Utrecht University

201800479 CCAP Master Thesis

An Inclusive Mindset Towards Transgender Youth Through Inner Dialogue

Student: Matthias Maria Wagemans
Studentnumber: 3952681

Supervisor: Annerieke Oosterwegel
Second grader: Stathis Grapsas
Date: 20 June 2022

Abstract

In past decades awareness of transgender issues and acceptance of transgender individuals has grown, but today transgender youth is still at risk for mental health problems and bullying. This lagging acceptance implies a need for effective ways to increase tolerance. Through inner dialogue between different voices, individuals can gain new perspectives on others. We investigated whether tolerance towards transgender youth can be increased through awareness or inner dialogue. We also investigated working ingredients of inner dialogue for increasing tolerance. We conducted an online randomised controlled trial with control, awareness, and inner dialogue conditions and a pre-posttest design among youth aged 16 to 25 ($n = 156$). The T-KAB questionnaire measured the level of tolerance before and after each condition. We compared difference scores of tolerance increase between conditions using a one-way ANOVA. In addition, we scored the inner dialogues on presence of reflection, personal engagement, and alliance and explored the relationship of these dialogue characteristics to tolerance increase using non-parametric tests. Results indicated a significant difference between groups. A post hoc analysis revealed that awareness explained an increase in tolerance. Inner dialogue also appears to increase tolerance, but the effect is not significant. Additional analyses of the inner dialogue condition revealed a significant difference between groups for personal engagement, but not for alliance and reflection. Results indicate that awareness matters for tolerance, that there is potential for inner dialogue, and that friendship is important for a positive outcome of dialogue. Future research should focus on the design and characteristics of inner dialogue to further examine its potential.

An Inclusive Mindset Towards Transgender Youth Through Inner Dialogue

In the past decades activists have worked hard to raise awareness for the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) community and awareness has led to increased acceptance of the LGBT community (Kyte-Bryant & Leese, 2016). However, there is still intolerance towards the LGBT community in society (Harper & Schneider, 2003; Kyte-Bryant & Leese, 2016; Nadal, 2019). For example, it is estimated that 20 percent of Dutch people disapprove of gender ambivalence (Kuyper, 2012). Although little is known about acceptance of transgender identity among youth, a focus-group study with transgender youth aged 12 to 18 found that transgender youth experience all forms of bullying, ignoring, and physical attacks (Thio et al., 2015). More importantly, within the LGBT community, inclusion of transgender individuals greatly varies among LGB members and many members oppose inclusion of transgender individuals (Stone, 2009). Also, although the 'T' is often included in the literature, many studies focus on LGB experiences and neglect the experience of transgender youth in schools (Griffin & Ouellett, 2003). Although visibility of the trans community has increased, it is often portrayed as bleak and individual variety in trans identities is disregarded (Compton & Bridges, 2016). This indicates lagging inclusivity of transness in society at large as well as within the LGBT community.

Tolerance for transness is important because at present, transgender youth is still at higher risk for various negative factors such as violence victimization, substance use, suicide risk, sexual risk, and victimization in schools compared to their cisgender peers whose gender identity matches their sex assigned at birth (Baams, 2018; Crothers et al., 2017; Fish et al., 2020; Myers et al., 2020; Tankersley et al., 2021). Transgender youth are at higher risk of suicidal thoughts, suicide attempts, victimization by peers, and elevated levels of unexcused absences from school (Robinson & Espelage, 2011). Common risk factors for transgender youth's negative mental health variables are physical and verbal abuse, exposure to discrimination, social isolation, poor peer relations, low self-esteem, weight dissatisfaction, and age (Tankersley et al., 2021). Transgender youth are also much more likely to be victimized and to feel unsafe in schools than their cisgender peers (Hong & Espelage, 2012; Kuyper, 2017). Further, transphobia can affect cisgender friends of transgender youth by association (Formby, 2015). Today, more than a quarter of gender non-conforming youth suffer from suicidal ideation and behaviours resulting from stigmatisation and bullying (Surace, et al., 2021). Above all, some risks have not declined over time, such as the risk for non-suicidal self-harm (Liu et al., 2019). These concerning facts imply a need to investigate how social inclusivity and acceptance towards transgender youth can be fostered.

Schools may be important sites to foster tolerance, since peer support and school support are often related to well-being of transgender youth (Durwood et al, 2021). An important positive factor for LGBT student well-being is acceptance and open-mindedness of peers (Higa et al., 2014). Also, civic

education, such as teaching tolerance for LGBT youth, can increase wellbeing and school attendance of LGBT youth (McClain, 2020). In the Netherlands, schools are obliged to promote a safe school environment (Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap [OCW], 2015). However, interventions in Dutch schools are often limited to one class and focus on sexual diversity, despite the wider obligation to stimulate a respectful attitude towards diversity in society (Dankmeier, 2017). Hence, it is both necessary and obliged for schools to find ways to provide a safe climate and increase acceptance in schools.

In this research we focus on youth in secondary and tertiary schools, as adolescence offers a window of opportunity to foster tolerance. Adolescence is an important period for identity formation (Arnett, 2000). Age has been related to different levels of perspective taking (Selman, 1975). For example, some research on tolerance towards diversity among children and adolescents found that children aged 15 to 16 started developing cognitive maturity. This maturity provides opportunities to understand and challenge intolerant belief systems (Witenberg, 2007). Interventions therefore may focus on this age group.

Besides considering age, interventions must be LGBT-sensitive (Cultuur- en Ontspanningscentrum [COC], 2013). Although some important strategies are LGBT-sensitive, they often do not focus on changing the school climate but instead focus on an individual level (Russell & McGuire, 2008). Four current strategies at schools have been identified: Adapting school policies to explicitly include gender identities, teacher interference in harassment, availability of safe spaces, and access to LGBT related information and resources (Russell & McGuire, 2008). Some examples are classes about homosexuality, adaptations of language, safe spaces with organisations, and counselling for the victim. However, although school curricula have given more space for non-heteronormative sexual orientation, transness is treated as unimportant within schools (McQueen, 2006). In addition, the focus in these interventions is prevention of bullying behaviours, reduction of bullying behaviours, and supporting victims, rather than challenging the underlying gender-normative social norms. Current interventions therefore seem to overlook intolerant beliefs and propagate gender normativity (Formby, 2015; Payne & Smith, 2013). Instead, interventions should move beyond an approach of victims and bullies towards changing the school culture and social norms (Formby, 2015; Martino et al., 2020; Payne & Smith, 2013).

Factors that May Increase Tolerance

There are many different definitions of tolerance, but a widely accepted one is "*a moral value involving acceptance of others different from us as long as no harm occurs to others*" (Witenberg, 2019). However, tolerance often functions merely as a barrier against discrimination as it prevents individuals from acting on negative attitudes. Therefore, tolerance itself is not sufficient to reduce discrimination (Verkuyten et al., 2020).

Three important factors contribute to reducing discrimination and increasing acceptance, namely: Perspective taking and empathy, stimulating confrontation and awareness, and flexible thinking through counter-stereotypes (Kennisplatform Integratie & Samenleving, 2020). Thus, it is necessary to explore mechanisms which can stimulate these factors.

