors and interaction manners. Members of the society interiorize the rules, traditions and mindscapes of the society throughout their lifespan (Haviland, Prins, Walrath, & McBride, 2006). When studying and discussing about the notion of morality, it is important to consider the notion of culture and cultural differences, for morality is related to thought, behaviour and interaction. The way people think, behave, feel and interact varies across the cultures. Even though there are universal norms and institutions (e.g., incest taboo and family institution), several norms differ in the structure and feature. First degree cousin marriages are an example to this variation. First degree cousin marriages are outlawed in 30 states of USA and it is widely accepted as immoral and harmful to children of the family (Ottenheimer, 1996). Nevertheless, there is no significant danger for the children of this type of family and it is practiced in many communities.

Though researching various phenomena via experimental or quasi-experimental design and trying to shed light on them, experimental (main stream) social psychology has been criticized for taking phenomena out of context or ignoring the importance of context and culture (Parker, 2007). Bloom (2011) similarly criticized studies of moral psychology. That is to say, Bloom (2011) asserted that studies of moral psychology were centred upon how people interpret, judge, respond, and give meaning to hypothetical or unrelated strangers and their interactions. However, most people pay more attention to

their neighbours or families than unrelated strangers (Bloom, 2011). Studies of moral psychology neglect the importance of context, bringing about wrong questions put forward, wrong studies designed, and wrong theories developed (Bloom, 2011). Another criticism put forward for studies of moral psychology is that these studies handle ethic as a singular structure though it has more than one component (Cesur, 2018). In contrast to many a theory in moral psychology literature, one of the anthropological moral theories handling ethic as a pluralistic structure and taking contextual importance of culture into consideration is Shweder's big three ethics (Cesur, 2018). Shweder, Much, Mahapatra, and Park (1997) investigated the nature of morality and causal explanations for suffering with 29 male and 18 female participants, mostly adults and mostly Brahmans in Orissa, India. As a result of this study, 16 moral categories arose, some of which were virtue and merit, social order, souls and sentiments, hierarchy, transcendence, respect for possessions, chastity, duty, sacred order, justice and rights. Having utilized several statistical analyzes, Shweder et al. (1997) obtained three clusters or codes, called subcategories in this article: The Ethic of Autonomy, The Ethic of Community and The Ethic of Divinity. According to them, the concepts such as harm, rights and justice lie at the root of the ethic of autonomy placing high importance on individuals' rights to make arbitrary choices based upon personal preferences. Shweder et al. (1997) indicated that this ethical approach was salient in individualist societies. Putting emphasis on core concepts such as duty, hierarchy, interdependency, and souls, the ethic of community is salient in collectivist societies (Shweder et al., 1997). According to them, the ethic of community aims to protect divergent components or roles comprising community or society. Female genital mutilation carried out in quite a few African countries can be investigated to compare these two moral codes. For instance, a woman's rejecting female genital mutilation can be assessed in the context of the ethic of autonomy inasmuch as she makes her decision freely, which is not in accordance with the ethic of community, for she disregards hierarchy, duty, and rules of the community she lives in. In the study of Shweder et al. (1997), the third code is the ethic of divinity having to do with regulative concepts such as sacred order, natural order, tradition, sanctity, sin and pollution. This moral code intends to prevent the soul, the nature and the spiritual aspects of human from degenerating (Shweder et al. 1997). The ethic of divinity is not only associated with religious beliefs but with what is and is not accepted as natural. Rozin, Lowery, Imad, and Haidt (1999) found that violation of the three moral codes, which are community, autonomy, divinity, elicited contempt, anger, and disgust respectively, because of which this study was called CAD hypothesis. Russell, Piazza, and Giner-Sorolla's (2013) study supported the CAD hypothesis.