Inter-Group Contact as a Central Factor

The contact hypothesis suggests that prejudice towards minority groups can be reduced through contact between individuals of different social groups under appropriate circumstances (Allport et al., 1954). Although contact theory was originally devised for racial and ethnic encounters, it can be extended to other groups (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Intergroup contact has been positively related to acceptance of LGBT adolescents (Collier et al., 2012). For example, interpersonal contact with a transgender speaker panel can reduce stigma and prejudice such as transphobia (Walch et al., 2015). Moreover, prejudice reduction in the contact situation is transferable to members of the group who were initially not involved in that situation (Pettigrew, 2009). Contact may therefore be a central factor to reduce prejudice, to become aware of transgender issues, and to become more understanding towards transgender individuals.

However, there are some concerns with in-person inter-group contact. First, ingroup-outgroup interactions may produce negative emotions such as anxiety and stress for the outgroup individual (MacInnis & Page-Gould, 2015). A threshold of positive interactions must be achieved to lower intergroup bias, however, negative emotions of the outgroup member are likely to decrease only after this threshold (MacInnis & Page-Gould, 2015). This exposes an already vulnerable group of transgender youth to negative emotions to achieve prejudice reduction. Second, the scarcity of youth who identify as transgender hinders facilitation of inter-group contact between cisgender and transgender youth. It is estimated that in US high schools about 1.8% of students identify as transgender (Johns et al., 2019). Depending the definition of transgender, numbers vary in the Netherlands. About 3.9% of Dutch citizens does not identify with their sex assigned at birth (Felten & Boote, 2015). A study in the Netherlands with participants aged 15 to 71 shows that 5.7% of men and 4.0% of the women in the Netherlands do not feel unequivocally male or female (Kuyper, 2012). Hence, it is worth to explore feasible ways in which tolerance can be increased without negative effects on members of the outgroup.

Fostering Tolerance Through Awareness

Exposure to personal experiences from members of the transgender community may foster awareness of marginalisation. Sharing personal stories which counter the dominant social perspective may raise awareness to LGBT issues and foster understanding (Wagaman et al., 2018). For example, multiple trans women shared their personal experiences with marginalisation in online videos which generated support and understanding among the viewers (Jackson et al., 2018). A possible tool to foster

tolerance, without physical inter-group contact, is therefore to expose youth to videos where problematic experiences of transgender individuals are shared.

However, there is little research on the effectiveness of videos on increasing tolerance towards transgender youth and findings are ambiguous. Queer theory driven inclusivity video-training can increase tolerance towards LGBT persons, although a significant effect was observed only for bisexual individuals (Johansen, 2021). Also, media portrayals of transgender individuals in television storylines may decrease negative attitudes of conservative viewers (Gillig et al., 2018). In contrast, videos based on LGBT activism can decrease pro-LGBT attitudes, possibly due to over-exposure to LGBT rights and equality arguments in mass media (Deese & Dawson, 2013). When videos show personal stories rather than activism or aim to educate the audience, they seem to generate support from the audience. It may therefore be worth exploring whether videos that foster awareness of issues which transgender youth face can foster tolerance.

Fostering Tolerance Through Inner Dialogue

Another possible mechanism to reduce prejudice and foster tolerance may be the self and inner dialogue. The self is central to perspective taking and perspective taking is important for self-development (McHugh & Stewart, 2012). According to the Dialogical Self Theory (DST), inner dialogue between conflicting voices (I-positions) may lead to new perspectives (Hermans, 2018; Hermans et al., 2017; Meijer & Hermans, 2017). For example, as a reader you may experience *I as a learner* who cannot stop reading about DST due to your curiosity and *I as a colleague* who needs to take a break and socialise with colleagues. When these I-positions interact, they may come to an understanding that your curious and social I-positions may coexist (e.g., if you take a break and socialize by sharing what you learned about DST).

Furthermore, the self operates as an internal mini-society which is analogous to the external macro-society (Hermans, 2014). Interactions between internal voices may represent interactions within society at large. For example, you can individually discuss DST further after the break, in an inner dialogue between *I as myself* and *I as my colleague*, as you can imagine the perspective of your colleague. If inner dialogue can lead to new perspectives and if internal and external societies are analogous to each other, it is worth investigating whether inner dialogue can increase tolerance towards transgender youth. For instance, by increasing tolerance towards internal conflicting I-positions related to transgender youth which represent conflicting positions in society at large.

The self could indeed be central to the reduction of prejudice, by activation of different levels of inclusiveness through inner dialogue (Imperato & Mancini, 2021). Some research suggests that people can become more tolerant towards others (refugees) through dialogue between tolerant and intolerant voices within themselves (Markopoulou, 2021). However, there is currently little further support for these findings and research into the effects of inner dialogue on tolerance towards

transgender minorities is missing. Therefore, it is necessary to research whether similar effects can be found for tolerance towards transgender youth.

Conditions for Positive Change Through Inner Dialogue

Dialogue itself does not necessarily lead to positive outcomes (Stückelberger, 2009). Dialogue can positively influence the listener's opinion about the LGBT community if the speaker expresses their positive opinion about the community, is a peer, is liked by the audience and is relatable for the audience (Felten et al., 2015). On the other hand, expression of negative opinions about the LGBT community may negatively influence the listener's opinion and reinforce normalisation of these opinions (Felten et al., 2015).

Similarly, the contact hypothesis assumes that there are conditions for a positive outcome of inter-group contact. Allport listed four conditions which need to be met to decrease negative stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination: 1) Both groups should have equal status within a situation, 2) overall the groups must have common goals, 3) they must work together to obtain these goals without competition and 4) there should be support from authorities to establish a norm of acceptance (Pettigrew, 1998). Pettigrew later added a fifth condition of 5) friendship potential (Pettigrew, 1998).

Dialogue can take various shapes, such as intergroup dialogue or generative dialogue. Both intergroup dialogue and generative dialogue include aspects which are aligned with the above conditions. Intergroup dialogue includes appreciating differences, engaging the self by sharing personal experiences, critical reflection and alliance building (Dessel & Rogge, 2008; Nagda et al., 2012; Zúñiga & Nagda, 2001). Generative dialogue includes mutual respect and trust, personal engagement and commitment, suspending judgement, and reflective questioning (Petta et al., 2019). Therefore, dialogues which include aspects of intergroup dialogue and generative dialogue are likely to promote a positive outcome.

Among these dialogue aspects, one can identify three common characteristics: Personal engagement, alliance, and reflection. Personal engagement occurs when individuals express themselves cognitively and emotionally in their role as a friend, whereas personal disengagement occurs when individuals decouple themselves from this role (Khan, 1990). Alliance is a unified effort involving two or more individuals to achieve common goals with respect to a particular issue (Gudergan, 2007). In relation to the LGBT community, an ally supports the rights of LGBT people (Thornton et al., 2019). This can range from an active ally to a potential ally who recognizes LGBT rights but does not act on it (Baker, 2004). Reflection is the process of engaging the self in attentive, critical, exploratory and iterative inter-actions with one's thoughts and actions, and their underlying conceptual frame, with a view to changing them and with a view on the change itself (Nguyen et al., 2014). Since these aspects are common in both intergroup and generative dialogue, which are likely to

promote a positive outcome, it is worth exploring whether personal engagement, alliance, and reflection are related to tolerance increase.

In this study, the following questions are investigated; *Can inner dialogue increase tolerance towards transgender youth? Is this effect equal to, or perhaps even larger, than the effect of awareness through watching a video?* and *Are dialogue characteristics personal engagement, alliance and reflection related to increased tolerance towards transgender youth?* It is hypothesised that inner dialogue can increase tolerance, that inner dialogue instigates more tolerance than raising awareness by watching a video, and that positive dialogue characteristics contribute to tolerance increase.

       We will investigate this with a randomised experiment where we compare tolerance increase in groups which are exposed to either personal story sharing in videos (awareness) or to inner dialogue. In the latter group we will investigate the relationship between dialogue characteristics and tolerance increase.

Method

Participants

To ensure ethical conduct towards participants, this project was first approved by the ethics committee of the Psychology department of the University of Utrecht. Next, participants were informed that participation was voluntary and anonymous before the study and consented by indicating 'I consent, begin the study' before participating. Participants younger than 16 years could not access the experiment as the necessary parental consent could not be obtained. They were directed to the end of the experiment upon indicating their age. Furthermore, there was partial disclosure about the aim at the beginning of the study and at the end of the study we provided full disclosure in the debriefing. Also, in the debriefing we referred to free mental health support lines for further support and participants received ten suggestions for self-acceptance to encourage their well-being.

The sample consisted of 156 late adolescents, aged 16 to 25. Sampling was done by dissemination of a link to the online experiment via the personal, academic, and professional network of the researchers. Members of organisations connected to the target group distributed the experiment within their organisation, we thus used a combination of convenience sampling and snowball sampling. For an overview of distributions, please see Appendix 1.

To find a medium effect of 25% at the significance level of $p = .05$, a total sample size of 159 was required, with 53 participants in each condition. The total sample size roughly satisfied these requirements ($n = 156$), however, the sample size in the inner dialogue condition did not (n = 34).

Measures

The Transgender Knowledge, Attitudes, and Beliefs (T-KAB) Scale was used to measure *tolerance* before and after the manipulation (see Appendix 2). The T-KAB is a reliable tool with strong internal consistency ($\alpha = .97$) (Clark & Hughto, 2019). Participants indicated to what extent they strongly disagree (1) or strongly agree (5) with 22 statements about transgender individuals on a five-point Likert scale. Compared to the original T-KAB, we included an answer option 'neither agree nor disagree' (3) in the present study. We checked the internal consistency of the T-KAB before and after the manipulation after this change and this showed high internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.93$ and $\alpha = 0.94$ respectively). To distract participants from memorising their responses to the T-KAB on the pretest, we showed participants an image of furniture and asked them to memorize it and later to indicate which furniture they had seen.

The T-KAB consisted of three subscales, however, we used the total score. To compute a total score of tolerance, we inverted scores on items 1 until 8, 13 and 14, and 16 until 20 and summed up the score on all items. The difference score between tolerance before and after the manipulation resulted in the dependent variable *tolerance increase*.

For the independent variable *condition*, we divided participants into a *control*, *awareness*, and *inner dialogue* group. In the control group participants watched a short (one minute) video which was unrelated to transgender issues, namely a video about a laughing fox. In the awareness condition participants watched a six-minute TEDx video by a transgender male young adult in which he shares personal experiences related to his transness. In the *inner dialogue* group participants wrote two dialogues. In the first dialogue participants practiced with the format and were primed for a (self)supporting attitude, by remembering an upsetting moment in their youth and comforting their younger self. In the next exercise participants were asked to imagine the first contact with their best friend who recently started gender transitioning and to write a dialogue between them.

We measured the secondary measurements of the inner dialogue condition *personal engagement*, *alliance* and *reflection* by labelling and scoring dialogues. We expected that participants either showed *personal engagement* (1) or personal disengagement (0) in the dialogues. *Alliance* was measured as achieved in the dialogue (2), not achieved but there was a potential to achieve it (1), or it was not achieved and there was no potential (0). *Reflection* was measured as either present (1) or absent (0). Two researchers scored the dialogues independently (see Appendix 3). The overall inter-rater reliability (the sum of the scores for personal engagement, alliance and reflection) was fair ($\kappa = 0.32$, $p < .01$). Inter-rater reliability was substantial for personal engagement ($\kappa = 0.65$, $p < .01$), fair for alliance ($\kappa = 0.63$, $p = .11$), and moderate for reflection ($\kappa = 0.53$, $p < .01$) (McHugh, 2012). We concluded that the inter-rater reliability was sufficient. Therefore, and due to time constraints, we did not adjust differences in scores. Instead, we used the scores of Rater 1 for the analysis.

Procedure

Participants were informed of the study topic, anonymity, voluntary participation, and indicated their consent. After submitting demographic information participants were presented with the T-KAB and the memorisation task. Participants were then randomly assigned to one of three conditions (*control*, *awareness*, or *inner dialogue*) and were not aware in which condition they were placed. After the manipulation participants were presented again with the T-KAB. After this they were debriefed. All questions were in English. In the inner dialogue condition participants could submit their dialogues in Dutch or German as well, we translated these to English.

Before analysing data, we checked for missing data (i.e., missing responses to the pre and/or posttest) and the inclusion criterion of age (i.e., 16-25). We then computed a difference score for tolerance increase by subtracting the pretest score of tolerance from the posttest score. We labelled groups according to the condition, with 1 for the control condition, 2 for awareness, and 3 for inner dialogue.

To determine whether there were differences in tolerance increase between the three conditions, we analysed results with a one-way ANOVA using IBM SPSS 27.0. To check which

groups differed, we used a post-hoc analysis using Fisher's Least Significant Difference (LSD) for pairwise comparisons of the three groups. To determine the statistical power, we used the program G*Power 3.1.9.7.

To check whether there was a relation between tolerance increase and dialogue characteristics, we made groups based on scores for personal engagement (0 or 1), alliance (0, 1 or 2), and reflection (0 or 1). We used a Mann-Whitney test to check differences in tolerance increase for groups where *personal engagement* and *reflection* was present or absent, as there were two groups (0 and 1). For *alliance* we used a Kruskal-Wallis test as there were three groups (0, 1, and 2).

Results

Preliminary Analysis

We distributed the online experiment via multiple channels in the period of April 11, 2022 until June 1, 2022. In the second week of data collection the experiment was inaccessible for multiple days due to a cyber-attack. This may have resulted in a lower response rate. Of the 297 participants who completed the online experiment, 28 (9.4%) participants were excluded because they did not meet the criterion for age. An additional 113 participants failed to complete part of the pre- and/or posttest which resulted in a final total of 156 participants. Sixty-six participants ($n = 66$, 42.3%) were in the control condition, 56 participants were in the awareness condition ($n = 56$, 35.9%) and 34 participants were in the inner dialogue condition ($n = 34$, 21.8%).

To check whether the assumptions for the one-way ANOVA were met, we first checked for outliers in the pre- and posttest scores using a box plot. Although we observed several outliers, the scores were probable for the measure of tolerance and therefore they were included in the analysis. We then visually inspected histograms and Q-Q plots in each condition and in the total sample, which confirmed that tolerance increase scores were normally distributed. Due to the difference in sample sizes in each condition, we checked for homogeneity using Levene's Test. The variance was equal in all conditions ($F(2,153) = 1.89$, $p = .16$). We therefore concluded that all assumptions were met.