The relation of moral codes with gender identity and sexual orientation were investigated in this research. In this context, it is important to know briefly about the notions of gender identity and sexual orientation. Sexual orientation can be defined as the emotional, romantic and sexual attraction towards a specific gender. In short, it can be described as which gender the person's sexual desires gravitate towards. There are three main sexualities: Heterosexuality, homosexuality and bisexuality. The origin of the word homosexuality comes from the integration of the Greek word "homos" meaning "same, like" and the Latin word "sexus" meaning "sex" (Nişanyan, 2002, as cited in Dondurucu & Uluçay, 2015). Though used as a medical term firstly, it describes the sexual and/or emotional attraction between two individuals of the same sex. For male homosexuals the term "gay" and for female homosexuals the term "lesbian" is used. The origin of the word gay is related to the Gay Liberation Movement in the early 1970s. The term was used for both male and female homosexuals in the past, but currently it is generally used for male homosexuals. The origins of the word Lesbian comes from the Lesbos Island. In this island female homosexual poet Sappho lived in 6th century BC. The word "lesbian" is used to describe the emotional, sexual and romantic attraction between women. Bisexuality is used to describe the people who are sexually, romantically and emotionally attracted to both genders. Heterosexuality is the sexual orientation in which the individuals are attracted romantically, sexually and emotionally to the opposite gender. In spite of the fact that there are three main sexualities, some type of sexual orientations are unlikely to be assessed under these categories. To illustrate, pansexuality is a sexual orientation in which individuals are attracted sexually, romantically and emotionally to people regardless of their gender or biological sex and the pansexuals can be called "gender blind". However, asexuality is used for people who are lacking in sexual attraction to others, but these people can be attracted to others romantically and emotionally. For instance, an "asexual panromantic" is a person who is attracted emotionally and romantically to people regardless of gender and biological sex, lacking in sexual attraction. Different

from sexual orientation, gender identity is the personal sense of one's own gender. A person can call himself/herself male, female, a blend of both or neither. One's own gender can be the same or different from their sex assigned at birth. When one's own gender is different from their sex assigned at birth, this person is called transgender. On the other hand, cisgender is a term used for people whose gender matches their sex assigned at birth. Nevertheless, agender is the term used for people identifying as neither male or female, signifying a person is likely not to have a gender identity. People who aren't exclusively male or female can call themselves "non-binary". Intended to include sexual and gender minorities, the term "queer" is an umbrella term used for people who are not heterosexual or cisgender.

There are several studies conducted and associated with sexual orientation and ethic, but in all of the studies to be reached, sexual orientation was linked with ideology. For example, Haidt and Hersh (2001) investigated the relationship between political tendencies and various sexual activities. One of the hypotheses of this study was that liberals demonstrated a perspective bounded by the ethic of autonomy and that no act is considered wrong as long as it does not hurt people's health. On the contrary, conservatives were expected to demonstrate more extensive perspective, including the ethics of community and divinity, that all "unnatural" sexual acts must be condemned. As expected, the results of the study revealed that liberals demonstrated a perspective which is mostly restricted to the ethic of autonomy and is based on concepts such as harm, rights and justice, but conservatives demonstrated more extensive perspective based upon the ethics of community and divinity. According to the results of this study, it was the homosexual scenarios leading to the biggest difference between liberals and conservatives, for the liberal position on homosexuality is simple: As long as they don't hurt anybody, people should be allowed to love, have sex with and marry whoever they want. However, homosexual rights and same sex marriage create value conflict for conservatives. The values of religion and traditional family structures conflict with values of individual freedom (Haidt & Hersh, 2001). Stern, West, Jost, and Rule (2013) conducted a study investigating whether liberals and conservatives differed on the process of separating individuals into a perceptually uncertain groups because of their difference in the cognitive styles, examining whether conservatives were more likely to count on gendered cues (e.g., feminine = gay) when classifying male faces as heterosexual or homosexual. In conclusion, it was demonstrated that the liberals were less likely to use gendered cues compared to the conservatives.

Despite the fact that sexual orientation was handled in the aforementioned studies, any study that investigates whether moral codes change depending on sexual orientation hasn't been reached in literature.

There are several studies linked to gender identity in literature. One of these studies was a study conducted with Muslim students by Tepe, Piyale, Sirin, and Roger-Sirin (2016). The results of this study indicated that moral judgement differed between genders. Haidt's five harmless-offensive stories were used in this study. Intending to provoke and triggering feelings of disgust, these stories had disrespectful and sickening contents. The results of this study demonstrated that women were more inclined to support interference in the stories, feeling more uncomfortable than male participants. On the other hand, Walker, de VriesB, and Trevelhan (1987) investigated Kohlberg's and Gilligan's theory of moral development based on gender identity, but they couldn't find any significant difference based upon gender identity.

Participants are expected to differ based upon gender identity and sexual orientation in the context of Shweder's big three ethics. We have these hypotheses that the heterosexuals use the ethic of divinity more than others and female participants use the ethic of community more than male participants.

## 2. METHOD

### 2.1. Participants

200 people aged between 18 – 40 (mean age = 22.05, SD = 2.86) from various universities and departments in Turkey participated in this research. 46% of the participants identified themselves as male (N = 92), 50.5% as female (N = 101), 0.5% as agender (N = 1), 1% as non-binary (N = 2), 1% as queer (N= 2) and the 1% of the remaining participants did not use any gender identification term (N= 2). As for sexual orientation, 48% of the participants identified as heterosexual (N = 96), 27% as bisexual (N = 54),

21.5% as gay (N = 43), 0.5% as asexual panromantic (N = 1), 1% queer (N = 2), 1% as pansexual (N = 2) and the 1% of remaining participants did not use any label (N = 1) and did not report any sexual orientation term (N = 1). Lastly, 3% of the participants reported their economic status as very low (N = 6), 16% as low (N = 32), 70,5% as middle (N = 141) and 10.5% as high (N = 21).

## 2.2. Materials

**2.2.1. Demographic Information Form:** The “Demographic Information Form” created by the researchers is composed of questions about age, gender identity, sexual orientation, economic status, university, major and the class of the participants.

**2.2.2. Ethical Values Assessment:** In this study, Ethical Values Assessment developed by Walker and Jensen (2016) and adapted to Turkish by Dost-Gözkân for an international project between February and May of 2016 was used in order to determine which subcategories of ethic the participants used predominantly. The long form of the scale has subscales, each of which contains six items for each subcategory: the ethics of autonomy, community, and divinity. The sentences that “I should try to achieve my personal goals” for the ethic of autonomy, “I should take care of my family” for the ethic of community, and “I should follow God’s law” for the ethic of divinity can be given as exemplary items. Every item is graded in five-point likert type, ranging from (1) “Not Important at All” to (5) “Very Important”. The long form of the scale was conducted on 551 students. Cronbach’s alphas were .79, .75, and .95 respectively for the ethics of autonomy, community and divinity (Walker & Jensen, 2016). Turkish version of the scale was conducted on 423 participants aged between 14-31 and in this version, there are 6 items measuring the ethics of autonomy and community. In the scale, the lowest possible score for the ethics of autonomy and community is 6 and the highest possible score is 30. The Cronbach’s alphas were .83, .90, and .83 respectively for the ethics of autonomy, community and divinity/religion in the Turkish version of the scale (Dost-Gözkân, 2016). However, in a standardization study conducted by Sunar, Tepe, Piyale, and Biten (2015) with a sample of university students, it was demonstrated that an item of the ethic of divinity/religion that “I should have a spiritual compass” was not valid in Turkey. Because of this, the item was removed from the scale. Seeing that the sample of this study was also composed of university students, the item was excluded from the scale used in this study. Therefore, there are 5 items measuring the ethic of religion/divinity. Accordingly, the lowest possible score for the ethic of religion/divinity is 5 and the highest possible score is 25.