Demographic Characteristics

Frequency tables gave insight into demographic data of the sample (Table 1). Of 156 participants, most participants were 22 or 23 years old (25.0% and 26.9%), identified as cis-female or cis-male (44.9% and 49.4%), and had a Dutch nationality (57.7%). Most participants were non-religious (64.1%), attended university (86.6%) and previously felt part of a minority group (44.2%). Most participants had a close relation to someone who identifies as transgender, such as a family member, friend, or romantic partner and/or identified as transgender themselves (36.5%). Some participants did not have a close relation but were familiar with a transgender public figure (23.7%). Some participants were not familiar with any individual who identifies as transgender (20.5%).

Table 1
Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants at Baseline

Baseline characteristic	Control		Awareness		Inner Dialogue		Full sample	
	n	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*
Gender								
Female	30	45.5	23	41.1	17	50.0	70	44.9
Male	35	53.0	29	51.8	13	38.2	77	49.4
Non-binary	-	-	3	5.4	3	8.8	6	3.8
Self-describe	-	-	1	1.8	1	2.9	2	1.3

	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Prefer not to say	1	1.5	-	-	-	-	1	0.6
Age								
16	-	-	2	3.6	1	2.9	3	1.9
17	-	-	1	1.8	2	5.9	3	1.9
18	1	1.5	3	5.4	-	-	4	2.6
19	1	1.5	-	-	1	2.9	2	1.3
20	4	6.1	5	8.9	1	2.9	10	6.4
21	9	13.6	6	10.7	2	17.6	21	13.5
22	16	24.2	15	26.8	8	23.5	39	25.0
23	21	31.8	13	23.2	8	23.5	42	26.9
24	8	12.1	4	7.1	5	14.7	17	10.9
25	6	9.1	7	12.5	2	5.9	15	9.6
Nationality								
Dutch	34	51.5	36	64.3	20	58.8	90	57.7
German	11	16.7	7	12.5	6	17.6	24	15.4
Other	21	31.8	13	23.2	8	23.5	42	26.9
Religion								
Christian	11	16.7	7	12.5	6	17.6		15.4
Islamic	3	4.5	7	12.5	3	8.8		8.3
Buddhist	2	3.0	-	-	-	-		1.3
Jewish	1	1.5	-	-	-	-		0.6
Humanist	1	1.5	1	1.8	1	2.9		1.9
Non-religious	40	60.6	37	66.1	23	67.6		64.1
Other	6	9.1	2	3.6	-	-		5.1
Prefer not to say	2	3.0	2	3.6	1	2.9		3.2
Highest educational								
Secondary – Vocational (VMBO)	1	1.5	3	5.4	3	8.8	7	4.5
Secondary – Academic (VWO)	1	1.5	1	1.8	2	5.9	4	2.7
Tertiary – Vocational (MBO)	2	3.0	2	3.6	1	2.9	5	3.4
Tertiary – Applied (HBO)	1	1.5	-	-	3	8.8	4	2.7
University Level (WO)	56	84.8	48	85.7	25	73.5	129	86.6
Other	5	7.6	2	3.6	-	-	7	4.5
Transgender Familiarity								
Close relation	23	6	21	37.5	2	4	57	36.5
Public figure	14	16	12	21.4	3	6	37	23.7

Acquaintance		14	60	8	14.3	40	80	27	17.3
No relation		15	18	12	21.4	5	10	32	20.5
Other		-	-	3	5.4	0	0	3	1.9
Previous feeling minority[a]		26	39.4	25	44.6	24	48	69	44.2

Note. $n = 156$ ($n = 66$ for control, $n = 56$ for awareness, and $n = 34$ for inner dialogue). Participants were on average 22.2 years old ($SD = 1.9$).

[a] Reflects the number and percentage of participants answering "yes" to this question.

Group Differences in Tolerance Increase

The average tolerance increase was larger in the awareness condition ($M = 2.79$, $SD = 4.63$) than in the inner dialogue condition ($M = 2.18$, $SD = 4.41$) and larger in both manipulations than in the control condition ($M = 0.77$, $SD = 4.08$). A one-way ANOVA revealed that there was a significant effect of condition on tolerance increase at the $p < .05$ level for the three conditions [$F(2, 153) = 3.40$, $p = .036$] (Table 2). Post hoc comparisons using the Fisher's Least Significant Difference (LSD) test indicated that the mean score for the awareness condition was significantly different from the mean score in the control condition ($M = 0.77$, $SD = 4.08$; $p = .012$, 95% C.I. = [-3.58, -0.45]) (Table 3). However, the inner dialogue condition did not significantly differ from the control ($p = .13$) and awareness ($p = .52$) conditions.

Taken together, these results suggest that the condition in which the participants were placed explains variance in the tolerance increase. Specifically, our results suggest that when respondents were exposed to a condition which stimulates awareness of transgender issues or a condition which stimulates inner dialogue, they respond more tolerant. However, the tolerance increase was significant only in the awareness condition. Inner dialogue does not appear to significantly increase tolerance.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and One-Way Analyses of Variance in Tolerance Increase

Measure	Control		Awareness		Inner Dialogue		$F(2, 153)$	η^2
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Tolerance Increase	0.77	4.08	2.79	4.63	2.18	4.41	3.40[*]	.042

[*]$p < .005$.

Table 3

Result of LSD post-hoc between groups (Multiple Comparisons)

Dependent Variable	(I) Condition	(J) Condition	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Tolerance Increase	Control	Awareness	-2.01*	0.79	.012	-3.58	-0.45
		Inner Dialogue	-1.40	0.92	.129	-3.22	0.41
	Awareness	Control	2.01*	0.79	.012	0.45	3.58
		Inner Dialogue	0.61	0.95	.521	-1.26	2.48
	Inner Dialogue	Control	1.40	0.92	.129	-.041	3.22
		Awareness	-0.61	0.95	.521	-2.48	1.26

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Analysis of Inner Dialogue

Before analysing the inner dialogues, we removed responses of five participants because they did not submit a dialogue. Hence a total of 29 responses ($n = 29$) was included in the analysis. A Mann-Whitney test revealed that tolerance increase was larger in the group that showed *personal engagement*, this difference was significant ($U = 4.00, p = .04$) but that the difference for *reflection* was not significant ($U = 18.5, p = .49$) (Table 4). A Kruskal-Wallis Test revealed that there was no significant difference between the groups for *alliance* ($H (2) = 3.71, p = .16$) (Table 5). These results suggest that personal engagement is related to tolerance increase in inner dialogue, whereas no reliable connection was found between alliance and tolerance increase, nor for reflection and tolerance increase.

Table 4

Summary of Differences Between Dialogue Characteristics (Mann-Whitney U Test)

Characteristic	0 (absent) Mean rank	1 (present) Mean rank	z-value
Personal Engagement	3.50	15.85	-1.99*
Reflection	14.69	19.25	-0.74

*$p < .005$.