## 2.3. Procedures

The research was conducted under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Sevim Cesur and the data were collected between April and August of 2019 from voluntary participants. Participants were reached via "snowball sampling" method using social media platforms such as twitter, facebook, LGBTI+ support groups and student groups. Participants that are university students were invited to participate in an online survey and were also asked to refer friends who met the recruitment criterion. “Informed Consent Form“, “Demographic Information Form” and “Ethical Values Assessment” were sent to the participants online and their answers were collected in an online database. When the scale was finished, participants were thanked for their participation. In average the scale was completed in five minutes and demographic information form was completed in two minutes. That is, the procedure was finished in average of seven minutes.

*Analysis of the data:* The data collected were examined via two-way multivariate analysis of variance, and whether the subcategory scores of the scale based upon sexual orientation and gender identity differed were examined. The independent variables were gender identity and sexual orientation. Gender identity has three subcategories, being “male”, “female” and “other”. When participants chose "other", they could write how they identified themselves or which gender label they used. The variable “sexual orientation” has four categories, being “bisexual”, “homosexual”, “heterosexual”, and “other”. Similarly, when participants chose "other", they could write how they identified themselves or which sexual orientation label they used. However, the category “other” in variables of gender identity and sexual orientation were not included in the analyses because there were only seven participants in these categories, but their mean scores and standard deviations in the subcategories were presented. The

dependent variables of this study are the subcategories of Ethical Values Assessment: The ethics of autonomy, community and divinity.

### 3. RESULTS

The aim of this study was to determine whether university students' frequency of usage of moral codes differs significantly with respect to the variables of gender identity and sexual orientation in subcategories, which are the ethics of autonomy (EA), community (EC) and religion (ER), of Ethical Values Assessment. There being only 7 people choosing "other" for gender identity and sexual orientation, these participants were excluded from analyzes. Although excluded from analyzes, these participants' mean scores and standard deviations were presented in table 1 and table 2. A Type 1 error rate of  $p < .05$  was adopted for statistical tests in this article.

Participants' mean scores and standard deviations of subcategories by gender identity are presented in table 1.

**Table 1.** Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Subcategories, by Gender Identity

Subcategories	Gender Identity	M	SD
EA	Men	26.46	2.33
	Women	26.36	2.35
	Other	25.38	3.38
EC	Men	22.95	3.19
	Women	23,15	3,21
	Other	22.13	4.39
ER	Men	12.33	5.50
	Women	12.87	5.20
	Other	7.50	3.66

Two-way MANOVA was computed to determine whether the participants' frequency of usage of moral codes differs significantly with respect to gender identity. The results of two-way MANOVA revealed that there was no significant difference in subcategories based upon gender identity (Wilks'  $\lambda = .996$ ,  $F_{3, 180} = .258$ ,  $p = .856$ ).

Participants' mean scores and standard deviations of subcategories by sexual orientation are presented in table 2.

**Table 2.** Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Subcategories, by Sexual Orientation

Subcategories	Sexual Orientation	M	SD
EA	Bisexual	26.06	2.37
	Homosexual	26.63	2.73
	Heterosexual	26.44	2.27
	Other	26.14	1.57
EC	Bisexual	21.63	2,74
	Homosexual	23.05	3.32
	Heterosexual	23.73	3.23
	Other	23.71	3.68
ER	Bisexual	9.80	4.42
	Homosexual	11.21	5.18
	Heterosexual	14.42	5.21
	Other	12.43	5.32

Two-way MANOVA was computed alike to determine whether the participants' frequency of usage of moral codes differs significantly with respect to sexual orientation. The results of two-way MANOVA revealed that there was a significant difference in subcategories based upon sexual orientation (Wilks'  $\lambda = .848$ ,  $F_{6, 360} = 5.17$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .08$ ). According to Cohen (1988, as cited in Başol & Altay, 2009) this partial  $\eta^2$  denotes medium effect size. Given the significance based upon sexual orientation, the univariate main effects were examined using Bonferroni adjusted alpha levels of .017 per test (.05/3). Evaluated respectively, the dependent variables reaching significance were the ethics of community ( $F_{2, 182} = 7.00$ ,  $p = .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .07$ ) and religion ( $F_{2, 182} = 12.42$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = .12$ ). A series of Sidak post-hoc tests were performed using Bonferroni adjusted alpha levels of .006 per test (.017/3). Results revealed that bisexuals' and homosexuals' scores were significantly lower than heterosexuals' scores in the ethic of religion and bisexuals' scores were significantly lower than heterosexuals' scores in the ethic of community (respectively  $p < .001$ ,  $p = .005$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The differences among groups in other subcategories weren't significant. The interaction effect of gender identity and sexual orientation wasn't significant (Wilks'  $\lambda = .960$ ,  $F_{6, 360} = 1.16$ ,  $p = .33$ ).