Table 5

Summary of Differences Between Dialogue Characteristics (Kruskal-Wallis H Test)

Characteristic	0 (absent)	1 (potential)	2 (achieved)	
	Mean rank	*Mean rank*	*Mean rank*	*H(2)*
Alliance	9.00	14.40	20.00	0.16

*$p < .005$.

Discussion

In this study we investigated whether inner dialogue could increase tolerance and if so, which aspects of inner dialogue (personal engagement, alliance, and reflection) are related to the tolerance increase. In both the awareness and inner dialogue manipulations we observed an increase in tolerance, however the increase in tolerance was only significant in the awareness condition. Simultaneously, there was no significant difference between awareness and inner dialogue. These results therefore cannot yet confirm neither reject our hypothesis that inner dialogue could be an effective facilitator of tolerance. Inner dialogue seems to have potential for increasing tolerance, however, it is necessary to further investigate inner dialogue to explore this potential. Below we share some recommendations for this. In any case, awareness seems to increase tolerance. We further found that personal engagement is related to a positive outcome of inner dialogue (i.e., to tolerance increase). However, no significant connection between tolerance increase and alliance or reflection was found. These findings only partially support our hypothesis that three dialogue characteristics are related to a positive outcome of dialogue. In any case, the idea that friendship (personal engagement) is an important factor is supported. Below we share some possible explanations for these findings considering some limitations.

Limitations and Recommendations

First, due to limitations in sampling methods, the target group is not representative for late adolescents in the Netherlands. Although we reached many late adolescents in their twenties who follow university level education, we did not reach younger adolescents who follow other types of education. Conversely, since the research was conducted online, participants with a wide variety of other demographic variables was reached. In effect, our findings cannot be generalised to a wider population. In the future, close cooperation with secondary and tertiary schools is necessary to distribute the study among Dutch youth. Youth organisations and secondary school teachers showed willingness to distribute the experiment, however, they were limited by time constraints and insufficient follow up. Therefore, cooperation should be initiated sooner and there should be sufficient follow-up to reach the target group.

Second, the short timeframe between the two measures of tolerance may have provided limited opportunities for a change in perspectives to occur. We observed a range of completion time from a few minutes to half an hour among participants, which may be too short for profound changes to occur. Perhaps changes occurred over time after the posttest, this is known as sleeper effects (Kumkale & Albarracín, 2004). Additionally, many participants may have been unfamiliar with the inner dialogue format and may have needed time to get acquainted with it. This may have reduced the effect of the manipulation. This is known as practice effects (Donovan & Radoselich, 1999). It may be useful to investigate the role of sleeper effects and practice effects and adjust the study design

accordingly. For example, by repeating the inner dialogue manipulation, including multiple measures and including a delayed follow-up measure.

Third, there may have been personal or practical barriers to submit a dialogue in the inner dialogue condition, which may have reduced the effect of inner dialogue. A retrospective conversation with one of the participants, after data collection was completed, revealed that the participant did not submit any dialogue because they expected a discrepancy between a hypothetical dialogue and their actual response in real life. Also, some participants submitted 'I prefer not to do that'. This shows that not all participants are willing or confident enough to disclose an inner dialogue. In the future, it could help to understand these barriers and to adjust the design of the inner dialogue exercise accordingly, for example by conducting the research in a controlled setting and inviting participants to give feedback.

Another possible explanation for reduced effectiveness of inner dialogue may be that in its current design Allport's conditions for a positive outcome of inter-group contact (equal group status, common goals, cooperation to obtain common goals, and an established norm of acceptance) were not entirely met. As one of the participants who identifies as transgender aptly pointed out: The inner dialogue condition assumes that the participant is unfamiliar with the presented situation, but this participant *is* familiar with it. The (incorrect) assumption shows a tendency to view the situation from the dominant cisnormative perspective while disregarding views from the perspective of transgender youth, pointing to unequal status of these groups. This illustrates the limitation of cisnormative bias in the current study and shows that not all conditions were met. If these conditions are considered in future designs of the inner dialogue condition, perhaps a positive outcome with regards to tolerance increase is attainable. Additionally, close cooperation with members from the transgender community may help to reduce cisnormative bias.

Another limitation may be that conflicting I-positions were insufficiently invoked, possibly reducing the opportunity to resolve tension and create new perspectives. In the current study we avoided invoking intolerant voices in the inner dialogue condition due to possible negative effects on participants (for example, if transgender participants speak intolerantly towards themselves). Within DST, however, inner dialogue can lead to new perspectives if conflicting I-positions interact and new, hybrid, and mixed identities have a chance to develop (Hermans et al., 2017). A positive outcome is realisable under the conditions that someone 1) knows which I-positions underly conflict, 2) if I-positions exist in the absence of an entirely dominant I-position, 3) when there are open boundaries between positions, and 4) if someone can view the conflict from a meta-position (Meijers & Hermans, 2017). We noticed that there was little reflection in the dialogues, namely only in two out of 29 dialogues. Reflection and perspective taking seem closely connected (Gerace et al., 2017). It is possible that the lack of reflection coincides with a lack of conflicting I-positions, but we did not check which I-positions were invoked so we cannot be certain. In future designs, a check for I-positions could be included to investigate presence of I-positions and their meaning. For example, the

Personal Positioning Repertoire can be used (Hermans, 2001). Alternative conflicting voices, other than (in)tolerant ones, may additionally be explored and invoked in the dialogues, such as independent and mutually dependent, similar and different, and open and closed ones (Young & McKibban, 2014).

Implications and Relevance

Despite these limitations, our findings have several implications for providing an inclusive and safe school environment for transgender youth. Since awareness can increase tolerance, schools may use similar TEDx talks in their curriculum to foster tolerance. In the meantime, the inner dialogue exercise should be optimised and its effects should be investigated further in close cooperation with schools and with the transgender community to explore the potential for its societal use. Inner dialogue in its current form allows youth to practice with interactions with transgender peers, without causing distress for transgender youth in the first phase of physical inter-group contact. However, it must first be confirmed that inner dialogue is effective in increasing tolerance before it can be implemented in interventions at schools. Our findings give insight into possible improvements and suggest that in future designs friendship (personal engagement) can be used as a basis for inner dialogue.

This study is to our knowledge the first one into fostering tolerance towards transgender youth through inner dialogue, expanding research on inner dialogue from intercultural tolerance to tolerance for gender minorities. Although we could not confirm effectiveness of inner dialogue in its current form, our findings offer insight into future directions that may contribute to our understanding of how inner dialogue can lead to new perspectives in the context of gender minority groups.

Future Directions

First, it is worth investigating the added benefit of inner dialogue to awareness. Since we found that awareness of transgender issues could increase tolerance and inner dialogue has potential, possibly there is a serial effect of these components. For example, youth may first become aware of transgender issues which then enables them to engage in inner dialogue between conflicting I-positions. If that is indeed the case, interventions may include both components of raising awareness and components of inner dialogue. Future research could therefore compare the effect of awareness with the effect of both awareness and inner dialogue to investigate a serial effect.

Second, although we did not find support for the importance of alliance in inner dialogue, research on Gay-Straight Alliances (GSAs) continues to support the formation of alliances to improve well-being of LGBT students (Day et al., 2020; Deming et al., 2014). The normalising effect of GSAs has an important positive effect on social and academic experiences of LGBT youth (McCormick et al., 2015). An important aspect of GSAs is the political nature, in which students actively support LGBT peers and show support in their behaviours (Miceli, 2013). However, amount in prejudice

appears to be an important predictor for engaging in ally behaviour (Fingerhut, 2011). Thus, besides an inclusive mindset active support seems necessary to increase well-being of transgender youth. In some of the dialogues we observed that there was a possibility for alliance, but participants did not show active support in the dialogue (i.e., score '1' for alliance). In view of the importance of alliance in the form of active support, it is important to further explore how inner dialogue may contribute to prejudice reduction and specifically what motivates ally behaviour.

It is also worth investigating the dynamic between intolerant and tolerant attitudes and specifically how intolerant attitudes are invoked instead of tolerance. There was a decrease in tolerance for some participants and reasons are unclear. It is possible that drawing attention to LGBT marginalization adversely causes anti-LGBT attitudes among less tolerant individuals. Visibility of LGBT issues and adoption of pro-LGBT rights may be viewed as a symbol of Western neoliberalism and may invoke resistance to LGBT rights to exert resistance to Westen neoliberalism (MacCartney, 2018). Perhaps as a result, a dynamic exists between fostering tolerance and inclusivity on one hand and resistance to fostering inclusivity on the other, whereby attempts at inclusivity broaden the very gap they aim to narrow. In an e-mail response to the invitation to participate in the current study, someone criticised the LGBT inclusive policy of a university for creating "*a climate where politically moderate students and staff are afraid to express themselves in any way or speak out against the indiscriminate policies imposed on them".* The participant called the inclusive policy extremist and critiqued that the university hoists the LGBT flag, comparing it to the Nazi German flag because it excludes people (cis- and heteronormative individuals). However, the LGBT flag represents pride and inclusivity (Sanders, 2018). This shows that the very invitation to participate in a study which draws attention to inclusivity, can invoke an intolerant attitude.

Nonetheless, there is growing polarization of tolerant and intolerant individuals in the context of LGBT issues (Gooch, 2018). In light of the prominent risks for well-being of transgender youth it is important to facilitate acknowledgement of LGBT issues and acceptance of the LGBT community. Bearing in mind the above, we must further investigate how inclusivity can be achieved without invoking anti-LGBT attitudes. Perhaps the study of dialectical thinking, which is the tolerance of apparently contradictory or ambivalent beliefs, offers opportunities to explore this (Hui et al., 2009; Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2010). Dialectical thinkers are hypothesised to be less vulnerable to rigid thinking about social groups and are more open to stereotype change and intercultural adaptation (Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2012). Therefore, it may be valuable to explore how dialectical thinking and the dialogical self are related.

Finally, we suggest distinguishing between 'being tolerated' and 'being respected'. Being tolerated can be negative for the target of tolerance and can pose psychological risks, as it implies that individuals are to some extent limited in their personal freedom by benevolence and conditions of others (Verkuyten et al., 2020). To develop a society where positive regard for transgender youth is the social norm, we should focus on respecting our transgender peers rather than tolerating them in

future research. To foster respect, it may first be necessary to learn from experiences of transgender youth, to focus on their strengths and qualities and the positive change they have brought to society, and we may need to re-evaluate the ever-present societal norms surrounding gender and transness. For example, we may focus on transnormativity as a master narrative approach in future research (Bradford & Syed, 2019). A first step may be to challenge ourselves in what it means to be transgender and how transness is related to us all. As a trans male comedian once asked in a very intriguing exercise: "*Isn't everyone a little trans?*" (Harvie, 2015).

References

Allport, G. W., Clark, K., & Pettigrew, T. (1954). The nature of prejudice.

Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American psychologist*, *55*(5), 469–480. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.469

Baams, L. (2018). Disparities for LGBTQ and gender nonconforming adolescents. *Pediatrics*, *141*(5). https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2017-3004

Baker, C. (2004). The importance of LGBT allies. *PART ONE: INTERRUPTING HETERONORMATIVITY FRAMING THE ISSUES*, 65. Retrieved from: https://graduateschool.syr.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/Interrupting-Heteronormativity-text.pdf

Bradford, N. J., Syed, M. Transnormativity and Transgender Identity Development: A Master Narrative Approach. Sex Roles 81, 306–325 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-018-0992-7

Clark, K. A., & Hughto, J. M. (2020). Development and psychometric evaluation of the Transgender Knowledge, Attitudes, and Beliefs (T-KAB) scale. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, *17*(3), 353-363. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-019-00399-9

Collier, K. L., Bos, H. M., & Sandfort, T. G. (2012). Intergroup contact, attitudes toward homosexuality, and the role of acceptance of gender non-conformity in young adolescents. Journal of adolescence, 35(4), 899-907. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2011.12.010

Compton, D. L., & Bridges, T. (2016). # callmecaitlyn and contemporary trans* visibility. Contexts, 15(1), 84-84. https://doi.org/10.1177/1536504216628852

Crothers, L. M., Kolbert, J. B., Berbary, C., Chatlos, S., Lattanzio, L., Tiberi, A., ... & Meidl, C. (2017). Teachers', LGBTQ students', and student allies' perceptions of bullying of sexually-diverse youth. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, *26*(9), 972-988. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2017.1344344

Cultuur- en Ontspanningscentrum, C. O. C. (2013). LHBTI-kinderen in Nederland. Retrieved from https://www.coc.nl/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/Rapport-LHBTI-kinderen-in-Nederland-2014.pdf

Dankmeier, P. (2017). De wetenschap over respectvol omgaan met seksuele diversiteit op scholen. EduDivers.

Day, J. K., Fish, J. N., Grossman, A. H., & Russell, S. T. (2020). Gay-straight alliances, inclusive policy, and school climate: LGBTQ youths' experiences of social support and bullying. Journal of research on adolescence, 30, 418-430. https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12487

Deese, M. A., & Dawson, B. L. (2013). Changing attitudes toward LGBT students: An analysis of an awareness training paradigm aimed at increasing pro-LGBT attitudes. *Papers & Publications: Interdisciplinary Journal of Undergraduate Research*, *2*(1), 7. Retrieved from:

https://digitalcommons.northgeorgia.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1043&context=papersan
dpubs

Deming, E., Soule, K., Poulsen, N., & Walker, T. (2014). Gay–Straight Alliances Impact on School
Climate and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, or Transgender Student Well-Being. VISTAS Online,
45, 1-9. Retrieved from: https://www.counseling.org/docs/default-
source/vistas/article_45.pdf?sfvrsn=12&sfvrsn=12

Dessel, A., & Rogge, M. E. (2008). Evaluation of intergroup dialogue: A review of the empirical
literature. *Conflict resolution quarterly*, *26*(2), 199-238. https://doi.org/10.1002/crq.230

Donovan, J. J., & Radosevich, D. J. (1999). A meta-analytic review of the distribution of practice
effect: Now you see it, now you don't. Journal of Applied Psychology, 84(5), 795.
https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.5.795