#### 4. DISCUSSION

Whether university students' frequency of usage of moral codes differs significantly with respect to gender identity and sexual orientation was investigated in this study. The analyzes revealed that there was no significant difference in subcategories based upon gender identity, denoting being a man or woman has no role on the frequency of moral codes used. In a study in which moral and gender identity was investigated by Walker et al. (1987), Kohlberg's and Gilligan's theory of moral development were investigated and no significant difference was found based upon gender identity for moral development and orientation, in accordance with the results of this study. However, the results of the study including 167 Muslim students from Turkey of Tepe et al. (2016) revealed that women felt much more disturbed and interfering compared with men towards Haidt's five harmless-offensive stories, inconsistent with the results of this study. The reason of this incongruence may be owing to the use of different instruments. In



addition, all the participants in this study are university students, which may also be the source of the incongruence. Hofstede's (2001, pp. 215) study showed that Turkey, scoring 37 on individualism dimension, is a collectivist society. Contrary to this finding, participants' mean scores were higher in the ethic of autonomy compared to the ethic of community in this study, irrespective of gender identity or sexual orientation. Hence, frequency of usage of moral codes is likely to differ with more heterogeneous samples.

The results of this study revealed that bisexuals' and homosexuals' scores were significantly lower than heterosexuals' scores in the ethic of religion and bisexuals' scores were significantly lower than heterosexuals' scores in the ethic of community. There was no significant difference based upon gender identity or sexual orientation in the ethic of autonomy. The interaction effect of gender identity and sexual orientation was also not significant. As noted in the study of Shweder et al. (1997), the ethics of autonomy, community and divinity comprise the clusters of ethic. The ethic of divinity does not only include monotheistic moral perspective or religious values but it is also related to concepts such as protection of sacred order, nature, transcendence or spirits. The cultural differences emerge at this point, for the concept of divinity generally includes religion or Allah/God rather than the mere respect felt for sacred order, nature or spirits in Turkey. Thus, evaluating the results by way of monotheistic moral perspective, we used the term "the ethic of religion" rather than the ethic of divinity. In conclusion, heterosexuals' mean scores for the ethic of religion were significantly higher than those of bisexuals and homosexuals. The differentiation of the ethic of religion based upon sexual orientation is more than likely to be associated with pervasive and relentless homophobic/homonegative, biphobic and heterosexist approaches of religions. Gelbal and Duyan's (2006) study with university students revealed that participants' views on religion were significant predictors of their stance towards gay people, signifying the more students became religious, the more negative attitude they held against gay people. Because homosexuality is a sin according to Islam (Erol, 1996, as cited in Gelbal & Duyan, 2006). Another possible reason for the differentiation in the ethic of religion might be that conservative, religious or LGB individuals using the ethic of religion more than LGB individuals in this study avoided attending this study due to refraining from giving information about their sexual orientation. In this study, participants weren't requested to give information about their name and surname, which was highlighted in the informed consent form. On the other hand, a great many studies in literature (e.g., Gelbal & Duyan, 2006; Herek, 1988; Orta & Camgöz, 2018; Yalçınoğlu, 2013) indicate that level of piety is positively correlated with homonegativity or internalized homonegativity. Accordingly, conservative LGB individuals may not have attended this study, feeling threatened by their sexual orientation. In addition to the ethic of religion, bisexuals' mean scores for the ethic of community were significantly lower than those of heterosexuals. Although bisexuals scored lower than homosexuals in the ethic of community, this difference wasn't significant. The reason why this difference arose may be owing to both homosexuals' and heterosexuals' having negative and irrational stereotypes against bisexuals, giving rise to prejudice and discrimination against them. Set to be labelled as "unstable", "promiscuous" or "confused" by heterosexuals and homosexuals, bisexuals may feel like they don't belong any community (Miller, André, Ebin, & Bessonova, 2007). Feeling not understood and being minority in minority, bisexuals may attribute less importance to their roles in the community in which they live. Many a study in literature supports this explanation. In a study conducted by Lindley, Walsemann, and Carter (2012), bisexual women were found to be more stressed, depressed and exposed to discrimination compared to other groups. Perales and Baxter's (2018) study including 25.348 participants from UK and 9.206 participants from Australia investigated the quality of intimate relationships of bisexual, gay, lesbian and heterosexual individuals. There was no significant difference between same-sex couples and heterosexual couples in UK based upon quality of intimate relationship, but same-sex couples reported higher levels of relationship quality than heterosexuals in Australia. Bisexuals reported the lowest relationship quality in both UK and Australia (Perales & Baxter, 2018). In addition, a higher percentage of couples reported feelings of jealousy when one of the partners was bisexual. (Scherer, Akers, & Kolbe, 2013).