Durwood, L., Eisner, L., Fladeboe, K., Ji, C. G., Barney, S., McLaughlin, K. A., & Olson, K. R.
(2021). Social support and internalizing psychopathology in transgender youth. Journal of
youth and adolescence, 50(5), 841-854. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-020-01391-y

Felten, H., Emmen, M., & Keuzenkamp, S. (2015). Do the right thing. *De plausibiliteit van
interventies voor vergroting van acceptatie van homoseksualiteit. Utrecht: MOVISIE.*
Retrieved from: https://www.movisie.nl/sites/movisie.nl/files/publication-
attachment/Factsheet-conclusies-do-the-right-thing%20%5BMOV-7649630-1.1%5D.pdf

Felten, H., & Boote, M. (2015). Feiten en cijfers op een rij. Movisie. Retrieved from:
https://www.movisie.nl/sites/movisie.nl/files/2019-03/Handreiking%20LHBTI-
Feiten%20en%20Cijfers%202018_0.pdf

Fingerhut, A. W. (2011). Straight Allies: What Predicts Heterosexuals' Alliance With the LGBT
Community? 1. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 41(9), 2230-2248.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00807.x

Fish, J. N., Baams, L., & McGuire, J. K. (2020). Sexual and gender minority mental health among
children and youth. In *The Oxford handbook of sexual and gender minority mental health* (pp.
229-244). Oxford University Press.

Formby, E. (2015). Limitations of focussing on homophobic, biphobic and transphobic 'bullying'to
understand and address LGBT young people's experiences within and beyond school. *Sex
Education*, *15*(6), 626-640. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2015.1054024

Gerace, A., Day, A., Casey, S., & Mohr, P. (2017). 'I think, you think': Understanding the importance
of self-reflection to the taking of another person's perspective. Journal of Relationships
Research, 8. https://doi.org/10.1017/jrr.2017.8

Gillig, T. K., Rosenthal, E. L., Murphy, S. T., & Folb, K. L. (2018). More than a media moment: The
influence of televised storylines on viewers' attitudes toward transgender people and policies.
Sex Roles, 78(7), 515-527. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-017-0816-1

Griffin, P., & Ouellett, M. (2003). From silence to safety and beyond: Historical trends in addressing lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender issues in K-12 schools. *Equity &Excellence in Education*, *36*(2), 106-114. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665680303508

Gooch, D. M. (2018). From Consensus to Conflict: Political Polarization, the Culture War, and Gay Rights. In American Political Parties Under Pressure (pp. 77-120). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Gudergan, S. P. (2007). Alliances. *The Blackwell encyclopedia of sociology*. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405165518.wbeosa042

Harper, G. W., & Schneider, M. (2003). Oppression and discrimination among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered people and communities: A challenge for community psychology. *American journal of community psychology*, *31*(3), 243-252. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023906620085

Harvie, I. (2015, December 15). *Everyone Is Trans* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0YeVt2kp_So

Hermans, H. J. (2001). The construction of a personal position repertoire: Method and practice. Culture & Psychology, 7(3), 323-366. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X0173005

Hermans, H. J. (2014). Self as a society of I-positions: A dialogical approach to counseling. *The Journal of Humanistic Counseling*, *53*(2), 134-159. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1939.2014.00054.x

Hermans, H.J.M. (2018). *Society in the self: A theory of identity in democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hermans, H. J., Konopka, A., Oosterwegel, A., & Zomer, P. (2017). Fields of tension in a boundary-crossing world: Towards a democratic organization of the self. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, *51*(4), 505-535. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-016-9370-6

Higa, D., Hoppe, M. J., Lindhorst, T., Mincer, S., Beadnell, B., Morrison, D. M., ... & Mountz, S. (2014). Negative and positive factors associated with the well-being of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and questioning (LGBTQ) youth. Youth & society, 46(5), 663-687.

Hong, J. S., & Espelage, D. L. (2012). A review of research on bullying and peer victimization in school: An ecological system analysis. Aggression and violent behavior, 17(4), 311-322. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.03.003

Hui, C. M., Fok, H. K., & Bond, M. H. (2009). Who feels more ambivalence? Linking dialectical thinking to mixed emotions. Personality and Individual Differences, 46(4), 493-498. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.11.022

Imperato, C., & Mancini, T. (2021). Intergroup Dialogues in the Landscape of Digital Societies: How Does the Dialogical Self Affect Intercultural Relations in Online Contexts?. *Societies*, *11*(3), 84. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc11030084

Jackson, S. J., Bailey, M., & Foucault Welles, B. (2018). # GirlsLikeUs: Trans advocacy and community building online. *New Media & Society*, *20*(5), 1868-1888. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444817709276

Johansen, J. (2021). *Effects of Queer-Theory-Driven Online-Video LGBTQ Awareness Training on Employed Individuals' Attitudes Toward LGBTQ Issues* (Doctoral dissertation, Keiser University).

Johns, M. M., Lowry, R., Andrzejewski, J., Barrios, L. C., Demissie, Z., McManus, T., ... & Underwood, J. M. (2019). Transgender identity and experiences of violence victimization, substance use, suicide risk, and sexual risk behaviors among high school students—19 states and large urban school districts, 2017. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, *68*(3), 67. http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6803a3

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of management journal*, *33*(4), 692-724. https://doi.org/10.5465/256287

Kennisplatform Integratie & Samenleving, (2020). BIJ, W. W. HET VERMINDEREN VAN DISCRIMINATIE. Retrieved from: https://www.kis.nl/sites/default/files/wat-werkt-bij-het-verminderen-van-discriminatie-def_0.pdf

Kite, M. E., & Bryant-Lees, K. B. (2016). Historical and contemporary attitudes toward homosexuality. Teaching of Psychology, 43(2), 164-170. https://doi.org/10.1177/0098628316636297

Kumkale, G. T., & Albarracín, D. (2004). The sleeper effect in persuasion: a meta-analytic review. Psychological bulletin, 130(1), 143. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.130.1.143

Kuyper, L. (2012). Transgenders in Nederland: prevalentie en attitudes. *Tijdschrift voor Seksuologie*, *36*(2), 129-135. Retrieved from: https://www.seksonderzoek.be/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Seksuele_gezondheid_in_Nederland_2011.pdf#page=50

Kuyper, L. (2017). Transgender personen in Nederland. Retrieved from: https://repository.scp.nl/bitstream/handle/publications/172/Transgender%2bpersonen%2bin%2bNederland.pdf?

Liu, R. T., Sheehan, A. E., Walsh, R. F., Sanzari, C. M., Cheek, S. M., & Hernandez, E. M. (2019). Prevalence and correlates of non-suicidal self-injury among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical psychology review*, *74*, 101783. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2019.101783

MacCartney, D. (2018). The global-local tension of LGBT rights. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12142-017-0485-z

MacInnis, C. C., & Page-Gould, E. (2015). How can intergroup interaction be bad if intergroup contact is good? Exploring and reconciling an apparent paradox in the science of intergroup

relations. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *10*(3), 307-327.
https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614568482

Markopoulou, K. (2021). *The association between inner dialogue and tolerance towards refugees* [Bachelor Thesis, Utrecht University].