Being one of the rare researches investigating sexual orientation within the context of Shweder's big three ethics in Turkey, this research is important. Moreover, we believe that this research has made

significant contributions to literature, shedding light on irrational stereotypes that men and women or LGB and heterosexual individuals are very different from each other in terms of moral perspective fundamentally. Besides, this research also points out the fact that efforts should be raised to enhance bisexual people's level of inclusivity. On the other hand, this study includes only participants that are university students to increase internal validity, which is the limitation of this study in a way. Because of this, it is important to research on a sample more inclusive in terms of age, ideology, socioeconomic and education status to obtain more comprehensive results in the future studies.

## REFERENCES

- Ahlâk. (n.d.) In *Turkish Language Association's dictionary*. Retrieved from <http://sozluk.gov.tr/>
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 1-26.
- Başol, G., & Altay, M. (2009). Eğitim yöneticisi ve öğretmenlerin mesleki tükenmişlik düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 58(58), 191-216.
- Bloom, P. (2011). Family, community, trolley problems, and the crisis in moral psychology. *The Yale Review*, 99(2), 26-43.
- Cesur, S. (2018). *Ahlâkın sosyal psikolojisi*. İstanbul: Pales Yayınları
- Çam, Z., Çavdar, D., Seydooğulları, S., & Çok, F. (2012). Ahlâk gelişimine klasik ve yeni kuramsal yaklaşımlar, *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 12(2), 1211-1225.
- Çoban, G. İ., & Türer, S. (2014). Ahlâki gelişim ve hemşirelik. *Gümüşhane Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(3), 948-958.
- Dondurucu, Z. B., & Uluçay, A. P. (2015). Yeni medya ortamlarında nefret söylemi: Eşcinsellere yönelik nefret söylemi içeren videoların youtube üzerinden incelenmesi. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education Research*, 1(3), 875-902.
- Dost-Gözkân, A. (2016). Ergenlerin ebeveynleri ile bilgi paylaşma davranışları: bireysel ve aileye ilişkin faktörler ve olumlu gelişim. Yayınlanmamış rapor.
- Fiske, A. P. (1992). *Structures of social life: The four elementary forms of human relations*. New York: Free Press.
- Gelbal, S., & Duyan, V. (2006). Attitudes of university students toward lesbians and gay men in Turkey. *Sex Roles*, 55(7), 573-579.
- Haviland, W. A., Prins, H. E. L., Walrath, D., & McBride, B. (2006). Kültürün özellikleri. İ.D.E. Sarıoğlu (Ed.), *Kültürel antropoloji* (pp.101-145). İstanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları.
- Haidt, J., & Hersh, M. A. (2001). Sexual morality: The cultures and reasons of liberals and conservatives. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31, 191-221.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. USA:Sage publications.
- Kohlberg, L. (2008). The development of children's orientations toward a moral order: I. Sequence in the development of moral thought. *Human Development*, 51(1), 8-20. (Reprint of *Vita Humana* 1963; 6:11-33).
- Lindley, L. L., Walsemann, K. M., & Carter, J. W. (2012). The association of sexual orientation measures with young adults' health-related outcomes. *American journal of public health*, 102(6), 1177-1185.