Martino, W., Kassen, J., & Omercajic, K. (2020). Supporting transgender students in schools: Beyond an individualist approach to trans inclusion in the education system. Educational Review, 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2020.1829559

McClain, L. C. (2020). Bigotry, Civility, and Reinvigorating Civic Education: Government's Formative Task Amidst Polarization. The Role of Law in Character Formation, Moral Education, and the Communication of Values in Late Modern Pluralistic Societies (Leipzig: EVA Publishers, 2020, Forthcoming), Boston Univ. School of Law, Public Law Research Paper, (20-9). http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3547533

McCormick, A., Schmidt, K., & Clifton, E. (2015). Gay–straight alliances: Understanding their impact on the academic and social experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and questioning high school students. Children & Schools, 37(2), 71-77. https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/cdu028

McHugh, M. L. (2012). Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. Biochemia medica, 22(3), 276-282. https://doi.org/10.11613/BM.2012.031

McHugh, L., & Stewart, I. (2012). The self and perspective taking: Contributions and applications from modern behavioral science. New Harbinger Publications.

McQueen, K. (2006). Breaking the gender dichotomy: The case for transgender education in school curriculum. *Teachers College Record*. Retrieved from: https://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=12663

Meijers, F., & Hermans, H. (Eds.). (2017). The dialogical self theory in education: A multicultural perspective (Vol. 5). Springer.

Miceli, M. (2013). Standing out, standing together: The social and political impact of gay-straight alliances. Routledge.

Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap, 2015. Retrieved from https://www.onderwijsinspectie.nl/onderwerpen/sociale-veiligheid/zorgplicht-veiligheid-leerlingen

Myers, W., Turanovic, J. J., Lloyd, K. M., & Pratt, T. C. (2020). The victimization of LGBTQ students at school: A meta-analysis. *Journal of school violence*, *19*(4), 421-432. https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2020.1725530

Nadal, K. L. (2019). A decade of microaggression research and LGBTQ communities: An introduction to the special issue. *Journal of homosexuality*, *66*(10), 1309-1316. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2018.1539582

Nagda, B. A., Yeakley, A., Gurin, P., & Sorensen, N. (2012). Intergroup dialogue: A critical-dialogic model for conflict engagement. *The Oxford handbook of intergroup conflict*, 210-228.

Nguyen, Q. D., Fernandez, N., Karsenti, T., & Charlin, B. (2014). What is reflection? A conceptual analysis of major definitions and a proposal of a five-component model. *Medical education*, *48*(12), 1176-1189. https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.12583

Payne, E., & Smith, M. (2013). LGBTQ kids, school safety, and missing the big picture: How the dominant bullying discourse prevents school professionals from thinking about systemic marginalization or… why we need to rethink LGBTQ bullying. *QED: A journal in GLBTQ worldmaking*, 1-36. https://doi.org/10.14321/qed.0001

Petta, K., Smith, R., Chaseling, M., & Markopoulos, C. (2019). Generative dialogue: A concept analysis. *Management in Education*, *33*(2), 53-61. https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020618780978

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual review of psychology*, *49*(1), 65-85. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Thomas-Pettigrew/publication/5282610_Intergroup_Contact_Theory/links/0912f51046c6dac2f1000000/Intergroup-Contact-Theory.pdf

Pettigrew, T. F. (2009). Secondary transfer effect of contact: Do intergroup contact effects spread to noncontacted outgroups?. *Social Psychology*, *40*(2), 55-65. https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335.40.2.55

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *90*(5), 751. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751

Robinson, J. P., & Espelage, D. L. (2011). Inequities in educational and psychological outcomes between LGBTQ and straight students in middle and high school. *Educational researcher*, *40*(7), 315-330. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X11422112

Russell, S. T., & McGuire, J. K. (2008). The school climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) students. *Toward positive youth development: Transforming schools and community programs*, 133-149. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195327892.003.0008

Sanders, R. (2018). *Pride: The story of Harvey Milk and the rainbow flag*. Random House Books for Young Readers.

Selman, R. L. (1975). Level of social perspective taking and the development of empathy in children: Speculations from a Social-Cognitive viewpoint. Journal of Moral Education, 5(1), 35-43. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305724750050105

Spencer-Rodgers, J., Williams, M. J., & Peng, K. (2010). Cultural differences in expectations of change and tolerance for contradiction: A decade of empirical research. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 14(3), 296-312. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868310362982

Spencer-Rodgers, J., Williams, M. J., & Peng, K. (2012). Culturally based lay beliefs as a tool for understanding intergroup and intercultural relations. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 36(2), 169-178.

Stone, A. L. (2009). More than adding a T: American lesbian and gay activists' attitudes towards transgender inclusion. *Sexualities*, *12*(3), 334-354. https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460709103894

Stückelberger, C. (2009). Dialogue ethics: Ethical criteria and conditions for a successful dialogue between companies and societal actors. *Journal of business ethics*, *84*(3), 329-339. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0201-2

Surace, T., Fusar-Poli, L., Vozza, L., Cavone, V., Arcidiacono, C., Mammano, R., ... & Aguglia, E. (2021). Lifetime prevalence of suicidal ideation and suicidal behaviors in gender non-conforming youths: a meta-analysis. *European child & adolescent psychiatry*, *30*(8), 1147-1161. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-020-01508-5

Tankersley, A. P., Grafsky, E. L., Dike, J., & Jones, R. T. (2021). Risk and Resilience Factors for Mental Health among Transgender and Gender Nonconforming (TGNC) Youth: A Systematic Review. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-021-00344-6

Thio, S., Bos, H., Wormgoor, T., & Kaufmann, R. (2015). Ervaren stigmatisering onder transgenderjongeren in Nederland. *Pedagogiek*, *35*(2), 110-127. https://doi.org/10.5117/PED2015.2.THIO

Thornton, S., Green, B., & Benn, E. (2019). Friends and allies: LGBT+ inclusion in statistics and data science. *Significance*, *16*(3), 39-41. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-9713.2019.01280.x

Verkuyten, M., Yogeeswaran, K., & Adelman, L. (2020). The negative implications of being tolerated: Tolerance from the target's perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *15*(3), 544-561. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619897974

Wagaman, M. A., Obejero, R. C., & Gregory, J. S. (2018). Countering the norm,(re) authoring our lives: The promise counterstorytelling holds as a research methodology with LGBTQ youth and beyond. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 17(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406918800646

Walch, S. E., Sinkkanen, K. A., Swain, E. M., Francisco, J., Breaux, C. A., & Sjoberg, M. D. (2012). Using intergroup contact theory to reduce stigma against transgender individuals: Impact of a transgender speaker panel presentation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *42*(10), 2583-2605. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00955.x

Witenberg, R. T. (2007). The moral dimension of children's and adolescents' conceptualisation of tolerance to human diversity. *Journal of Moral Education*, *36*(4), 433-451. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240701688002

Witenberg, R. T. (2019). *The psychology of tolerance: Conception and development*. Singapore: Springer.

Young, S. L., & McKibban, A. R. (2014). Creating safe places: A collaborative autoethnography on LGBT social activism. Sexuality & Culture, 18(2), 361-384. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-013-9202-5

Zúñiga, X., & Nagda, B. A. (2001). Design considerations in intergroup dialogue. *Intergroup dialogue: Deliberative democracy in school, college, community and workplace*, *306*, 327.