- Miller, M., André, A., Ebin, J., & Bessonova, L. (2007). *Bisexual health: An introduction and model practices for HIV/STI prevention programming*. National Gay and Lesbian Taskforce Policy Institute.
- Orta, İ. M., & Camgöz, S. M. (2018). Türkiye'de yapılan homofobi çalışmalarına genel bir bakış. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, 58(1), 409-439.
- Ottenheimer, M. (1996). *Forbidden relatives: The American myth of cousin marriage*, Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Jensen, L. A. (2016). Validation of the long- and short-form of the Ethical Values Assessment (EVA): A questionnaire measuring the three ethics approach to moral psychology. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 40(2), 181-192.
- Parker, I. (2007). Critical psychology: What it is and what it is not. *Social and personality psychology compass*, 1(1), 1-15.
- Perales, F., & Baxter, J. (2018). Sexual identity and relationship quality in Australia and the United Kingdom. *Family relations*, 67(1), 55-69.
- Rozin, P., Lowery, L., Imada, S., & Haidt, J. (1999). The CAD Triad Hypothesis: A mapping between three moral emotions (contempt, anger, disgust) and three moral codes (community, divinity, autonomy). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(4), 574-586
- Russell, P. S., Piazza, J., & Giner-Sorolla, R. (2013). CAD revisited: Effects of the word moral on the moral relevance of disgust (and other emotions). *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 4(1), 62-68.
- Quinodoz, J. M. (2016). Benlik ve altbenlik. A. G. Küey (Ed.), *Freud'u okumak* (pp. 223-231) İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık.
- Santrock, J. W. (2012). Erken çocuklukta sosyo-duygusal gelişim. A. E. Aslan (Ed.), *Yaşam boyu gelişim* (13<sup>th</sup> ed.) in (pp. 241-272). Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Scherer, C. R., Akers, E. G., & Kolbe, K. L. (2013). Bisexuals and the sex differences in jealousy hypothesis. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 30(8), 1064-1071.
- Shweder, R. A., Much, N. C., Mahapatra, M., & Park, L. (1997). The "big three" of morality (autonomy, community, divinity) and the "big three" explanations of suffering. A. M. Brandt & P. Rozin (Ed.), *Morality and health* in (pp. 119-169). Florence KY, USA: Taylor and Frances/Routledge.
- Stern, C., West, T. V., Jost, J. T., & Rule, N. O. (2013). The politics of gaydar: Ideological differences in the use of gendered cues in categorizing sexual orientation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(3), 520-541.
- Sunar, D., Tepe, B., Piyale, Z.E., & Biten, A.F. (2015). Unpublished report.
- Tepe, B., Piyale, Z. E., Sirin, S., & Sirin, L. R. (2016). Moral decision-making among young muslim adults on harmless taboo violations: The effects of gender, religiosity, and political affiliation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 101, 243-248.
- Turiel, E. (2002). *The culture of morality: Social development, context, and conflict*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tylor, E. B. (1871). *Primitive culture: Researches into the development of mythology, philosophy, religion, language, art and customs* (pp.1). London: Murray.
- Walker, L. J., de VriesB., & Trevelhan, S. D. (1987). Moral stages and moral orientations in real life and hypothetical dilemmas. *Child Development*, 58, 842-858.

Yalçınođlu, N. (2013). *Eşcinsel ve biseksüel erkeklerin psiko-sosyal sorunları ve bunları etkileyen faktörlerin incelenmesi*. Unpublished specialty thesis in medicine, İstanbul Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi, İstanbul.